R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 850 AC 001 218

A CRITICAL BALANCE, HISTORY OF CSLEA.

BY- WHIPPLE, JAMES B.
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUC. FOR ADULTS

REPORT NUMBER 55 PUB DATE MAY 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.60 65P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, *HISTORICAL REVIEWS, *ADULT EDUCATION, *GENERAL EDUCATION, *PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, EVENING COLLEGES, UNIVERSITY EXTENSION, FINANCIAL SUPPORT, UNIVERSITIES, PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, INNOVATION, GROUP DISCUSSION, ADULT LEARNING, HIGHER EDUCATION, LEADERSHIP TRAINING, EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, PROGRAM CONTENT, BOSTON UNIVERSITY, FUND FOR ADULT EDUCATION, CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS,

THE CHANGING CHARACTER OF THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS (CSLEA) FROM 1950-1966 AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF CSLEA TO THE FUND FOR ADULT EDUCATION (FAE) THROUGH THE YEARS ARE STRESSED IN THIS HISTORY. DURING THE FIRST PHASE (1951-1955), THE CENTER'S ROLE WAS REFLECTIVE--IT STUDIED ADULT NEEDS AND ENCOURAGED LIBERAL ADULT EDUCATION CLASSES, COMMUNITY PROGRAMS, AND PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP. DURING THE SECOND PHASE (1956-1961) AN OPERATIONAL ROLE WAS ADDED, IN WHICH RESEARCH, PUBLICATION, INNOVATION AND FIELD WORK, AND CONSULTATION WERE CARRIED ON. WITH THE DISSOLUTION OF THE FAE IN 1961, THE CENTER FACED BUDGET AND INCREASED ANTI-LIBERAL PRESSURES. IT BECAME AFFILIATED WITH BOSTON UNIVERSITY IN 1964. THE PRESENT ROLE OF CSLEA IS MAINLY OPERATIONAL, MORE "NON-LIBERAL," AND MORE PREOCCUPIED WITH THE INSTRUMENTS OF HIGHER ADULT EDUCATION SUCH AS THE NEGRO COLLEGE PROJECT. AN ATTEMPT IS BEING MADE TO ACHIEVE A NEW BALANCE BETWEEN THE REFLECTIVE AND OPERATIONAL ROLES. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS, 138 MOUNTFORT ST., BROOKLINE, MASSACHUSETTS 02146, FOR $1.50. (PT)

NOTES AND ESSAYS ON EDUCATION FOR ADULTS 55

A CRITICAL BALANCE

History of CSLEA

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**

CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Center publications on education of adults include the *Notes and Essays* series examining purposes and philosophy, *Reports* on methods and practices in the field, *Research Reports*, and *Occasional Papers*.

For a complete list and prices write:

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY
138 Mountfort St.
Brookline, Mass. 02146

$1.50

A CRITICAL BALANCE

History of CSLEA

JAMES B. WHIPPLE
Associate Director
Center for The Study of Liberal Education for Adults

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**
at Boston University

THE CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS** was established in 1951 by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with universities seeking to initiate or improve programs of liberal education for adults. In 1964 CSLEA affiliated with Boston University. The purpose of the Center is to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

PREFACE

Two characteristics that distinguish the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults are its concern for higher liberal education for Adults and its quasi-independence. The Center was established because a group of deans from the Association of University Evening Colleges believed evening colleges needed help in developing more effective programs of liberal education. Originally proposed as a specific project, it soon became apparent that there was here a continuing task. For although practically everyone in American society favors liberal education, few do anything about it. In John B. Schwertman's words, there is a strong anti-liberal spirit abroad. The Center's role has been to support the university's efforts to maintain and strengthen the important liberal aspect of continuing education in the hostile or, at best, apathetic environment. CSLEA does this from the quasi-independent position it was given at its birth—working outside, but for, the university. Thus, although CSLEA is an independent organization, it is also dependent on the universities. Unrelated to the institutions actually providing continuing education, the Center's program would have little meaning.

To show why and how CSLEA, as this quasi-independent agency concerned with the development of liberal adult education, has dealt with its continuing task is the essential purpose of this institutional history. It attempts to understand how the Center has seen its role in the context of the environment, both inside and outside the university.

For the most part this history is a story without people. If this seems too much of a contradiction in terms, perhaps it would be more accurate to say it is a history without people named, because people act between and behind almost every line. The impersonality is dictated by the still limited perspective. We are too close for making historical judgments on actions of persons still alive and active in the field. This point is particularly telling when one of the actors is the author.

Historically speaking, fifteen years is not a very long period, and

certainly the interpretation will be modified as the years go by. Nevertheless, from this perspective, it is possible to identify changes in the field of higher adult education and in the way CSLEA has operated. This history is organized therefore into three phases, each of which appears to have distinctive characteristics. During the first phase (1951-55), the Center's major emphasis was on study and reflection, and, by the end of the period, the study had enabled the staff to identify a number of tasks related to the development of more effective liberal education for adults. This led to a second phase (1956-1961) as the Center attempted to work at these tasks. During these middle years, the Center program took on an operational dimension. But the operation was in addition to, not in place of, study, and the staff was able to achieve a balance between operation and reflection. Since 1962, in the third and present phase, a number of factors have tended to upset the balance, and the present period represents a search for a new synthesis which will enable the Center to continue to develop and strengthen higher liberal education for adults.

I have written the history of the Center for three reasons. First, I hope it may be useful as a study of the ways in which a center-type agency (CSLEA) has operated to stimulate and help other institutions (the universities) to work toward goals established by the agency—in this case to work toward more effective liberal education for adults. Second, I hope the history will provide insights into the situations faced by the universities and CSLEA as they have attempted to develop liberal adult education. Finally, I hope the history will underline the vital need for liberal education and point up some of the obstacles to its effective development.

In writing the history, I have received advice and assistance from both Board and staff of CSLEA. But it should be made very clear that this is not an official history and carries no formal endorsement by staff or Board of Directors. Every historian brings his own biases to his study of the past, and it is unlikely that any two would interpret the evidence in exactly the same way. This interpretation is mine.

J. B. W.

May, 1967

CONTENTS

I. BEGINNINGS: 1950-1956

1

By 1950 the "G.I. bulge" was on the wane, but the veterans had left a significant imprint on higher adult education.[1] They had gone to the evening colleges by the thousands, and the booming enrollments which resulted had transformed a relatively small operation into big university business. Not only did older evening colleges grow, but many new ones entered the field.[2]

But the impact of the veterans was not limited to size and extent alone; it also affected the nature of the education involved. By and large, the veterans accentuated the characterization of the adult student as a "man on the make." Because they had postponed both personal and vocational ambitions, they were hard-headed and practical about those educational objectives which led toward immediate advantages. They went to school day and evening, year-round, to get an education which was personified by a degree. They helped upset the classical, ivy-league image of the leisurely, well-rounded liberal education as a foundation for vocational and personal success. Their most pressing objective was vocational, and in overwhelming numbers they worked toward a business school degree. This did not imply a rejection of the liberal arts. If they thought about it at all, they accepted the liberal arts for the conventional reasons—the liberal arts increased one's ability to deal with vocational as well as personal or social problems.

The veterans were apt to find the evening college a congenial place to study. It existed in cities and thus permitted the adult to work and

---

1. The veterans left a significant imprint on all higher education, but in this history we are concerned with their impact on university adult education.

2. Membership of the Association of University Evening Colleges increased from 33 charter members in 1939 to 92 in 1950; although this threefold growth is not entirely explained by the G.I.'s, they certainly played a significant part in it.

study at the same time. Measured by both age and experience, the student body was more mature. Finally, the evening college attitude toward education tended to be immediate, practical, and overwhelmingly vocational. The director, understanding the needs and objectives of his students, was vigorous in trying to develop a program for them, often fighting with his daytime colleagues for the privilege to do so.

Interdivisional university debate over the position of the evening college was heated. Perhaps the most crucial issue centered on credit. The offering of credit and degrees in part catered to student demand for academic currency, but it was more than that. The directors needed the currency for their own purposes. Credit meant academic respectability; non-credit spelled watered-down, non-university education. Unhappily for the evening college, however, the credit route led to other problems related to standards. It made it difficult to modify the daytime curriculum in any way whatsoever in order to adjust to adult students. And even the director, who was willing to let the day school call the tune, found his program under fire over the question of inferior quality of day school courses offered at night. At the time, the debate was less acute with business schools. They too were striving for academic respectability and were practical and experimental in outlook. But by and large, the arts and science faculties were rigidly opposed to the evening college pretensions toward equality, and this opposition undoubtedly contributed to the halting growth of liberal adult education.

Probably the strongest card in the director's hand was financial solvency. He paid his own way and probably made money for his university. Thus the kind of students in his college and their place in the university financial picture combined to make the director operate as a kind of entrepreneur by bringing the resources of the university to bear on the special needs of adults and by employing the techniques of the business community—techniques that included product development as well as promotion and sales—to make his operation pay. The educational product was heavily vocational because that was what sold. Writing in 1953, John B. Schwertman described the evening college as "pragmatic" and "utilitarian," and summarized adult education as a growing movement which, "while not anti-liberal, . . . was largely non-liberal in nature."[3]

3. CSLEA: Third Interim Report, "The University Evening College

Of course the emphasis on the utilitarian was not merely a reflection of the urgent demands of adult students. The non-liberal spirit has been a dominant thread running through American history. Alexis de Tocqueville was probably the first careful observer to note the practical strain. He emphasized our taste for physical well-being: "To satisfy the least wants of the body and to provide the littlest conveniences of life is uppermost in every mind." He saw Americans as men of action who were more addicted to practical than theoretical science—they "not only seldom indulge in meditation, but they naturally entertain little esteem for it." It was not that Americans were indifferent to science, literature, and the arts, but they cultivated them after their own fashion and brought to the task their own peculiar qualifications and differences.[4]

A few decades later, Ralph Waldo Emerson agreed with De Tocqueville, writing even more bluntly:

> The horseman serves the horse,
> The neathered serves the neat,
> The merchant serves his purse,
> The eater serves his meat;
> 'Tis the day of the chattel,
> Web to weave and corn to grind;
> Things are in the saddle,
> And ride mankind.[5]

Developments of the twentieth century—the machine technology and the electronic technology—have tended to nurture a drive toward more and more specialization directed toward practical purposes and to solidify the non-liberal spirit in American life.

The trend toward specialization, coupled with the increased pressures on the evening college, tended to augment the position of adult education. In this connection, one significant development in 1950 was the transformation of the Ford Foundation from a small, Michigan-oriented operation into America's largest philanthropic organization. It was destined to make significant contributions to liberal education for both young and old. In 1949 a study committee had made a report and recommenda-

---

and Adult Education," May 15, 1953 (mimeographed), p. 3.

The terms liberal, non-liberal, and anti-liberal, as used in the present study, will be described more fully in Chapter II.

4. Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, edited by Phillips Bradley (New York: Vintage Books, 1945), Vol. II, pp. 41-136 passim.

5. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Ode Inscribed to W. H. Channing."

tions to the Foundation. According to Hartley Grattan, one of the major points emphasized the need for "education for a democratic society." The report talked about the "high degree of public apathy." It pointed out that an "important function of our schools that is largely disregarded is education for the adult population."[6] The Fund for Adult Education (FAE) was established as a foundation-operating agency and "assigned that part of the total educational process which begins where schooling is finished." And, according to Grattan, it was only to be expected that the Fund's emphasis should include "liberal, value-creating adult education."[7]

Although the dominant note in the evening college was non-liberal, liberal arts were still part of the scene. They were included in vocational curricula. Some students sought the bachelor of arts degree, and many studied individual liberal arts credit courses for personal or vocational reasons but with no plan to earn a degree. There was a small number of evening colleges with strong experimental non-credit programs of liberal education. Many evening college directors were uneasy about the lack of liberal education in their programs. Many of them had emerged from one or another liberal arts discipline, and probably all directors recognized that strength in arts and sciences could bring prestige from conservative campus colleagues. For whatever reason, there was a genuine desire to do more—if only they could make it pay. Unlike their counterparts in the commercial world, the directors did not have risk capital for experimental and developmental phases. When FAE began to mount programs in liberal adult education and to emphasize education through discussion guides and other mass media, it is not surprising that the Committee on Liberal Education of the Association of University Evening Colleges (AUEC) appeared with a proposal.[8]

---

6. C. Hartley Grattan, In Quest of Knowledge: A Perspective on Adult Education (New York: Association Press, 1955), p. 294.

7. Ibid., pp. 296-97.

8. The original idea was developed by Harlan Blake, Assistant Dean at the University of Chicago's University College. He saw it as a way to exploit FAE biases to obtain money for the Basic Program and other university liberal education programs. When it became apparent that the Fund would not underwrite such a program at a single university, Blake found support within AUEC for the multi-university sponsorship. Others from AUEC who played an important part in developing the proposal were John Barden from Western Reserve University and Francis H. Horn from The Johns Hopkins University.

The proposal for a two-year grant at $80,000 a year made special appeal to FAE biases in favor of liberal adult education. According to the proposal, the basic problems facing the evening college were: (1) inadequate material for both "short courses and long-term programs in the liberal arts which can be introduced into the programs of evening colleges and other adult education agencies"; (2) the need for a systematic study of the discussion method and the training of discussion leaders; (3) the need for a systematic investigation of the organizational factors which make for success in community programs; and (4) inadequate development of ways for "organizing adult liberal education programs to minimize financial loss connected with them." The barriers, the proposal stated, were the lack of staff and funds to undertake the rigorous study and experimentation needed to launch liberal education programs. This was to be the task for a new Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.[9] Although FAE's major emphasis at this time was on the creation of new institutions for adult education, the Fund board awarded the grant to establish CSLEA. John Diekhoff, a Milton scholar, was appointed director, and offices were established in 1951 on the campus of the University of Chicago.

The proposal's simple diagnosis and simple prescription were a long way from reality. As one staff member put it in December, 1954, the proposal "reads sort of quaintly at this distance."[10] Actually the founders of CSLEA were not quite as naive as the document implied. Even before the Center staff came to work, Diekhoff was telling the FAE staff that the Center must study the field of adult education and work on the "improvement of teaching," a term that was much broader than the proposal's reference to the discussion method.[11] Objectives were de-

---

9. See Proposal for a Center for the Study of Adult Liberal Education, undated (mimeographed). See also James B. Whipple, Original Proposal to Establish the Center (memorandum to the staff), January 26, 1955, for an analysis of the proposal and early attempts to implement its objectives. Additional evidence and a somewhat longer perspective make the analysis appear oversimplified; by and large, however, it is essentially valid and was generally accepted as a reasonable interpretation by the Center staff in 1955. In the latter connection it is an interesting reflection of staff attitudes at the time.

10. Whipple, op. cit., p. 5.

11. R. E. Pettengill, The Center for Adult Education: Memorandum of a Meeting of Board of Directors with Representatives of FAE, May 14, 1951 (CSLEA files).

fined in a preliminary report to the Fund on September 11, 1951, stating that the "Center proposes among other things, to attempt: (a) to find out what is being done in the evening colleges; (b) to develop programs of liberal education suitable for adults in evening colleges; (c) to explore means of improving instruction; (d) to investigate ways of solving problems of enrolment and budget in the evening colleges."[12]

Nevertheless, the first major effort of the Center was directed toward the production of discussion guides for evening college liberal education programs. Subjects selected for the first courses reflected the disciplines represented on the staff: literature, social psychology, history, and philosophy.[13] Once completed, the guides were taken to the field. Public statements by Diekhoff spoke of encouraging responses at ten universities. But he was putting his best foot forward in an unhappy situation—the reception of the guides can only be described as a total flop.[14] This was in 1952; during succeeding months additional courses were produced. In every case they were interesting and excellent experiments in liberal education for adults, but none succeeded in bringing liberal adult education to the evening college.

The Center never carried out the complete plan with respect to development of discussion guides as outlined in the original proposal. Instructors for pilot programs, provided for in the original budget, were not employed. Nothing was done to deal with the budgetary problem, and only superficial evaluations were attempted. Instead, the Center simply

---

12. John S. Diekhoff, Report of Progress (memorandum to FAE), September 11, 1951 (manuscript in CSLEA files). Similar statements of objectives appear in an address by Diekhoff to a Section Meeting on Evening Colleges and Extension Classes, NUEA, Bend, Oregon, July 23-24, 1951 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

13. The first discussion guides were R. F. W. Smith, Themes and Variations: An Invitation to Literature; Harry L. Miller, Understanding Group Behavior; Richard Storr, The American Tradition; and Leonard K. Olsen, Analytical Reading.

14. A year later, John Schwertman was still trying to make a case for the guides, but it was not very impressive. According to his figures for the spring of 1952, the guides were being used by 10 institutions, 18 instructors, and 355 students. By fall there were 13 institutions, 20 instructors, and 408 students. In the spring of 1953, he boasted of 85 institutions, 154 instructors, but significantly, only 140 students. The guides had been passed out at faculty seminars, and Schwertman hoped this would result in greater use. However, this did not happen. See CSLEA: Third Interim Report, p. 4.

offered the courses to the evening colleges and left them to their own devices.

Nevertheless, there were many reasons why the project was doomed to fail. First, the directors were not poised at the barriers willing or able to gamble on these particular courses. Significantly, even the directors who had been instrumental in creating the Center were reluctant dragons. At Cleveland College, to take one striking example, there was no genuine effort to make the experiment go.[15]

Second, there was the evening college orientation toward credit. As far as the Center was concerned the courses were college level and could be used in a credit or non-credit program. But the evening college was not ready to use them as credit courses. They simply did not fulfill the requirements of the regular departments. The situation was well summarized by a professor of English who commented on Smith's Invitation to Literature. "The fundamental question," he wrote,

> is whether the course is intended to introduce men and women to literature, or whether the literature in the title is just a cultural "come-on" to attract adults to a pleasant evening where each one can air his own private opinions. . . . It would be a pleasant evening, to air one's views and argu with the insurance man about the Faustian man. . . . But this is not an introductory course in literature. On the other hand, if the "theme" notion is simply a way to get started and to get the adults to read literature, and the final aim is to understand Othello and the rest as literature, then it seems to me that far more extensive materials are needed in the discussion manual.[16]

Third, as this comment eloquently reflects, faculty were unsympathetic. They tended to resist discussion methods, the tampering with content, and the whole idea of telling a professor what and how to teach. Neither the evening college dean nor the Center was in a position to produce an "educated" faculty. So the guides merely underscored the need for long-range faculty education.

Fourth, the guides were unsuccessful because the Center had not developed an adequate definition of liberal education for adults. The guides dealt with method especially for adults, and, at least in the Miller and Smith courses, there was an attempt to present content in terms of adult

---

15. See Whipple, op. cit., for further description of the treatment of the experimental courses at Cleveland College.

16. As quoted in James B. Whipple, Especially for Adults (Chicago: CSLEA, 1957), p. 45.

experience. But a classical definition and prescription of liberal education remained. The proposal had stated as a given proposition that

> liberal education is designed to free the mind, to develop mental capacities, to excite the imaginative powers, and thus it is not an informational program; and that liberal education is not to be confused with vocational training. People have to earn a living, but liberal education is not supposed to teach them how. Liberal education should, however, make the student better equipped to solve both theoretical and practical problems, and thus make him more capable of living a good and creative life.[17]

Such a proposition assumed that there were certain basic qualities in the study of the liberal arts which provided the individual, young or old, with skills or understandings that would help resolve a wide range of personal, social, or vocational problems. In other words, the adult interest or need was oriented to the liberal arts rather than the other way around. If the Center had undertaken to study ways to promote and finance liberal adult education, as originally proposed, it might have discovered that one reason why the guides failed was that the approach to content was too pure.

2

According to the original proposal, if the Center were to continue beyond two years, it might want to redefine its objectives. As already noted, the redefinition began even before the first staff reported for work. From the outset there was continuing discussion of the meaning of liberal education. And certainly there was much to be learned about the precise nature of the evening college. "Since its foundation," wrote John Diekhoff, "the Center for the Study of Liberal Education has had responsibility for finding out what is going on in the evening colleges."[18] But the failure of the guides must have hastened the decision to look more carefully at the field and plan new directions. In February, 1952, the Center Board authorized a study "to obtain data useful in defining areas in which the Center might work most fruitfully with liberal arts programs in the future."[19]

The study, published as Patterns of Liberal Education in the Evening College, was based on "a great deal of observation and relatively unstruc-

---

17. Proposal for a Center for the Study of Adult Liberal Education, pp. 4-5.

18. Patterns of Liberal Education in the Evening College: A Study of Nine Institutions (Chicago: CSLEA, 1952), p. iii.

19. Ibid.

tured interviewing" at nine institutions. "The objective was not to get quantitative data, but to get the greatest possible range of viewpoints and problems." It provided the staff with many clues for redefinition of purpose.[20]

The conclusions of the study centered on eight problem areas.[21] First, there was the question of identity: "The evening college must decide . . . what it wants to be." This called for careful consideration of the relationship to the rest of the university on the one hand and to the adult education movement on the other.

Second, evening colleges were not free agents. Activities were determined in part by persons "who are not primarily concerned with evening education." This was particularly a problem with evening faculty where frequently there were "discrepancies between their views of methods and aims and the views of directors." Therefore it was necessary to define the relationship between the evening college and the rest of the university in terms clearly understood and accepted by both administration and faculty.

Third, there was, for the most part, no sense of evening college academic community. This "geographical and psychological separation" meant that teachers had limited opportunity or motivation to communicate about common issues with each other, the evening college staff, or the adult students.[22] The report emphasized the "need to achieve a unified and interested faculty, informed about its own activities and about the relevant needs and attitudes of administration and students."

Fourth, commenting on the worry about enrollment and the need of the evening college to be self-supporting, the report pointed out that "if a program is to attract students, it must promise satisfaction of some want or need." Furthermore, there had to be some reasonable probability tnat the promise could be fulfilled. Although for the most part the adult students were "on the make," they were not exclusively "vocation-minded." They saw liberal arts as a route to realization of themselves

---

20. Ibid. The research report holds up well after fourteen years; many of its findings still have a familiar ring.

21. Ibid. Summary and quotations are from pp. 66-72, passim.

22. The separation was geographical in that the evening college frequently operated on off-campus locations.

and their place in society. However, it was still necessary to adapt liberal arts courses to the special needs of adults. This required cooperation from faculty who had to be willing to experiment with content and from administration who had to be willing to underwrite the costs of experimentation.

Fifth, the ability to keep students depended not only on the need for content especially for adults, but on methods used in the classroom. The staff report did not argue for one "best" method of teaching but for experimentation. As with revisions of content, experimentation in method could only take place with a cooperative faculty.

Sixth, evening college curricula tended to be adaptations of the regular undergraduate degree programs. Granting that it was a real contribution of the evening college to provide an opportunity to earn the regular degree, the report argued that there was also a need to develop an adult curriculum which would meet two demands: It should have real substance as liberal education, and it should have "prestige in the marketplace of employment." Again, this could not be accomplished without faculty cooperation and financial support from the university administration. Behind this conclusion lay the ever-present issues of standards and credit. "Problems arise," the report noted, "(1) when the day course or day practice is not found entirely suitable for evening classes and (2) when modifications to make it more appropriate to evening teaching go beyond the limits of the day instructor's idea of respectability."[23]

Seventh, the report challenged the pay-as-you-go principle underlying the evening college operation. Investigation revealed that "several adult curricula, which provided some of the deepest satisfactions . . . do not as yet attract many students. Perhaps they never will draw large classes which spell a surplus." The issue of underwriting, the report implied, involved differing concepts of the evening college—is the purpose of the evening college to produce an income or to provide a public service?

Finally, the report emphasized the need to improve teaching. This universal problem was complicated in the evening college by the heavy reliance on "day faculty—whose experience lies outside adult education." One important element in good instruction was sensitivity to the student.

---

23. Patterns of Liberal Education in the Evening College, p. 2.

"Such familiarity can hardly be expected in the evening college instructor who is not thoroughly used to teaching adults, and who may be conditioned by the experience of teaching young people to expect student reactions which simply do not characterize adults." The report suggested that an important element here was an understanding of student motivations. Once again came the familiar refrain—the solution called for faculty cooperation and more "intercommunication between the officers of the evening college and its students."

Thus, as the Center ended its first year, certain factors which were to influence Center direction were becoming clear. First, the evening colleges were not ready for the discussion guides. However, the staff was not ready to admit defeat. In Diekhoff's words, "Our experience with the courses justifies asking the colleges to try them again, may justify the time and effort necessary to revise them, and justifies our continuing efforts in this direction."[24] Second, CSLEA thinking had started to move away from the prescription in the proposal even before the staff arrived in Chicago. Notably it had been acknowledged that there was need to know more about the evening colleges and to do something about the improvement of instruction. Third, the case studies pointed up many needs: clarification of the purposes of the evening college; increased understanding and support from faculty and administration; greater knowledge about the motivations of adult students; and courses and programs especially for adults. Finally, there was staff uncertainty over the meaning of liberal education for adults.

The question of the meaning of liberal education for adults, mentioned earlier, needs to be considered in more detail before turning to the directions which the Center program began to take. In an early statement on the subject, the Committee on Liberal Education indicated that the Center would not be concerned with vocational training as such or with "hobby education," at least not immediately. The committee's definition of liberal education did include the liberal education component of vocational programs or the "liberalization" of the vocational programs themselves. By and large, however, "the province of the Center may be described as including non-vocation in 'content' courses and intellectual

24. Memorandum for the Committee, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, April 22, 1952 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

skills—education which has as its object the humanization of human beings."[25]

> If this was the object of liberal education, the attention of the Center will be on the teaching and learning of such basic intellectual skills as reading, writing, listening, speaking, calculation, the gathering and evaluation of evidence, the drawing of sound conclusions from evidence and argument, the making of choices. . . . These are liberating skills not only in profound ethical meaning, but also in a much narrower political meaning. They may help men free themselves from the tyranny of their passions and appetites; they are also skills of citizenship. Programs of education cannot make responsible citizens . . . but programs of liberal education should aim at skills relevant to political and other responsibility.

And if these are the skills, the Center was to be interested in any content which aims to

> provide knowledge basic to the development and exercise of such skills, which give the adult student greater understanding of himself, greater understanding of the physical world in which men live. For these purposes all theoretical disciplines (as contrasted with the applied arts of vocational programs) are relevant.

The statement went on to say that all the disciplines in undergraduate education were "also appropriate in liberal education programs for adults, however inappropriate conventional divisions into courses may be and however inappropriate conventional course- and credit-requirements may be for most adults."

The committee prefaced its remarks by noting that it "does not think it necessary to engage in controversy about what constitutes liberal education. The area of the Center's activities may be defined exactly enough to provide working principles without entering into current arguments in educational philosophy." It might be difficult to quarrel with the definition, but the assumption of no controversy and the belief that the Center could avoid related questions of educational philosophy turned out to be wide of the mark. According to one former staff member, staff debates over liberal education were endless and often acrimonious—and the issues were unresolved and very much alive as the Center turned toward its second year.

3

The preliminary efforts of the Center can be likened to the discov-

25. The Scope of Activities of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, undated (manuscript in CSLEA files).

ery of a watershed. By 1952 the grand outlines were clear: on one side there was the university with a heritage which was a complex mix of classical European notions and American views of education as practical, experimental, and egalitarian; on the other side there were adults asking higher education to help with an endless variety of social, political, economic, and personal problems—problems that in one way or another were different from the conventional demands placed upon the university. But as with all watersheds, the topography was blurred, and the next broad task of the Center was to understand these topographical details and to find ways to deal with them.

The situation faced by the Center was especially congenial to the nature of Schwertman, who served as director from 1953 until his death in the middl of 1956. On the one hand he was a practical man of action. At the same time he was philosophically inclined to take the long view, and, most important, he avoided closure like the plague. On the one hand he had a kind of boldness which permitted him to experiment with new ideas, and on the other hand a kind of humility which made him uncertain about and constantly searching for answers.

It was during these years that CSLEA came closest to fulfilling the notion implicit in its title that it was an organization for the "study" of liberal education for adults. In his history of the evening college, John P. Dyer described the Center as a "small, closely knit, highly articulate group of young scholars." After summarizing the major directions of its program, Dyer comments: "These are all, however, means to an end, devices to stimulate thinking, for the Center is more thought-oriented than action-oriented." In his opinion, "The most noteworthy contribution it has made is the questions it has raised—questions which sooner or later must be answered if the evening college is to be meaningful in our society."[26]

The questions that were raised could be reckoned up by dozens. They were raised and refined around the staff table in both formal and informal discussions, at Board meetings, in the field, in hotel-room conversations with colleagues that lasted long into the night, or at more formal workshops and conferences. By the end of 1955 the Center had identified

---

26. John P. Dyer, Ivory Towers in the Market Place (Indianapolis: The Bobbs Merrill Co., 1956), pp. 46-47.

the major characteristics of the topography or, in other words, the basic issues in higher liberal education for adults.

The search for basic issues was not always conscious, nor was it the sole preoccupation of the Center. Interim reports display a mixture of concern for the immediate and the long range and for matters for thought and action. Still, over the years there was increasing clarity regarding Center objectives and the broad questions which required answers if the goals were to be realized.

Objectives were based on two underlying assumptions. First, there was the recognition that the problems of the evening college could not be solved in isolation—that the evening college was inextricably related to its own university, to all higher education, and to all adult education. Second, there was the recognition that the problems were vast and that the developments within the field were uneven. Therefore, as a matter of expediency, it was necessary to work with the forces and the individuals that were ready to move. In 1953 the purpose was stated as "an opportunity within the framework of the Association of University Evening Colleges to provide aid and leadership to the germinating forces that could fashion the evening college movement into an effective instrument for the liberal education of adults." By the following year, "germinating forces" were specifically identified as "persons, ideas and programs."[27]

Later in the year, following discussion by the Board of Directors, the direction was made even more specific by the addition of a second purpose:[28] "To encourage for adults the development of a wide range of university-level educative experiences which do more than parallel the regular degree or credit programs and which are planned on the basis of the distinctive interests, experiences and abilities of adults." In commenting on the Board policy, the Sixth Interim Report emphasized that

> it opens to the Center both the opportunity and the obligation to work with a "cutting-edge," i.e., the institutions, programs, men, and above all—the ideas which move beyond the "night school" concept in favor of new areas of opportunity for university-level services to adults. Thus the Center has gambled heavily on its ability to influence some of its clientele of 100 major universities to strike out

27. See CSLEA: Third Interim Report, May 15, 1953, and Fifth Interim Report, January 15, 1954.

28. See Sixth Interim Report, October 15, 1954, for this statement and comment on objectives.

boldly and experimentally in bringing the tremendous and unique resources of the university to bear upon adult education opportunities which do more than merely parrot and parallel the regular graduate and undergraduate curricula.

The Center recognized that this policy direction would bring some opposition, but the alternative was "sinking the Center's effort without traceable effect into the mass of complicated and unsolved problems of all higher education." The new direction would provide "an opportunity to make a noticeable contribution in helping the American urban-area university think through what commitment it ought to make, or ought not to make, to adult education."

Parallel to the growing clarity of purpose was the study and gradual identification of the basic issues facing higher liberal adult education. By 1955 the Center had developed a fairly clear and complete picture of these issues. Details changed, but the grand outline remained constant—and it has continued to hold up ever since. In May and June, 1955, a series of staff meetings was devoted to the formulation of seven tasks for the Center. Six of these tasks, listed below, identify the major issues and in a very real sense represent the culmination of four years of study, discussion, and experimentation:[29]

(1) To encourage the development of liberal education programs explicitly for adults;

(2) To help clarify the meaning of liberal education for adults;

(3) To study the role and function of adult education divisions within the American university system;

(4) To encourage the development of professional commitment and professional leadership for liberal education for adults;

(5) To study the concept of "community" with special reference to implications of urbanism for university adult education;

(6) To clarify the meaning of "adult needs."

Behind each of the tasks lay much staff discussion and many excursions into the field with experimental projects or research. It should be emphasized, however, that the Center did not start with a set of hypotheses or tasks; rather the hypotheses emerged from a series of tentative, almost random thrusts testing a variety of ideas and exploiting opportune

29. See Seventh Interim Report, "The Tasks of the Center," October, 1955. The term "explicitly for adults," used in connection with the first tasks, had been coined by Schwertman; in a lengthy memorandum, George E. Barton, Jr. demonstrated that "explicitly" was not proper usage, and subsequent references shift to the term "especially for adults."

situations in the field. These thrusts had one thing in common: They were the learning experiences which made it possible to set the tasks in 1955. In this connection, it is not always possible to classify activities as contributing exclusively to the formulation of a single task. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify the primary lesson emerging from the various projects which engaged the Center during these years.

Understandably, major activities continued to be related to the development of courses or programs especially for adults. Discussion guides were produced through 1954, but at a diminishing rate as the staff became convinced that universities simply were not receptive.[30] Significantly, the greatest sales of the guides were for non-university lay groups or, in a few cases, as texts for regular undergraduate courses. The Center always insisted, however, that the experiment had been valuable. The courses served as models which influenced faculty members' thinking as they prepared their own courses for adults. Perhaps more important, the staff learned a great deal from the guides about the special problems of effective higher adult education.

In 1953, the Center offered four curriculum seminars for faculty from evening colleges. The purpose was to provide a theoretical attack on the problem of effective liberal education for adults and reflected the vital need to reach the faculty directly without the intervention of the director. In successive workshops, teachers from a number of universities met with distinguished consultants to consider curriculum for adults in communications, arts, sciences, social sciences, and humanities.[31]

A third type of excursion related to the first task led to a variety of experimental programs. They took the form of support for ideas developed in the field or on the staff. It was particularly in this sense that the Center sought ideas and men who were willing to undertake pilot experiments in which the Center's contribution consisted of a great deal of ad-

---

30. Guides produced were Callenbach, Our Modern Art the Movies; Gordon and Nagy, International Political Behavior; Kriesberg, Looking at Pictures; and Savetz, Scientists at Work. Except for Gordon, the authors were not members of the staff, thus reflecting a significant modification in the original plan.

31. The Center also attempted to approach the question in terms of methodology by providing financial support for improvement of instruction at the universities of Louisville and Indiana. The Indiana project was abortive; at Louisville the program was completed, but there is some question whether anything was learned from it.

vice and consultation and modest financial support. The most successful venture during these years was the Brooklyn College Experiment. In addition to participating in planning the project, the Center obtained a special grant from the Fund for Adult Education to underwrite its development. The project was a notable attempt to equate experience with college credit and to develop an appropriate program to enable adults to complete the baccalaureate. It had been commonplace to say that adults were different, but this was a pioneering attempt to deal with the differences in a meaningful and systematic way. The experiment was not only successful in its own right, but also provided much knowledge about the relationships between experience and formal schooling.

In a different direction, CSLEA cooperated with money and advice on a program at Queens College. The Queens seminars experimented with another commonplace: that you must start education for adults "where they are." The seminars started without a preconceived curriculum, and students were asked to help plan the direction and progress of their own class.[32]

One activity most significant for the future directions of the Center was a project called "Operation Micro." Supported by a special grant of $10,000 from FAE, the staff began to work on the problem of liberal education for adults whose education and experience were primarily specialized. Few endeavors during this period were more challenging, more puzzling, and more frustrating. Hundreds of staff hours were devoted to discussion and field interviews as the Center considered both the substance of liberal education for specialists and the factors that might motivate them to undertake non-vocational education. Many proposals were suggested only to be rejected as unsatisfactory or inappropriate to the purpose of the project. At the end of the first year, only $250 of the grant had been used—and this was for travel to gather information.

By 1955, about two years after the grant, three programs were agreed upon, more in desperation than in the belief that the staff had the answer. The Center itself operated a successful residential program for secretaries (the Vassar Institute) and had two other programs in planning phases—liberal education for journalists, offered in cooperation with

---

32. See Marc Belth and Herbert Scheuler, Liberal Education for Adults Re-examined (Chicago: CSLEA, 1959), for a discussion of the theoretical framework for the experiment.

the University of California, Berkeley; and a liberal education seminar for teachers, to be used as part of the graduate education program at Northern Illinois University. Unquestionably the most significant aspect of Operation Micro was its contribution to Center thinking. The discussions involved many ideas, some of which were developed later. Among these ideas were: the use of the residential setting; the approach to liberal adult education through homogeneous groups in contradiction to the common assumption that heterogeneity was inevitable; the possibilities in "liberalizing" vocational courses. Most important, Operation Micro directed the Center's attention to a question that was to become an increasing concern for all education: In CSLEA terms, how can we fashion a program of liberal adult education that will compensate for the tendency toward greater and greater specialization?

On another tack, but still related to the first task, the staff devoted energies to the development of proposals for ideal programs which it urged the field to adopt for experimentation and development. Some were simply unelaborated ideas; at least two were completely developed propositions. One, a Master's Degree Especially for Adults, was an attempt to deal with liberal education for specialists within the framework of graduate credit. The major thrust of the Master's Degree program was the mastery of basic concepts of a discipline and the application of these disciplinary tools to day-to-day problems of adult life. In a different direction there was a proposal for a Lab College for adults. Here Harry L. Miller, the major author, proposed to use the social, political, economic, and artistic life of the city as text and laboratory to teach adults how to learn systematically from their urban experiences.

Through the period, the staff did considerable soul-searching regarding its second task—clarification of the meaning of liberal education for adults. Some of this was done formally. In 1953, the staff used a series of readings on liberal education edited by George E. Barton, Jr. as the basis for a regular seminar for staff and other adult education leaders in Chicago. A year or so later, Barton conducted a seminar on four modes of thought which were relevant to understanding an individual's philosophy of education. In addition, there were many spontaneous discussions raised in connection with the experimental programs. This was particularly the case with Operation Micro, where the individuals to be liberally educated were so far outside of the conventional academic sphere. According to an

interim report, "No other activity has rattled our teeth more than 'Micro.' It is forcing us, the Board, and the evening college movement to think deeply about the meaning of liberal education for adults in our kind of society."[33]

By 1955, the staff was not satisfied with its answer to the question: What does liberal education for adults really mean? Staff thinking in general, however, showed a strong tendency to shift the emphasis from classical content to the process of liberating the individual from intellectual or psychological constraints that were preventing him from acting as a free, well-rounded, and responsible person. This led to unresolved issues regarding the line of demarcation between therapy and education, and to the debate as to whether, under such an approach, the teaching of plumbing would not be liberating for non-plumbers. By and large, the Center stuck to the accepted subjects in the arts and sciences—the shift was in the point of departure; it was not a rejection of content. Everyone agreed that this distinction was fuzzy and not satisfactory, which explains why seeking clarity regarding the meaning of liberal education appeared as the second task. Nevertheless, there was a kind of internalized understanding which tended to serve as a workable operating definition, and organized discussion ceased except when the Center explained, primarily to new staff, "what we mean by liberal education for adults."

The first move of the Center to expand its mission beyond the original mandate was to study the role and function of the university adult education division. Diekhoff had recognized the need to study the evening college from the outset. The early formal and informal contacts with the field revealed the necessity to make the evening college an integral part of the university, receiving genuine support from the administration and faculty alike. Major efforts during these years were directed toward obtaining a better grasp of the situation and developing programs to improve understanding and support from the university.

In 1952 the Center ran a workshop for evening college deans—and incidentally inaugurated what were to become annual leadership conferences. This workshop dealt with the "Purposes of the Evening College," thus implementing a conclusion of the case study that a basic problem of the evening college was achievement of clarity regarding its role and function in

33. Seventh Interim Report, p. 12.

relation to the needs of adults, the needs of the community, and the demands of the academic tradition. Following successful discussion by AUEC leaders, "Purposes of the Evening College" became the theme for the annual convention in 1953.

Moving outside the evening college, the Center made fleeting attacks on the total university. In 1954, the "Role of the Liberal Arts in the Evening College Curricula" was the subject for an invitational conference for liberal arts deans. In the spring of 1956, at Daytona Beach, a conference for urban university presidents groped for greater understanding and greater commitment from top administration. Between 1953 and 1955, regional faculty seminars blanketed the country. Major emphasis was placed on professional improvement; the project itself will be considered later, but in part the seminars were concerned with the relationship and responsibilities of the faculty for the evening college.

Another area was that constant thorn in the Center's side, credit. With the notable exception of the Brooklyn College Experiment, almost every suggestion regarding curriculum ran headlong into the credit issue. Any attempt to modify the daytime credit program met stern resistance. Any attempt to substitute non-credit liberal education was questioned by faculty on grounds of standards and by evening college administrators on grounds of the inability to get enough students to make it pay. However, first as the path of least resistance but increasingly by conviction, the Center moved toward a bias for non-credit. Non-credit provided greater freedom for experimentation; but more important, as Operation Micro made apparent, it had to be the ultimate concern for university adult education.

In trying to deal with non-credit, the staff followed two directions. First, it attempted to raise the standards and thus the faculty image of non-credit offerings. A second route led to a concern for integrated, non-credit curricula in liberal education for adults. Interim reports in 1954 and 1955 make frequent references to such terms as integrated programs, focused study, continuity, and programs that do not merely parallel the regular daytime offerings.

Closely related to this task was the next task—the encouragement of professional commitment and professional leadership. It is difficult to separate Center activities in these two areas or, in the final analysis, between the two tasks. Thus it is readily apparent that many of the activ-

ities related to the role of the evening college also contributed to Center thinking on commitment and leadership. As already mentioned, there was a major effort to increase the faculty sense of professional commitment to adult education through faculty seminars (1953-1955) where some five hundred teachers were introduced to the special needs of adult students and to the social or community situations which were relevant to education for adults.

Another attempt to reach faculty was through a faculty grant program. Following the apathetic reception of the discussion guides, the Center decided to offer grants to teachers for outlines, sample lessons, or complete courses that were especially for adults. Actually one complete course, Our Modern Art the Movies, and a Notes and Essays publication describing a human relations course were outcomes of the project.[34] But the major purpose was to encourage greater faculty concern for effective adult education. From the Center's point of view, the major benefit came in the staff discussions regarding the material submitted and particularly in the attempts to determine what indeed was different about courses for adults; a Center publication, Especially for Adults, emerged from the discussion.[35]

In still another attempt to reach and understand the faculty, staff members attempted to work through the learned societies to cultivate interest among scholars in various academic disciplines. Except for some success with the highly unconventional College English Association, the efforts produced little but additional confirmation of the difficulties faced in trying to convert this vital segment of the university.

In working with the field, the staff soon realized that the evening college could not ignore other areas in the adult education movement, and the Center played an important role in helping to unite adult education leaders from many parts of the educational spectrum. Beginning in 1953, the Center worked closely with the Adult Education Association; but even more significantly, in 1955 the CSLEA Leadership Conference brought the leaders of AUEC and the National University Extension Association (NUEA) together. This laid the foundations for the extension of Center

34. Callenbach, op. cit.; and Daniel J. Malamud, A Participant-Observer Approach to the Teaching of Human Relations Classes (Chicago: CSLEA, 1955).

35. Whipple, op. cit.

services to the great public universities and for closer collaboration between the two major associations concerned with university adult education.

Another approach to commitment and competence was the development of a CSLEA publication program. Starting with an occasional mimeographed paper, the Center launched into a regular program that included Notes and Essays on Adult Education and Reports dealing with programs or research. These monographs, which soon were recognized as outstanding contributions to the literature and professional standards, supplemented and supported many Center purposes. In addition to our own efforts, the Board of Directors commissioned John P. Dyer, a historian and Dean of University College at Tulane, to write a history of the evening college movement, subsequently published under the title Ivory Towers in the Market Place. The Center helped collect and analyze the data so that the book contributed both to the evening college literature and to the education of the Center staff.

The fifth task dealt with the community. According to the original plans, the Center was to increase its understanding of the community in order to help the evening college with promotion problems. Gradually, however, the Center recognized that an even more important obligation was to understand the nature of urban and suburban society in order to help universities deal with this most crucial educational issue facing American society. It was a complicated problem to understand, not to mention to do anything about. Over the years there was much talk and there were a couple of programs. In 1952 the Center ran a workshop reflecting the earlier concern with community relations. In 1954 there was a noticeable shift in the new direction when the Center ran a seminar at New Orleans which attempted to define methods for the study of the urban community. By 1955 very little was certain about the role of the urban university in adult education for urban life—except that understanding it was an important Center task.

Finally, there were the questions about the adult student, the inevitable complement to the concern for the meaning of liberal education. The matter of the adult student was often on the agenda both at the Center and in the field. A number of publications were commissioned. Gardner Murphy and Raymond Kuhlen wrote about Psychological Views of Adult Needs. Whipple's Especially for Adults attempted to summarize what the Center

had learned on the subject. Occasional speeches by Schwertman or articles such as Siegle's "Mountains, Plateaus and Valleys in Adult Learning" proposed theoretical constructs for further study.[36] There were two small research projects: one a CSLEA study in Kansas City based on Havighurst's concepts of social roles; and the other a study of leisure time undertaken by the University of Washington under a grant by the Center. But the Center had no final answers—again, except for the clear recognition of an important task.

4

What kind of an organization was the Center by 1955, and how did it relate to the field of higher adult education? The operation itself can be easily described. Activities were divided into three parts: administration; personnel; and program, which included curriculum development, leadership development, coordination, and communication. The latter was a catch-all which, in addition to publications, included such occasional items as research or anything else the Center wanted to do. The program was carried on by a "core staff" of seven, including the director, with project staff added for special tasks. By and large the program was taken to the field by the director. The rest of the staff served in a supporting role working to develop ideas or programs under the leadership of the director. In this sense Dyer's reference to the Center staff as a group of "young scholars" was close to the mark. The only significant change came in 1954 with the appointment of an assistant director, necessitated in large measure by the field activities of the director. In 1955 the same core staff had worked together for two years and had achieved a cohesiveness which came from common experiences and a common sense of purpose.

Budgets during the period reflect a decisive emphasis on program. To take 1953-54 as an example, in a total budget of $184,000, allocations for administration were 7 per cent, personnel 26 per cent, and operations 67 per cent. Even allowing for the fact that national academic salaries were at a low ebb, the emphasis on program is significant. In addition to its own experiments, the Center, in effect, operated in part as a small grant-giving organization, prepared to contribute money as well

36. Gardner Murphy and Raymond Kuhlen, Psychological Views of Adult Needs (Chicago: CSLEA, 1955); Whipple, op. cit.; Peter E. Siegle, "Mountains, Plateaus and Valleys in Adult Learning," Adult Leadership.

as advice to those men, institutions, and ideas that were ready to move along lines approved by CSLEA.

Crucial to the situation was sympathetic support from the Fund for Adult Education and from the evening colleges. The Fund board was willing to accept the principle of core support which permitted the Center to have a staff whose major activity was to study and think creatively about higher liberal adult education. In addition to this, the basic grant included funds for experimentation, and the board was receptive to requests for supplementary grants for special projects. During these years the basic annual grant increased from $80,000 to $110,000, and the supplementary grants brought the total budget to over $180,000 a year.

The Center also received strong and often enthusiastic support from the evening colleges. The AUEC and its member institutions needed the Center to help them with programs and, perhaps more important, to help strengthen the evening college position in the university. At a minimum, there was a feeling of status connected with the presence of this offspring of the AUEC—it helped give the movement tone. At a maximum, vigorous evening colleges capitalized on the staff, money, and ideas available to support their programs. There were conflicts, to be sure—resentment over the fact that a favored few "big" schools appeared to receive most of the Center's attention, resentment of the growing preoccupation with non-credit when the orientation of the evening college remained on credit, resentment that the Center chose the services it would perform and was deaf to some evening college needs, and a feeling that the staff was impractical and unappreciative of the hard problems on the "firing-line." On its side the Center staff often was frustrated by the apparent lack of support from the field or impatient with the excessive caution or lack of imagination of directors who refused to be moved.

But by and large, the situation was one of healthy tension between the Center and the Fund and between the Center and the evening colleges. In 1955, the Center employed A. A. Liveright to study the CSLEA operation. In his report, he caught the spirit of this healthy tension in his definition of CSLEA as a "quasi-independent" agency. It was <u>dependent</u> upon AUEC and its member institutions to get its ideas and materials tried out in the field, and thus could not ignore the environment in which the evening college operated. At the same time, it had another source of financial support which made policy and direction <u>independent</u> of the eve-

ning colleges. In a like manner the Center was dependent on FAE for financial support and by implication limited to a concern for liberal adult education, but it was independent of the Fund in terms of its specific policies and directions which had to reflect the evening college situation. In 1955 the Center argued that this position was a "useful and highly favorable" one which enabled it to move forward on its mission.

The mission continued to be the development of more effective liberal education for adults in an environment that was essentially non-liberal if not anti-liberal in spirit. By 1955, the Center recognized that liberal education could not develop without consideration of the many problems related to the place of the evening college or extension division in the university. By 1955, the Center believed it had identified major problems in higher adult education, and it had acquired considerable knowledge about them. It enjoyed the confidence of both benefactor and clients. And its strong and experienced staff was ready to move with confidence toward the future.

II. 1956-1961

1

Insofar as the years 1956-61 had a distinctive character, they were marked by Sputnik, the cold war, and the mushrooming impact of automation.

By and large, Americans carried away only one lesson from Sputnik and the cold war, and that was the necessity to intensify our emphasis on specialization. Survival was viewed in terms of science and its handmaiden, technical "know-how." There was little recognition that the humane factor was equally relevant to survival, if not more so. The fact that "things were in the saddle riding men" was reflected in the National Defense Education Act and other federal aid for the technical aspects of our drive for superiority—research, conquest of space, technical services abroad. Indeed, to borrow Schwertman's phrasing, as quoted at the beginning of this history, it might be said that the spirit abroad was not merely non-liberal, it was anti-liberal. As used by Schwertman and other members of the staff, the terms liberal, non-liberal, and anti-liberal were shorthand to represent three positions along a continuum. At one extreme, there was the liberal; its starting point and concern was the individual and the humane. At the other extreme there was the anti-liberal; its starting point was the material, and its concern was with things. In between there was the non-liberal; with this term Schwertman was trying to convey not an active rejection but a kind of indifference toward liberal education. Perhaps a-liberal would have been a more meaningful term.

The response of the American people to the challenges of the period was a frantic drive for greater and greater technical proficiency needed to get ahead and an intensification of the fun morality that featured a frenetic search for new thrills. Of course there were exceptions and bright spots. The Peace Corps and the civil rights movement gave Americans almost their first opportunities since the New Deal to join humane causes in the service of man. There was a growing interest in the arts, although

it had a strong materialistic, anti-liberal strain—the strain of an affluent people buying art in addition to other things, of artists who pretended they could ignore people, and of experts who were devoted to proving that democratization would kill art.

These years brought new demands and new pressures on education. The war babies reached school age, and automation increased the need for more schooling and more specialized knowledge. The younger students filled the regular colleges, spilled over into the evening college or extension division, and poured into junior colleges as fast as they were built. Liberal arts continued to be a part of the curriculum, but, as disciplines, each of the arts and sciences tended to become more and more technical and specialized. Engineering replaced business as the most popular, practical course of study.

There were other pressures on the university, not new but intensified. There were greater demands for graduate study to prepare teachers, researchers, and technicians for the knowledge industry. There were contracts from government and industry for research and assistance on developmental projects. And there were opportunities again from both government and industry for private consultation by faculty members. Still another pressure on the university was financial; it cost more and more to maintain the educational establishment, in both capital investment and salaries.

In a different direction, another significant development was the entry of business and industry into the educational spectrum. Over the years industry tended to move away from almost complete dependence on the college and university to the creation of its own educational establishment. A popular explanation blamed the university for its lack of imagination or unwillingness to innovate. Although shortcomings in the university might have been a contributing factor, industry had actually moved through many tentative, exploratory phases which appear to have led to the declaration of independence. Ultimately, it was based on a conclusion that each business had its own special needs in terms of skills, understandings, and commitments, needs which could not be served by public institutions whose education must be generalized to serve many industries as well as a wider public interest. As corporations became bigger and bigger, it became financially and educationally feasible for them to establish their own internal programs. It was not a case of elim-

inating the university. Smaller companies, which could not afford their own programs, continued to depend on public institutions, and all industry continued to turn to the university for highly technical education or for programs in areas where it was possible to generalize across company lines. Furthermore, even if a university wanted to provide a program for a particular company—and this was done—there were limits beyond which a public institution could not go in support of special and often narrow interests of the business world.

Industry was not particularly in conflict over the question of educational purpose. There were a few tentative excursions into liberal education, the most notable example being the American Telephone and Telegraph Company experiments in liberal education for executives. At the discussion level, representatives from business and industry paid lip service to the need for "broad-gauged" executives. But in the final analysis, the spirit of industry's educational philosophy was unapologetically non-liberal and in most cases anti-liberal.

The changing situation had many implications for the evening college and extension division. Deans noted that decreasing proportions of their degree students were adults, and this made their degree programs more and more simply day school offered at night. As far as credit and degrees were concerned, there was a growing interest in degree programs especially for adults. Although the overt connection was not made, it seems likely that the smaller, more select, more distinguishable adult student body encouraged the university to look with more sympathy on undergraduate education that provided more than a replication of the day school degree. On many campuses faculty committees searched for purposes and methods which would be more relevant for mature persons in search of a college degree. It soon became apparent that it was a long and difficult way from the first committee meeting to the inauguration of a special degree program. Nevertheless, by 1961 a number of interesting experiments were under way. Significantly, the response to each new program was a flood of applications from adults in search of education which was relevant to their needs.[1]

1. See A. A. Liveright and Roger Decrow, New Directions in Degree Programs Especially for Adults (Chicago: CSLEA, 1963). CSLEA was very active in this area, participating in deliberations on many college campuses and in consultations or conferences to increase support for special degree programs.

Trends in business education struck a hard blow at an important life-line of the adult education division. Not only did engineering become the route to success, but business schools became more "respectable." As a result, the campus schools of engineering and business took programs away from the evening college. In the adult divisions there was much talk about "standards," especially as measured by restrictions on the use of part-time teachers without the approved advanced degrees. There was some tendency for adult education to move into non-credit business programs, but at least in part this was limited by the educational developments in industry.

Even more than the credit issue, the new pressures on the university tended to be a barrier to the adult education division's aspirations for first class citizenship. Ironically, just at a point when there appeared to be some recognition that the enterprise was legitimate, the new demands on the total university came to mean that many potential programs were "acceptable," but given low priority. This stimulated the adult division to find new areas that reflected the new demands. Perhaps the most notable new direction was management of Peace Corps training—scarcely adult education, but clearly continuing and certainly successful. There were other developments, less dramatic, but in the long run more significant: programs for smaller businesses; specialized high-level programs for business and government (although these were not always under the jurisdiction of the adult division); leadership programs for public officials; or education dealing with public issues.

All this meant that by and large, university continuing education remained non-liberal, but not anti-liberal. The hard facts of demand from an anti-liberal society continued to control supply.

One notable counterforce to the anti-liberal spirit was the Fund for Adult Education, which continued to hold the ground for liberal education. During these years two shifts in FAE policy were significant for higher adult education and the Center. First, there was a shift away from the attempt to create new institutions and toward support for established organizations and especially universities. Second, there was a movement toward support for what the Fund called "hard" programs—programs which applied liberal education to practical social and political problems of our times with special emphasis on leadership for public responsibility. Conversely, the Fund was less interested in supporting the "soft"

programs such as the arts or other esoterica that might be studied by adults for individual satisfaction. A number of colleges and universities were given large grants to help them develop hard liberal education programs.

The Fund's new outlook was important for CSLEA. Although the Center maintained its posture of quasi-independence, in many ways the new policies brought FAE and CSLEA closer together. The Center had already developed close working relations with most of the institutions receiving Fund grants. It was natural for CSLEA to work with both FAE and the grantees as consultant and collaborator. In this connection there was one significant change: the Center was less likely to be a source of funds for colleges and universities. Earlier, CSLEA had served as a little "foundation," providing money for programs or conferences either out of its own budget or by intercession at the Fund; after 1956 the universities went directly to FAE, particularly for large grants. The Center continued to provide small amounts of money, and gradually a new role emerged: The Center became an explorer and tester of new ideas in pilot projects that might be expanded with larger financial backing from FAE.

The hard approach was also congenial to the Center. Like FAE, the Center had learned to distrust pure liberal arts. CSLEA was not as ready to reject the arts out of hand, but then neither were the university clients. If this was a difference, it was certainly minor, particularly in view of the Fund's flexibility. Thus, although the environment for liberal education was hostile and the tasks of the Center were many and difficult, the giant ally, FAE, made it possible for the staff to move ahead with vigor and optimism.

2

In 1954 R. J. Blakely, Vice-President of FAE, had helped the Center make a useful distinction between operator and intellectual. "By operator," wrote Schwertman, paraphrasing Blakely, "we mean a person whose major occupational commitment is to some kind of economic, social, political or professional enterprise; by intellectual we mean a person whose major occupational commitment is to study and reflection upon what the operators do, and upon the meaning of what they do."[2] The definition was

2. Sixth Interim Report, October 15, 1954, p. 12.

not proposed as a dichotomy; as Schertman hastened to add, many operators are "reflective, intellectually-oriented persons," and many intellectuals are operators.

The distinction had been developed in conjunction with Operation Micro, but interestingly it helps visualize developments that were occurring on the Center staff. Having established its tasks, it was logical—and perhaps inevitable—that the Center should go to work on them, particularly in view of the prospect of strong support from the Fund. Instead of a group of young scholars, the staff became a group of young reflective operators. Unquestionably the staff was reflective and intellectually oriented, but the problem was operational, and the staff's function was to serve as an agent for change, attempting to modify the crucial factors inhibiting the growth of more effective liberal education for adults. In this connection one of the most significant implications was a shift in primary emphasis from the substance of liberal education to the institutional setting that effected the development of liberal education for adults. Thus the Center became increasingly concerned with the university as an institution which needed to be changed if adult liberal education were to flourish.

The development of CSLEA as a reflective operator can be seen clearly both in the major activities and in the way the Center conceptualized its program. The Center tended to think of its activities first in terms of major program areas and second in terms of instruments to achieve program purposes. The formulation was specifically stated in a review of 1958.[3] The three program areas incorporated the essentials of the six tasks. First, there was programming for liberal education for adults. Concern here was to be concentrated on "experimentation on the frontiers of liberal adult education," with CSLEA participating more directly in the "implementation during the experimental period." The second area covered teaching, where the Center hoped to contribute to both theory and method. The final program area was called "climate," a term that never entirely satisfied the staff, but nevertheless served as shorthand for many tasks related to leadership development all across the board—deans, their staffs, faculty, top administration, and even community leaders.

---

3. A Review of 1958: Future Directions of the Center and a Report of Current Activities (Chicago: CSLEA, 1959), pp. 5-17.

Even more significant was the emerging notion of instruments, or instrumental activities, for dealing with the major problems. One of these instruments was research. In an important policy change, the Center decided to move from the past procedure of conducting or supporting "scattered, disconnected studies to the development of planned integrated attacks on well-defined problems basic to the concern of the Center."[4]

A second instrument was publications. Although this was part of the Center program from an early date, it had been more or less random. By 1958 the Center was proposing a publications program designed to bear directly on its major objectives.[5] In effect the Center became a regular publisher of monographs devoted to higher adult education.

A third instrument was an innovation: the creation of a clearinghouse to provide basic information and service to the field in the three areas of Center concern. Its purpose was to "stimulate and facilitate exchange of information on methods and problems of liberal education for adults." It was not to be a repository for materials, but an active participant, "seeking out new ideas, initiating speedier reporting of projects, and bringing together people with parallel programs."[6] Plans for the clearinghouse specifically indicated that the Center could not serve the entire field of adult education, and it proposed to focus its activities on the collection and dissemination of knowledge about higher liberal education for adults.[7] From the very first years, AUEC had urged CSLEA to establish a clearinghouse, but the idea has been firmly resisted as a service function outside the purposes of the Center and one which "would divert staff time and energies . . . from other projects and activities."[8] In its own time, however, and for its own operational purposes, the clearinghouse became a large and important instrumental activity.[9]

---

4. Future Center Directions, Staff Meetings, 1958 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

5. Ibid.

6. CSLEA Board Working Papers, March 4 & 7, 1958 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

7. CSLEA Board Working Papers, November 10, 1957 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

8. Ibid.

9. In practice, it was difficult to decide just what was relevant and what was irrelevant to higher liberal education for adults, and as the clearinghouse grew in reputation it became a strong force tugging the

Finally, field work and consultation became an important instrumental activity. Before 1956 these words were not part of the Center vocabulary. The Center staff had gone to the field largely to collect information or occasionally to run a conference. In the 1955 report, there is one reference to "advice and counsel," and only about half a dozen visits were listed. But Schwertman suggested that it might become an important activity. Then in 1957 the Eighth Interim Report included a section on "Field Work and Communication," where there was this prophetic statement:[10]

> Requests to the Center for consultation and aid in the field have increased considerably during the past fifteen months. Our policy in general has been to meet such requests in an ad hoc fashion using whatever staff resources were available at the time. . . . We do feel, however, as a result of our experience this year, that field consultation might well be one of the most important of Center activities, providing as it does an opportunity to give service to institutions and at the same time a chance to collect new ideas, information, and fresh solutions to old problems.

By the following year field work and consultation had become a vital instrument and accepted policy. The staff went to the field or received visitors in Chicago to consult on a wide range of problems, and to participate in conferences about pilot programs. Compared to the handful of consultations in 1955, the 1958 report lists one or more contacts with 95 AUEC/NUEA institutions. In the single year of 1961, there were 50 contacts with AUEC/NUEA institutions and another 62 consultations with persons not affiliated with the two associations.[11]

Largely because of the vastness of the problems and the hostility of the environment, in 1957 the Center approach tended to become strategic: the staff moved in where the situation seemed right and where there were men and institutions ready to move. An elaborate rationalization for the approach was developed as part of the proposal to FAE in 1959 for a grant renewal. According to this analysis, the major question was: How can a small professional staff bring about significant change in a vast, decentralized, problem-ridden field?[12]

Center toward the operational and toward non-liberal as well as liberal education.

10. Eighth Interim Report, p. 23.

11. CSLEA Field Work Log (manuscript in CSLEA files).

12. Proposal for a Two-Year Grant, March, 1959 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

> Our years of experience and the continuous reflection that accompanied the activity convinced us, if reason did not, that we are unlikely with these limited resources to make any considerable and permanent direct change on the field. We are in the position of a person who wants to move a very large and heavy rock; like him, we must look about for a system of levers which will transmit and magnify the strength we do have. Whether the leverage will move the rock or not rests ultimately on the validity of a series of inferences about the real connection between the levers and the rock itself.

The statement listed four levers which the Center used to magnify its strength and move the "rock." These were:

> Key individuals in the associations. Sometimes they are important because they occupy high offices and can facilitate access to persons in individual institutions, or to an important communication channel. Others are important because they are widely known and respected, and are in some degree, opinion leaders.
>
> Key occasions. Some are important because they embody significant rituals, as in the case of annual meetings. Others have been deliberately created by the Center and in a few cases have attained the status of tradition.
>
> Key institutions. Some universities as we have reason to know from our recent study, are emulated more than others. This higher visibility makes them strategically important in the general process of change.
>
> Key problems. Some of the problems of liberal programming are of greater importance here than in non-liberal education. The quality of teaching, for example, is a more urgent problem in building a successful liberal program than in a course in accounting. Finding audiences for liberal education is another very special one.

Periodically the staff was uneasy about its leverage approach. It appeared to ignore many individuals and many institutions needing help. And the staff's own feelings of guilt were fed by occasional accusations —sometimes wistful and sometimes angry—that the Center played favorites or worked only with the big universities. In the final analysis, however, the staff remained convinced that its "influence on the attitudes of key people, on the activities of key institutions, on the conduct and content of important occasions, and on the production of reasonable answers to recurrent problems [would] result in instituted changes in the total field."[13]

In any event there was an internal consistency between the tasks, the board objectives, the instruments, and the strategy. This enabled

13. Ibid.

the staff to apply its levers with some assurance that it was moving in the right direction. Between 1957 and 1961, a number of key problems preoccupied the Center. In the programming area there were continuing efforts to develop effective liberal education for specialists. The Vassar Institute spawned many regional seminars for secretaries, and sponsoring universities found CSLEA a willing ally to help in planning or to serve as faculty.

At the same time there were attempts to introduce a liberal component into programs for other groups whose experience and education were primarily specialized. One notable success resulted from cooperation with Pennsylvania State University on liberal education for steelworkers. For many years the university had offered a training program for union officers dealing with the practical problems of union management and collective bargaining. With cooperation from the Center, a two-week residential seminar in liberal education was introduced for officers who had completed the technical courses. Like Vassar Institute, success with the steelworkers resulted in Center participation in regional seminars or in the development of other liberally oriented union education.[14]

In a major effort, the staff attempted to reconcile the values of liberal education with the purposes of executive development. The project began with a study and descriptive analysis of the important experimental programs, New Directions in Liberal Education for Executives.[15] The climax was a conference involving representatives of business and the university. Its purpose was to search for common ground between the contributions of liberal education and the qualities needed in a business executive. The report of the experimental programs made an important contribution to the literature. The conference was less successful. An unpublished report of the conference reflected some of the basic difficulties of the Center in trying to encourage meaningful liberal education for specialists—or for all adults for that matter. Both parties to the dialogue were limited by conventional wisdom. The scholars were

14. See Maxwell H. Goldberg, Meaning and Metaphor (Boston: CSLEA, 1965), for a description of the experiment.

15. See Peter E. Siegle, New Directions in Liberal Education for Executives (Chicago: CSLEA, 1958).

able to respond to the problem of management development only in terms of the conventional liberal arts program. And the managers could see their problems only in conventional terms of technical efficiency. The report suggested that scholars must find unconventional ways to apply the received disciplines to problems of the marketplace, and that business and industry must accept unconventional social responsibilities which include preservation of the executive's humanity as well as perfection of his managerial skills.[16]

A second experiment with specialists was designed for CSLEA colleagues, the AUEC/NUEA deans and directors. In a very real sense it was concerned with attitudes of key individuals as well as with key problems. In 1957 the Center inaugurated an Institute in Liberal Studies for University Administrators, and over a three-year period ran five residential seminars. Topics ranged far and wide in the humanities and social sciences, and the seminars were supported enthusiastically with many deans returning for two or even three sessions.

Another key programming problem to which the Center devoted continuing attention was the development of degree programs especially for adults. The changing nature of the adult clientele and the success of the Brooklyn College experiment impressed many university adult educators with the fact that there was a potential adult student body interested in a program of liberal education leading to a baccalaureate degree—adults who wanted a program that did not merely replicate day school at night. Beginning in 1959, the Center worked closely with the University of Oklahoma as consultant and participant in a faculty project which culminated in the creation of a special degree program, the Bachelor of Liberal Studies. The problems faced at Oklahoma were to be duplicated on many university campuses. First there was the question of appropriate content and method; another issue centered on faculty and other conservative elements in tne university who were not easily convinced that degree programs especially for adults could be anything but watered-down versions of a special degree. Subsequently the Center devoted much energy to a drive to multiply the number of universities offering special degrees. Consultations, conferences, journal articles, and CSLEA publications were used to propagate degree programs especially for adults.

---

16. James B. Whipple, What About Liberal Education for Executives? (manuscript in CSLEA files).

Another area selected for special attention was the community. In the early part of this period there were random attacks centered on the introduction of liberal education as a discrete component to the development of more effective leadership. During 1958-59, for example, the Center cooperated with the University of Rhode Island in the planning and execution of a liberal studies seminar for community leaders. At the same time, on the West Coast, the Center helped the University of Washington launch week-end seminars in liberal studies for community leaders. Although both programs were successful, they did not truly resolve basic questions about the role of liberal education in improving the quality of urban life. In 1960 the Center made a study and report on the role of the university in education for urban life, and the following year it added a student of community affairs to the staff with major responsibility to develop liberal education for urban life.[17]

Another series of problems centered on teaching and learning. Generally speaking, method was a concern in all experimental programs. Nevertheless, there were a few cases where teaching was the key problem.

The evaluation project was the most extensive effort in this direction. Working with key institutions, which had strong programs or interest in liberal adult education, the Center developed a set of behavioral objectives for programs in the following areas: political and social, community participation, moral and ethical, and aesthetic. Funds were never available to develop tests, but the objectives and the evaluation process were described in the Center Research Report, Evaluating Liberal Adult Education.[18] As such, it served as a helpful guide to members of the CSLEA staff and to administrators or teachers who were trying to plan meaningful programs for adults.

Other efforts to deal with teaching as a key problem were directed at classroom teaching. In 1957, the Center produced a film strip to be used by adult educators who wished to introduce faculty to the special

---

17. See Kenneth Haygood, The University and Community Education (Chicago: CSLEA, 1962).

18. Harry L. Miller and Christine McGuire, Evaluating Liberal Adult Education (Chicago: CSLEA, 1961). The U. S. Office of Education expressed an interest in supporting the next phase of the project, but at the time the office required university sponsorship; as an independent organization CSLEA did not qualify.

problems of teaching adults. And at a more theoretical level, the research staff commenced to explore teaching style and its relation to effective adult learning. Between 1958 and 1963 there was a continuing series of research projects and reports dealing with the problem.

Finally, there was a steady stream of publications dealing in one way or another with teaching and learning. Notes and Essays or Research Reports included: On Teaching Adults: An Anthology (1960); Week-End Learning in the U.S.A. (1960); The Residential School in American Adult Education (1956); A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Residential and Non-Residential Learning Situations (1961); Learning and Teaching Through Discussion (1958); Professional Preparation of Adult Educators (1960); Especially for Adults (1957); and Adult Education and Adult Needs (1960). The first four listed dealt with residential education.

Of all the levers at the Center's disposal, key problems received major attention. From another point of view, however, a problem always presumed the application of one or more of the other levers because the Center needed key institutions, key occasions, or key individuals to test and transmit its ideas. Still, there were a few situations where the major emphasis rested at other leverage points.

The two associations, AUEC and NUEA, frequently provided key occasions. Annual conventions, regional meetings, special workshops, and committee work--all provided occasions for cooperation. After the successful workshop on "Purposes of the Evening College" at the 1953 AUEC convention, the Center was generally welcomed as a partner on the association's Program Committee. In 1957, the Center again provided the entire program, "New Directions in Programming for University Adult Education"; more frequently, however, CSLEA limited its role to a single session or to participation on the Program Committee. Regional meetings of both associations provided similar opportunities to join in as planner or participant in the programs. In both cases, regardless of the extent of the participation, the Center's purpose was not to take over the deliberations, but to use the occasions to include elements dealing with liberal education or professional development of university adult educators.

Work with NUEA focused on the major divisions in the association, with the Center again concentrating particularly on professional develop-

ment and to a lesser extent on liberal education. At one time or another the Center cooperated with all divisions—correspondence study, community development, evening college and extension classes, and conferences and institutes (C & I). The major and most successful program involved the C & I directors. In 1959 the Center inaugurated workshops for the division which have continued ever since. Their general purpose has been to help the director of conferences and institutes to see himself as an educator and to undertake a continuing program of professional development to increase his ability to assume greater educational responsibility.

A final key occasion was an unpremeditated creation of CSLEA. This was the annual Leadership Conference. The conferences began in 1952 when the Center invited elected and appointed leaders of AUEC to meet in Chicago. Similar conferences in 1953 and 1954 set a pattern which has continued to the present. Participation has been by invitation, and the occasion has provided an opportunity to conduct association business and to join in a Center program devoted to an important issue related to higher adult education.

One activity which was directed primarily at key individuals was the Visiting Staff Member program. Beginning in 1957, the Center received a special grant from FAE to provide an opportunity for administrators, usually at the junior level, to come to the Center on a leave of absence for periods that ranged from a few months to a year. Freed from the pressures of day-to-day tasks, the visiting staff member thought deeply about some aspects of higher adult education. A member of the Center staff served as tutor and was responsible for making the visitor's individual study program a meaningful contribution to his professional development as a university adult educator.

The emphasis on key institutions, or key individuals for that matter, is reflected in the log of CSLEA field work and consultations. Although there were contacts with many institutions, about 19 and no more than 25 colleges and universities received major attention from the staff.[19] More specifically, the question of key institutions became a major focus in a research project designed to discover the "organizational and institutional bases that must be present" before liberal adult education can "exist

19. CSLEA Field Work Log.

and flourish."[20] The results of the research were published as Forms and Forces in University Adult Education. This diagnostic study identified major growth cycles in the movement of the adult education division from a peripheral to a fully assimilated unit in the university, and suggested that there should be different ways to proceed toward more effective liberal adult education depending on the position of a particular institution on the growth continuum.

4

The years between 1956 and 1961 were busy, productive, and satisfying. The Center was busy with its own experiments, with filling the requests and taking the opportunities for consultations, with leadership development activities, and with clearinghouse, publications, and research. The Fund for Adult Education was generous in its support, moral as well as financial. Financially there was continuing support for the core operation, with many supplementary grants for such special programs as the Carey Study, the evaluation project, and the Negro College project.

The new activities meant changing patterns of operation. The director was no longer able to serve as the contact with the field. Increasingly, consultations and operational responsibility for field projects were delegated to the staff. At first, projects tended to be handled jointly by the director and another member of the staff, but later, programs were run by staff alone. The operational responsibilities of the staff associates, at home and abroad, dictated the appointment of staff assistants. The assistant did not fill the earlier role of "young scholar," but was assigned to support an associate who was burdened by operational details. Similarly the administration of the Center became more complicated—there were two assistant directors, one for operations and one for research, and a staff associate who served as clearinghouse director.

The transition from scholar to operator was not simple. The busy operation tended to weaken the community of scholarship that had been such a prominent feature of the early years. Ideas had been developed in common, often as a result of spontaneous meetings called on the spur of the moment or growing out of a coffee break. Generally all the staff was intimately familiar with the entire Center program. After 1956

20. James J. Carey, Forms and Forces in University Adult Education (Chicago: CSLEA, 1961), p. 4.

there was less time for such common effort. Staff members were in the field, and, even more significant, each staff member had his own projects which took most of his attention and left little time for anything else. Attempts to organize staff meetings to recapture the former spirit lacked spontaneity and never quite achieved their purpose. Gradually, a new kind of staff activity began to emerge—formal or informal subcommittees thought and worked together, sharing ideas and planning programs. Full staff meetings were used to review and make suggestions on the basis of detailed written and oral presentations which described the project and raised a series of specific issues for discussion.

Perhaps a major problem was a failure to recognize that the situation had changed. There was a romantic nostalgia for the "good old days" that affected new staff members as well as old. There was a vague recognition that the situation had changed, but a failure to accept the change as inevitable or to recognize that it made any difference.

The issues related to the internal development of the Center should not overshadow the fact that these were productive years—two major research projects, a strong publications program, an aroused Negro adult education movement, significant contributions to leadership development, many experiments in programming, and hundreds of hours of consultation. All these added up to a solid contribution to the development of more effective higher liberal education for adults.

Any evaluation of productivity in this period must face several questions. First, how extensive was the Center's influence? The Center continued to maintain its important association with AUEC and NUEA, although the link was not as close as it had once been. Relations with NUEA in 1956 probably weakened the ties between CSLEA and its parent organization. A more important factor explaining the distance between the Center and the two associations, however, was the Center's policy to seek out men and institutions ready to move. Thus, although a major activity of CSLEA continued to be related to leadership development within the associations, and the ultimate target continued to be the total field, the conviction continued to grow that the best way to influence the field was to locate and work with its leaders individually. As we have seen, this principle was refined in 1960 in conjunction with a proposal to FAE for a grant renewal; the Center operation was likened to the application of levers at crucial points with the ultimate object of moving a larger mass.

On the basis of this leverage principle, the Center could acknowledge that it had made only the slightest dent in the movement of the total field but considerable impression on the leadership.

The theory was neat enough, but in practice it raised at least three important points. How does the Center apply the levers? Was the Center an innovator of a propagator? Was the Center's responsibility limited to the introduction of a sound program to the key leaders, or should the Center use its energies to multiply its successes? During these years these points were raised in connection with programs for secretaries and the Institute in Liberal Education for University Administrators. After the Vassar Institute, the Center participated in several successful programs for secretaries offered by a number of universities. Similarly, the Center's institutes for deans and directors had been successful. Should the Center continue to push a "good thing," or was its responsibility limited to innovation? In both cases the Center decision was to withdraw—and in both cases universities failed to carry on the programs without CSLEA. The failure, if it was a failure, still left the question unresolved at least as far as the staff was concerned. In large measure it was an inability to find a satisfactory middle ground between the intellectual and the operator, between an obligation to sow seeds and to cultivate fertile soil.

A second question that must be raised in evaluating productivity related to a scatter effect that tended to emerge naturally from the leverage approach. The vastness of the problems and the hostility of the environment encouraged the Center to be strategic—to move in with its levers where the situation seemed right and where men and institutions were ready to move. This led to a proliferation of activities, and, as new, more congenial situations arose, ideas were often dropped or put aside before they were completely developed. Periodically the staff was uneasy about the strategic approach. At the annual staff meetings in 1958 there was a recommendation that "there should be a serious attempt to systemize the process of innovation and experimentation, both in the selection of the innovations to be undertaken and in the use of the experiment as a contribution to knowledge about liberal education for adults." But in spite of good intentions, the use of levers remained the basic operating principle.

The third question dealt with expansion of services to other agen-

cies: Was it possible for the Center to restrict itself to a limited segment of adult education? In 1956 there had been the logical expansion to the NUEA institutions, widening the circle to include the majority of universities with formal adult education divisions offering liberal adult education. But many colleges or universities remained outside the Center sphere of influence, colleges that were or should have been providing liberal adult education. The Board and staff debated often about the wisdom of working with the growing junior college movement or with cooperative extension, which was groping its way toward a broader place in higher adult education outside of traditional agricultural extension boundaries. Although there were occasional contacts and cooperative ventures, the Center continued to decide against further formal expansion.

Another large body outside the Center's sphere was the liberal arts colleges, and here the Center made a serious attempt to stimulate interest and support through the Association of American Colleges. Working with its Commission on Liberal Education, the Center developed a joint proposal for an experimental project which would have established model programs for liberal arts colleges. The Fund for Adult Education refused to provide financial support, and the drive to capture the liberal arts colleges petered out.

The Center did, however, extend its services in another important direction. A Negro College project represented a very special venture in expansion. G. W. C. Brown, for many years the only Negro member of AUEC, convinced the Center that it should work with the Negro colleges. An ad hoc group created the Negro College Committee on Adult Education, with CSLEA as its secretariat. Its program was directed first at arousing a sense of responsibility for continuing Negro education and second at developing appropriate programs and leadership. The activity not only extended the Center into a new area, but at times stretched its definition of liberal education for adults. It also reflected a growing inclination to focus on societal as well as individual problems and to be less and less concerned with conventional applications of the so-called liberal arts.

Beyond higher liberal adult education there was a wide open area. The clearinghouse tended to accentuate and call into question the fine lines which the Center used to separate education, university from non-university, liberal from vocational. The divisions were not only fine, but

they were also inconsistent as they shifted from organizational structure to substance. There were periodic debates, particularly under the prodding of the clearinghouse director, about expanding the Center's services, but the staff never seriously considered such expansion. The growing reputation of the staff pulled the Center into many peripheral areas resulting in cooperation and consultation, but like the earlier decisions on field work, each excursion was decided on an individual, ad hoc basis—and in this case without any serious thought of a change in policy.

A different but equally important factor in the Center's role in higher adult education related to a staff and Board decision to place major emphasis on non-credit programs. The Center policy, enunciated at the annual staff meetings in September, 1957, was a logical culmination of the frustration over the failure to crack the credit mentality and a growing conviction that the future of continuing education rested outside the credit framework. The staff statement carefully pointed out that this was not a repudiation of credit. But it argued that in addition to the importance of non-credit in its own right, non-credit programs offered the greatest opportunity for experimentation. Successful non-credit programs, the staff suggested, might even provide the opportunity to influence the adult credit curriculum. In part the more forthright commitment was a reflection of the Center's association with NUEA, whose members found non-credit, problem-oriented education much more congenial than their sister urban universities in the AUEC.

In spite of the questions, these were satisfying years. In harsh reality, the Center's ultimate purpose seemed pretentious. It was not possible for a small organization to revolutionize higher education. The Board and staff recognized this, and the Center's objectives were couched in relative terms: to help American higher education develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults. Behind this there was the deep conviction that it was vitally necessary to have an organization to provide aid and leadership to the forces that could develop higher liberal adult education. The core support from the Fund for Adult Education and a sympathetic reception in the field provided the Center with an opportunity to operate programs which experimented with ideas for the development of more effective liberal education for adults.

III. 1962-1967

1

The most crucial characteristic of our present time is the intensification of certain already existing factors. The need for knowledge to run both machines and men is more obvious and more urgent than ever before. Professionals struggle to keep up with new knowledge, and the mass of non-professionals is discovering that its lack of knowledge limits its ability to perform tasks demanded by the electronic age.

Against the apparent progress and affluence created by our technical advances, however, America faces a deepening sense of crisis highlighted by restive, frustrated young people, involvement in an impossible war, civil rights disturbances, urban chaos, and, from the Center's perspective, an intensification of what was termed earlier the anti-liberal spirit in American thought and action.[1] This anti-liberalism is demonstrated eloquently in the unsuccessful attempts to resolve our crises by concentrating on things rather than people. An outstanding example is the Great Society and its war on poverty, which has failed really not so much because of the war in Vietnam, but because of the mechanistic, materialistic spirit that lies behind the good intentions; our solutions are concerned with things—poverty, slums, technical skills—not with people. As was noted earlier, it is ironic that even the support for "culture" appears to fit the anti-liberal pattern. Funds flow freely to support arts councils, new buildings, or performing companies, but CSLEA has been unable to locate funds to support an experiment to educate people as more sophisticated audiences for the arts. Both public and private agencies expressed an interest in the project, but explained that such activities were contrary to policy.

For the university, the intensification of existing factors means greater pressures and problems—to educate more students, to do more

1. As in Chapter II, the term liberal continues to be used in its intellectual sense and refers to the term coined by Schwertman.

research often directed toward particular problems of government and industry, to undertake more continuing vocational education, and to enter into many new educational or service areas which only a few years ago would not have been considered university responsibilities. The pressures are both social and financial. As public institutions, universities cannot refuse to undertake or at least seriously to consider education and other academic services needed by society; and it becomes even more difficult to refuse as university finances become increasingly dependent on grants from industry, government, and foundations.

A growing element in both public and private spending is for higher adult education needed to achieve national purposes in defense, domestic affairs, international affairs, or business and industry. In addition to being part of many government programs, the concern for continuing education has been directly acknowledged in Title One of the Higher Education Act of 1966. It provides federal support for university projects dealing with basic community problems.

As elsewhere, the overwhelming emphasis in university adult education is non-liberal in nature. As a result, the adult education division continues to advocate liberal education, but programming is overwhelmingly anti-liberal. The proponents of higher liberal adult education need strong, systematic support now more than ever, and the Fund for Adult Education has gone out of existence. The decision to liquidate the Fund was made in 1960. During the next two years, FAE made a number of terminal grants, and CSLEA was one of the major beneficiaries. Thus by 1962 the Center saw itself with increased responsibilities for the support and development of more effective higher liberal education for adults, almost as the sole force available to the university in the area of adult education.

In its attempt to face up to its continuing task of serving as a counterforce to pressures from an anti-liberal front, the Center has been influenced by two critical factors: one flows from the elimination of its giant ally, the Fund for Adult Education; the other is rooted in the Center's own historical development during its first decade.

Probably the dissolution of the Fund is the more significant of the two, and unquestionably it has created issues that are more difficult to

resolve. First, there is a problem that is both psychological and practical: the Center faces an uncertain future. The Fund never guaranteed to finance the Center indefinitely. Indeed, periodically its officers expressed uneasiness over the fact that FAE was the sole source of support and implied it could not go on underwriting CSLEA forever. Nevertheless, there were continuing grant renewals and generous support for special projects which gave the Board and staff a sense of security—a feeling that the Fund would not abandon its grantee as long as the Center could demonstrate its effectiveness.

In its final grant, the Fund expressed the hope that the Center would find other sources of financial support that would permit it to continue, but it also provided for steps to be taken if it became necessary for the Center to terminate after the four-year grant period.[2] The same belief that the Center should continue was stated and restated by the Board, staff, and practitioners in the field. But after 1962 it became necessary to reassert the principle over and over again, because the faith was constantly challenged by the practical question: Where can the Center find core support? The search for an answer has been unending and has had mixed results.

One major effort to ease the problem of core support culminated in affiliation with Boston University. The Center had discussed the advantages and disadvantages of affiliation at least as early as 1956. A staff proposal in its favor was presented at an annual September staff meeting.[3] The paper argued that affiliation would be mutually beneficial to both the university and CSLEA. From the Center's point of view, there would be intellectual stimulation emerging from membership in an academic community. The Center program would be strengthened by the resources available in the university, and the university connection would make it easier to attract qualified staff members. Although the staff agreed that the argument was logical, the value of complete independence appeared to be an even more compelling reason against union. Thus the idea was not given serious consideration until 1963, when the financial advantages of affiliation turned the balance, encouraging the

---

2. Letter, C. Scott Fletcher to A. A. Liveright, January 27, 1961 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

3. Minutes of Annual September Staff Meetings, 1956 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

Center to take a step which had been considered reasonable all along. In a series of complicated negotiations, the Center prepared the ground. It received permission from the Ford Foundation to prorate its terminal grant over a longer period; it received a grant of $150,000 from the Carnegie Corporation; and it negotiated an agreement to affiliate with Boston University.[4] These measures insured most of the core support needed to operate the Center until June 30, 1969. At best, however, this could only be regarded as a temporary expedient which gave the Center a little time but did not solve the long-range question of continuation.

Theoretically, at any rate, another route to funding the Center was through income for consultations or support from project grants. Although this approach has been somewhat successful, it has not solved the problem of core support. The amounts have been inadequate, the activities have intruded on established obligations, and where there was additional income, it has had to be diverted to employ additional staff required to do the additional work. While in themselves the projects may have been "worth doing," they have not dealt with the problem of termination. At the meeting of the Board of Directors in November, 1965, doubts regarding the ability to continue the Center were raised again. Again the Board tried to deal with the question by refusing to accept the closing of the Center even as a possibility. They adopted a statement which asserted "as a matter of policy . . . that the Center must be continued indefinitely to provide the long range needs of higher adult education."[5] But the reassertion of faith still left unresolved the practical problem of funds.

Uneasiness over the future and the search for new ways to finance the Center are bound to have adverse psychological effects on the staff, draining creative energies away from the development of liberal education for adults. Practically, the situation means that the staff is distracted from its major task in a number of ways. There is the actual time diverted to a search for a resolution of the problem. Although this is a

---

4. The affiliation represents a significant contribution by Boston University. The university provides space and certain administrative services and pays one quarter of the salaries for the present core professional staff. In return, the staff performs teaching or administrative services and cooperates with departments or committees particularly where the concern is the university's continuing education program.

5. Minutes, CSLEA Board of Directors, November 20, 1965.

major distraction for the director, to some extent it involves the entire staff.

The use of consultation as a source of income is a second diversion. Although there has been a serious attempt to restrict consultations to situations which have some connection with liberal education, inevitably compromises have been necessary at least to the extent of devoting attention to urgent immediate problems for a fee instead of the important basic problems as a Center contribution to the field. In 1962 the Center undertook a study of South Bend, Indiana to make recommendations regarding its needs for liberal adult education. In 1964 the Center participated in a study of higher education in Ohio. In 1966 the director undertook a survey for the U. S. Office of Education, and in 1966-67 he participated on a consultant team to plan for the new Cleveland State University. In all cases, except for the Indiana study, these projects went far beyond liberal education for adults and were concerned more with the organization and structure of higher adult education than with its substance. From one point of view, such activities were legitimate Center preoccupations. First, CSLEA experience provides the staff with competence to deal effectively with organizational problems of higher adult education; second, the Center has insisted for years that liberal education can only flourish if adult education has a proper place in the university. At the same time, the fact remains that these consultations diverted staff energies from a concern for substantive aspects of liberal education for adults.

Another financial aspect related to the dissolution of the Fund has been the cut in the size of CSLEA's operating budget. In 1960, the annual budget exceeded $300,000.[6] Of this amount, $247,000 represented the basic operating budget, and the balance came from supplementary FAE grants for special projects. Excluding the special items, allocations for the core budget were as follows: salaries, $127,700 (51 per cent); projects $72,500 (29 per cent); and administration $47,800 (20 per cent). How was the Center to operate on a budget of $150,000? The question was simple enough to answer as an exercise in percentages. The salary item was reduced to $89,250 (60 per cent); projects were cut back to $36,250 (24 per cent); and administration became $24,500 (16 per cent). The sig-

6. Budget and Expenditures for the Year 1960 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

nificant difference was the increased proportion devoted to salaries at the expense of projects and administration, but this has been the trend throughout the Center's history. In part it was a reflection of rising academic salary levels, but even more it was an indication that CSLEA saw its contribution in terms of professional staff rather than project grants. By 1961 the staff consisted of thirteen professionals, two part-time research fellows, and six secretaries. The new budget provided for seven professionals and three clerical workers.[7]

The decision to operate at the reduced level was dictated by the hard facts of the terminal grant. The Fund was not in a position to give the Center a million dollars, which would have provided for an additional four years at the higher level. The Center took what it could get, and, given $150,000 a year, the mathematics for the budget trimming were irrefutable. But of course it was not as simple as that, and the Board and staff gave much thought to making the operation effective at the drastically reduced figure.

Generally speaking, there were two ways to deal with the enforced retrenchment. One choice was to reduce the areas of activity, or, in other words, to eliminate some of the tasks which had been identified as important in 1956 and to concentrate only on the areas most crucial to higher liberal education for adults. The other choice was to ask a smaller core staff to undertake to maintain the same scope of activities at a reduced level. The Center chose the latter, partially on the assumption that it was important to continue to push ahead on all fronts and partially in the hope that special grants would enable the Center to supplement the core operation. The expectation was reasonable, but thus far has not been realized. The assumption was defensible, but the choice has left CSLEA with a question to which there has not been a satisfactory answer: What is the basis for limiting activities on many fronts?

In 1960, at the annual September staff meetings, there was a serious attempt to clarify activity under the core operation.[8] A statement, which emerged from the discussions, starts bravely, specifying two objectives: to develop and disseminate knowledge, and to influence leader-

7. Proposal to the Fund for Adult Education, 1961 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

8. Clarification of Center Activity Under the Core Operation, 1960 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

ship attitudes and activities. But when it came to specifying the projects which might be undertaken to implement the objectives, little or nothing was eliminated. Guidelines for future Center direction were stated as follows:[9]

Objectives

I. RE: DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE

A. The Center shall give HIGHEST PRIORITY to:

1. Studies concerned with understanding factors related to conditions for adult learning and especially to optimum conditions for adult learning as related to the goals of adult education; secondary goals in this area are (a) studies of differences between adults and younger students, and (b) studies of variations in learning achievement among adults.

AND

2. Studies of appropriate institutional and curricular forms for higher adult education and especially to the study of embryo forms now in existence or the experimentation with models for possible forms (by this we mean new or different ways to organize educational experiences so they are more appropriate for the needs of adults).

B. The Center shall give MEDIUM PRIORITY to:

1. The role of the university in liberal education for adults—by this we mean ways to improve university support for liberal adult education.

AND

2. Goals and objectives for university liberal education for adults with special emphasis on clarification of the difference and relation between continuing and preparatory education—that is, clarification regarding the distinctiveness of continuing education.

C. The Center shall give LOWEST PRIORITY to:

1. Methods for reaching adults with university programs in liberal education.

2. Effective teaching of adults.

II. RE: INFLUENCING LEADERSHIP ATTITUDES AND ACTIVITIES

A. The Center's targets for leadership development shall be:

1. Administrative officers of university adult education (faculty and top administration only in particular institutions in cooperation with D and D's).

2. Key persons in higher education associations (NUEA,

9. Ibid.

AUEC, Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, AAC, etc.)

B. The Center shall place HIGHEST PRIORITY on the development of increased competence in dealing with:

1. Defining objectives
2. Developing curricula
3. Faculty training
4. Faculty involvement in planning enterprises

C. The Center shall place MEDIUM PRIORITY on:

1. Increased commitment to university liberal adult education. This commitment shall be reflected in the staff, budget, and discussion related to the liberal education of adults.

AND

2. Greater understanding of (a) the role of the university in liberal adult education, (b) the meanings of liberal adult education, (c) philosophical bases for liberal adult education.

There were priorities, to be sure, but the formulation permitted the Center to range among the priorities—and in effect to follow paths of least resistance and do what could be done.

Research activities provide a striking case in point. Between 1961 and 1964 the Center's major research effort was devoted to teaching style. Although this item rated the lowest priority, it became the exclusive preoccupation of the small research staff. Interest of the CSLEA researchers, support from the field, and the hope that the project would produce additional grants all dictated the decision. The research resulted in publications which made a contribution to knowledge about the relation between teaching style and learning.[10] But it also foretold a future in which a smaller staff would attempt to carry on all the old activities. The criterion became the urgent or the immediate rather than the important, as the staff attempted to do the best it could with every issue that came along.

3

A second critical factor influencing the present is rooted in the historical development of the Center. Over the years the collective experience of the CSLEA staff has resulted in ability to deal with many aspects

10. Daniel Solomon and Harry L. Miller, Explorations in Teaching Styles (Chicago: CSLEA, 1961); and Daniel Solomon et al., Teaching Styles and Learning (Chicago: CSLEA, 1963).

of higher adult education, including aspects which often may be extraneous to a limited focus on liberal education. At the same time there has been strong support for the argument that it is impossible to isolate higher liberal education for adults from the rest of adult education. In theory the Board and staff have held the line in favor of a limited focus on liberal education, but in practice there has been a tendency to yield to growing pressures or temptations to expand in directions which modified the basic purpose.

The situation was analyzed in a working paper prepared in 1962 for the annual September staff meetings.[11] According to the point of view expressed in this memorandum, one role was described as "pioneers on the cutting edge of liberal education." In this role the task was to create and experiment with new programs and methods appropriate for liberal adult education. In this role, too, the Center speculated about organizational relationships for university adult education, about university responsibilities, and about the nature and educational needs of adults.

According to the working paper, the major emphasis in this role was on study and reflection. Paul Sheats, University of California's extension director, called the Center a "think shop," and Reginald Phelps of Harvard saw the Center playing "with gusto and success the role of gadfly to American adult education."[12] For both men the Center's major purpose was to develop ideas relevant to more effective liberal education for adults. In this capacity the Center was available to anyone in the field who wanted to collaborate. It was on the basis of this role that CSLEA developed the leverage theory whereby the staff counted on and received support from leaders in higher adult education and from universities which were on the cutting edge. Ultimately, the universities operated the experimental programs, and it was their leadership, not the Center's, which moved and changed the field.

The working paper went on to identify the Center's second role as "consultants on higher liberal education for adults." In this capacity CSLEA worked with universities in a variety of ways and on a wide range of problems related to higher adult education. Activities included

---

11. Working Papers for September Staff Meetings, 1962 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

12. Reginald H. Phelps, "Broadening the Base of Education," Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin, Fall, 1962, pp. 13-19.

consultation, sustained cooperation on a particular project, secretariat services, information services, field studies, conference planning, and provision of program resources. Although major emphasis continued to be placed on liberal education, there was a tendency to move outside the narrow focus on the liberal toward the non-liberal. Typical of the wider range of activities were: participation in the organization and development of the International Congress of University Adult Educators; the studies for South Bend, Indiana, Ohio, and the U. S. Office of Education; development and operation of the Conference on Urban Life for the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.; the Negro College project; consultation on the credit-by-examination programs being developed by New York State and the College Entrance Examination Board; a massive effort to achieve wide adoption of degree programs especially for adults; active attempts to encourage greater cooperation among adult education associations; consultation with other associations such as the American Alumni Council and the National Council of Churches; and consultation on the community education projects underwritten by Title One of the Higher Education Act.

In recent years the reduced budget and staff have been contributing factors in the trend toward consultation, but the trend was also a fact of the Center's historical development and was already apparent in 1962. In the working paper for the 1962 meeting, it was stated this way:[13]

> Perhaps it is inevitable that this [consultation] has played an increasing part in our activities. As we grow in knowledge and experience, we have sound advice and assistance to give. We also have time for thoughtful planning and, being national in outlook, we are less apt to be bogged down by parochialism which obscures the view of the separate university. As we grow in reputation we have more and more opportunities to give advice—we became the boys in Chicago with the technical and intellectual know-how and they came for help from all over America and even abroad. If they do not come, we can go to them and generally are welcome.

There were certain crucial differences between the two roles—the reflective role and the operational one. The first one tended to be more study-oriented and more precisely directed toward liberal education, and it permitted greater independence. The second role tended to be more operational, more non-liberal, and less independent. Although it was not always the case, one significant aspect of the operational stance

13. Working Papers for September Staff Meetings, 1962.

was a tendency for the Center to intervene directly as an agent of change rather than to work through universities. As far as independence was concerned, the role did not imply that the staff was not creative or imaginative or did not provide leadership in initiating activities. But frequently the client was the piper who called the tune, with the Center providing interesting or creative variations. Although it was possible to find a liberal component in all the consultative activities, often the connection was tenuous so that it was possible to say that CSLEA, like its clients, "was not anti-liberal but non-liberal."

The working paper raised questions regarding the compatibility of the two roles. But in practice it appeared possible to achieve a balance between the two roles so long as CSLEA received adequate financial support and could employ a staff needed to perform its varied tasks. But in spite of valiant attempts, it has been impossible to maintain the balance with reduced funds and reduced forces. At a time when our society needs organizations like the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults more than ever, the pressures of termination, budget, and non-liberal operational obligations have tended to upset the balance between the reflective and the operational activities of the staff and have conspired to force the Center to turn to the immediate rather than the important and to gravitate toward a posture that is not anti-liberal but is non-liberal in nature.

There was general agreement on the staff that the Center had moved toward the operational role "and that it was appropriate that we do so; however, there was considerable reluctance to abandon Role 1 entirely and agreement that we should consider more fully possibilities for developing a formula to insure some expenditure of energy for activities associated with the role."[14]

Essentially, the present period is marked by an attempt to achieve a new balance between the two roles, a balance that will enable the Center to continue to contribute to the development of more effective liberal education for adults. During most of 1966, a series of staff meetings was devoted to a search for a stance or spirit which could serve as a moving force directing the Center in its continuing task. The staff called this a search for geist, and its conclusions were stated in a memorandum to

---

14. Minutes of September Staff Meeting, September 10-11, 1962 (manuscript in CSLEA files).

the Board of Directors dated October 21, 1966.[15] The report reviewed fundamental issues which had troubled the staff either consciously or unconsciously throughout the period. The tone of the report was self-critical, reflecting a feeling that the balance between the reflective and the operational had been upset and had become weighted toward the operational. Furthermore, the Center activities appeared to have moved away from "an explicit emphasis on liberal education for adults as projects . . . were undertaken that had . . . somewhat peripheral relationship to this goal."

The staff agreed that the focus "should be on the development of liberal education for adults," broadly defined in terms of contemporary society. It called for a "proper tension between reflection (study or research) and operation (development and dissemination)." The statement suggested the need to resolve two questions: "Do we operate primarily to learn more and to add to understanding of liberal education for adults? Or do we operate mainly to encourage the field to apply our ideas?"

The staff arrived at no precise answer to these questions, but the statement represents increased clarity regarding the Center's purpose and a reaffirmation of a determination to make the development of more effective liberal education for adults its continuing task.

---

15. Memorandum to Board of Directors, October 21, 1966 (manuscript in CSLEA files). See also James B. Whipple, The Continuing Task: Reflections on Purpose in Higher Adult Education (Brookline: CSLEA, 1967).