DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 607 HE 006 198

AUTHOR	Hall, James C.
TITLE	A History of Baccalaureate Programs for Adults 1945-1970.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	31 Oct 74
GRANT	NE-G-00-3-0199
NOTE	350p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$17.13 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education; Adult Students; Bachelors Degrees; Educational Innovation; *Evening Students; *External Degree Programs; *Higher Education; Part Time Students; Program Descriptions; University Extension

ABSTRACT

An external degree is one that may be earned outside the central structure of a college or university. The most common form of external degree program is the evening college in which students, who are usually working adults, meet the standard requirements for a four-year degree by taking a part-time program after work. No allowances are made in evening college programs for what adult students may have learned outside the classroom, even though this learning may be equivalent to what they are required to learn for their degrees. Sensing this problem, a number of programs were developed in the late forties and fifties to take advantage of the rich experience that many adults have had in their lives. Most often such programs provide not only an opportunity for credit for life experience but also for teaching methods and requirements that seem to be more appropriate for mature students. The adult degree programs of nine schools are examined in the report; Brooklyn College, Queens College; Mundelein College; Roosevelt University; University of Oklahoma; Syracuse University; Goddard College; University of South Florida; State University of New York College, Brockport. The most significant findings of the study are: (1) these programs seem to be reacting to the move toward vocational orientation in undergraduate programs. (2) The programs are moving away from their unique designs toward compatibility with more traditional programs. (3) Lack of full time faculties keeps the staff of these programs from exercising authority within their institutions. (Author/PG)

ED101607

A HISTORY OF BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS 1945-1970

by James C. Hall

Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare
National Institute of
Education

Grant No. NE-G-00-3-0199
October 31, 1974

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

- External Degree
- Identification of Programs To Be Studied
- Sources of Information
- Methodology

II. UNIVERSITY EXTENSION IN ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES BEFORE 1900 11

- The United States
  - The American National Lyceum
  - Extension Lecturing
  - The Chautauqua Institution
- England
  - The Mechanics' Institutes
  - The Workingmen's Colleges
  - University Extension
- Cross-Fertilization
  - University Extension at Johns Hopkins
  - The American Library Association
  - The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching
  - State Support for Extension
  - The University of Chicago
  - The University of Wisconsin
  - The Demise of the Cambridge System

III. THE RESURGENCE OF EXTENSION AFTER 1906 38

- The Progressive Movement
  - General Extension: The University of Wisconsin
  - Cooperative Extension
  - The Evening College
  - The Association of Urban Universities

World War I
The American Association for Adult Education
The National University Extension Association
World War II

IV. LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS 69

University College, The University of Chicago
  Hutchins and the Chicago Plan
  The Great Books Program
  The Basic Program at Chicago
World War II and Its Impact on Extension
  The Association of University Evening Colleges
  The Growth of Evening Colleges
Liberal Education and the Ford Foundation
The Ford Foundation
The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
  CSLEA: The Early Years
  CSLEA: The Middle Years
  CSLEA: The Declining Years

V. THE RESIDENT PROGRAMS: BROOKLYN, QUEENS, MUNDELEIN, ROOSEVELT 103

Introduction
Brooklyn College--The Experimental Degree Project for Adults
  The Response of Brooklyn College to the War
    Tutorial Services
    Counseling Program
    Exemption Examinations
    The Experimental Curriculum
    Foreign Language Requirement
  Establishment of the Project
  SGS and the CSLEA
  Designing the Project
  The Second Grant
  Re-designing the Project: The Second Year
  The Special Baccalaureate Degree Program at Brooklyn College

  - The Changed Environment
- Queens College--The Adult Continuing Education (ACE) Program
  - The Design of the ACE Program
  - Growth of the ACE Program
  - Elaboration of the ACE Design
- Mundelein College--The Degree Completion Program
  - Design of the DCP
  - Origins of the DCP at Mundelein
  - Creation of the DCP
- Roosevelt University--The Bachelor of General Studies Program
  - Creation of the Adult Education Division
  - The Initial Special Baccalaureate Proposal
  - From the Founder to his Successors: A Transitional Period
  - The Second Proposal
  - The Design of the BGS
  - The Approval Process
  - The Early Years of the BGS Program
- Summary

VI. THE INDEPENDENT PROGRAMS: OKLAHOMA, GODDARD, SYRACUSE, SOUTH FLORIDA 236

- Introduction
- The University of Oklahoma--The Bachelor of Liberal Studies
  - The Daydreaming Committee
  - The Degree Committee, 1958-1961
  - The Design of the BLS
    - Independent Study
    - Liberal Studies
    - Comprehensive Examinations
    - Residential Seminars
    - The Faculty
    - The Audience for the BLS
    - Outside Funding
  - Summary
- Goddard College--The Adult Degree Program
  - The Experiment
  - The Danish Folk High School
  - Bates' Visit to Australia
  - Planning the ADP

- Design of the ADP
- Program Autonomy
- Syracuse University--The Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies
  - The Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies
    - The Planning Process
    - Design of the BA in LS
    - Problems with the BA in LS
    - BA in LS: A Part of the Whole
- The University of South Florida--The Bachelor of Independent Studies (BIS)
  - The Design of the BIS
  - Problems with the BIS
- Summary

VII. BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS: THEIR FUTURE 317

- Trends in Program Design
  - From Increased Access to a New Curriculum
  - From One Method to Many
    - SUNY Brockport--The BA in LS
  - From Liberal Studies to a Vocational Orientation
  - From Unique Designs to Compatibility
  - Trends in Staffing and Financing for Special Baccalaureate Programs
- A Final Word

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

External Degrees

Baccalaureate programs for adults are part of a broader genre of programs in higher education which are coming to be known as "external degree programs." An external degree is "one that can be earned by a student outside of the normal institutional framework. . ."[1] Cyril O. Houle, in The External Degree suggests a framework for describing the evolution of the external degree in America. The categories he presents are: 1) the extension degree, 2) the adult degree, and 3) the assessment degree.[2] The extension degree is the minimal external degree.

> The extension degree, in its purest form, is one awarded on completion of a coherent and complete traditional degree program offering all necessary subjects and options at a

---

[1] Alan Pifer, "Is It Time for an External Degree?" College Board Review, No. 78, Winter 1970-71, p. 5.

[2] Cyril O. Houle, The External Degree (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1973), p. 87.

> time or place accessible to those who cannot come to the campus or whose other responsibilities make it necessary for them to spread their study over a longer period than does the student on campus. In admission, instruction, evaluation, and certification, few or no changes are made.[1]

The adult baccalaureate degree, on the other hand, is based on the conviction that adults are different, both psychologically and socially, from adolescents and that degree programs for adults should take these differences into account and, in fact, should take advantage of them whenever possible.

> Such a degree may depart completely from traditional patterns of admission, instruction, evaluation, or certification, or it may mix new elements with old ones so that some compatibility exists between it and an extension or an internal degree In either case, however, the guiding principle is that the students are men and women, not late-adolescents.[2]

The degree programs included in this study fall into this category.

Houle's third category of programs, the assessment degree program, is characterized by its emphasis on the demonstration and evaluation of the competence of students in relevant areas of learning. In assessment programs

> one or more of the traditional procedures of higher education--admission, teaching, evaluation, certification or licensure--can be so modified or separated from the others that the actual learning of the student, rather than his completion of formal requirements can become the center of attention and the basis of the awarding of the degree.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 88.

[2] Ibid., p. 89.

[3] Ibid., p. 90.

These programs are not restricted to an adult audience and are often designed to provide "life experience" for younger students rather than to take advantage of the experience which older students already have.

The three forms of external degree programs suggested by Houle appeared sequentially, at least in the United States.[1] The American extension degree seems to have had its origins in the popular education movements of the nineteenth century in England and the United States. A brief sketch of the evolution of these movements in the two countries appears in the following chapter.

The extension degree, while it was earned by a few through the College of Liberal Arts at Chautauqua in the 1890's, was not offered by colleges and universities with any great frequency until the twentieth century. And even then this form of the external degree was found almost solely in the evening college programs of urban institutions. The creation and development of the urban evening colleges and their extension degrees are treated in Chapter III.

The adult degree seems to have evolved from the patterns established by the extension degree after World War II, largely in response to the special character of the veterans-turned-students who flooded the colleges and universities with the help of the G.I. Bill. An account of the educational environment after the War in institutions of higher education and of the special interest of the Ford Foundation and its subsidiaries in liberal education for adults can be found in Chapter IV.

---

[1] In other countries extension and assessment degrees may have appeared in reverse order. In England, for example, an assessment degree was offered by the University of London as early as 1836--Eric Ashby, Universities: British, Indian, African (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 24--while an extension degree was not offered until 1920 at Birkbeck College, The University of London--The Yearbook of the Universities of the Empire, W.H. Dawson (ed.) (London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1921), p. 124.

The history of the origins and development of the special baccalaureate programs for adults constitutes Chapters V and VI. Master's programs for adults as well as Associate in Arts programs were excluded from the study since they seemed to represent responses to educational needs of adults which are substantially different from those at the baccalaureate level. Such master's and Associate in Arts programs might more appropriately be treated in other investigations.

Identification of Programs To Be Studied

Since many degree programs in the United States style themselves "programs for adults," four criteria were chosen at the outset of this study to focus attention on what seemed to be a reasonably coherent group of special baccalaureate programs which bear some relationship to one another both in their origins and in their intentions. First, only programs established between the end of World War II and 1970 are included because many of these programs seemed to have received a good part of the final impetus for their creation from the experience that colleges and universities had with the veterans after World War II and because by 1970 special degree programs for adults seemed to be giving way to the assessment degree program which resemble, in some ways, the special baccalaureate programs for adults but which are intended for a much broader audience.

Second, to be included in this study, each of the special baccalaureate programs had to be restricted to adult students as defined by a stated lower age limit. While the stated age limits varied from twenty-one at SUNY Brockport to thirty at Brooklyn College, the intent seemed similar at each institution: to limit the programs to mature students and to exclude students within the more typical college age range of eighteen to twenty-two both because of the students' assumed immaturity and the institutions' internal, political reality.

Third, students in each of the programs had to have an opportunity to use what they had learned outside their formal education toward their degree requirements. Mechanisms for the application of the mature students' life experience toward degree requirements took many forms in the nine programs finally selected, ranging from credit by examination to substantially modified degree requirements which were thought to take advantage of the students' maturity and experience. These mechanisms will be discussed and assessed as each of the programs is subsequently described.

Finally, the materials describing each of the special baccalaureate programs for adults had to contain assertions that the programs employed curricula and teaching methods which were designed for mature students and assumed to be more effective with mature students than were the established and more traditional undergraduate curricula and teaching methods. While the curricula and teaching methods vary from program to program, the programs studied, with a single exception, may be subdivided into two categories on the basis of their curricula and teaching methods. One category includes those programs which incorporate already existing courses for most of the degree requirements for the mature students and which rely, to the greatest extent, on classroom instruction which is offered within the institutions' regular academic calendars. The other category includes those programs for which special curricula were created for a substantial portion or for all of the students' degree requirements and which rely, to the greatest extent, on independent study which proceeds at the individual student's own pace regardless of the institutions' regular calendars. The exception to both of these categories was designed from components borrowed from both categories.

The nine programs identified for the study were, according to the best evidence available, the only programs which met the four criteria stated in the preceding paragraphs.[1] Of the nine, the programs at Brooklyn College and Queens College of the City University of New York, and Mundelein College and Roosevelt University in Chicago can be described as programs which incorporated existing courses for most of their degree requirements and which use largely classroom instruction within the design of their adult degree programs. The programs at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York, Goddard College in Plainfield, Vermont, and the University of South Florida in Tampa, on the other hand, rely more heavily on specially constructed curricula and on independent study in their program designs. The remaining program at the State University of New York College at Brockport (SUNY Brockport), the most recently established of the nine is eclectic in its design, including components from both the foregoing categories.

---

[1] The nine programs included in the study were identified from the literature and from listings provided by John Valley in "An Inventory of External Degree Programs and Proposals" (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, March 3, 1971), p. 4 (Mimeographed) and in "A Supplement to An Inventory of External Degree Programs and Proposal" (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, May 7, 1971), p. 4 (Mimeographed) and by Roy Trout in Special Degree Programs for Adults (Iowa City, Iowa: ACT Publications, 1971), pp. 55-58. Catalogs and brochures were requested from each of the institutions so identified; from the information in these materials, some programs clearly fell within the definition of an adult degree program used in this study but others seemed inappropriate for inclusion. Letters were sent to the deans or directors of each of the programs in the latter group requesting clarification of the nature of their programs. The replies to these letters indicated that, in each case, the respondent did not feel that his program met the four criteria used in defining special baccalaureate programs for adults for the purposes of this study.

Although the programs within the two groups of four just described are not, by any means, identical in all respects, they have been grouped for discussion into two separate chapters: the resident/existing curricula programs are discussed in Chapter V and the independent/special curricula programs in Chapter VI. The SUNY Brockport program is included in Chapter VII, the concluding chapter, since it seems to resemble the new assessment degree programs, Houle's third type, as much as it resembles the other eight adult degree programs and thus may represent a transition from one type of external degree program to another.

The separation of the nine programs into two groups of four and an isolated program is, of course, artificial. The time sequences in which the programs in the two groups were developed and established overlap. And the individuals responsible for the development of those programs established after Brooklyn's knew of and learned from the programs preceding theirs. It is hoped, however, that treating the two groups in separate chapters and the eclectic program in the concluding chapter will increase the clarity and usefulness of the description of each without seeming to deny the interconnectedness among them all.

Sources of Information

The information upon which the study is based came largely from three sources. The earlier chapters on the evolution of university extension in England and the United States, the creation of the urban evening colleges with their extension degree programs, and the educational environment following World War II are based, for the most part, on primary and secondary written documents. The later chapters dealing specifically with the nine special baccalaureate degree programs included in the study are based, for the most part, on primary written documents found in the archives and files of the nine institutions at which the programs are in operation and on interviews with numerous individuals who were either directly involved in the development of the nine programs or who were in a position to observe their development.[1] Fugitive documents from the archives and files were microfilmed and indexed for later analysis and use. With few exceptions, the interviews were tape recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim. In the few cases in which interviewees expressed their wish not to be tape recorded or in which physical surroundings made it technically impossible to record with the available equipment, extensive notes were taken for later summary.

Methodology

The evidence upon which this history is based was subjected to appropriate methods of historical scrutiny to establish its authenticity and credibility. Both primary and secondary sources were subjected to internal and external criticism. Interview data for each individual was checked against that provided by others and against contemporary documentary evidence to determine the confidence which may be placed in its accuracy.

---

[1] A complete listing of the names of the individuals interviewed may be found in Appendix A.

Finally, because this is a contemporary history about events, actions, and circumstances which are still present in the recollection of many individuals, it has been necessary on a few occasions, to mask the source of sensitive information and to delete references which might be harmful to the reputations of individuals now living or recently deceased. It is felt that nothing of critical importance has been lost in not including all the information in these cases.

CHAPTER II

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION IN ENGLAND
AND THE UNITED STATES
BEFORE 1900

The United States

The American National Lyceum

In America, the Lyceum Movement was an early example of popular education for adults. The Movement was first proposed in 1826 as an "Association of Adults for Mutual Education." A letter, apparently from Josiah Holbrook, to the editor of the American Journal of Education listed goals for Lyceums and laid out a local, county, and national scheme of organization. Holbrook hoped that adults involved in mutual education would improve morally as well as intellectually.

> . . . If associations for mutual instruction in the sciences and other branches of useful knowledge, could once be started in our villages, and upon a general plan, they would increase with great rapidity, and do more for the general diffusion of knowledge, and for raising the moral and intellectual taste of our countrymen, than any other expedient which can possibly be devised. And it may be questioned if there is any other way, to check the progress

> of that monster, intemperance, which is making such havoc with talents, morals, and every thing that raises man above the brute, but by presenting some object of sufficient interest to divert the attention of the young from places and practices which lead to dissipation and to ruin.[1]

The Lyceum Movement flourished and within five years could boast of more than eight hundred local groups, more than fifty county societies, and a national organization, the American National Lyceum.[2] But the popularity of the Movement was short-lived: the national organization had disappeared by the end of the 1830's and while the local lecture and debate societies continued through the 1840's, they lost their intensity well before the beginning of the Civil War. Herbert Baxter Adams attributes the demise of the Lyceum Movement not to the common man's lack of interest in education but rather to the increased availability of newspapers, illustrated magazines, and public libraries which provided mass education in convenient and inexpensive forms.[3]

Extension Lecturing

Concurrently with the rise of the Lyceum, a few college teachers began to present lectures to audiences not enrolled at their institutions. One of the earliest of these extension lecturers was Professor Benjamin Silliman of Yale College who delivered a series of talks in 1808 to a group of ladies and gentlemen in New Haven on the subject of chemistry. His lectures were well received and by 1834 he was traveling as far as Boston to deliver lectures, a practice he continued until he retired in 1859.[1]

---

[1] /Josiah Holbrook/, "Associations of Adults for Mutual Education," American Journal of Education, I (October 1826), pp. 594 and 595.

[2] Herbert Baxter Adams, "Educational Extension in the United States," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900, Volume I (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1901), p. 285.

[3] Ibid., p. 298.

Extension lecturing was a common phenomenon by the 1870's, and not just in the East. "From the beginning of California University, in 1874, members of the faculty were expected to go out from Berkeley and give lectures in the city of San Francisco."[2] But Johns Hopkins University seems to have been the first American institution to incorporate extension lecturing into its normal pattern of operation. Daniel Coit Gilman, Johns Hopkins' first president, recounted his rationale for providing public lectures beginning with the University's founding in 1876.

> In order to illustrate the activities of other universities, and to secure the counsel of eminent scholars in respect to our development, the decision had been reached already that academic lectures on various important and attractive themes should be opened to the public, and that the professors should come from institutions of acknowledged merit established in the North, South, and West. The usages of the *Collège de France* were in mind. Thus the instructions of

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 299 and 300.

[2] Herbert Baxter Adams, "University Extension and Its Leaders," *American Monthly Review*, III (July 1891), p. 608.

> a small faculty were to be supplemented by courses which should be profitable to the enrolled students, and entertaining, if not serviceable, to the educated public.
>
> Each course included twenty lectures. They were given in a hall that held about 150 persons, and the hour was usually five o'clock. Ladies and gentlemen attended, without enrolment or fees, as well as the students and professors of the University. The lecturers were accessible to all who wished to confer with them, and many among us then formed friendships which lasted until the ties were severed by death.[1]

But while Johns Hopkins' commitment to extension lecturing was an important, early step toward the establishment of university extension at institutions across the country, it was a small step compared to the pervasive influence of Chautauqua.

The Chautauqua Institution

The Chautauqua Institution, a massive educational system which developed out of the Sunday-school Teachers' Assembly chartered in 1874 to train Sunday school teachers, provided the point of focus for the final impetus toward university-based extension in the United States. The Chautauqua Institution was remarkable not only for the broad range of high quality programs it provided for its large audience during the summers at Lake Chautauqua and during the winters at home, but perhaps more importantly for the group of academic giants it assembled for years. This group included William Rainey Harper, Melvil Dewey, Herbert Baxter Adams, T.C. Chamberlin, and Robert G. Moulton.

---

[1] Daniel Colt Gilman, The Launching of a University (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1906), p. 61.

Two of Chautauqua's many divisions, the Chatauqua Literary and Scientific Circle (C.L.S.C.) established in 1878 and the Chautauqua College of Liberal Arts chartered by the Regents of the University of the State of New York in 1882, seem most directly connected to the evolution of university extension. Bishop John Vincent, who founded Chautauqua with the help and financial backing of an Akron, Ohio industrialist named Lewis Miller, described the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle as an organization which

> . . . aims to promote habits of reading and study in nature, art, science, and in secular and sacred literature in connection with the routine of daily life (especially among those whose educational advantages have been limited), so as to secure to them the college student's general outlook upon the world and life, and to develop the habit of close, connected, persistent thinking. It encourages individual study in lines and by text-books which shall be indicated; by local circles for mutual help and encouragement in such studies; by summer courses of lectures and "students' sessions" at Chautauqua; and by written reports and examinations.[1]

The *Chautauquan* magazine provided some of the stuff of local group meetings and individual study for members of the C.L.S.C. during the larger part of the year when Chautauqua was not in session on its New York campground.

Students who completed the four year program were awarded a certificate of completion.[2] Although the vast majority of those who enrolled did not complete the full four years, the impact of the program was immense: more than 225,000 readers joined the C.L.S.C. between 1878 and 1894 with 10,000 new readers enrolling every year[1] and, according to the estimate of its Principal, J.C. Hurlbut, who reported on the progress of the Circle at its fourteenth anniversary celebration in 1892, the C.L.S.C. had been responsible for the distribution of ". . . nearly 2,000,000 copies of good books" to the American citizenry.[2]

---

[1] John H. Vincent, *The Chautauqua Movement* (Boston: Chautauqua Press, 1886), p. 75.

[2] Herbert Baxter Adams, "Chautauqua: A Social and Educational Study," *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1894-95*, Volume I (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896), p. 1004.

The more elite counterpart of the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle, ". . . the highest form of the Chautauqua movement" as Vincent put it,[3] was the Chautauqua College of Liberal Arts. The College was authorized by the New York Regents to grant degrees ". . . although that /was/ rarely done and never except in cases absolutely worthy of recognition."[4] The College offered its course work during the summer assemblies but it also offered correspondence study throughout the rest of the year. Compared to the C.L.S.C., the Chautauqua College of Liberal Arts was very small; Chancellor Vincent reported that 405 students were enrolled during the summer of 1894[5] and that only two degrees were conferred that year.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1001.

[2] Ibid., p. 1008.

[3] Vincent, Chautauqua Movement, p. 169.

[4] Adams, Chautauqua, P. 1031

[5] Ibid., p. 1027.

England

England of the nineteenth century also evidenced a rising concern for the education of working class people. A number of institutional patterns emerged to meet this newly recognized need; among them were the mechanics' institutes, workingmen's colleges, and university extension.

The Mechanics' Institutes

The first mechanics' institute was begun in 1800 in Glasgow with a series of lectures presented to a group of workingmen by Dr. George Birkbeck. The purpose of the mechanics' institutes, in the words of a participant, was

> to supply, at a cheap rate, to the different classes of the community, the advantages of instruction in the various branches of science which are of practical application to their several trades or occupations.[2]

Lectures and demonstrations typically supplied the instruction for the members of the institutes and, in most institutes, libraries with reading rooms provided information and social contact as well. Those interested in access to the libraries and and admission to the lectures periodically paid fees for the support of their institute, but contributions from patrons were also solicited and, in fact, relied upon for the continuing operation of the institutes.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1032.

[2] James Hole, Light, More Light (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1860, reprinted in facsimile London: Woburn Books Ltd., 1969) pp. 54 and 55.

By 1850, 610 institutes with 102,050 members existed in England and another 92 with 18,031 members had been established in Wales, Scotland, and Ireland,[2] but the original goals of the institutes were generally not reached. The middle class supporters of the institutes had been overly sanguine in their assumption that mechanics and artisans were well enough prepared to study advanced science. When the workers' deficiencies early became apparent, the goals of the institutes were adjusted to meet the abilities and interests of their expanding clientele.[3] The changing emphasis and audience is described by Harrison thus:

> Classes seldom paid their way; and in any case the majority of clerks and shopkeepers who frequented the institutes wanted not science and the discipline of study, but the opportunity of acquiring a little of the cultural elegance which they had noted as a peculiar adornment of their social superiors. Thus by the forties the emphasis in most of the institutes had shifted completely to literary or fashionable topics, both in lectures and choice of books for the library. Science was not always completely abandoned, nor was the struggle to maintain classes, especially in elementary subjects and chemistry, soon given up. But the main weight of the emphasis in the institutes was now quite differently

---

[1] J.F.C. Harrison, Living and Learning, 1790-1960 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961), p. 58.

[2] J.W. Hudson, The History of Adult Education (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851, reprinted in facsimile London: Woburn Books Ltd., 1969), p. vi.

[3] Harrison, Living and Learning, pp. 62-66.

placed from where it had been twenty years earlier.[1] The mechanics' institutes, though their original goals were modified, remained an important source of information and education for the working people of Great Britain and, perhaps even more importantly helped to breed a demand for education among the adult population.

The Workingmen's Colleges

But the movement toward popular education for adults during the nineteenth century was not motivated only by the desire of the middle and upper classes to help mechanics and artisans do their jobs better by learning the scientific principles behind their work. The nineteenth century was also a time of political upheaval, especially in France and Germany. The common man and the politics of the common man was on the rise. Robert Ellis Thompson, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania, looking back from his vantage point in 1891 saw that

> forty years ago there was great disturbance among the working-classes in England, responsive to the revolutionary agitations on the Continent. More than one plan was put forward among them, and parties formed to bring in the millenium by express speed. At one time serious fears were aroused as to the safety of English society and its form of government.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 67 and 68.

[2] Robert Ellis Thompson, "The Fountain-Head of University Extension," *University Extension: A Series of Articles on Phases of the Movement* (Philadelphia: The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, 1891), p. 9.

In response to this apparent threat and to what he considered the misinformation of many of the workingmen involved in the radical politics of the time, Frederick Denison Maurice and a group of his friends from Oxford and Cambridge joined with some of the workingmen to form a workingmen's college in London. The intent of the organization was to pass on to the workingmen the best of what the Oxford and Cambridge men had learned in their college careers and most likely to inculcate middle class political values as well. The workingmen's college was immediately successful: ". . . the first workingmen's college was started October 30, 1854; and by the end of November it had one hundred and thirty students."[1]

University Extension

James Stuart, the creator of the Cambridge method of university extension teaching, also noted that the lines between the classes in England were becoming blurred in the last half of the nineteenth century:

> A leading characteristic of the present day is undoubtedly the breaking down of privilege, or rather the extension of the advantages hitherto enjoyed by the privileged to the community as a whole. In education this is the order of the day no less than in other regions. . .[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 10

[2] James Stuart, "The Origin of University Extension," University Extension, III, July 1893, p. 418.

Popular education for adults sponsored by the University had been discussed as early as 1850 by the Oxford Commission, but suggestions for extending the services of the University to those not enrolled in one of the Colleges were rejected. Nevertheless, the movement toward education for the masses of working people continued without the support of either of the two great universities until Stuart, then a young instructor at Cambridge, successfully petitioned his University in 1871 to establish an extension program. The program began in 1873.

Stuart described his first experience in itinerant lecturing out of which his method of university extension grew in the American periodical University Extension:

> In the autumn of 1867 I was engaged to give a course of lectures in astronomy to ladies in Leeds, Sheffield, Manchester and Liverpool. These lectures lasted for two months, and I traveled the round of the four places each week. There were in the four places about 600 pupils. With the object of making the lectures as educational as possible, and remembering that the pupils had not been accustomed to take notes, I accompanied each lecture by a syllabus which was intended to be a sample of the notes which they should take, whose skeleton might be filled up by them afterward to recall the thread of the lecture. Further, in order to avoid the difficulties of an oral examination, I adopted a plan of setting printed questions to be answered in writing at home. The answers to these were transmitted to me by post, and I returned them the following week with corrections and comments.[1]

Stuart's system of extension lecturing, comprised of five characteristics, became the basis for university extension work in England and, for a time, in the United States as well.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 419

The first characteristic was itinerant lecturing which allowed one lecturer to serve a relatively large geographical area. The other four characteristics--the syllabus, exercises, the discussion class, and the final examination--are described well by Richard G. Moulton who became one of the most famous extension lecturers in both England and America.

> The course of instruction is laid down in the syllabus--a document of perhaps thirty or forty pages, sold for a trifling sum; by referring for details to the pages of books this pamphlet can be made to serve as a text-book for the whole course, making the teacher independent in his order of exposition of any other text-book. The syllabus assists the general audience in following the lectures without the distraction of taking notes; and guides the reading and thinking of the students during the week. The syllabus contains a set of "exercises" on each lecture. These exercises, unlike examination questions or "quizzes," are not tests of memory, but are intended to train the student to work for himself; they are thus to be done under the freest conditions--at home, with full leisure, and all possible access to books, notes or help from other persons. The written answers are sent to the lecturer for marginal comment, and returned by him at the "class." This class is a second meeting for students and others, at which no formal lecture is given, but there is free talk on points suggested to the teacher by the exercises he has received: the usual experience is that it is more interesting than the lecture. This weekly routine of lecture, syllabus-reading, exercise and class goes on for a period of twelve weeks. There is then an "examination" in the work of the course held for students who desire to take it. Certificates are awarded jointly on the result of the weekly exercises and the final examination.[1]

Stuart's five part system of extension lecturing was adopted by Cambridge University in 1873, by the London University Extension

---

[1] Richard G. Moulton, "University Extension as the University of the Future," University Extension: A Series of Articles on Phases of the Movement (Philadelphia: The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, 1891), pp. 2 and 3.

Society in 1876, and by Oxford in 1878.[1] It provided popular education for the working people of England which was carefully planned and had serious educational intent. The extension movement in England grew rapidly after it received the support of Cambridge and Oxford; between 1885 and 1908 nearly half a million students were served at 577 centers by the Oxford University Extension Delegacy alone.[2] Cambridge and London were equally active in the movement.

Cross-Fertilization

The English and American popular education movements developed concurrently in the two countries during the first eighty years of the nineteenth century. The Cambridge system of university extension perhaps epitomized the English experience as Chautauqua, in its many forms, seems to have epitomized the American. Both countries had developed popular lecturing independently of each other, but without a base in a nationally recognized institution, these single lectures and lecture series waxed and waned according to the efforts of their promoters and the sometimes fickle preferences of their audiences. James Stuart's creation of a five part methodology for extension teaching which was accepted by Cambridge and then by Oxford provided a consistency not always found in the earlier lectures and lecture series. And the association with the two old universities of England gave university extension a more respected position in the educational affairs of the nation.

---

[1] Joint Committee of University and Working-class Representatives on the Relation of the University to the Higher Education of Workpeople, *Oxford and Working-class Education* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), pp. 32 and 33.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

The leaders of the Chautauqua Institution, on the American side, modified the religious camp meeting by giving it serious educational intent. They also perfected a system of home study which allowed the students of Chautauqua to break free from the time restrictions which were a consequence of a warm weather program. Home study allowed Chautauqua to continue during the winter months and meant that the influence of Chautauqua could be felt throughout the entire year.

The leaders of the extension movement in England and of Chautauqua and extension teaching in the United States were each aware of the activities in the other country. John Vincent, one of the founders of Chautauqua, visited England in 1880 and again in 1886, taking special note of university extension there. He returned committed to offering university extension according to the Cambridge system through Chautauqua. Herbert Baxter Adams with the help of William Rainey Harper and others drew up the prospectus for "Chautauqua University Extension" which was first published in 1888.[1]

---

[1] Adams, "University Extension," *American Monthly Review*, p. 602.

Richard G. Moulton,the experienced university extension lecturer who had been brought to the United States by the Redpath Lyceum Bureau, both contributed to the adoption of the Cambridge system here and transmitted information about the "Chautauqua idea" back to England. The report of the first national conference on university extension held in America contains the following comment on the reciprocity between two countries:

> A noticeable characteristic of the American promoters of University Extension has been that they have given full and free credit on every possible occasion to the English originators of this movement. It is pleasant to remark then the same quality in our trans-Atlantic cousins, who, to mention only one instance, have always stated their indebtedness to America for the Chautauqua idea of summer schools, and the Chautauqua idea of home study.[1]

The first national conference on university extension was held December 29-31, 1891 as the enthusiasm for the movement was peaking in America. Two events four years earlier seem largely responsible for bringing the Cambridge system of extension teaching before a broad, American audience.

University Extension at Johns Hopkins

Johns Hopkins University, which had offered public lectures from its founding in 1876, again took a leading role in the adoption of the five part system of university extension.

---

[1] "University Extension: A Step Forward," University Extension, I, January 1892, p. 204.

> The first conscious attempts to introduce English University Extension methods into this country were made in 1887, by individuals connected with the Johns Hopkins University.
>
> The first practical beginning was made with a class of young people who met once in two weeks, throughout the winter of 1887-88, in the reading-room of a beautiful modern church close by the Woman's College. After an introductory talk upon "University Extension" by a Hopkins instructor, the class was intrusted to a graduate student . . . who gave a series of instructive lectures, accompanied by class exercises, upon "The History of the Nineteenth Century," with Mackenzie for a text-book on the subject. A working library of standard authorities was collected by the joint effort of the leader, the class, and the . . . pastor of the church.[1]

One of the organizers of this extension course was Herbert Baxter Adams who became involved in extension teaching at Johns Hopkins as early as 1878 and continued his involvement until his death in 1901.

The American Library Association

Adams was directly responsible for the second event which helped to speed the acceptance of the Cambridge system in America. At the 1887 Conference of the American Library Association at Thousand Islands, New York, he proposed not only that university extension should become widespread in America but that

> every great public library should become, in its own local field, a people's university, the highest of high schools in the community. It should be the roof and crown of organized public instruction not only for existing schools, but also for the graduates of schools, for studious persons

---

[1] Herbert Baxter Adams, "Public Educational Work in Baltimore," *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1899), pp. 10 and 11.

> already past the school age, whether in the higher or lower walks of life.[1]

The challenge was immediately taken up by J.N. Larned, head of the Buffalo, New York, public library who organized a twelve session course in labor economics with the help of some of his fellow citizens of Buffalo and the advice of Adams. The course, offered during the late fall and winter of 1887-88 in the Buffalo library, drew nearly 250 people and was considered very successful.[2]

In January 1888, Melvil Dewey who was well acquainted with Adams and with university extension through his own work with Chautauqua took Adams' plan for the use of libraries as university extension centers

> before the regents of the University of the State of New York, and at the University convocation in Albany, July, 1888, advocated university extension in connection with public libraries. A year later he again brought the matter before convocation. In February 1890, a committee of New York colleges and universities urged the regents to establish, under state supervision, a system of extension teaching.[3]

---

[1] Herbert Baxter Adams, "Seminary Libraries and University Extension," Johns Hopkins Studies in History and Political Science (Baltimore: N. Murray, 1887), p. 461.

[2] J.N. Larned, "An Experiment in 'University Extension,'" The Library Journal, XIII, March-April 1888, pp. 75 and 76.

[3] Herbert Baxter Adams, "Summer Schools and University Extension," Monographs on Education in the United States, II, ed. by Nicholas Murray Butler (Albany, New York: J.B. Lyon Company, 1900), p. 24.

The committee of colleges and universities broadened Adams' original proposal for the use of libraries to include also the use of colleges and universities as extension centers. But regardless of the slight modification of the plan, pressure was being exerted on the University of the State of New York to formally recognize university extension as one of its responsibilities. And by 1890, Melvil Dewey was Secretary to the Board of Regents.

The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching

As interest in university extension quickened in the United States, Philadelphia briefly emerged as the center of the movement. Dr. William Pepper, Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, organized an association to provide extension lectures in Philadelphia and to support the general growth of the movement. The association, called the Philadelphia Society for the Extension of University Teaching, was established on June 1, 1890, with Pepper as its first President; by December of that year, its name was changed to the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching to reflect its broadening perspective. Forty extension courses were offered by the Society in Philadelphia during 1891 with an aggregate attendance of 50,000. Edmund J. James, who would later become the first Dean of University College at the University of Chicago, succeeded Pepper as President of the Society in April 1891 and formed a general advisory committee including, among others, William Rainey Harper, President Designate of the University of Chicago, and Thomas C. Chamberlin, then President of the University of Wisconsin.[1]

Other cities were active in the extension movement as well. W.F. Poole, librarian of the Newberry Library in Chicago, also attended the Thousand Islands Conference in 1887 where he heard Adams speak of university extension. Poole left committed to including extension in the program of the Newberry which was then being designed. The September 1, 1892 issue of The Dial contains a letter from Poole reporting that the Newberry had offered three extension courses with great success during the winter of 1891-92; he further described the activity in extension in the Chicago area by listing five other extension centers operating concurrently in the city and suburbs.[2]

State Support for Extension

On May 1, 1891 the Governor of New York signed into law the bill which had resulted from Melvil Dewey's urging in 1888 and thereafter. The law authorized the spending of $10,000 for the establishment and promotion of a system of extension to be offered through the University of the State of New York. None of the $10,000 was to be used in payment of lecturers.

---

[1] Adams, "University Extension," American Monthly Review, p. 606.

[2] W.F. Poole, "University Extension Work in Chicago," The Dial, XIII, September 1, 1892, pp. 130 and 131.

> The intent of the New York act /was/ simply to provide the necessary means for organizing a State system of University Extension, to suggest proper methods of work, to secure suitable lecturers, to conduct examinations, to grant certificates, and to render such general assistance and co-operation as localities may require.[1]

While the Wisconsin legislature had appropriated funds for the support of extension lecturing as early as 1885,[2] New York was the first state to establish a system of university extension.

The University of Chicago

At the same time that the bill establishing extension in New York State was nearing signature, William Rainey Harper was engaged in final preparations for the opening of the University of Chicago which opened its doors with Extension as one of its three major Divisions. The second issue of The Quarterly Calendar published in Fall 1892 contained this description of the Extension Division:

> University Extension seeks to bring a liberal education within the reach of those who, for any reason, cannot

---

[1] Herbert Baxter Adams, "University Extension in America," The Forum, XI, July 1891, p. 519.

[2] Frederick Jackson Turner, "Extension Teaching in Wisconsin," University Extension, I, April 1892, p. 313.

> pursue studies in residence. It aims to meet the wants, not only of those who have never pursued college and university courses, but also of those, who, having completed such courses, desire to review them, and to avail themselves of the results of recent research. By encouraging regular reading and study, it aims to widen the intelligence and enlarge the sympathies, thereby promoting the better employment, as well as the enjoyment of leisure.[1]

Of the three instructional departments of the Extension Division described in the same number of the Calendar, two are especially important to the evolution of university extension: the Lecture-study Department and the Class-work Department.

Lecture-study strongly resembled university extension as it had developed in England; in fact,Richard G. Moulton, perhaps the most famous English extension lecturer, was hired away from the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching in Philadelphia by Harper to lend direction to the University of Chicago's Lecture-study program. While Lecture-study credits could be used, within certain restrictions, toward a degree at Chicago, the program was ". . . intended rather to interest the student, and to direct and inspire him to higher reading and study, than to furnish information."[2] The audience for the Lecture-study program was meant to be ". . . university graduates and artisans, bankers, lawyers, physicians, teachers, and graduates of high schools."[3]

---

[1] The University of Chicago, The Quarterly Calendar: University Extension Edition, I, Fall 1892, p. 20.

[2] Ibid., p. 21.

[3] Ibid.

Class-work, on the other hand, was meant

> to offer opportunity for thorough college work to those whose limited leisure prevents residence at the University. For this purpose it will organize afternoon, evening and Saturday classes. These classes are designed especially to aid those students who are looking forward to a college course or to graduate work.[1]

President Harper and his associates attempted to meet a social need through the Class-study Department by offering their University's regular academic program at times and in places more accessible to working people. The University was careful to preserve the quality of the courses offered through the Class-study Department by using the faculty of the University to teach them. Not all requirements for a degree could be met through the Class-study Department, but the University of Chicago, perhaps following the lead of the Chautauqua College of Liberal Arts which Harper had also headed, offered courses required for a degree through the Class-study Department of its Extension Division rather than offering only extension lectures which were largely peripheral to a degree. This represented a major break from the English tradition of the extension lecture and probably signaled, as much as any other event of the time, the Americanization of university extension.

The courses offered by the Class-work Department ". . . were scattered over the entire city and in a few suburban towns." Only 129 students took advantage of the courses in 1892-93, the first year of the University's operation, but by 1896-97 more than 1800 were enrolled and ". . . the large majority. . . were teachers of the public schools of the city."[1] To serve these teachers, the University created the College for Teachers in 1898. The College, located in downtown Chicago six miles from the University's main campus, grew rapidly and ". . . at the end of the second year of the work, the name was changed to 'The University College,' because the name formerly used was understood to indicate that the work proposed limited itself to the training of teachers."[2] Through the establishment of University College, the University of Chicago set a pattern which would become commonplace in metropolitan areas in the first half of the twentieth century. University College was the first "evening college" in the United States at which credit toward a degree could be earned.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

The University of Wisconsin

In the early 1880's, a parallel system of university extension was developing in Wisconsin. The first step in the Wisconsin system seems to have been taken with the formalization of the Farmers' Institutes in 1885.

The Farmers' Institutes seem to have originated in the

---

[1] The University of Chicago, The President's Report: July 1892-July 1902 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1903), p. 146.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. lxxxviii.

> conversation of the late Hiram Smith, a regent of the University, practical farmer and public-spirited citizen. Suggestions dropped by him resulted in the drafting of a wise bill by Charles E. Estabrook, recently Attorney-General of the State, and this bill became a law in 1885. Under the law as it exists at present /in 1892/ the University is given $12,000 annually for conducting Farmers' Institutes. . .[1]

In addition to the Farmers' Institutes, lectures of a less "practical" nature had been given around the state for some time before these lectures were re-organized according to the Cambridge method.

> It was not until /1892/ that this side of University Extention work was entered into systematically by Wisconsin, but the germs of the movement had existed for some time. There had been, of course, many lectures given about the State by individual members of the faculty, and work had been done closely allied to the Extension movement. In January, 1888, the Contemporary Club, of Madison, acting on the suggestion of the late William F. Allen, professor of history in the University, arranged a course of free lectures upon the history of the Northwest.[2]

A syllabus and a reading list was developed for this course. And in 1889 a second course on the history of the far west was offered as was, in 1890, a third course on the history of Kentucky and Tennessee.

During the winter of 1890-91, Frederick Jackson Turner,

> who had given Extension lectures while a student at the Johns Hopkins University, conducted courses of six lectures upon the Colonization of North America at two centres in the State. At the close of December, 1890, President Chamberlain delivered an address before the State Teachers' Association at Madison, upon University

---

[1] Turner, "Extension Teaching in Wisconsin," p. 313.

[2] Ibid., p. 315.

> Extension, in which he indicated the intention of the University to enter upon the work. The interest in the movement was increased by the address of Dr. H.B. Adams, of the Johns Hopkins University, before the State Historical Society two weeks later upon the Higher Education of the People.[1]

The University issued circulars at the opening of the following academic year announcing courses of six lectures each to be offered by ten members of the faculty. These series were very successful, with forty-seven centers visited the first year and requests received from seventy-eight centers the next. And in 1892, the University received funds from the legislature expressly for university extension.

The Demise of the Cambridge System

The proponents of university extension in the Cambridge fashion held forth great expectations for its potential affect on the American people. Some of the socialistic and moralistic flavor of the extension movement in England and of the political ferment on the Continent carried over to the United States. As Herbert Baxter Adams put it in his panegyric to extension in 1887:

> Antagonism between the classes and the masses [in England] has been broken down. Capital and labor have joined hands for the elevation of society. The attention of entire communities has been directed to the burning questions of our time. Public reading, instead of being frivolous and desultory, has been led into profitable fields. Intellectual energy has been concentrated upon particular subjects

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 316

> for sufficient time to create some mental and moral impression. Now, my notion is that these same results can be accomplished in America. . .[1]

But such happy results were not forthcoming. University extension lecture series, which seemed destined to become an integral part of university education in the early 1890's, were almost dead by the end of the century. And the depression which ended the nineteenth century almost certainly hastened the demise of the English variety of university extension in America by reducing the funds available for public lectures. Even Adams, one of the extension's earliest and most fervent promoters, had realized by 1900 that the movement had failed. University extension, he said,

> . . . has been tried and found wanting in many parts of this country and Canada. The state universities of the west and south, for public reasons, early entered their state fields and some still hold their own with varying degrees of honor and success; but as an educational movement, university extension in America cannot be said to have accomplished all that its friends at first hoped.[2]

But while Adams, who was nearing the end of his life, must have felt that his efforts in favor of extension had come to little, university extension did not disappear in America. The start made by the University of Wisconsin in providing university teaching for the residents of its state constituted a new pattern followed by many state institutions in the years to come.

---

[1] Adams, "Seminary Libraries," p. 462.

[2] Adams, "Summer Schools and University Extension," pp. 848 and 849.

And more importantly for this study, the University of Chicago with the establishment of the University College began another tradition which would provide higher education and college degrees for many thousands of working people in urban areas in the twentieth century. English university extension had indeed failed in America, but American university extension, which would succeed in the twentieth century even more dramatically than English university extention had in the nineteenth, had just begun to take shape.

CHAPTER III

THE RESURGENCE OF EXTENSION AFTER 1906

The Progressive Movement

> At the turn of the century, Americans could look back over three generations of progress unparalleled in history. The nation had advanced, in Jefferson's prophetic words, to 'destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye.' The continent was subdued, the frontier was gone, and already Americans were reaching out for new worlds to conquer. From a small struggling republic, menaced on all sides, the nation had advanced to the rank of a world power, its hegemony in the Western Hemisphere undisputed, its influence in the Eastern everywhere acknowledged.[1]

But in spite of accomplishments and progress since its Civil War, all was not well with America. Prosperity had been achieved at enormous social and material cost. Children and women were exploited to reduce the cost of production; machines produced efficiently but killed and maimed thousands in the process. Slums and disease stunted and crippled thousands more. Wealth seemed destined to become more and more focused on the few and the personal ethics of simpler times proved inadequate to guide an expanded scale of enterprise based on mechanization and mass production.

---

[1] Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager, The Growth of the American Republic (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 440.

Against the evils which were the unhappy by-products of progress arose a protest with a "distinctly moral flavor."

> It took the form of an agrarian revolt, and in that form attempted to adapt the principles of Jeffersonian agrarianism to the facts of a modern industrial economy. It demanded the centralization of power in the hands of a strong government and the extension of regulation or control over industry, finance, transportation, agriculture, labor, and even morals. It found expression in a new concern for the poor and the under-privileged, for women and children, for the immigrant, the Indian and the Negro. It called for new standards of honesty in politics and in business, the reform of political machinery, and the restoration of business ethics. It formulated a new social and political philosophy, which rejected political laissez faire and justified public control of social and economic institutions on the principles of liberal democracy.[1]

The Progressive Movement, as the protest was called, resulted in major advances in social, economic, political, and education spheres. Attempts were made and programs instituted to give working people legal recourse against the power of corporations which were often monopolies. The income tax helped to control the pyramiding of huge fortunes and to distribute the wealth of the nation over a broader segment of its population. Reform movements, especially in the cities, attacked the corruption of the bosses and achieved, temporarily at least, the appearance of change. And education at all levels consolidated the gains made in the last half of the nineteenth century.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 442.

General Extension: The University of Wisconsin

University extension which had nearly disappeared in the nineties reasserted itself in new and more pragmatic forms. The economic and social well-being of extension's constituency became the central focus of its re-birth; the more purely academic, lecture-discussion approach which was central in England did not reappear to any significant degree in America. And as the multi-dimensional extension program of the University of Chicago under Harper had been the epitome of the earlier development, so the re-organized Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin under Van Hise and Reber became the touchstone of the new movement. As James Creese put it, perhaps a little too enthusiastically:

> In the entire history of university extension, no event had more critical importance than the re-establishment of the Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin by President Charles R. Van Hise and Dean Louis E. Reber in 1906-07. The revival at Wisconsin led to restoration of partly abandoned extension divisions in universities all over the country, at privately endowed institutions as well as at state universities.[1]

---

[1] James Creese, *The Extension of University Teaching* (New York: American Association for Adult Education, 1941), p. 98.

Van Hise, who had been an extension professor at the University of Chicago for eleven years while also a faculty member at Wisconsin,[1] echoed the concern of the Progressives for meritocracy in educational opportunity in a speech to the National University Extension Association in 1915.

> It should be the aim of University Extension . . . to find the way for the boy and girl of talent, whatever the place of birth, whether to tenement on the east side of New York or the mansion on Fifth Avenue, so that the states and the nation may have the advantage of his highest efficiency and at the same time make possible for him the fullest and largest life.

Van Hise went on to include "the ordinary individual as well as the man of talent" within the proper audience for university extension work. His concept of extension was much broader than Harper's had been ten years earlier. Van Hise intended that extension at the University of Wisconsin and at other institutions should attempt ". . . to carry light and opportunity to every human being in all parts of the nation; this he felt was ". . . the only adequate ideal of service for the university."[2]

Louis E. Reber, the man whom Van Hise chose as his Dean of Extension, had been Dean of Engineering at Pennsylvania State College before coming to Wisconsin. Perhaps the fact that both Van Hise and Reber were engineers by training partially accounted for their fresh and practical approach to extension which was not encumbered either by a liberal education bias or by the earlier assumption that university extension offerings had, in some sense, to be "university level." Reber not only accepted Van Hise's definition of the proper audience for extension but broadened the definition of the services extension would perform in Wisconsin. In Reber's own words:

---

[1] C. Hartley Grattan, *In Quest of Knowledge* (New York: Association Press, 1955), p. 192

[2] National University Extension Association. *Proceedings of the First National University Extension Conference* (Madison, Wisconsin, 1915), p. 24.

> Right or wrong, you find here [In Wisconsin] a type of University Extension that does not disdain the simplest form of service. Literally carrying the University to the homes of the people, it attempts to give them what they need--be it the last word in expert advice; courses of study carrying University credit; or easy lessons in cooking or sewing. University Extension in Wisconsin endeavors to interpret the phraseology of the expert and offers the benefits of research to the household and the work shop, as well as to municipalities and state.[1]

It was in these terms that the "Wisconsin Idea" was defined and colleges and universities across the country, especially public institutions, joined the new extension movement.

The activity in extension after 1906 outstripped anything seen in this country or in England before the turn of the century. Creese reports that between 1906 and 1913, twenty-one institutions re-organized their extension programs which had been neglected or discontinued during the "lean years" and twenty-eight universities entered the field for the first time.[2] Grattan provides a list of nineteen institutions which established extension divisions between 1908 and 1919; all but two of the nineteen were publicly supported.[1] The discrepancy between Creese's figures and Grattan's list is probably accounted for by a difference in the criteria they used for including or not including certain institutions: Creese seems to include any institution which began to engage in extension activities or which re-entered extension work following Wisconsin's re-organization while Grattan includes only institutions which officially established extension divisions for the first time following Wisconsin's lead. No matter which authority is used, however, it is clear that a dramatic upswing in extension activity occurred between Wisconsin's re-organization and the First World War.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[2] Creese, *Extension*, p. 55.

Cooperative Extension

But the pattern of extension activities which took shape after Wisconsin's vigorous re-entry into the field was more complex than simply "general extension," as the Wisconsin idea came to be called. Agricultural extension had been growing parallel to both the university extension lectures of the nineties and the emergence of general extension epitomized by the Wisconsin program in the first decade of the twentieth century. Cooperative extension, or agricultural extension, sponsored through the cooperative efforts of the federal and country governments and the land-grant universities, seems to have developed out of the Farmers' Institutes which appeared in the United States with the Lyceum Movement of the 1830's and 1840's.

---

[1] Grattan, Quest, pp. 189 and 190.

> Lycea held in farming communities of Connecticut early took on an agricultural flavor. Immediately after the Civil War a Kansas agricultural society began to sponsor something somewhat similar called a "farmers' institute." The idea caught on around the country. Between 1880 and 1890 farmers' institutes were established on a more or less permanent basis in 26 states, some under the aegis of local clubs, some under state associations, and some under land-grant colleges. A typical institute met for two or three days. Daytime sessions were devoted to lectures and discussions on practical farm problems, the evening to "culture" and entertainment. Conductors were adjured to "shut off partisan political statements." By 1899 institutes were reported in 47 states, with a total attendance of 500,000 farmers and their wives.[1]

A number of factors conspired to create the Cooperative Extension Service from these largely local activities. Among them were the political power of the large number of farmers involved in the institutes, the increase in technology and mechanization on farms which required a concurrent increase in specialized training for farmers, and the rise of the Progressive Movement which had its roots in rural America.

The Cooperative Extension Service was created with the signing of the Smith-Lever Act by President Wilson in May, 1914. The Act provided at least $10,000 per year for each state upon presentation of a satisfactory plan. States with larger rural populations received proportionately more funds. Land-grant colleges in each state were required by the law to create an agricultural extension division separate from any general extension division they might have. The Office of Extension Work in the Department of Agriculture provided federal leadership.[1] Cooperative extension was designed to offer wide-ranging services not limited to academic subjects just as general extension; but cooperative extension was to serve a more narrowly defined audience with activities focused on agriculture and problems related to agriculture. Because of its federal funding and coordinated leadership, the Cooperative Extension Service rapidly became the largest and perhaps the most powerful agency for adult education in the United States.

---

[1] Theodore Shannon and Clarence A. Schoenfeld, *University Extension* (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965), p. 10.

The Evening College

In addition to general and cooperative extension, a third pattern of extension gained strength and direction early in the century. This was the evening college described in the preceding chapter through its prototype, University College at the University of Chicago which grew out of the Class-study Department of the Division of Extension. University College, unlike the Class-study Department ". . . received its students as matriculants of the University," but it differed from the other colleges of the University in the breadth of its offerings. The courses offered through University College were drawn from a wide range of departments within the University and were not limited to those appropriate for a single degree program or a set of careers. "Potentially, its interests were far more diverse than those of any particular curriculum pursued in the Quandrangles."[1]

---

[1] Malcolm S. Knowles, The Adult Education Movement in the United States (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962), pp. 42 and 43.

University College at the University of Chicago and subsequently other evening colleges, stood in the middle ground between traditional resident colleges and the earlier pattern of university extension.

> Thus, University College was both a device to draw Extension closer to residential study and a vehicle to bear the influence of the University outward along new roads. The mixture of centripetal and centrifugal tendencies which the College exhibited was a product of experience. Unlike the class-study department, which had been born of excogitation (and then devoured by University College at its birth in 1900), the College evolved through a process of adaption to the environment.[2]

The environment to which University College was adapting consisted of a burgeoning urban population, often prepared educationally through the secondary level and much in need of further education to compete successfully in a labor market which was demanding more skills and more complex skills of its workers.

---

[1] Richard J. Storr, Harper's University (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 200.

[2] Ibid., p. 201.

In describing his students, and probably the students of evening colleges in general, Otis W. Caldwell, then Dean of University College, painted a picture of a pragmatic, no-nonsense group in a speech to the National University Extension Association (NUEA) in 1916. "They are giving collegiate education a chance to demonstrate whether it can make a contribution to the betterment of their daily work..."[1] Caldwell accepted the challenge presented by these students in much the same spirit that Reber accepted the challenge to serve the citizens of Wisconsin. Caldwell clearly felt that it was the University's duty to adapt its courses, schedules, and teaching style to them.

> The opportunity for service to the people who compose this city which such a city college presents to a university is one of the highest importance, and the ability of the university to organize its academic materials and its methods of procedure so as to meet these progressive needs of busy working people is a true test of the university's right to the confidence which up to this time the public has placed in the University.[2]

The adptation to student needs at Chicago did not extend to a full degree program, however. Just as the credit earned through the Class-study Department had been limited first to one half and later to one quarter of the credit necessary for a baccalaureate degree, so University College was limited almost entirely to offering the first two years of the four year degree.[1]

---

[1] National University Extension Association. Proceedings (Chicago, 1916), p. 52.

[2] Ibid., p. 56.

But Chicago was not the only urban university to create an evening division to extend the offerings of the day colleges. Columbia University in New York City responded to a similar need for part-time study in a similar fashion. Columbia had long been involved in extension though public lectures and as early as 1830 had created an extension program for working people called the "Literary and Scientific Course." While this particular program did not fare well and was dropped in 1843, Columbia continued in various other ways its service to the city through offerings open to the public.[2]

In the early years of the twentieth century, a trend in extension work became apparent at Columbia as it had at Chicago and elsewhere: registrations and demand were shifting from lecture series to regular collegiate courses offered in the extension program.

> For some years the emphasis in /extension7 work had been steadily shifting from the more formal type of public lecture to systematic courses involving preparation, classroom discussion, and examinations for certificate or diploma credit. By 1903-04 enrollment had reached 1,590, a figure approximately equal to the entire number of full-time students then studying for degrees in Columbia College,

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[2] John Angus Burrell, *A History of Adult Education at Columbia, University* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), pp. 3 and 4.

> Barnard College, and the three nonprofessional graduate schools. . . . It was obvious from the experience of Summer Sessions and Extension Teaching that the day was past when instruction of part-time students could be viewed as merely a gesture of community service, dependent upon annual resolutions and carried on by improvised measures.

In April, 1904, President Nicholas Murray Butler proposed permanent status for Summer Session and Extension Teaching at Columbia. His proposal was approved and went into effect on July 1, 1904.[1]

The Association of Urban Universities

As other urban institutions of higher education came to recognize the growing opportunity and need for service to their communities, a number of individuals from urban institutions and the leadership of the National Association of State Universities (NASU) began to explore ways to solve the special problems of urban institutions in an organized manner. Initially it was thought that the urban institutions might unite with the NASU but "after mature consideration. . . the conclusion was reached that the interests of both State and city institutions would be best served by forming a new and separate association representing urban universities and colleges, particularly those cooperating in municipal affairs." Invitations to a conference in Washington, D.C. scheduled for November 9 and 10, 1914, were sent to representatives of urban institutions interested in service to their communities. Twenty-five individuals attended the conference, twenty-two from urban institutions, two from the U.S. Bureau of Education, and the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Board of Education. Fourteen institutions were represented at the conference, although sixteen institutions are listed as charter members of the new Association of Urban Universities.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 8 and 9.

Thus by 1914, what Knowles calls the "third tributary" to the modern concept of extension had become enough of a force in urban education to generate a national association focused on its particular problems and the problems of the urban institution as distinct from those of the state and rural institutions. The evening college, according to Dyer,

> . . . came into being as a result of the demands of urban people for educational facilities offered at a time when they could take advantage of them, and of the demands of industry and business for specialized training for their employees.[2]

---

[1] "The University and the Municipality: Summary of the Proceedings of the First Session of the National Association of Municipal Universities," U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, No. 38, 1915 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1915), pp. 5 and 6. N.B. The Commissioner of Education mistakenly calls the new association the National Association of Municipal Universities both in the title of the Bulletin and in his letter of transmittal which stands as its preface. The Association of Urban Universities, however, is the correct name of the organization, however, as is indicated in the text of the Bulletin on page six.

[2] John P. Dyer, Ivory Towers in the Market Place (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1956), p. 38.

Charles W. Dabney, President of the University of Cincinnati and first President of the Association of Urban Universities, saw the parallel between the service that could be provided by urban extension through the evening colleges and the service provided by the state institutions through General and Cooperative Extension.

> The service of some of our great State universities is a splendid illustration of what can be done by such institutions to promote the agricultural, industrial, political, and social, as well as the educational interests of their States. In similar manner, the university mind is becoming the city mind, and the city itself is becoming a university for training its own servants. Now, the municipal university is needed to develop this city-mindedness and to organize this study of the city's problems.[1]

Two reasons for the advent and growth of the evening college as the third pattern of extension in the United States, and the pattern peculiar to the cities, have already been suggested: the concentration of large numbers of working people in the cities which provided an ample population base for extension activities and the increasing need for new knowledge and skills which paralleled the increasing complexity of the technology employed in business and industry.

A third reason for the growth of credit work in the evening colleges was the impact of public education at the secondary level on the American people and especially on the people who lived in cities. While the average American completed relatively few years of school in the first decade of the century--about five nationwide--the average in the cities was substantially higher. And the higher educational attainment of city people provided an expanded potential for part-time higher education. George Wheeler, Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction of Philadelphia, referred to this phenomenon indirectly in a speech before the Association of Urban Universities in 1919.

---

[1] "The University and the Municipality," p. 9.

> Evening education has developed wonderfully in recent years in all of our great cities, not merely in the number of students but also in the grade and the variety of the work. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that although nearly all evening education was formerly of an elementary nature and largely concerned with giving to illiterates some knowledge of the three R's, the enrollment is now made up of persons studying subjects of secondary or college rank.[1]

Many of the subjects studied in the evening colleges were directly related to the students' jobs. Teachers were an early audience for urban extension; University College at the University of Chicago, after all, was originally called the College for Teachers.

Business subjects were popular as well and the evening colleges performed a special service to the business community in this subject area. James Egbert, who was made Director of the Summer Sessions and Extension Teaching at Columbia when the two programs were combined in 1910, reported first offering business subjects through extension in 1911. "By 1914 these business courses had greatly increased in number, and [Egbert's] report for that year speaks of the School of Commerce." Two years later a School of Business was created to meet the need for courses and a degree in business and business courses passed out of the control of Extension Teaching.[1]

---

[1] Association of Urban Universities. _Summary of Proceedings_ (Boston, 1919), p. 33.

This cycle recurred elsewhere and in other, almost always professional subject areas. The evening college would present a special curriculum not offered by its host institution to meet a professional need; the curriculum would be refined through experience and an audience would be nurtured; finally, the new program would form the center of a new division focused solely on a particular career or group of careers and on serving a particular professional audience.

But to characterize all evening college programming as a coherent, organized process which results in innovative programs responsive to the evolving needs of its clientele would be to ignore the basically eclectic nature of the evening college. Evening college programs have always been, and are still, a *potpourri* of courses borrowed from the daytime programs plus a sprinkling of offerings developed from time to time to meet a special need of the part-time, working student. The following description of the development of the program at Columbia seems to catch with accuracy the flavor of evening college planning.

Proceeding with judgment and caution as Extension was obliged

---

[1] Burrell, *Columbia*, pp. 44 and 45.

> to do, and resorting constantly to a trial-and-error method, gradually during its history it managed to offer a sound and well-organized curriculum of studies. Many courses, as we have seen, some of them unbelievable from our present-day point of view, were tried and withdrawn. Sometimes they were discarded because of severe criticism from the academic hierarchy, though this was rare, because all courses had to have the approval of the department in question, the Director, and of the University Council. More often courses were withdrawn for the more mundane reason that they were financially unsuccessful. Courses that were from the beginning successful have remained.[1]

As evening colleges were accepted and as the number of part-time students enrolled in them grew, colleges and universities began offering baccalaureate and master's degrees through their evening colleges. Students who earned degrees through course work taken in evening colleges were expected to meet all of the same requirements as students enrolled in the corresponding daytime programs. The evening college students simply took more time, often more than twice as much, to earn the credits necessary for their degrees. And because of the eight to ten years or more of part-time study needed to earn a baccalaureate at night coupled with the still substantial value of a high school diploma in the market place, degree candidates in the years before the Second World War accounted for a relatively small fraction of evening college students.

While most institutions were content simply to make course work and their baccalaureate programs available through part-time study in the evening, a group of Boston institutions formed a consortium to serve part-time students and created a special degree program for them. President Lowell of Harvard reported in 1910 the establishment of ". . . a permanent commission on extension courses, containing representatives of Harvard and Boston universities; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Boston, Tufts, Wellesley, and Simmons Colleges; and the Museum of Fine Arts." The commission arranged for instructors to give courses ". . . identical with or equivalent to those offered in the several institutions." In addition to making the courses available to part-time students in the Boston area, Harvard, Radcliffe, Tufts, and Wellesley offered a special degree for extension students: The Associate in Arts. The degree requirements were virtually identical to those at the four institutions but two concessions were made to the extension students. First, the program was open to all who wished to join it and, second, graduates of the program were allowed to enter graduate study at Harvard and other institutions.[1] The Associate in Arts program, however, served a very small group of students; between 1913 when the first Associate in Arts was awarded and 1937, only one hundred fifty students earned the degree. But of the one hundred fifty, at least forty-two went on to complete their master's and six earned doctorates.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 85 and 86.

---

[1] N.U.E.A. *Proceedings*, 1915, pp. 12 and 13.

[2] Creese, *Extension*, p. 160.

World War I

Just as the new patterns of university extension in the United States were beginning to exhibit a sense of stability, identity, and purpose, the First World War made new demands on their creativity and resiliency. General extension and the evening colleges in particular felt the impact of the War almost immediately.

> Virtually overnight in 1917 university general extension doffed its civilian garb and left its state or regional orientations to join the national effort. Special correspondence courses were written for soldiers and sailors. Red Cross nursing classes were offered. Post-graduate medical refresher training entered extension's curriculum. From extension's presses came bulletins on such topics as food conservation, women in industry, and fuel conservation. Package libraries on "causes of the Great War" made their contribution to anti-German propaganda. Extension leaders went on leave to supervise special training schools set up by the Emergency Fleet Corporation and take charge of the American Expeditionary Force University in France.[1]

The demand for new programs caused by the national emergency and the drain on both the administrative and teaching staffs of the extension divisions and evening colleges were not the only challenges extension faced during the War. The draft which provided the manpower for the mobilization of the American Expeditionary Force also reduced the collegiate student body both in daytime and evening programs across the country. The diversion of young men from colleges and universities into the Armed Forces resulted in substantial financial problems especially for the private institutions which relied on tuition revenue more heavily than the state institutions. Since the evening colleges were mainly creatures of private, urban institutions and were revenue generating, the decline in enrollment owing to the War was felt most keenly at the private institutions.

---

[1] Shannon and Schoenfeld, *University Extension*, p. 23.

But the War did not last long and little permanent damage was done to the colleges and universities from the temporary decline in civilian students and the loss of staff. In fact, the veterans returning from Europe created something of a renaissance, especially for part-time programs.

> With the return of the veterans in 1919, Extension Teaching /at Columbia/ was prepared to receive civilian students, and there was a great rush of men and women to the classes. It is rather amazing, as one looks back, to find in what numbers the students came. There was no G.I. Bill; the students paid their own fees. . . . From the six or seven thousand students enrolled in 1918, the following years brought some thousands more, so that by 1923 there were sixteen or seventeen thousand men and women in classes. . .[1]

Extension's part in helping to meet the need for a wide range of military and civilian training connected to the War seems to have caught the attention not only of potential students who entered and re-entered evening colleges in record numbers after the War but also of at least one person about to ascend to a position of power.

---

[1] Burrell, *Columbia*, p. 72.

The American Association for Adult Education

Frederick P. Keppel, who became President of the Carnegie Corporation in 1923, had been impressed by the work of extension, especially in Great Britain, during and after the War. Upon returning to the United States, he was distressed to learn how little information was available about extension and adult education and set out to rectify the situation. He convinced the Carnegie Corporation, early in his presidency, to include adult education in its list of concerns. And since lack of information about adult education seemed to be a problem, the Carnegie Corporation under Keppel attempted initially to discover the state of the art. Four regional meetings were held in 1925 and 1926 to gather opinion from adult educators on how to create a strong movement in the United States. The American Association for Adult Education (AAAE), organized at a conference in Chicago in late March, 1926, was the major outcome of the regional meetings.[1]

While the AAAE in the twenty-five years of its existence did not succeed in integrating the many varieties of adult education in the United States into a coherent movement, it did increase the visibility of the broad range of adult education activities. Further, it set the stage, through the melding of its own membership with that of the Department of Adult Education of the National Education Association, for the creation of what may prove to be a stronger national organization: the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. One of the major faults of the AAAE seems to have been its autocratic approach to leadership. The organization was dominated for its entire life by a single individual, its Executive Director, who was consistently supported by a small Executive Committee. In addition to what proved to be a dysfunctional approach to leadership, the AAAE relied too heavily for the first fifteen years of its existence on the Carnegie Corporation for income. When Carnegie withdrew its support, the Association was unable to broaden its base of support rapidly enough to save itself. Thus the first incursion of a major foundation into the field of adult education in the United States was not an overwhelming success--a pattern which would be repeated a quarter of a century after the organization of the AAAE.[1]

---

[1] Knowles, *Adult Education Movement*, pp. 94 and 95.

The National University Extension Association

Even before the creation of the AAAE, a leader of another national adult education organization, the National University Extension Association (NUEA), had attempted to create a national office to act as clearinghouse and coordinator for general extension programs. J.J. Pettijohn, while Director of the Extension Division at the University of Indiana, joined with Louis Reber of Wisconsin and others in forming the NUEA. The new Association met in 1915, 1916, and 1917 before the War intervened.

---

[1] For an extended treatment of the striving by adult educators for a national organization, see Knowles, *Adult Education Movement*, pp. 190-246.

Both Reber and Pettijohn accepted positions of national leadership during the War, Reber with the Department of Labor and Pettijohn with the Bureau of Education.[1] As Director of the Office of Educational Extension in the Bureau, Pettijohn received funds for and attempted to set up a national program of extension. When the War ended and the NUEA resumed its annual conferences in 1919, Pettijohn proposed the continuation of the Washington office in affiliation with the NUEA. His proposal was accepted and the office continued under a separate charter: NUEA, Inc. But the attempt at national coordination was short-lived. The NUEA voted at its 1920 conference to recommend to NUEA, Inc. the immediate discontinuation of the Washington office.[2]

Perhaps this retreat from Washington was symbolic: while the evening colleges enjoyed increased enrollments after the War, general extension suffered a temporary decline in support and lost whatever impetus it had gained through its important contribution to the War effort. Shannon and Schoenfeld describe the 'twenties as a time of retrenchment for general extension.

---

[1] National University Extension Association, *Expanding Horizons . . . Continuing Education* (Washington, D.C.: North Washington Press, 1965), p. 12.

[2] NUEA, *Proceedings*, 1920, p. 48.

> Faced with an inhospitable climate, general extension turned inward on itself in a number of ways. It became less a movement and more a cult, and like all cults it became more concerned with how it did things than what it did.[1]

Little new was happening in extension. Some talked of using the expanding medium of radio for extension work but the NUEA was unable to settle on a statement of policy so, as an organization, it did nothing.[2] General extension did not come alive again until the country was on the brink of another national emergency, the Great Depression.

> The reverberations of the 1929 economic crash were detected quickly and plainly by extensionists, and emergency extension programs antedated the New Deal by a good two years. There were off-campus classes for high school graduates who couldn't afford to go away to college, special correspondence courses for the unemployed, and package libraries on refinancing mortgages and similar topics. Some states provided extension scholarships for the indigent. With the advent of another Roosevelt, extension once again came into its own. University professors took off for Washington to take their places in a "brain trust" of presidential advisers, and federal funds came to the campus to stimulate extension activities.[3]

During the Depression, many students came to the universities and colleges because they did not have jobs; others came to prepare themselves for better jobs. Still others hoped to assuage their boredom and despair arising out of their unemployment by going to school. And the schools, particularly the evening colleges, seem to have met each need and served city-dwellers rather well.[1]

---

[1] Shannon and Schoenfeld, *University Extension*, p. 24.

[2] [illegible], [illegible] *Horizons*, p. 17.

[3] Shannon and Schoenfeld, *University Extension*.

The state institutions, most of which were members of the NUEA, became involved in coordinating the statewide WPA adult education programs and providing instruction in literacy, general adult education, vocational education, workers' education, and parent education. And while some members of the NUEA expressed concern that the extension divisions were cheapening themselves providing programs which were not university level, the institutions continued to offer a splendid range of services in spite of reduced budgets and, in effect, trained themselves for the demands which would be placed on them during the War to come.[2]

World War II

The involvement of extension in the Second World War was similar to its involvement in 1917 and 1918, only more so. The United States joined the conflict relatively earlier than it had in the First World War, and because of Pearl Harbor with a greater enthusiasm. But extension, in fact, anticipated the declaration of war by more than a year.

> University general extension went to war early. It recruited money, men, and mission in 1940. The money came through the United States Office of Education--millions for emergency

---

[1] Burrell, Columbia, p. 77.

[2] NUEA, Expanding Horizons, pp. 20-23.

> manpower training. The men--and women--came from all walks of life; in just one year, 900,000 people had gone through the courses. The mission was that combination of fear, high strategy, imperialism, and missionary zeal which Henry R. Luce was to call "The American Century." The crash of bombs at Pearl Harbor turned the university into more of a camp than a campus, and it was to general extension that presidents and generals looked for know-how in operating special training programs for many types of uniformed personnel and in promoting all manner of home-front "drives."[1]

Four major innovations which were particularly important in the evolution of special baccalaureate programs for adults resulted from the adaptation of colleges and universities to the consequences of War. First, under the pressure of time, the assumption that four years of full-time study (or part-time multiples of four years) were essential to a baccalaureate degree was called into question. Acceleration became a key word in academic circles. Robert M. Hutchins had already begun to challenge the dominant pattern of undergraduate education at the University of Chicago before the War, but the pressure of the War and the impact of conscription on young, male students helped bring his new approach to the attention of the nation and highlighted, for better or worse, what came to be called the "Chicago Plan."[2] Less dramatic forms of acceleration were employed at hundreds of institutions on the grounds that trained men and women were more important in the drive for victory than manufactured goods. The argument ran that if the schedules of industry could be accelerated to produce more goods so the calendars of colleges and university programs could be accelerated to produce more trained people.[1] And the modification of programs in higher education to meet the special needs of students in a national emergency seems to have made the modification of programs for adults in peacetime less controversial.

---

[1] Shannon and Schoenfeld, *University Extension*, p. 25.

[2] Hutchins apparent contribution to the evolution of special baccalaureate programs for adults will be treated more fully in the next chapter.

Second, programs in higher education were opened to a wider audience than ever before. For example, a new division for emergency training was created at the University of Michigan late in 1942 and ". . . adults, including those who are not high-school graduates but that are qualified to take courses offered in the division for emergency training" were specifically included as one of the six groups who were to be recruited for training.[2] Allowing adults who otherwise would not have been acceptable for lack of formal credentials to join programs in higher education seems to have had at least two consequences: the confidence and expectations of the adults who entered the programs and of others with whom they came into contact were heightened and colleges and universities realized through experience that formal credentials were not the only predictor of success in higher education.

---

[1] [illegible], "The Government and the Colleges in Wartime," *Educational Record*, XXIII, October 1942, pp. 629 and 630.

[2] *Education for Victory*, I, February 1, 1943, p. 22.

A third innovation arose from the remarkable range of training provided through the military and from the educational opportunities which were available to military personnel but which were not directly related to military duty. The former activities were typically part of military training and involved such subject matter as electronics, aviation, mechanics, or communications. The latter took at least two forms. These education experiences were programs offered through extension in its broadest sense: the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI), college or university programs offered on campus, correspondence study, courses offered at remote locations, and the like. Or they were experiences from which military personnel learned but which were not connected to the programs offered either by the military or the educational establishment.

The last category seems the most difficult to explain. A contemporary article described these experiences as follows.

> In general, the experiences included are those which have significant but *incidental* general educational values, and those which are relatively *informal* and *individual* in character--that is, those which cannot be described uniformly on a group basis, but depend primarily for their significance on the interests and abilities of the individual man or woman. This category includes first of all, direct observation and firsthand experience of the men in countries and places visited. Through their travels both here and abroad, and through their contacts with people and institutions, the servicemen may learn much that they would otherwise have learned had they remained in school. The physical and economic geography of the areas and countries visited, the political and social customs and institutions of their inhabitants, and particularly their languages--may be learned by direct observation and daily contact perhaps even more effectively than they could be

> learned through books. In this . . . category may be included too the more definitely military experiences beyond those gained in the formal training programs--experiences gained while on the job, while performing technical duties and solving military problems.[1]

Various methods for evaluating each of these kinds of learning for college credit were developed. Perhaps the most widespread practice was the awarding of a set number of credit hours of undifferentiated credit, "blanket credit," for a minimum period of military service. Blanket credit typically could be used only as elective credit. While this approach was easily applied, it was not favored by some educators because it did not allow for distinctions to be made between the quality and content of one service person's experience and that of another.

Other institutions developed systems for the assessment of service experiences which were grounded on the individual evaluation of each person's records and experience. Such systems overcame the objections to blanket credit but proved to be both expensive and cumbersome. The American Council on Education, in an attempt to standardize to some degree and thus to reduce the cost of individual assessment, sponsored the Cooperative Study on Training and Experience in the Armed Services under the direction of G.P. Tuttle. This study resulted in the so-called "Tuttle Guide" which has, in various revisions provided guidelines used by colleges and universities for more than twenty years.

---

[1] E.F. Lindquist, "The Use of Tests in the Accreditation of Military Experience and in the Educational Placement of War Veterans," Educational Record, XXV, October 1944, pp. 358 and 359.

A third method of assessing service experiences, by written examinations, was preferred by the Advisory Committee to USAFI. The difficulty inherent in this method was that most institutions of higher education did not have either the personnel or the facilities necessary for the development and standardization of such examinations. Thus the Examination Staff of USAFI saw it as its duty to construct as many of these examinations as possible.[1]

While each of these methods of assessing service experiences were used by many institutions, with some institutions using more than one method, the point is not so much which method was used by which institutions or which method was best, but rather the fact that a major change had taken place within institutions of higher education which allowed service experiences to be assessed at all for possible credit toward degrees. Although there were exceptions, most institutions before the War seemed to focus their attention primarily on their programs and the requirements for those programs and secondarily on the individual needs of their students and on the experience or knowledge their students might have brought to the programs. After the War, perhaps because of the massive influx of veterans who were different from traditional undergraduate students, many institutions seemed more willing to mold their programs to the individual needs and prior accomplishments of their students. Such individualization of programs and, in many cases, modes of instruction became the hallmark of special baccalaureate programs for adults.

---

[1] Lloyd, pp. 360-362.

Finally, the G.I. Bill itself seems to have had a major, if indirect, impact on the establishment of special baccalaureate programs for adults. The impact was major in that "eventually some 12 million veterans took advantage of the education subsidies of the 'G.I. Bill of Rights,' and the college population increased by over a million."[1] But the impact was indirect in that the veterans did not demand special programs for themselves but simply acted as the mature, experienced persons that they were and thus reminded some academics and convinced others that adult students were not the same as adolescent students. Before long, the School of General Studies at Brooklyn College was ready to act on this difference between adult and adolescent and to create the first special baccalaureate program for adults.

---

[1] Morison and Commager, Growth, II, p. 852.

CHAPTER IV

LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

University College, The University of Chicago

Hutchins and the Chicago Plan

Robert Maynard Hutchins was perhaps best known in the 'thirties for his re-organization of the University of Chicago and for the Chicago Plan for undergraduate education. The re-organization seems to have been an attempt to create an environment at the University which would encourage the faculty to converse with one another across departmental lines while reducing the autonomy of departmental chairmen and their virtual control over budgets in the bargain.[1] The Chicago Plan was an attempt to drive specialization out of undergraduate education and to replace it with a general education grounded in the study of the world's great literature. Hutchins' approach to undergraduate education was designed as a four year program but could be shortened by successful completion of comprehensive examinations which were available to students on demand. Further, the Chicago Plan moved undergraduate education forward two years so that it began in what usually was the junior year of high school and ended following the sophomore year of college.[1] The Chicago Plan drew almost continuous fire from the educational leadership of the time both inside and outside the University of Chicago.[2] And while parts of the Plan were emulated elsewhere, it was not, taken as a whole, a successful innovation. The re-organization, on the other hand, was widely accepted within the University; many of its features remain in effect today.

---

[1] Robert Maynard Hutchins, *No Friendly Voice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936,, pp. 189 and 190.

Both the re-organization and the Chicago Plan were, in large part, a reaction to vocationalism which Hutchins felt was corrupting the universities. Professional schools were, in his view, an appropriate part of the university only if the faculty and students in the professional schools were primarily concerned with the intellectual problems of the professions. Training for the professions by teaching the "tricks of the trade" was bad for the professions because of the narrowness of the training received, bad for the university because faculty members were thus diverted from the pursuit of truth and were rendered unable to converse with one another owing to their increasing specialization, and bad for the students because they were being taught an anachronistic view of the profession which would likely be inapplicable by the time they entered the practice of the profession.[1] According to Hutchins, "all that can be learned in a university is the general principles, the fundamental propositions, the theory of any discipline."[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 190-194.

[2] A pointed example of the articles and speeches against the University of Chicago's College program under Hutchins can be found in William Pearson Tolley, "Counterfeit Bachelor's Degree," *Education Record*, XXIII, July 1942, pp. 593-601.

And if Hutchins objected to the effects of vocationalism on the university and particularly on the professional schools, his objections were re-doubled in his reaction to the service function of the universities:

> Undoubtedly the love of money and that sensitivity to public demands that it creates has a good deal to do with the service-station conception of a university. According to this conception a university must make itself felt in the community; it must be constantly, currently felt. A state university must help farmers look after their cows. An endowed university must help adults get better jobs by

---

[1] Robert Maynard Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), pp. 51-54.

[2] Ibid., p. 18.

> giving them courses in the afternoon and evening. Yet it is apparent that the kind of professors that are interested in these objects may not be the kind that are interested either in developing education or advancing knowledge. Since a university will not be able to have two kinds of professors and at the same time remain clear as to what it is about, it must follow that extension work can only confuse the institution.[1]

Just as Hutchins disdained vocationalism because he felt it diverted the university from its only goal, the pursuit of truth, so he disdained the service function of the university whether expressed through general extention, cooperative extension, or evening colleges. In light of Hutchins' narrow construction of the role of the university, it is perhaps ironic that he played an important part in the creation of special baccalaureate programs for adults, all of which were created as part of extension programs.

The Great Books Program

The part Hutchins played in the creation of special baccalaureate programs for adults stemmed both from his commitment to general education at the undergraduate level and from an interest he subsequently developed in adult education. The general education curriculum which Hutchins instigated in the College at the University of Chicago included, as early as the Autumn Quarter of 1930, a general honors course taught by Hutchins and his friend and mentor Mortimer J. Adler whom Hutchins had brought to the University of Chicago from Columbia.[1] The course was meant to explore some of the great intellectual questions raised throughout history through the reading and discussion of some of the world's best literature. The Adler-Hutchins great books course was not long limited to students in the College. Since Adler and Hutchins believed that everyone could benefit from such a course, they offered it in many of the subdivisions of the University.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 6 and 7.

> For over ten years, into the 1940's, Hutchins and Adler taught the great books in various parts of the university. Besides the original General Honors class, University High School, and the Law School, there were courses at one time or another in the Humanities Division, Department of Education, and most significantly for the adult development of the Great Books program, at University College, the extension division of the University of Chicago. . . .[2]

The work Hutchins did at University College seems to have been both a cause and an effect of his growing interest in adults as students and particularly as students of the great books. As Hutchins encountered more and more resistance to his administration among the faculty in the early 'forties, he seems to have turned his attention from the University's central programs to the great books programs offered through University College and to the work of Encyclopedia Britannica. The first great books program offered by University College had as its curriculum a reading list which, over a five year period, progressed from the Greeks to the present. But the program met with little success.

---

[1] Hugh S. Moorhead, "The Great Books Movement" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964), p. 250.

[2] Ibid., p. 258.

University College at that time was a conventional evening college offering regular course work through the departments, non-credit lecture series, and programs in the liberal arts meant to supplement the training programs of some of the downtown professional schools such as the Art Institute and the American Conservatory of Music. Old-timers who were understandably protective of their programs and their positions dominated the administration of University College.

Perhaps because a new administrator was needed to enliven the programs of University College, perhaps because Hutchins wanted someone who understood the goals and methods of his and Adler's approach to the great books, Hutchins appointed Cyril O. Houle to the committee to study the future of University College and also made him Acting Dean. Houle, who had studied under Adler and Hutchins, was a young Ph.D. from Floyd Reeve's new adult education program in the Department of Education at the University.[1]

Houle changed the five-year great books program into a sequence which paired an older book with a more modern work, ". . . the rationale being that comparison between the two would enhance the discussions." Interest in the offering increased as the quarter progressed but, as the demand grew, Houle reassessed the format and decided to discontinue the pairing of older and newer works. And in each case the newer book was dropped from the reading list.[1]

---

[1] Interview with Cyril O. Houle, May 20, 1974, pp. 2-4.

> By the next year, 1945-1946, University College was a harbinger of the Great Books program to come. The total involvement required the addition of an administrator. . . to spend half-time on the growing demands. Three different series were given, three years of chronologically arranged readings--the *Declaration of Independence* to Marx, Homer to Tawney, and Hippocrates to William James. The first one, for new students, filled twelve sections; three groups took the second year's readings, and one the third. The number enrolled almost doubled from the 361 of the prior year to 667. The sixteen sections. . . called for twenty-five instructors.[2]

As the great books seminars at the Downtown Center of University College prospered, a parallel program of discussion groups was started in the city's libraries.

> . . . The Chicago Public Library was playing a crucial role in the expansion of Chicago's program--in the extension of it outside and beyond the confines of the Downtown Center of the University. As a result, the fall of 1945 saw, in addition to the 667 participants there, some thirteen hundred others meeting in thirty-four meeting places in and around the city.[3]

And the growth continued. By the next year, University College enrolled more than a thousand great books students, the Public libraries of Chicago more than twenty-seven hundred, and three other cities in the middle west an additional five thousand or more.[1] The great books courses begun by Adler and Hutchins at the University of Chicago had been expanded into a movement and the movement was given legal standing with the incorporation of the Great Books Foundation in Chicago on July 1, 1947.[2]

---

[1] Moorhead, "Great Books," p. 288.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 289.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 291.

The Basic Program at Chicago

In the fall of 1946, Houle offered another variation of the great books courses called the Basic Program of Liberal Education for Adults. The assumption underlying the Basic Program, perhaps the assumption underlying the great books courses in general, was that many people have mastered all the specialized knowledge they need to make a living but lack the knowledge they need to live a critical life.

> Most of them are already proficient in the activity by which they earn their livelihood. In some sense most of them are experts, and the problem for them is not primarily one of earning a living, but chiefly that of improving the quality of their lives.
>
> The urgent need of adults is for the knowledge which will help them to deal wisely with personal problems and social issues, and to realize themselves as individual human beings.[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 311.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 329.

[3] Galway Kinnell, *The Basic Program of Liberal Education for Adults*, Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, No. 11 (Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1955), p. 25.

The Basic Program consisted of three tutorials or discussion classes carried on in small groups and a seminar which had as its goal the synthesis of what had been learned in the tutorials. Classes met six hours a week in the Autumn, Winter, and Spring Quarters over a four year period. Although the program did not lead to a degree, students who completed the courses received college credit and those that completed the four-year sequence received a Certificate in the Liberal Arts. The faculty members who taught in the program were specially trained both in the great books discussion method developed by Adler and Hutchins and in working with adult students. And each faculty member was expected to teach all parts of the program regardless of his or her area of specialization.[1]

The program began with fifty students in the Autumn Quarter, 1946, and grew to an enrollment of three hundred fifty to four hundred in the 1950's. Houle had hoped that the Basic Program might become a baccalaureate degree program parallel to the program offered on campus in the College of the University of Chicago, but Hutchins' waning influence and the difficulty [illegible] to have [illegible] the program [illegible].[2]

[illegible]

[illegible]

World War II and Its Impact on Extension

The Association of University Evening Colleges

Just before the War, the deans and directors of the evening colleges formed a new, national association which they hoped would help them to focus more effectively on problems peculiar to their form of extension. The new association grew out of the Association of Urban Universities (AUU) which had since 1915 provided a forum for the municipal and private institutions of the cities to discuss their common concerns. The AUU had been largely an organization of university presidents in its early years but had, over time, become dominated by the deans and directors of the evening colleges. Consequently, the concerns of the Association had been narrowed to those of the evening colleges rather than to those of the universities as a whole. At the 1939 meeting of the AUU,

> . . . the leaders decided to revert to first principles and virtually to require that institutions be represented by their presidents instead of their evening college deans. The latter, sensing that their virtual domination of the Association was about to come to an end, met informally over coffee and decided that the time had come to form an organization of their own. The result was the Association of University Evening Colleges.[1]

The formation of the Association of University Evening Colleges (AUEC) was probably fortuitous, coming when it did, since shortly after its formation the United States entered the War and immediately after the War the slow, steady growth of the evening colleges gave way to a torrent of G.I.'s. In the five years after the War ended, enrollments in evening colleges doubled.

---

[1] John P. Dyer, Ivory Towers in the Market Place (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1956), p. [illegible].

The Growth of Evening Colleges

The dramatic growth of the evening colleges in the post-war years elicited a nearly frantic response from the deans and directors. While the AUEC provided an opportunity for discussion of common concerns, the discussions centered, almost without exception, on administrative questions--the "nuts and bolts." An occasional presentation was made at annual meetings on the broader purposes or goals of the headlong activity in the evening colleges, but when such a paper was read, Dyer reports, "it was listed to with great politeness, and then the deans and directors would return to the administrative problems."[1]

Liberal Education and the Ford Foundation

Concern for present problems and for meeting the demands of constantly growing enrollments dominated the atmosphere in most evening colleges. The need to create new programs and approaches, especially in response to the apparently different needs of the returning veterans, lost out to the first priority of keeping the colleges running. Yet the Association of University Colleges played a substantial part in the development of special baccalaureate programs for adults. At least two phenomena seem to have made the involvement of the Association and its members in the creation of these new programs possible.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

First, the educational community seems to have been engaged in a re-assessment of the place and worth of specialization in higher education. And thanks to the University College of the University of Chicago and Cleveland College of Western Reserve University among others, the evening colleges and their Association joined in the discussion. Liberal or general education as defined by Hutchins, while it certainly did not threaten the popularity of specialized study, was re-appearing in the literature and re-gaining a position of honor at least in discussions at annual meetings if not in most programs. Many influential citizens, educators, and public officials seemed to feel that education, and especially liberal education, could produce the world-wide understanding that seemed essential to prevent World War III.

And second, Henry Ford, his wife, and his son Edsel all died in a relatively short period of time, leaving the family foundation which had been comparatively small, with millions, perhaps billions, of additional dollars in Ford stock. Both the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Securities and Exchange

Commission became very interested in the Ford Foundation and its activities in its new and enriched condition.[1] Thus the Foundation ". . . anticipating final settlement of Federal Estate matters and the probable receipt during 1949 and 1950 of income from the gifts of Mr. Henry Ford and Mr. Edsel Ford in amounts sufficient to permit The Ford Foundation to undertake a greatly expanded program. . ." endeavored to set new goals toward the accomplishment of which they could disburse some of the income.[2] Five program areas--The Establishment of Peace, The Strengthening of Democracy, the Strengthening of the Economy, Education in a Democratic Society, and Individual Behavior and Human Relations--were announced in November, 1949, by the Study Committee chaired by H. Rowan Gaither, Jr. who later became President of the Foundation. Henry Ford II persuaded Paul Hoffman, then head of the Economic Cooperation Administration which was overseeing the Marshall Plan, to direct the implementation of the programs of the expanded Foundation. And Hoffman in turn chose his staff, one of whom was Robert M. Hutchins, Chancellor of the University of Chicago and long-time proponent of liberal education for adults as well as for younger students.

---

[1] Interview with Robert Blakely, June 1[illegible], 197[illegible], p. 1.

[2] Report of the Study for The Ford Foundation on Policy and Program (Detroit: The Ford Foundation, 1949), p. [illegible].

The Ford Foundation

The stature and experience of the people chosen to distribute the money generated by the Ford Foundation seems to have matched the scale of the expenditures required. As Robert Blakely, later a Vice-President of the Fund for Adult Education, put it:

> It was a cluster of big people, big people, big time operators, big minds. (I'm both praising and scoffing a bit.) They were big time operators but the point is that they had a job to do which meant spending money and they knew how to spend it. They started off.[1]

What they started was eleven independent funds which they felt would serve the interests of the Foundation in the five program areas mentioned earlier. The five program areas all were intended to improve society through economic stability and the advancement of democracy. Their success relied heavily on the efficacy of education. One of the funds created was the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) which might have been more accurately called the "Fund for Liberal Adult Education." The Report of the Study for the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program, which was the guiding document in the early 'fifties, included statements such as:

> In recommending this program area in education /Education in a Democratic Society/ the Committee was motivated by its conviction that only men trained to think and act constructively can preserve and extend freedom and democracy.[2]

---

[1] Blakely, June 19, 1973, p. 2.

[2] Report of the Study, p. [illegible].

and

> The Foundation should find and assist programs of study in the schools and colleges which emphasize the breadth and richness of the student's educational experience, and which direct the student's attention to life, rather than to an immediate vocation, and to his responsibility as a thinking and acting citizen of democracy.[1]

The bias toward liberal education was clear; the bias against vocationalism was equally clear. And while it might be surprising that the initial Report was so much in favor of liberal education, it was not at all surprising that the work of the Foundation under Hoffman singled out liberal education for support since Hutchins was Hoffman's expert on education.[2]

The bias of the Fund for Adult Education was further assured with the choice of its first President, C. Scott Fletcher.

> Fletcher had worked for Hoffman at Studebaker. He worked for Hoffman in China war relief when Hoffman headed that up. He had worked with Hutchins. Because Hutchins and Bill Benton were very close with Encyclopedia Britannica and then Encyclopedia Films, Fletcher got into the films. He headed up Encyclopedia Films. He was President of Encyclopedia Films when he became President of the Fund for Adult Education. Many people thought Hoffman picked Fletcher but it was Hutchins who picked Fletcher because Hutchins believed that he needed somebody who wasn't a professional educator, somebody who had some drive, somebody who had some new ideas.

In addition to his other qualifications, Fletcher had participated in the Great Books program and was apparently a "believer."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 58.

[2] [illegible], June 10, 1973, p. 3.

[3] Ibid., p. 4.

Events moved swiftly as the Ford Foundation re-organized to meet its new challenge. Hoffman assumed the presidency early in 1951. The Fund for Adult Education under the direction of C. Scott Fletcher was created on April 5 of the same year. The Committee on Liberal Education of the Association of University Evening Colleges presented a proposal to the FAE for a Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults (CSLEA) which was funded by mid-summer.

The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults

The idea for such a Center was, in fact, discussed as early as the middle of May, 1951. Two hundred adult educators had gathered in Columbus, Ohio, May 13-15 to dissolve the old American Association for Adult Education and the NEA's Department of Adult Education in favor of a new, broadly representative organization named the Adult Education Association of the United States of America. At the conference, a meeting took place of the "Directors of the Center for Adult Education" which included, among others, Dean John Barden, Cleveland College, Western Reserve University; Professor John Diekhoff, Western Reserve University; Assistant Dean Harlan Blake, University College, University of Chicago; and Scott Fletcher. The minutes of that meeting prepared by Robert Pettengill contain the description of a proposed "Center for Adult Education" which would have been concerned primarily with community education and the solution of social problems through liberal, adult education.[1]

Dean Barden, who had to leave the meeting early, objected later in a letter to the proposed focus of the Center as described in Pettengill's minutes.

> In general I remain of the opinion that the most general function of the CAE /Center for Adult Education/ is to exercise intellectual leadership in the fields of adult education that are not vocational and not recreational. I conceive that the initial focus of its attention would be on institutions of higher learning which presently have intellectual leadership in continuing education and that out of this attention and study will come sound community programs.
>
> Please do not believe that I am against community programs. . . . I am merely against that complex of problems as the point at which CAE should start. Sound community programs may ultimately be the most influential contribution CAE can make.[2]

Barden's objections apparently described more accurately than Pettengill's minutes what the Committee on Liberal Education of the AEA intended, since the Center, which finally was named the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, was oriented more toward the programs and methods of evening colleges than toward community education.

---

[1] Robert Pettengill, "The Center for Adult Education: Memorandum on a Meeting with Directors of the Center for Adult Education," n.d. While Pettengill's minutes are not dated, it seems highly probable that the meeting on which he reported took place in Columbus, Ohio, between May 13-15, at the conference at which the Adult Education Association was formed. Three things suggest this: Barden's letter objecting to some parts of the minutes is dated June 5, 1951, three weeks after the Columbus meeting; Robert Blakely recalls a meeting on this subject during the Columbus meeting (Interview, p. 12); and it seems unlikely that the group, all of whom were at the Columbus meeting, would have arranged a separate meeting to discuss the proposed Center within a few days of the Columbus conference.

[2] Letter from John Barden to Robert Pettengill, June 5, 1951.

The authorship of the proposal for the CSLEA is credited to Harlan Blake who, at the time, was heading University College while Dean Cyril O. Houle was in Europe on a Fulbright Fellowship.[1] James Whipple of the CSLEA staff speculated further on the origins of the proposal in a memorandum written in 1955.

> It is interesting to speculate about the source of the ideas in the proposal. Apparently it was Harlan Blake who inspired the project. To sponsor it, he must have turned quite naturally to a few kindred spirits--the exceptions to the average dean--and this meant /men/ like John Barden of Cleveland College. The proposal seems to reflect many of their attitudes and interests--they were not cautious, but bold and imaginative; they were ready to experiment and were hindered by a lack of time, staff, and funds. One can see reflections of the Basic Program /at University College/ in the proposal--the use of discussion, special curricula for adults, a staff drawn largely from Cleveland and Chicago.[2]

Whipple indicated elsewhere that Blake initially sounded out the FAE about the possibility of a grant to expand the Basic Program at University College and to initiate other liberal education programs at Chicago. The FAE, however, did not respond favorably to his query because the Fund did not wish to make grants in support of programs at individual institutions. Thus Blake sought and received the support of his colleagues at the Association of University Evening Colleges for the CSLEA proposal.[1]

---

[1] Interview with Cyril O. Houle, February 16, 1973, p. 1.

[2] Memorandum from James Whipple to the Staff of the CSLEA, January 26, 1955, p. 5.

CSLEA: The Early Years

The Center was initially funded for two years at a level of $78,000 the first year and $82,000 the second.[2] John Diekhoff, a Milton scholar from Western Reserve, was named first Director. Diekhoff had been involved in the design of the Center through his association with John Barden of Cleveland College and through his participation on the Committee on Liberal Education of the AUEC.

The proposed work of the Center was focused on four points, two of which seem to reflect the particular interests of Blake, Barden, Diekhoff, and others on the Committee on Liberal Education and two of which seem to reflect more the interests of the Fund for Adult Education. The former two points involved the creation of discussion guides for both short and long-term liberal education programs which could be used in already existing evening college programs as well as the study of the discussion method in the hope of strengthening training programs for discussion leaders. The latter two points included the study of organizational factors which might help community educational programs to succeed and the study of how such programs could be operated without financial loss.[1]

---

[1] James Whipple, "Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults: A History," 1966, p. 5. (Mimeographed)

[2] John R. Schwertman, "A Brief Factual History of the Center," April 6, 1956, p. 3 (Mimeographed)

The development of "packaged programs" dominated the first two years of the Center's existence, but while Diekhoff and his staff were trying to sell the evening colleges on their discussion guides, the Center had started moving in another direction. During 1951-52, the CSLEA staff made a detailed survey of nine evening colleges to learn more specifically about the milieu in which the Center was working. Many of the findings were disconcerting, if not surprising. The evening deans, who were portrayed by Blake and the Committee on Liberal Education in the proposal for the CSLEA as creative, dynamic individuals who lacked only budget and staff to mount great experiments in adult education, did not measure up.

> . . . The Center discovered--or demonstrated--that most deans were not just waiting for a boost. They were uncertain, cautious, often unimaginative and resentful of outside interference. They were insecure in the academic family and chained to the profit-loss ledger.[2]

Perhaps because of their uncertainty, caution, or lack of imagination, but more likely because they looked on the Center's packaged material as an intrusion into their domain of authority and because liberal education programs had not drawn students to them in the past, the deans generally did not accept the discussion guides. Those that did accept them did little to make them work. And, to be fair to the deans, the Center did not go out of its way to promote the use of the packages once they were created. Whipple bluntly reported, in the uncirculated version of his history, that as the materials were being taken to the field in 1952, "public statements by Diekhoff spoke of encouraging responses at ten universities. But he was putting his best foot forward in an unhappy situation--their reception can only be described as a total flop."[1]

---

[1] James B. Whipple, *A Critical Balance: History of CSLEA* (Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1967), p. 5.

[2] Whipple to the CSLEA Staff, January 2[illegible], 1955, pp. 6 and 7.

CSLEA: The Middle Years

Faced with the quiet rejection of the discussion guides and with the approach of the end of its initial two year grant, the Center began to change markedly. John Diekhoff, feeling he had contributed what he could, accepted a new position as professor of education and director of the Office of Institutional Research at Hunter College. John Schwertman, who had taken a leave from his position as Assistant to the President of Roosevelt College in Chicago to join Diekhoff's staff on a short-term appointment, stayed on to become the Center's second director.

---

[1] Whipple, "CSLEA: A History," p. 7. (Mimeographed)

Schwertman was very different in his orientation from Diekhoff. While Diekhoff viewed educational problems primarily as a teacher interested in the process of learning in individual students and in providing appropriate materials and leadership to make that process more productive, Schwertman was more interested in how institutions operated and how to make their operation more effective. As Blakely put it:

> /Schwertman/ was interested in the sociology of things. The sociology of the university. The sociology of why adult education is low man on the totem pole. Why the deans and directors of adult education were treated differently. He began to have a lot of meetings and to produce a lot of literature that helped the deans and directors pay attention to the things that they were really interested in. A lot of them really wanted to broaden their activities but you can't broaden your activities by exhortation or by having a few packaged programs produced. You've got to study the processes and relationships of the university. So the change started right there in the Center. . .[1]

In a short document he prepared for the Fund for Adult Education and the Center's Board of Directors in the Spring of 1956, Schwertman described four shifts in the focus of the Center which he felt had occurred in its first five years of existence. The first shift from a commitment to the production of packaged curricula ". . . led the Center to concern itself also with the quality of administrative leadership in evening colleges, and with the attitude and performance of university faculty members who teach liberal arts courses for adults."[2]

---

[1] Blakely, [illegible] 10, 1973, p. 1[illegible]

[2] Schwertman, "Brief History," p. 1.

The survey mentioned earlier, Patterns of Liberal Education in the Evening College, provided information about administration and teaching in the evening colleges and increased the concern of the Center's staff for both.[1]

The second shift suggested by Schwertman involved the broadening of the Center's focus from the evening college to the ". . . total university as an instrument for the liberal education of adults." The study of the effects of urbanism and the social-psychological needs of adults gained in importance in this phase of the Center's life.[2]

The establishment of the first special baccalaureate program for adults seems to have been speeded by the third shift at CSLEA. The Center in this case moved from its concern ". . . for regular credit courses and sequences to a concern for new programs and concepts that did more than merely parallel the undergraduate degree programs."[3] It was at this time that Schwertman began to speak of degree programs 'explicitly for adults"[4] (until George Barton, Jr., one of his colleagues, corrected his diction by suggesting that the phrase should be

---

[1] Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Patterns of Liberal Education in the Evening College (Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1952).

[2] Schwertman, "Brief History," p. 2.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Association of University Evening Colleges. Proceedings, XVI, 1954, pp. 60 and 61.

"especially for adults.")[1] The Experimental Degree Project at Brooklyn College became the first degree program "especially for adults" partly as a result of the consultative help provided by Schwertman and his staff, a small grant from the CSLEA, and the support of the Center in securing a substantially larger grant from the Fund for Adult Education.

The fourth shift in the focus of the Center resulted in a broadening of the clientele with which the Center worked.[2] The Association of University Evening Colleges had acted as the parent organization for the CSLEA at a time when the AUEC and the National University Extension Association were unofficially, but effectively estranged. In 1955, the NUEA approached the Fund with a request for a "Center" of its own to serve the general extension divisions of the state universities. Sensing an opportunity to unite two major forces in the adult education movement, the FAE refused to support a separate organization and instead suggested that the Center might serve both organizations. The Board of the CSLEA was expanded to include both members from the AUEC and members from the NUEA at a meeting in Atlanta in 1956.[3] Thus the CSLEA became a potential force for bringing together the evening colleges of the urban universities and the general extension divisions of the state universities by providing services to both and by arranging discussions between them across long-standing barriers.

---

[1] Whipple, *Critical Balance*, p. 15.

[2] Schwertman, "Brief History," p. 3.

[3] Blakely, June 19, 1973, pp. 12 and 13.

The time between 1952, the year that the discussion guides ceased to be the CSLEA's primary activity, and July, 1956, probably represents the Center's pinnacle of influence. The organization certainly made important contributions to adult education thereafter through its expanded publications program, its consultation on programs with various institutions, its leadership conferences, and its other activities, but the Center under Schwertman's direction and with the full support of the FAE seems to have had a flair which caught the imagination of many individuals both inside and outside the adult education enterprise. Schwertman's apparent charisma and energy seem to have accounted for much of the Center's progress during this time. Whipple describes him as a man full of productive paradoxes:

> 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 importantly 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.[1]

But what the long-term potential of the CSLEA under Schwertman's guidance might have been cannot be known. He was struck by lightning and killed at his cottage in the Indiana Dunes late in July, 1956.[1]

---

[1] Whipple, Critical Balance, p. 13.

CSLEA: The Declining Years

Most likely Schwertman could not have avoided the ultimate demise of the CSLEA any longer than his successor A. A. "Sandy" Liveright did, since the Center seems to have died more as a result of external forces than of internal problems. While the CSLEA was enjoying its heyday in the early 'fifties, both the Ford Foundation and the Fund for Adult Education were experiencing many difficulties. According to Blakely, Paul Hoffman accepted the presidency of the Ford Foundation in 1951 on two conditions: first, that he would be able to choose his own people for his staff and, second, that he would be given a free hand in implementing the recommendations of the Report of the Study for the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program.[2] Hoffman succeeded in choosing, for the Ford Foundation staff and the staffs of the early Funds, the people with whom he wanted to work, but when he moved toward the establishment of the Fund for the Republic, trouble began in earnest.

> Ideologically, Hoffman wanted the Fund for the Republic established to make civil liberties respectable and that

---

[1] Robert Ahrens, Interview, June 6, 1973, p. 4.

[2] Blakely, June 19, 1973, p. 2.

> meant that you had to have a group of people who really believed in civil liberties and would do some bold things. He got agreement in principle from the trustees but every time he would put up the kind of people he wanted to be on the board they would veto him.[1]

In addition to apparently thwarting Hoffman in his attempts to create a Fund for the Republic which would have had the courage to challenge the suspicion of the times, the trustees also apparently objected strenuously to Hoffman's proposal to diversify the portfolio of the Foundation. Hoffman wanted to broaden the base of the Foundation's financial support so that not all of its income would come from stock in one company in a single industry. Some of the Foundation's trustees, especially H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., and the Ford family disapproved of the diversification since it would have put large blocks of Ford stock, which had been owned first by the family and then by the Foundation, on the open market thus increasing public control of the Ford Motor Company.

A major confrontation between Hoffman and the Board occurred in 1953 at a meeting in Pasadena, California, at the Huntington Hotel. According to Blakely, who was at the Hotel waiting to attend a meeting of the FAE,

> Hoffman came out furious and I remember him saying, "I was fooled by a book," referring to that Study[2]. . . He took

---

[1] Ibid., p. 5.

[2] Report of the Study for the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program cited previously.

> his job thinking that he was really going to be able to do something with the money by following that sort of plan, but things were closing in.[1]

Shortly thereafter, Hoffman resigned from the Foundation to take the presidency of Encyclopedia Britannica Films and H. Rowan Gaither Jr was named President of the Ford Foundation.

In addition to what seem to be the two proximate causes of Hoffman's leaving the Foundation, other factors appear to have made the accomplishment of the goals stated in the Report more difficult, it not impossible. These were the McCarthy days. The liberal bias of Hoffman and his staff, as well as the involvement of the Fund for Adult Education in the education of labor and liberal education in communities through its "Test Cities" program, brought the Foundation and the Fund under attack and investigation. Both the Cox and Reese Committees of Congress investigated foundations, among them the Ford Foundation and the Fund for Adult Education. First Reese of Tennessee, then Cox of Georgia demanded that the Fund for Adult Education explain its activities. Three members of the FAE Board were accused of being communists, as was Sandy Liveright who was by then on the staff of the CSLEA and would follow Schwertman as its Director.[2] None of the accusations were verified nor did the investigations establish any wrong-doing, but the suspicions aroused by the attendant publicity seems to have had a chilling effect on the bolder attempts of the Foundation and the Fund for Adult Education to strengthen democracy through liberal adult education.

---

[1] Blakely, June 19, 1973.

[2] Ibid., p. 14.

Within two years of Hoffman's resignation from the Foundation, the Fund for Adult Education began to experience problems with their funding which had been set up more or less on a year-to-year basis. First, the FAE was offered what would, in effect, have been a terminal grant by the Ford Foundation, but turned it down. Ford reacted by offering another grant which did not have the same finality. The second offer, which carried the Fund into the 'sixties and left open the possibility of another grant, was accepted.[1] Another grant, however, was not forthcoming and "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." The liquidation of the Fund for Adult Education left the CSLEA, in its own view, almost alone in the field of liberal adult education and ". . . almost as the sole force available to the university in the area of adult education."[2] The liquidation also left the Center with no regular source of future income.

> 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. . . The same belief that the Center should continue was stated and restated by the

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[2] Whipple, *Critical Balance*, p. 46.

> Board, staff and practitioners in the field, but after 1962 it was 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.[1]

CSLEA had called itself a "quasi-independent" agency: independent because of its funding but partially dependent for ideas and acceptance on the AUEC and later on the NUEA as well. But in its attempt to survive, the Center was compelled to compromise its "quasi-independence" in a number of ways. For example, in 1963 CSLEA negotiated an agreement with the Ford Foundation allowing it to spend the terminal grant from the FAE over a longer period of time than initially had been agreed; it sought and received a grant of $150,000 from the Carnegie Corporation; and it gave up its independent status in favor of an affiliation with Boston University. But all of these solutions were at best temporary; the Center still had not solved its long-term funding problem.[2]

One major factor which complicated the Center's financial exigency was the substantial growth of its staff and the concurrent shift of the largest share of the Center's costs to salaries from items not related to personnel. In the mid-fifties, the core staff of the Center averaged about six and its basic budget was about $100,000 per year; by 1960-63, the core staff had increased to fifteen and the budget exceeded $250,000. Whipple contends that the increase in staff was ". . . not a reflection of Parkinson's law" but rather a response to the magnitude of the problems in adult education which the staff was attempting to solve.[1] Some of those interviewed, however, contended that the leadership of the Center seemed unable to effect a reasonable turn-over in staffing in its later years so that as new skills were needed on the staff, more staff members were added without the deletion of less needed positions.

---

[1] Whipple, "CSLEA: A History," pp. 57 and 58.

[2] Ibid., p. 57.

Also in an attempt to raise operating revenues, members of the staff engaged in more outside consulting than they had formerly. Since they were selling their services and since the Center desperately needed the revenue, not all of the consulting was directly related to the advancement of the Center's purposes. Similarly, while the affiliation with Boston University provided a home for the Center, it also required that the staff of the Center spend one-quarter of its time in service to the University. Both the consulting and the affiliation tended to diffuse rather than to focus the efforts of the Center.

Finally, when faced with the terminal grant from the FAE in 1962 and with the realization that it would have to reduce drastically its level of expenditure and consequently the size of its staff, the Center, with the concurrence of its Board, made a paradoxical decision: CSLEA would not curtail its program but would attempt to accomplish the same amount of work with fewer staff members and a smaller budget. This decision, of course, did not lead to a solution but instead compounded the Center's problems.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

At a meeting on October 29, 1966, the Board of the Center decided to engage an outside consultant to study the state of CSLEA and to make recommendations for change. Liveright, the Director of the Center, concurred with the decision. Robert B. Hudson, who had been involved in the discussions between the Committee on Liberal Studies of the AUEC and the Fund for Adult Education sixteen years earlier, accepted the task. During the Spring and Summer of 1967 Hudson proceeded to review the accomplishments and problems of CSLEA by analyzing materials prepared by the Center staff, by talking with both current and former Board Members, and by interviewing more than seventy practitioners and experts in the field of adult education.[2] He concluded in his report dated August 25, 1967, that

> both this sampling of professional opinion and the written record, combined with a general background acquaintance with some aspects of adult education, lead me to the conclusion that a center is needed.[3]

His recommendations, if accepted, would have resulted, however, in a substantially changed organization. His recommendations, in summary, were:

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 59

[2] Robert B. Hudson, "Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults: Consultant's Report," August 25, 1967, pp. 1 and 2. (Typewritten)

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

1. that the name of the CSLEA be changed to the National Center for Continuing Higher Education to reflect the wider scope which he felt the Center had already adopted and which it should continue to serve.

2. ". . . that the Center undertake to be an energizing force and to provide an intellectual input to the whole field of continuing higher education--a force and an input that currently is available to it from no other source."

3. that the Board of the Center recruit its members from a wider base, including representatives from the academic disciplines and public members as well as administrators of higher adult education.

4. that the staff of the Center be made up largely of persons on short to medium-term appointments; that the only long-term appointments be a small core of administrators.

5. that the sponsorship of the Center be expanded beyond the AUEC and the NUEA to include other national organizations such as the American Alumni Council and the Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

6. that the Center re-establish itself as an independent body.

7. that funding be sought for the new Center from federal sources, major private foundations, and participating organizations.[1]

The Board of the CSLEA chose not to implement the recommendations but instead decided to terminate the Center at the end of its seventeenth year. A. A. Liveright, who had directed the Center for more than ten years, accepted a faculty position at Syracuse University. Other staff members concluded their responsibilities and moved on. James Whipple, Associate Director of the CSLEA for most of its life, stayed on through August 1968 to look after the final details.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

The Center continues only indirectly through its publication program which was assumed by Syracuse University. In its lifetime, CSLEA produced hundreds of monographs, reports, and newsletters which were widely read in the field. The Center also provided encouragement, advice, and small sums of money for programs at scores of institutions. Among these were the special baccalaureate programs for adults at Brooklyn College, the University of Oklahoma Syracuse University, Goddard College, Queens College, and Roosevelt University. The role of the CSLEA in the establishment of these programs is described subsequently.

CHAPTER V

THE RESIDENT PROGRAMS: BROOKLYN, QUEENS, MUNDELEIN, ROOSEVELT

Introduction

Each of the four programs included in this chapter resemble the others in that all employ primarily classroom instruction as their mode of delivery and all follow the same academic calendar as other programs at their institutions. But the programs differ one from another as well and one of the major points of difference seems to be the extent to which faculty members are involved in the planning and ratification of the special baccalaureate programs for adults at their institutions.

The Experimental Degree Project for Adults came into being at Brooklyn College through the efforts and with the support of a director of extension who had been President of the College's Faculty Senate as well as a respected economist, a dean of faculty who had repeatedly demonstrated his commitment to innovation in the College's programs, a president who exhibited a special concern for adults as students, and a faculty planning committee made up of individuals who commanded the allegiance of many of their fellows. The ACE Program at Queens College was planned, on the other hand, by a group of younger faculty members who were less well-known to their colleagues than their counterparts at Brooklyn, a director of extension who was highly respected by other faculty members and who supported the ACE Program once convinced of its merits, and a president who was primarily committed to upholding traditional standards through the continuation of traditional practices.

Mundelein's Degree Completion Program arose almost exclusively through the efforts of a single individual who had the unwavering support of his president, but at Mundelein faculty participation in planning and ratification of the adult degree program was virtually non-existent. And the Bachelor of General Studies program at Roosevelt University resulted from the efforts of a persuasive director of extension supported by her dean of faculties and president but, as in Mundelein's case, with little or no faculty involvement in planning.

The consequences of the varied levels of faculty involvement are apparent both in this chapter and in the next. The general pattern seems to be that the more faculty members were involved in the planning and design of the program and the more prestigious were the involved faculty members, the less resistance the program seems to have felt within its academic community. Further, the greater the faculty involvement and the more prestigious the faculty involved, the more coherent and daring the design of the program seems to have been.

That substantial faculty involvement and the involvement of prestigious faculty members tended to reduce resistance to the special baccalaureate programs on some campuses is not remarkable. But that faculty involvement and especially the involvement of the leaders of faculty opinion seems to have led to programs which were both more internally consistent and more daring may be. The programs at Brooklyn College and the University of Oklahoma appear to be the clearest examples of the latter phenomenon.

Brooklyn College--The Experimental Degree Project for Adults

It is difficult to know at exactly what point to start a description of the development of a new educational program since innovations in institutions of higher education, perhaps in all institutions, seem connected in a more or less direct line to many earlier innovations. Few, if any, new programs make their appearances full-blown on the floor of the institution's legislature without much shaping and re-shaping in discussions beforehand. The Experimental Degree Project for Adults, the first of the special baccalaureate programs for adults, was no exception.

Although Bernard H. Stern, then Associate Director of the School of General Studies at Brooklyn College, said at a Conference in March 1963, ". . . that the program at Brooklyn required six months of planning,"[1] he also frankly admitted in an extensive report on the Project written four years earlier that the regulations governing the Project ". . . were extensions or modifications of existing rules and practices." He hastened to add, however, that the combination of the extended and modified rules had ". . . pushed educational practices well beyond customary college patterns."[2] The Experimental Degree Project for Adults was thus both new and old. Perhaps it would be useful, before recounting the circumstances through which the Project itself was established, to describe Brooklyn College and to examine the regulations and practices on which the Project was based.

Brooklyn College, founded in May 1930, is the third oldest of the five colleges of the municipally supported City University of New York (CUNY). Before the Fall of 1930, students in the Borough of Brooklyn who took advantage of the program of higher education provided by New York City were served by branches of City College and Hunter College which offered freshman and sophomore coursework in Brooklyn; to complete their baccalaureate degrees, upperclassmen commuted to City or Hunter on Manhattan. Both the earlier branches of its two parent institutions and the early sessions of Brooklyn College utilized rented space in several office buildings and lofts in the Borough Hall section of Brooklyn. Permanent facilities were not ready for occupancy in the Flatbush area of Brooklyn, the College's current location, until Fall 1937 when the College was forced to open late because of delays in the construction of its new campus.

---

[1] Report of the "Conference on Special Degree Programs Sponsored by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults in Cooperation with the Department of Defense and Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, March 25-26, 1963," p. 5. (Mimeographed)

[2] Bernard H. Stern and Ellsworth Missall, *Adult Experience and College Degrees* (Cleveland, Ohio: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1960), p. 24.

The two criteria for admission to the new College were an acceptable high school average and residence in the City. But unlike most new institutions of higher education, Brooklyn College did not build a student body one class at a time over its first four years; 2800 Day Session students and 5000 Evening Session students were inherited its first year from the City College and Hunter College extensions.[1]

Brooklyn College offered evening classes for part-time students, most of whom were adults, from its first semester but, as is true at so many institutions, the Evening Session, according to Harry D. Gideonse, Brooklyn's second President, received neither equal attention nor equal budgetary support compared to the Day Session. President Gideonse, who led the College from 1939 to 1966, was committed to giving special attention to the Evening Session and to evening students. His unusual interest in the Evening Session at Brooklyn may be attributed to his experience both as a working graduate student at Columbia University and as an evening instructor at Columbia and City College. During the years of his administration the Evening Session, later re-named the School of General Studies, clearly benefited from his consistent interest and active support.[1]

---

[1] Brooklyn College of the City University of New York, "Report Prepared for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools," April 1966, pp. 1-3. (mimeographed)

Initially the Evening Session enrolled only two categories of students: matriculants who were working toward a Bachelor of Arts and non-matriculants who either were taking individual courses without a long-term academic goal or were taking courses in the hope of proving themselves and thus being allowed to matriculate. In the Fall of 1941, however, the Evening Session at Brooklyn College added a third category by instituting a terminal, two-year program called first the Associate in Arts diploma and later the Associate in Arts degree program. This program was meant to provide a liberal arts education for high school graduates whose records did not warrant admission to the baccalaureate program and for adults who wished to take a liberal arts program which offered a clear goal in fewer than the seven or eight years necessary to earn a B.A. through part-time study. The Associate in Arts program was an early example of the willingness of SGS to provide programs to meet the special needs of various student groups, especially adults.[1]

---

[1] Thomas Evans Coulton, A City College in Action (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1955), p. 95.

The Response of Brooklyn College to the War

As the Associate in Arts program was being instituted, the War began to have its effect on Brooklyn College as a whole and on the Evening Session in particular. Between Fall 1940 and Fall 1944, the number of male students in the Day Session declined from 3,411 to 1,468. In the Evening Session the drop was even more dramatic: 3,868 to 862.[2] But the decline in numbers of male students during the War was matched and exceeded at Brooklyn as elsewhere by the influx of veterans after the War, in the middle and late 'forties, and many of the veterans attended the Evening Session. After the War, total enrollments in the Day Session at Brooklyn grew by approximately 1500, from 6,199 in Fall 1945 to 7,734 in Fall 1948. During the same period, however, the Evening Session virtually doubled in size, recording an increase from 3,406 to 6,728.[1]

---

[1] Myrtle S. Jacobson, *Night and Day* (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1970), pp. 49 and 50.

[2] Coulton, *City College*, pp. 160 and 161.

A number of the regulations and practices upon which the Experimental Degree Project for Adults was based were responses to the needs of draftees, veterans, and persons displaced by the War. Other regulations and practices antedated World War II but were revised, broadened, and used more frequently owing to the special circumstances resulting from the War. Stern and Missall state in their report that

> four major adaptations of existing college regulations /had by 1959/ became significant features of the Experimental Degree Project: modification of the established tutorial service, increase in credit for informal study and off-campus experience, substitution of a more completely integrated general education curriculum, and removal of the foreign language requirement.[2]

In addition to these four adaptations, they describe at length the practice of extensive counseling and testing used from the beginning of the Project both to screen applicants and to place students in programs designed especially for them.[3] The origins of each of these regulations and practices is explored in the following paragraphs.

Tutorial Services. Standard procedures were changed in several ways ". . . to expedite the admission and adjustment of the veteran to academic life and to speed his college career to a satisfactory termination." A policy statement dated November 13, 1944, formally initiated these changes on the four campuses of the City University. For example, veterans were allowed to register for courses at any time during the year. And since veterans were able to enter classes which were well underway, a tutorial service was established to help those who registered late to catch up by the end of the term. In addition to providing a means of accelerating veterans' programs in this way, "Veterans Workshops" were begun to provide group support for those who found adjustment to college life difficult and needed help in their studies.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 166 and 167.

[2] Stern and Missall, Adult Experience, p. 22.

[3] Ibid., pp. 29-40.

A tutorial service had, in fact, been instituted informally even before veterans began returning in great numbers, but in its earlier form it had been set up to assist draftees to hasten completion of the courses they had already begun when their call came. Once the faculty recognized the benefits to the veterans and draftees which resulted from the tutorial service, the same service was extended to the entire student body.

The faculty of Brooklyn College thus accepted a tutorial service more than ten years before the establishment of the Experimental Degree Project for Adults and, perhaps because the largest single group of students who took advantage of the service were veterans, many faculty members seemed to connect the tutorials and the independent study the tutorials required with the strong motivation often found in adult students. This may have made faculty approval of the Experimental Degree Project less difficult to obtain.[1]

---

[1] Coulton, City College, p. 158.

Counseling Program. Faculty members, administrators, and other staff members had always been available to advise and counsel students in the Day and Evening Sessions of the College, but the War created a demand for a new kind of counseling which could help veterans assess their prior academic accomplishments and find their proper place in a college program. Fortunately, the federal government recognized this need and provided funding for the counseling program.

Many veterans, unlike most high school graduates who went immediately to college, had matured in the service and had expanded their knowledge and understanding. In preparation for their wartime duties, the G.I.'s acquired many new skills, some of which were potentially relevant to the requirements of a baccalaureate degree. Further, military personnel, in many instances, took advantage of traditional coursework offered through the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) which provided correspondence courses and study guides. Various colleges and universities also offered programs not related to military duty to veterans both at home and abroad.

---

[1] Stern and Missall, *Adult Experience*, pp. 19 and 20.

When the G.I.'s returned, however, the schools which they chose to enter were left with the task of evaluating and accepting or rejecting work done through USAFI and at other institutions as well as possibly assigning credit to the educational advances which veterans, during their service, had made on their own, outside formal educational programs. Brooklyn College was willing to consider toward degree requirements both work done through USAFI and other institutions and informal learning accomplished independently. A special counseling program was key to the appropriate evaluation of the student's prior learning.

More than 7,000 veterans were helped between 1945 and 1947 by the counseling office established under Veterans Administration funds. And apparently the worth of the counseling program had been so well demonstrated by the time the federal support began to be withdrawn that Brooklyn College decided to continue the service on its own.

> . . . The people of Brooklyn had become aware of the federal program and understood better its values through the benefits derived by the fathers, sons, and daughters who had served in the armed forces and had turned to it for guidance after their discharge. It was natural, therefore, that there developed a demand for like services for nonveterans--adults, young people, and children. It seemed logical to bring together the facilities at hand and the expressed community wishes.[1]

Just as the scope of the tutorial service had been broadened from serving only draftees and veterans to serving the whole student body, so the counseling program, when it was re-organized in November 1947 as the Brooklyn College Testing and Advisement Center, was opened to the entire community of Brooklyn. With the establishment of the Center another basic ingredient of the Experimental Degree Project for Adults was created.

---

[1] Coulton, *City College*, pp. 32 and 33.

Exemption Examinations. The War also provided the impetus for the establishment of a system of exemption examinations at Brooklyn. By 1948, an Office of Exemption Examinations was established to monitor the system. Prior to that year, an informal procedure had grown up, probably at the instigation of the veterans' advisers and with the concurrence of William R. Gaede, the Dean of Faculty. The informal procedure involved the department chairmen or their designates making judgments about the competence of students in subject matter covered in specific courses. Many of the students helped by this procedure were immigrants who had attended universities or other institutions of higher learning in Europe but who had been forced to flee Hitler with no credentials attesting to their educational backgrounds. Interviews were apparently used for most of the evaluations under this informal arrangement.

> The faculty members could talk with the student about the subjects he claimed to have taken and make some judgment, taking into account that it's probably ten, twelve, or fifteen years since he had been exposed to the subject.

Others served were veterans who had applied themselves during their service and felt that they had, either through USAFI or on their own, mastered material similar to that taught in courses offered by the College. Similar conversations were held with the veterans to determine whether or not what they had learned was sufficient to meet a course requirement.[1]

As the large number of veterans caused the informal arrangement by which displaced persons and veterans could receive credit for their prior learning to be used more and more frequently, the College moved to make the arrangement formal and to create a system open to a broader range of students. Unlike the tutorial service and the counseling program, however, the faculty moved much more slowly in opening the Exemption Examination Program to the whole student body. When it was formally instituted in 1950, the Program was limited to students in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences who were enrolled in the Experimental Curriculum.[2] Exemption from a required course was allowed if a student passed a written examination, similar to a course final, with a grade of "C." If the student passed the examination with a grade of "B" or "A," he was both exempted from the required course and given credit for the course on his permanent record. The examinations, though, were limited to the required courses and to students in the special program. Initially, elective courses were not included as they often had been under the informal arrangement.

---

[1] Interview with Ellsworth Missall, May 5, 1974, p. 5.

[2] The Experimental Curriculum was a group of interdisciplinary courses designed as an alternative to the general education requirements. It will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

In 1955, the Exemption Examination Program was opened to all matriculated students in CLAS, in 1956 to all matriculated students in SGS, and in 1958, elective courses were included in the Program. Examinations for required courses were available before each Fall Semester and at other times by special arrangement to students with at least a 2.75 grade point average. Study guides for the required courses were prepared and sold in the College bookstore as an aid to successful preparation. Examinations for elective courses were offered only by special arrangement and on the recommendation of a faculty adviser.[1]

All credit awarded initially through the informal procedure and later through the formal exemption system was restricted to individual courses offered on the Brooklyn campus. No so-called "blanket credit" was awarded for informal or off-campus learning, save the few hours allowed veterans for their military service. And the service credits that the veterans received could be used only as electives and not toward either their distribution or their major requirements.

Each method of awarding credit for learning which did not take place on campus--the informal arrangement, blanket credit for veterans, and the Exemption Examination Program--seems to have had an effect on the design of the Experimental Degree Project. The informal arrangement seems to have contributed the practice of using interviews to evaluate prior learning, especially the prior learning of adults. Blanket credit for military service carried with it an implicit acknowledgement that the classroom was not the only place for academically relevant learning. And the Exemption Examination Program with its study guides seems to have re-affirmed in the minds of many faculty members the utility of independent study, at least for highly motivated and able students. But the aggregate impact of the three procedures over time was probably more important than the impact of any one of them since the three as a group seem to have helped faculty members at Brooklyn College become accustomed to and comfortable with the practice of validating with credit learning which did not occur in the classroom.

---

[1] "Brooklyn College Staff Bulletin," X, December 1, 1958, pp. 26 and 27.

The Experimental Curriculum.- The Staff Bulletin carried an announcement in its October 1949 issue of a "New Experimental Program" which would be offered beginning in Spring 1950 to a cross-section of the 320 members of the freshman class in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Part of the announcement read:

> [The Experimental Program was designed] so that the blocks of 25 students in each of 13 English sections also meet as the same groups in 13 corresponding Social Science sections.

> This organization will allow a greater measure of integration between the two courses. To each of these block patterns of English and Social Science sections is attached a counselor from the Department of Personnel Counseling who will cooperate with the two teachers in an effort to evaluate each of the students enrolled in the program. A further purpose of this arrangement is to enable these students to make a satisfactory adjustment in their freshman year.

The Bulletin went on to describe the Exemption Examination Program discussed in the preceding section as an integral part of the total Experimental Program. And although independent study was included as a third component of the Program, independent study does not seem to have been a central part of the Program since the reading of only four additional books per year was required and no provision was made for measuring the effect of the extra reading on the student.[1]

The initiation of the Experimental Curriculum in CLAS seems important to the evolution of the Experimental Degree Project in at least two ways: ideas and people. The idea of crossing disciplinary boundaries in curriculum design was "in the air," according to Missall. The Experimental Curriculum in CLAS was the first attempt at Brooklyn to make operational such a curriculum. Further, Bernard Stern, Ellsworth Missall, and Seymour Fogel who constituted three quarters of the committee ultimately charged with designing the Experimental Degree Project for Adults, joined in creating and teaching three of the courses in the Experimental Curriculum. Stern helped design and teach the Literature and Communications course while Missall did the same with its pair, the Social Science course.[1] Fogel, a biologist, concerned himself with the Science course.[2] Not too surprisingly, the three later seem to have fallen back on this earlier experience when their initial approach to the special baccalaureate program for adults proved unworkable.

---

[1] "Brooklyn College Staff Bulletin," VI, March 1, 1950, pp. 5 and 6.

The Experimental Curriculum, incidentally, was limited to freshmen and sophomores in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for its five provisional years, Spring 1950 through Spring 1955. Although many innovations, the Exemption Examination Program for example, were first introduced in CLAS and only later into SGS apparently because of a bias against adult students, this was not the case with the Experimental Curriculum. Spengler indicated in his Tenth Annual Report that "because of technical and staffing difficulties it was considered prudent to postpone the scheduling of these courses in the School of General Studies." And his prudence was apparently well grounded in fact since the Curriculum was discontinued shortly after it was finally introduced into SGS in Fall 1956 because students going to classes in the evening found it impossible to register in the paired sections which were offered in sequence over a two year period.[3]

---

[1] Missall, May 5, 1974, pp. 2-4.

[2] Stern and Missall, Adult Experience, p. 7.

[3] Edwin H. Spengler, "Tenth Annual Report of the Director of the School of General Studies, Brooklyn College, 1959-1960," p. 15.

The experience that Stern, Missall, and Fogel had with the integrated courses of the Experimental Curriculum thus involved mainly seventeen, eighteen, and nineteen-year-olds and not adults. But Missall had also had substantial experience with veterans whom he counselled first under the Veterans Administration program at Brooklyn and later as Supervisor of the Division of Counseling and Guidance in the Evening Sessions. Soon after Edwin H. Spengler was appointed Director of the Evening Sessions in Fall 1949, he brought Bernard Stern on as his Assistant. Stern had been Supervisor of the Division of Liberal Arts in SGS.[1] Thus the ideas and the people which would result in the Experimental Degree Project were assembling.

Foreign Language Requirement. During the crisis caused by the War, the Brooklyn faculty, as in the other examples cited, reacted with what seems to have been a characteristic flexibility to the need of many veterans for a modified foreign language requirement.

> When hardship would result from delay in graduation because a veteran had not completed the required level of foreign language training, it became possible under faculty regulations for the Dean of Faculty to waive part of the requirement. Long periods commonly elapsed between the three years of high school foreign language training and its resumption in college. Despite special aids, it was common for the veteran to start a new language in college. In such cases the usual rule would have required three years of foreign language. Many veterans would have been obliged to stay in college beyond the ordinary period if such a rule were applied.

---

[1] Edwin H. Spengler, "Fourth Annual Report of the Director of the School of General Studies, Brooklyn College, 1953-54." p. 34.

But since the faculty allowed an exception, the veterans did not have to suffer. Stern and Missall felt that through this and the other variations in the regulations, precedents for flexibility were established and the faculty demonstrated a recognition of the difference between adults and adolescents as students.[1] These precedents and that recognition served the School of General Studies well when the time came to propose the Experimental Degree Project for Adults.

Establishment of the Project

The development of business and industry before the War had begun to exert a new pressure on men and women for further education and the technological advances made during the War, if anything, increased that pressure. Colleges and universities, especially those in urban areas, had become more adaptable during the crisis and tended to continue their adaptability after the War was won. Educators and their students looked with renewed interest to the liberal arts in an attempt to re-assess the meaning of human life and in the hope of finding a key to world peace through greater understanding of human nature.

Evening colleges had experienced almost frightening growth as the veterans returned. Some leaders in the evening colleges saw, because of the new visibility of their organizations, the possibility of an important and changed role for the evening colleges within their institutions. They felt the evening colleges could act not as mirrors of the day session but as a major force for improving the quality of life and strengthening the civic responsibility of American citizens. And the Ford Foundation was ready with millions to spend for the achievement of similar goals.

---

[1] Stern and Missall, Adult Experience, pp. 20 and 21.

The initiation of the Experimental Degree Project for Adults was not, however, the result of the need the nation might have for a new definition of humanity, nor of the grant money available from the Fund for Adult Education, nór of the ideas and charisma of some creative person. It was each of these things and more. As Dean Jacobson put it in her thoughtful analysis of the organizational dynamics which resulted in the creation of the Project:

> The story of the special baccalaureate program for adults begins with a dream. But it is not a story of a dream come true. Rather it is the tale of a dream altered, modified and tempered by the interplay of organizational forces in the world of reality.[1]

Going beyond Jacobson's sociological bias, the design of the Brooklyn program was also substantially modified in its early days as a result of the competencies of the students who were admitted to it. The competencies the students had were found to be different from the competencies the designers of the program expected them to have which signalled the need for a modification of the original approach of the program.

---

[1] Jacobson, *Night and Day*, pp. 91 and 92.

If the Brooklyn program was the consequence of a dream, no matter how altered, it was a dream enjoyed by at least two men. Edwin H. Spengler, professor of economics made Director of the Evening Sessions, was excited about the potential for offering a new variety of adult education in the evening colleges. He had, by 1949-1950, become involved in the Association of University Evening Colleges (AUEC). He held the respect of President Gideonse and Dean Gaede, both of whom had repeatedly demonstrated their interest in and support of the Evening Sessions. And his responsibilities were modified, in 1950, in a way that increased his influence:

> At a meeting of the Board of Higher Education on Monday, April 17, 1950, it was voted to establish five (5) Schools of General Studies to replace the Evening Sessions and all Extension Divisions in existence at the City Colleges.[1]

The new Schools of General Studies were given jurisdiction over all coursework offered in the evening for degrees, over all courses or programs leading to certificates and diplomas, over non-degree work including adult education courses, and over all non-matriculated students.[2] Spengler re-structured his expanded staff over the summer and "by September 1950 this new organization at Brooklyn was ready to function."[3] The re-organization seems to have been timely since the School of General Studies in Fall 1950 counted ". . . the largest evening enrollment in the history of Brooklyn College."[1]

---

[1] "Brooklyn College Staff Bulletin," VI, May 1, 1950, p. 5.

[2] Ibid., p. 6.

[3] Edwin H. Spengler, "First Annual Report of the Director of the School of General Studies, Brooklyn College, 1950-51," p. 1.

SGS and the CSLEA

Perhaps because of the growing success of Brooklyn's evening college work or because of the impetus often engendered by a re-organization, Spengler and some of his colleagues began to talk in 1950 and 1951 about how they might ". . . break away from the orthodox baccalaureate degree" and offer a curriculum designed more specifically for adults. No concrete move was made toward a special curriculum at that point, however, because Spengler feared that the introduction of such a radical idea might have drawn a strongly adverse reaction from the faculty of the College as a whole. And an adverse reaction so early in its life might have jeopardized the very existence of the new School of General Studies.[2]

The other part of the dream materialized in 1952 at a meeting of the AUEC, when Spengler met, for the first time, John Schwertman, then Assistant Director of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults (CSLEA). Schwertman apparently had heard of Spengler's slanting of courses in Brooklyn's evening college toward an adult audience by attempting to modify the instructor's approach. Schwertman and Spengler, in the brief conversation they had that day, talked about the possibility of a grant to support the development of a special degree program for adults. No details were discussed then, but Schwertman and another staff member of the Center came to Brooklyn shortly thereafter to explore the possibility of a special program.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[2] Interview with Edwin H. Spengler, November 8, 1973, pp. 1 and 2.

Ellsworth Missall, who was one of those included in the initial discussions with Schwertman, recalled him as ". . . a rather compelling, fascinating, and attractive person, highly articulate and very knowledgeable, imaginative about the things we were dealing with."[2] It appears that Schwertman's dynamism as well as his potential for encouraging the Fund for Adult Education to support the program, may have influenced Spengler to risk proposing the special program which he had hesitated to propose at an earlier time.

Before the proposal could be submitted to the Fund for Adult Education via the CSLEA, Spengler had to elicit support for the idea from President Gideonse and Dean Gaede, but given their attitude toward the evening college and the education of adults, their support was readily obtained. The proposal was then taken before the Committee on Long Term Curriculum Development which, as its name might imply, had jurisdiction. After remarkably brief deliberation, the Committee approved the proposal in principle with the provision that the Committee would directly oversee the development of the program should the proposal be funded. On the recommendation of the Committee on Long Term Curriculum Development the Faculty Council approved the proposal,[1] but not without "numerous, violent objections" from the floor. Since the program was approved by the Faculty Council on an experimental basis only, the program was given the name "The Experimental Degree Project for Adults."[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[2] Missall, May 5, 1974, p. 20.

The grant from the Fund for Adult Education arranged through the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults early in 1954 was particularly important to the development of the Experimental Project. The re-organization of the Ford Foundation had not, at that time, percolated down to individual institutions but was still focused on the creation of the eleven independent Funds and on the subsidiaries of the Funds. Years later Dean Jacobson noted that:

> to be financed by a foundation was particularly impressive in 1953 when financial support for experimental or demonstration projects was difficult to secure. Cooperative research programs financed by the U.S. Office of Education

---

[1] Jacobson, Night and Day, pp. 96-98.

[2] Spengler, November 8, 1973, p. 4.

> or other governmental agencies were at that time relatively unknown. Grants by the private foundations--Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford, etc.--were also relatively scarce . . .[1]

The grant caught the attention of the faculty of the College in a special way: it meant that outsiders were willing to invest in the program's development. This realization enhanced the credibility of the program and, further, the grant made the development of the program a practical possibility in the face of the School of General Studies' budget which contained no funds for experimentation. As Missall bluntly put it:

> It always was a scramble for cash /In the School of General Studies/ so I think it's fair to say that if the Chicago group hadn't stepped in and said, "Look, here's X thousand dollars--try and get this thing started," it probably wouldn't have gone.[2]

The project grant was approved in February 1954 by the full Board of the Fund for Adult Education after what appears to have been extraordinary scrutiny. The grant was made for one year only and carried no commitment from the Fund for renewal.[3]

Designing the Project

Before the grant was announced, Spengler had appointed a committee to begin to work out the details of the program. He kept the committee small: Bernard Stern, Evelyn Raskin, Seymour Fogel, and Ellsworth Missall. Stern, the Chairman, was Associate

---

[1] Jacobson, Night and Day, p. 95.

[2] Missall, May 5, 1974, p. 19.

[3] Jacobson, Night and Day, p. 98.

Director of the School of General Studies and had been involved in the development of a communications and literature course for the earlier Experimental Curriculum. Evelyn Raskin had had experience ". . . as the administrative and policy leader in the office of Exemption Examinations." Fogel and Missall both had developed courses for the Experimental Curriculum, Fogel in science and Missall in social science. Missall, in addition to his work with the Experimental Curriculum, had been Supervisor of the Division of Counseling and Guidance in SGS and after the War had helped evaluate veterans' informal learning experiences for possible credit.[1]

The committee apparently took its assignment very seriously, meeting at least once a week for an extended planning session[2] and its members seem to have worked well as a group:

> . . . We had really a free-flowing committee, very excited and challenged by the problems that were presented to us and I don't recall any time when we didn't in a group fashion, resolve whatever the problem was that was there. Now some of us may have been more important in the resolution in this case than in another but it was a highly cooperative, joint venture.[3]

John Schwertman, by then Director of the CSLEA, joined in the committee's deliberations with some regularity. His main contribution, according to Missall, was to provide the encouragement ". . . that would really give us the spirit to move on more vigorously."[1]

---

[1] Stern and Missall, Adult Experience, p. 7.

[2] Missall, May 5, 1974, p. 2.

[3] Ibid., p. 10.

When the grant was announced, the planning group was renamed the Committee on Admission and Evaluation and by February 20, 1954, the Committee began involving other Brooklyn faculty members in the Project by sending each of them a letter announcing the Project and requesting help in identifying adults who might be potential students in the program:

> With funds made available by the Ford Foundation, an experimental project is being launched in the School of General Studies which will enable a select group of adults . . . to achieve the baccalaureate degree on the basis of ability and demonstrated achievement rather than the mere accumulation of credits. For some adults this could present an opportunity for somewhat accelerated study. The program is aimed primarily at a mature adult group, preferably over thirty years of age, whose unique background and experiences seem to entitle them to special consideration and curriculum planning to meet their individual needs. Members of the community at large, as well as students enrolled in any degree or diploma curriculum are eligible for consideration. We believe that the results of this experiment may clarify many problems inherent in liberal education for adults.
>
> Upon acceptance into this experimental program by the Committee on Admissions and Evaluation, diagnosis will be made of the academic preparation required by each of the students for the baccalaureate degree. This diagnosis will result from counseling conferences, diagnostic tests, and other methods of appraising a student's record. Each student will then be directed into a program of studies which may include special tutorial services, independent study, exemption examinations, classroom or seminar attendance, a formal thesis, or comprehensive examinations. The student's progress will be evaluated and translated into equivalent college credits. When he has demonstrated to the Committee that he has achieved a liberal education, he will be recommended for the bachelor's degree.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

> In order to initiate this program, the Committee is requesting each member of the Brooklyn College staff to recommend one outstanding candidate for consideration.[1]

The recommendations were due in two weeks.

Having begun by looking for students with the help of the College staff, the Committee spent the rest of the month setting goals for the Project. By March 10, the members had agreed

> . . . that the objectives of the program would be answers to these questions:
>
> (a) What differences in method are desirable for adults to achieve the existing goals of the baccalaureate degree?
>
> (b) Would such different methods result in any savings in existing educational costs?
>
> (c) Would such different methods result in more valuable and practical benefits to the adults than the existing methods?

They also chose four sets of examinations they would use 1) in the selection process, 2) for diagnosis after selection, 3) for measuring achievement, and 4) for evaluating the students' movement toward becoming liberally educated. Each of the instruments in the total battery was already available either at the College or from national testing services with the exception of two instruments for evaluating movement toward a liberal education which had been part of the evaluative design of the earlier Experimental

---

[1] Letter to the Staff of Brooklyn College from Bernard H. Stern et. al., February 20, 1954. (Mimeographed)

Curriculum but which had not yet been constructed by the faculty.[1]

The initial group of students for the Project was selected in late Spring of 1954 and, since the Project was not scheduled to start in earnest until Fall, the students were given a brief orientation and an independent study project to complete over the summer. By Fall, it was apparent to the Committee that some revision of the program was needed. The assumption had been that the first group of students selected would most probably earn the equivalent of the first two years of college by examination[2] but, in fact, of the thirty-two students who attempted to complete a prescribed course in Classical Civilization over the first summer, only six were able to pass the exemption examination which was given just before the start of the Fall term. The problem seemed to be that,

> although many of /the students/ displayed a firm practical grasp of a subject like economics or sociology, their understanding of the theoretical aspects of the field was weak. Left to their own devices in studying a subject, they floundered.[3]

In spite of the initial problems, however, an enthusiastic announcement of the program, which provided much the same information about the program as had been included in the letter to the staff quoted earlier, was prominently placed in the October 1954 issue of the Staff Bulletin.[1] Meanwhile, the Committee on Admissions and Evaluation surveyed student opinion to determine what was wrong. They found that

---

[1] "Brooklyn College, School of General Studies, Ford Project in Liberal Education for Adults, Minutes of Meeting, March 10, 1954," p. 1. (Mimeographed)

[2] Spengler, November 8, 1973, p. 4.

[3] Stern and Missall, Adult Experience, pp. 95 and 96.

> /the students/ wanted more group study and less independent reading. They wanted to meet with their tutors at more frequent intervals, preferably weekly. They recommended setting up interdepartmental, integrated tutorial seminars. They were hungry for more personal contact with the faculty, for more "instruction", for less of the "detailed" and more of the "comprehensive".[2]

In response to the students' suggestions, two experimental tutorial groups were organized for Spring 1955, one on "Earth Science" and the other on "Normal-Abnormal Psychology." These tutorials, which were in effect special courses taught for the highly intelligent, well-motivated, mature adults who had been admitted to the Project, were very successful. "By capitalizing on adult experience and abilities, each of these groups telescoped into one semester of an area of study normally covered in a full academic year."[3]

The Second Grant

With the introduction of group tutorials, the students' need for guidance in their studies and their lack of theoretical knowledge seemed well on the way to being remedied, but another problem was, by then, facing the Committee. The grant from the

---

[1] "Brooklyn College Staff Bulletin," VI, October 1, 1954, pp. 5 and 6.

[2] Stern and Missall, *Adult Experience*, p. 97.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

Fund for Adult Education was scheduled to expire in June and the Project could not go on without additional outside funds. The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults had to be convinced that the Project was visibly successful before it would agree to a renewal of the grant.[1] And given Schwertman's tendency to take a more radical approach to curriculum and academic regulations than the SGS staff or the Committee, receiving a renewal of the grant was not a foregone conclusion. The prospects for renewal, in fact, seem to have been somewhat clouded by the revision of the design of the program, since the creation of the group tutorials, which were in fact courses, made the Project more like the regular degree program in SGS rather than more experimental.

The very fact that the Project had begun on a one year grant seems paradoxically to have dictated that the Project not deviate too far in its design from the regular baccalaureate offered by SGS because the students in the program risked being faced with the discontinuation of the Project and their return to the regular offerings should the grant not be renewed. To protect the student's interests, the Committee was virtually compelled to define the requirements of the Project in terms of credits and courses so that the Project would be compatible, in the event of its discontinuation, with the regular baccalaureate program.[1]

---

[1] Jacobson, *Night and Day*, p. 108.

The faculty of the College also acted as a constraint on the design of the Project. The Committee assumed, most probably accurately, that the Faculty Council would not stand for an experimental baccalaureate program which departed radically from established patterns. The Committee thus found itself facing a dilemma, similar to the one it faced when it wrote the initial proposal, as the application for a renewal of the grant was being prepared. On the one hand, the CSLEA and the FAE demanded visible success from the experimental venture at the end of its first year and success clearly meant that the program had to be workable for its adult audience, that it had to be considered an improvement on the standard evening college offerings, and that it had to attract the attention of other institutions. On the other hand, the students' need for more faculty contact, the constraint of the faculty of the College as a whole on experimentation, and the pressure exerted simply by the fact of a one year grant militated against the development of a radically different approach to the liberal education of adults.

Stern argued in his report on the first year of the

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 107 and 108.

Project that one year was only enough to launch the Project's students but certainly not enough to guide them toward their goals. He pointed out that, should the program be discontinued after its first year, only three of the thirty-two students who had begun the program would be able, by even the most liberal reckoning, to complete their degrees by the term of the grant. Stern then concluded:

> The Committee believes that the full benefit of the results of the experiment cannot be reaped in only one year. It is also convinced that the project is already proving to be of great concrete importance to the clarification and improvement of liberal education for adults. It is on these grounds that the Committee strongly recommends the renewal of the existing grant for an additional year.[1]

The FAE apparently agreed that the Project indeed needed additional time to consolidate its gains and renewed the grant for a year with an increase in funding from $15,000 to $19,000.[2]

With the renewed grant, the Committee set about redesigning the Project to take into account what it had learned from the first group of students. And while the focus of the Project remained on an alternative to the first two years of the baccalaureate, the group tutorials rather than independent study and testing received most attention.

---

[1] Bernard H. Stern, "The Launching of Degree-Seeking Adults at Brooklyn College," July 1954, p. 7. (Mimeographed)

[2] "Brooklyn College Staff Bulletin," VII, October 1, 1955, p. 7.

Re-designing the Project: The Second Year

When it was discovered that the students in the Experimental Degree Project lacked the theoretical knowledge which undergraduates typically acquire from the general education courses taken in their freshman and sophomore years, Spengler and the Committee had to ask how to provide this knowledge without dampening the enthusiasm of the students. "To make /the Project/ more palatable and interesting for these adults," Spengler and the Committee, true to their typical strategy, recruited a team of highly respected faculty members to study the problem and make recommendations to solve it.[1] By the end of the summer of 1955, the team had determined that four specially designed seminars should meet the needs of the adults and had set about designing them.[2]

A second group of students had, in the meantime, been admitted to the Project and the first group still largely lacked the theoretical base which was to be provided by the yet undesigned seminars. But, fortunately the Experimental Curriculum, begun in 1950, shared some goals with the seminars being prepared for the Experimental Degree Project and the courses from the earlier experiment were, of course, already available. In the interim, then,

---

[1] Spengler, November 8, 1974, pp. 4 and 5.

[2] Jacobson, Night and Day, pp. 109 and 110.

> it was possible to start courses with a number of the characteristics ultimately desired. These interim courses were modeled after some integrated courses already found in the "experimental curriculum", and they incorporated others that ordinarily were separately presented. By such selection and amalgamation an approximation of the objectives was attained.[1]

In addition to the subject matter borrowed from the Experimental Curriculum, the group tutorial method which had successfully been developed during the Spring Semester 1955 was employed.

The four seminars recommended by the team were in the areas of communication, humanities, social science, and science-mathematics--the same four course areas included in the Experimental Curriculum. The Committee and the curriculum team felt that if

> a curriculum for adults were constructed around these four fields and the group tutorial method with which we had experimented were used for instruction, it would be possible to achieve the goals of general education by capitalizing on adult experience and abilities, enriching adult study, and, within limits, accelerating those adults who possessed special competence in given areas of knowledge. This could be accomplished by (a) reordering the materials in the various fields of knowledge to meet adult needs and (b) stimulating the adults to do for themselves much of the work which the teachers think they have to do with younger undergraduates.[2]

The new seminars were, however, not meant to change the goals or requirements for a Brooklyn College baccalaureate degree in any substantive way. The seminars were designed to be an alternative method of meeting the general education requirement--a method perhaps more appropriate for unusually experienced and capable adult students.

---

[1] Stern and Missall, Adult Experience, p. 22.

[2] Ibid., pp. 103 and 104.

A meticulously worked out description of the humanities, social science, and science-mathematics seminars was ready for consideration by the Committee on Long Term Curriculum Development by early spring, 1956.[1] Edgar Z. Friedenberg, who coordinated the curriculum development project, prefaced the nearly two hundred page compendium as follows:

> These documents are separate; they are the works of separate groups of individuals. But these documents share a common characteristic which should be fundamental in curriculum development, although it sometimes is not. This is a concern for epistemology--for the kind of knowledge which characterizes each of the major areas into which human experience is classified by academic convention. The group which has worked in the humanities is concerned with the properties which experience takes when expressed through the arts, and with the relationship of this to the generalized truth of the sciences. The scientists are concerned with the consequences of their method; with the problems and disparities presented by the more complete formal theoretical development of the natural sciences as compared to the social. Each document is characterized by an awareness of the metaphysical character of the disciplines with which it deals and of the problems of relationships between them.[2]

The curricula were well received by the Committee on Long Term

---

[1] It is assumed that a description of the communication seminar was also ready although no description with a similar date was found in the archives.

[2] Edgar Z. Friedenberg (Coordinator), "Planning a Curriculum in Liberal Education for Adults," February 1956, p. 1. (Mimeographed)

Curriculum Development and were recommended to the Faculty Council for approval.

On April 17, 1956, the Faculty Council accepted the new courses with apparently no changes or serious objection: the mood had changed since the proposal for the Project had been attacked from the floor of the Council. The minutes, which described the problem the seminars were to solve as well as the proposed solution, read:

> The following proposals are made as a result of studies conducted in the Experimental Degree Project for Adults over the past two years. These studies show that for many degree-seeking adults life experience has already achieved some of the goals of liberal education, such as skills, understanding and personal and social maturity. When their life experience is equated with college credits, however, it is found that they usually have the equivalent of numerous specialized elective courses, but not all the required core courses. Regular elementary classes are geared to the level of young people and are not suited to the needs of adults with well-formed intellectual goals. Attendance in such classes can be tedious because many of them have already mastered much of the basic content and can, therefore, be accelerated. They also require more adult-oriented teaching techniques which are possible only when courses are planned specifically for their needs.
>
> The following seminar courses for adults are proposed as alternative equivalents to all prescribed courses in the core curriculum for a baccalaureate degree. Only two areas currently prescribed have been omitted: Health-Physical Education and Foreign Languages. The first of these need not be required of adults because of their age. Many adults are already proficient in a foreign language, and they will be encouraged to do advanced work in that language in regular courses. But for the other adults there has been a long interruption in foreign language study since graduation from high school. The necessity for prolonged elementary study in mastering a new foreign language makes it desirable to make such study elective for them, particularly in view of their need for conserving

> time at their advanced age.
>
> These seminar courses make it possible to capitalize on adult experience by instruction in small tutorial groups conducted by panels of Faculty members, supplementing considerable independent study. The courses are sufficiently comprehensive and integrated at a sufficiently high level of scholarship to permit adults to build on what they have learned from life experience.[1]

Brief descriptions of the seminars such as one might find in a college catalog were appended for the information of the Council.

Two advantages of the seminars were mentioned in the proposal to the Faculty Council: that the seminars would be taught using the group tutorial method which had proved especially effective with adults and that the life experience of the adults would be built upon in the seminars. A third and major advantage implicit in the proposal but not singled out for mention was that adults in the Experimental Degree Project could, by taking the four seminars, complete all of their required courses in a two year period. The same requirements could not normally be met in less than three to four years by SGS students who were not in the Project. The justification for the acceleration inherent in the design of the seminars was based on the highly selective admissions policy of the Project and on the favorable results of the first two group tutorials held in the Spring Semester of 1955.

Acceleration of the rate at which subject matter was covered in the seminars benefited students in the Project by reducing the time required to earn their degrees, but the resulting pace was grueling. Students in the Project typically were advised to register for the Humanities and Communications Seminars during their first semester. Ten hours of classroom attendance per week were required for these two courses, all of it during the evening. In addition to classroom work, students in the seminars were expected to study a minimum of twenty-five hours per week. Thus, while students in the Project could complete their required courses in less time than the average student in the School of General Studies, they were not engaged in a less rigorous program. The curriculum for required courses in the Project was at least as demanding as that of the regular program; students in the Project were simply allowed to take advantage of their unusual ability and experience.

---

[1] Brooklyn College, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty Council Held on April 17, 1956," p. 2.

The Special Baccalaureate Degree Program at Brooklyn College

With the approval of the four seminars in communication, humanities, social science, and science-mathematics by the Faculty Council, the final curricular component of the Experimental Degree Project was put into place. As of April 1956, the basic design of the adult degree program at Brooklyn College contained the following parts:[1]

---

[1] It should be noted that the design of the Brooklyn program remains the same today.

1. A special admission process including the completion by the adults of an extensive application which was then screened by the Committee on Admission and Evaluation. Following the initial screening, those adults remaining in the pool of candidates were tested for aptitude and achievement. Candidates with satisfactory test results were interviewed to assess further their potential as students. Finally, approximately thirty students were admitted in the Fall of each year.

2. Four seminars in communication, humanities, social science, and science-mathematics which had been created especially for the adults in the Project were offered in lieu of the core curriculum required of all undergraduates at Brooklyn College. Through these seminars, adults in the Program could complete their core requirements in two years.

3. Assessment of relevant life experience took place during each student's first year in the Project. The initial concept of meeting the core requirements through independent study and exemption examinations had been discarded in favor of the four seminars, but students were still encouraged to petition departments for credit in elective courses for which they felt their life experience had prepared them.

4. Individual and group tutorials were available to students who were nearly qualified for life experience credit in an elective area but who needed some additional study in the area before credit could be awarded.

5. The requirements for a major and for elective courses not credited through life experience were met by taking regularly scheduled courses offered in the School of General Studies. The total number of semester hours required for the completion of a baccalaureate degree either in the Project or in the regular program of SGS remained 128.

The Experimental Degree Projects for Adults differed from the regular program in the School of General Studies only in that it offered an alternative means of meeting the core or general education requirements and of earning credit for prior learning to a carefully selected group of highly talented adults.

The differences, however modest as they may seem today, were approved by the faculty of the College only after careful review and with some initial skepticism. Dean Jacobson suggested that the acceptance of the program was an example of "innovation through cooptation," arguing that the faculty accepted the proposal for the program and its subsequent design elements because ". . . members of the day faculty /were invited/ to serve in both a consultative and a decision-making capacity in association with SGS staff in order to advance recognition of innovation."[1] The strategy of cooptation served the program well for a number of years after its creation.

In 1956, for example, not only were the four seminars approved but the program moved toward fiscal self-sufficiency when the Board of Higher Education, on recommendation of the Committee, voted to allow SGS to charge special fees.

> /These fees/ provide for diagnostic testing, a portion of the counseling, and some of the instructional costs for individual and group tutoring. It is anticipated that this program will be self-financing, and cost analyses that have been made thus far show that it will be possible for the College to continue the Project when the subsidy is removed. The present grant is viewed as a financial contribution toward the costs of the experimental activities of the Committee on Admissions and Evaluation for the Project.[2]

And grants from the FAE continued through 1958 for a total of of four years and $63,000. Since then the program has been virtually self-supporting as predicted[1] although it still depends largely on the compensation of faculty members at overload rather than annualized rates to keep the instructional costs at a minimum.[2]

---

[1] Jacobson, Night and Day, p. 90.

[2] "Brooklyn College Staff Bulletin," VIII, December 1, 1956, p. 6.

Another example of the beneficial effects of cooptation of day session faculty on the Experimental Degree Project occurred in late Spring 1957 when the Committee on Course and Standing and the Faculty Council authorized an increase in the number of credits students could receive for informal study. The original regulation, established in 1952, read that

> in exceptional cases, at the discretion of the Dean of Faculty, students who have pursued academic study on an informal basis /could be/ eligible for credit for courses on the basis of examinations, up to a maximum of 32 credits.

The regulation was extended specifically for the benefit of the adults in the Project with the following resolution:

> Be it resolved that upon recommendation of the Dean of Faculty, with the approval of the Committee on Course and Standing, mature adults who have pursued informal study be eligible for credit for courses on the basis of examination in excess of 32 credits.[3]

In this case, the change in regulations had the effect of liberalizing faculty members' interpretation of what constituted a creditable experience and thus the practice of awarding larger amounts of life experience credit became more common.

---

[1] Bernard H. Stern,"Eighth Annual Report of the School of General Studies, Brooklyn College, by the Acting Director, 1957-58," p. 2.

[2] Spengler, November 8, 1973, p. 6.

[3] Brooklyn College, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on Course and Standing, December 3, 1958," p. 7.

And in 1958, "by action of the Faculty Council the experimental status of this program. . . was dropped and the more permanent title, 'Special Baccalaureate Degree Program for Adults' was adopted."[1] But also in 1958, the coalition which had been responsible for the creation and good health of the program began to come into conflict with a wider body of influence in the College. The judgment of those who were overseeing the operation of the program began to be challenged.

As the Committee on Course and Standing assumed the responsibility for reviewing requests from the Committee on Admission and Evaluation of the Special Baccalaureate Program it also began to question Bernard Stern, the Associate Director of SGS who was responsible for the program, about the uniformity, from department to department, of the procedures for evaluating life experience, about the criteria used in determining whether or not a particular experience was worthy of credit, and about the relationship of the exemption examination program to the less formal procedures employed in assessing life experience.[2]

The interest of the Committee on Course and Standing in the crediting of life experience led the Committee to charge Professor Stern with the preparation of a guide ". . . for the assistance of Departmental evaluators, subject to the approval of the Committee on Course and Standing, to assure uniform standards of evaluation." Included in the charge of the Committee were nine inquiries about, for example, how much time should be devoted to assessing a student's mastery of a course, how much weight should be given to a student's own statement of his experience in a subject area, and whether any limitation should be placed on the number of credits awarded to a single student within any given department. Stern's guide was to answer each of the nine questions. And in addition to the guide, the Committee on Course and Standing stated its wish to review the criteria used by the SGS Committee on Admissions and Evaluation for recommending life experience credits for students in the Program.[1]

---

[1] Edwin H. Spengler, "Ninth Annual Report of the Director of the School of General Studies, Brooklyn College, 1958-1959," p. 9.

[2] Brooklyn College, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on Course and Standing, November 5, 1958," p. 3.

Stern submitted the guidelines for the evaluation of life experience as the Committee on Course and Standing had requested and the minor tempest that had been brewing over the most controversial component of the Special Baccalaureate Program died down. In fact, in 1959, the Program seemed on the verge of a further elaboration of its design. As the Staff Bulletin reported:

---

[1] Brooklyn College, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on Course and Standing, December 4, 1958," pp. 7 and 8.

> The success of the program for the first two years of the curriculum now suggests the need for developing more fully the features of enrichment and acceleration for the second two years, including the functional major and pre-professional preparation. Development of such a curriculum, especially for the senior year, may have vital significance not merely for adults but also for the College as a whole. To study the problem, and to prepare a curriculum plan, a special committee had been appointed. The committee will address itself to the fundamental question: "What are the aims and objectives of the last two years of a liberal arts college education for selected adults and how may these objectives best be achieved.[1]

The committee appointed to create the new curriculum was, as usual, blue-ribbon and the work went ahead with alacrity. Within the year the "capstone" seminars were designed and approved by the Committee on Long Term Curriculum Development and the Faculty Council.[2]

Not all went smoothly, however. The question of procedures for awarding credit for life experience was raised again early in 1960 in the Committee on Course and Standing. This time, under the leadership of a new Dean of Faculty, the concept of credit for life experience did not receive the same strong support it had enjoyed under the earlier Dean, William R. Gaede. In a lengthy memorandum dated December 2, 1960, the new Dean narrowed the guidelines for awarding credit for life experience. No more than fifteen credits were to be awarded in any one department, even more stringent limitations were enacted for particular courses, and no credit at all was to be allowed for performance courses in music and certain honors courses. Further, the record keeping system was made more stringent and the possibility of requiring, in the future, formal exemption examinations in addition to the assessment through interviews was left open. The memo had a chilling effect on the faculty evaluators' enthusiasm for recommending credit; the liberalizing impact of the 1958 ruling which made possible the awarding of more than thirty-two credits for life experience was largely reversed.[1]

---

[1] "Brooklyn College Staff Bulletin," XI, November 1, 1959, p. 31.

[2] Jacobson, *Night and Day*, pp. 114 and 115.

The administrators and Committee charged with responsibility for the Special Baccalaureate Program appear to have taken heed of the message which seemed implicit in the new Dean of Faculty's December memo: no substantial changes in curriculum or procedures were proposed or made in the Program between 1960 and 1970. The "capstone" seminars which had been ratified by the Faculty Council were never instituted.[2] Those in charge of the Program seem to have accepted the status quo and, except for an increase in the number of students admitted each year which was approved in 1965,[3] seem to have opted for continuing a successful program as it was rather than risking further restrictions by proposing further innovations.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 115-117.

[2] Interview with John Quinn et. al., February 27, 1974, tape two, 9.65 minutes.

[3] "Middle States Report," p. 121.

The Special Baccalaureate Degree Program for Adults achieved during its first seven years an acceptance and stability within Brooklyn College, that, in spite of a few difficulties, is remarkable. The Program, mainly because of the high quality and exceptional performance of its student body, became a point of pride for many members of the Brooklyn faculty and served to inspire other institutions to follow its lead. Both Queens College, another of the city colleges of New York, and Mundelein College in Chicago patterned their program to some extent after the Special Baccalaureate at Brooklyn. Both are treated in turn, although not as extensively as Brooklyn College.

The Changed Environment

Before describing the origins of the Queens College program and recounting the events which led to its creation, it might be useful to note that the environment in which higher adult education was operating had changed substantially between 1954 when Brooklyn College initiated its baccalaureate program for adults and 1963 when Queens began accepting students for the Adult Continuing Education (ACE) Program. Brooklyn College stood alone when it developed the Experimental Degree Project; Queens College, on the other hand, had not only Brooklyn's experience to draw upon but also that of the Associate in Arts program for adults at Syracuse University, the Bachelor of Liberal Studies program at the University of Oklahoma and the Adult Degree Program at Goddard College.

If it were possible to capture in writing the true complexity of events, the description of the development of the program at Queens College would be intertwined with the aforementioned three programs as well as the programs at Mundelein College and Roosevelt University which were emerging at this same time. As it is, however, each of these programs of the early and mid 'sixties is treated separately and the reader is left with the task of creating for himself some of the excitement of this period of innovation in higher adult education when it appeared that special baccalaureate programs for adults might become the focus of a new movement in higher adult education.

Queens College--The Adult Continuing Education (ACE) Program

Queens College, second youngest of the five undergraduate colleges of the City University of New York, was founded as a liberal arts college on April 6, 1937, and began its first session in October of that year. Its campus, located on a fifty-two acre site in Flushing, consists of a square of older buildings which exhibit a Moorish influence and a potpourri of more or less modern low and high rise buildings.

> When the College was only a year old, afternoon extension courses were offered for the first time. The adult extension program grew until in 1950 the designation School of General Studies was used for the first time. Special curricula leading to the Associate in Arts and Associate in

> Applied Science degrees for the equivalent of two years of full-time study were introduced in the School of General Studies in 1952 and 1953. Since 1960, the School of General Studies has been offering the degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science.[1]

Enrollment in the School of General Studies increased rapidly in the late 'fifties and early 'sixties. Whereas there were only 304 matriculated students in the extension program in 1952, there were 1,945 ten years later. In fact, the total of matriculated, non-matriculated, and non-credit adult education students increased by more than three hundred per cent between 1952 and 1962.[2]

In the late 'fifties, a number of younger instructors who were augmenting their salaries by teaching in the School of General Studies on an overload basis, became increasingly aware of the problems of their adult students. At that time the open admissions policy currently in effect at the City University had not been instituted and, consequently, not all high school graduates in the City who applied were accepted into the day session. As a result, it appeared that the adults were being effectively squeezed out of the School of General Studies by younger students who had not meet the entrance requirements for the day session and were using the evening session as a possible route to matriculation.

---

[1] Queens College, School of General Studies, Bulletin, 1963-1964, p. 27.

[2] James E. Tobin, "Annual Report, School of General Studies, July 15, 1963," p. 1.

Ralph W. Sleeper, one of the younger instructors who was supervising a required social science course in SGS, recalls discussing the adults' problem as early as 1958 with Glenn W. Howard, Director of SGS; Carl E. Hiller, Assistant Director; and Peter Meyer, a counselor. While they were all concerned with the plight of the adults, an institutional response was somewhat slow in coming. But in late fall, 1961, Howard appointed a committee to review the Associate in Arts curriculum, which was the degree program primarily serving adults in SGS.[1] The committee was ". . . to prepare recommendations for an Associate in Arts degree curriculum which /would/ be suited to adults seeking essentially an integrated, liberal program of studies to be completed in the equivalent of two years of full time study."[2] Sleeper was made chairman of the committee.

By February 1962, Sleeper had prepared a lengthy memorandum outling some of the ". . . considerations to which the committee may wish to address itself."[3] While he indicated in the memorandum that "the transferability of courses to a baccalaureate degree at Queens College should not be a criterion for the acceptance of a course in the A.A. curriculum,"[1] an issue on which he later reversed himself, he included a brief description of an "Adult Institute" which would have as its purpose ". . . to serve all adults during the period of educational reentry." More specifically, he saw the functions of the Institute as follows:

---

[1] Interview with Ralph W. Sleeper, December 6, 1973, pp. 1 and 2.

[2] Glenn W. Howard as quoted in a Memorandum from Ralph W. Sleeper to the Committee to Review the Associate in Arts Curriculum, February 7, 1962, p. 1.

[3] Ralph Sleeper to the Committee to Review the Associate in Arts Curriculum, February 7, 1962, p. 1.

> a. Screening, testing and counseling all applicants on a more appropriate level than has heretofore been possible.
>
> b. Placement of students in appropriate one semester classes which will orient them to college work and which will cover in varying degrees of intensiveness and speed the basic information and skills of the prescribed program in all three divisions of the college. Where possible the courses should follow an interdisciplinary approach. (The "core" seminars at Syracuse University in the social sciences, humanities and natural sciences may be suggestive or what is needed in the institute.) Such programming has already been proven effective in making the most efficient use of teaching time and relieving the more mature student from "learning" in elementary courses what he already knows. In any case, all institute courses would be designed to meet the adult at his own level of experience and preparation.[2]

Since the ACE Program was finally designed as a replacement for the general education requirement of the Bachelor of Arts degree at Queens which gave special attention to the problems of returning adults, Sleeper's idea of the Adult Institute as expressed in this early memorandum to the committee seems to contain the central notion of the ACE Program as it was later approved.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 4.

But many issues remained to be resolved and it is not at all clear that Sleeper had the final shape of the program in mind when he wrote the memorandum.

The report of the Committee to Review the Associate in Arts Curriculum was ready for the approval of its members by April 4, 1962. The report recommended the appointment of a second committee to be drawn from the three divisions of the College and ". . . charged with the preparation of detailed curricular proposals for a program to be known as the Adult Continuing Education Program." The new program was to be limited to persons at least twenty years old, was to utilize advanced standing and proficiency testing ". . . to spare the adult student from 'learning' what he already knows," and was to rely on interdisciplinary courses to the extent possible. The committee had clearly reviewed precedents set at other institutions in its deliberation. In fact, the report frankly stated that "the actual conclusions of the /curriculum/ sub-committees bear a striking resemblance to adult courses already in successful operation at Brooklyn and Syracuse."[1]

Finally, the committee, in a reversal of Sleeper's initial position, recommended the articulation of the new Associate in Arts curriculum with the general education component of the Queens College baccalaureate.

---

[1] Ralph W. Sleeper, "/Final Report of/ of the Committee to Review the Associate in Arts Curriculum, April 4, 1962," p. 1.

> The committee feels that it is less than realistic to assume that many adults will voluntarily accept the A.A degree as terminal. Mr. Meyer's 1959 survey shows that 90% of matriculated students (for all degrees) wish to achieve the baccalaureate. We must therefore think of the A.A. as a possible, indeed probable, stepping stone toward the baccalaureate. Allowing for the fact that many will fall by the wayside, those who complete the A.A. degree with high standing should be moved along into the baccalaureate degree program with no loss of credit and with as many of the baccalaureate requirements completed as possible. In other words, the A.A. degree should be regarded as adequate preparation for the adult student, enabling him to begin his concentration and advanced elective work immediately.[1]

In concluding the report, Sleeper added that a bulk of the experience at other institutions as well as some of the work of CSLEA supported the recommendations of the committee. In lieu of appending all the evidence to each copy of the report, he suggested that those interested might review the materials in his office. Among the materials he listed in support of the committee's recommendations were reports on the programs at Brooklyn, Syracuse, Oklahoma, and the University of London; reports and studies from CSLEA; and correspondence with A.A. Liveright, Director of the Center, in which Liveright indicated interest in the developments at Queens and hinted that funding might be forthcoming for an adult degree program.[2]

The new committee was appointed, again with Sleeper at its head. And as the new committee talked about the proposed

---

[1] Ibid., p. 3.

[2] Ibid.

Associate in Arts for adults, it gradually changed its focus. As Sleeper put it, "More and more we began to think of this as the front end to a regular degree program."[1] The committee ultimately recommended to the Advisory Council of SGS that the Adult Continuing Education Program be designed as an alternative method of meeting the general education requirements for the baccalaureate rather than an Associate in Arts program for adults which would be compatible with baccalaureate requirements. The Advisory Council concurred and Sleeper was asked to write a proposal incorporating the committee's recommendations.[2] The conclusions of the committee thus thrust the Queens' program more in the direction of the Brooklyn model than in that of the Associate in Arts for adults at Syracuse.

On October 23, 1962, Sleeper described the proposed ACE Program in some detail to President Stoke of Queens. The occasion for his memo was the need for special fees for the Program.

> The School of General Studies is now making plans to offer a group of basic courses for adults in the Fall term, 1963. These courses will parallel those presently offered to all undergraduates in the "prescribed program" leading to the Baccalaureate Degree. They will comprise a rapid and, we believe, a more effective means of matriculation for the adult student than we now offer.
>
> To this end several devices will be employed: sequences of required courses that are now stretched out over several semesters will be consolidated and intensified; required courses will be taught on an interdisciplinary basis, using at times, two or more faculty members and a "seminar" approach; class size will be held to fifteen wherever possible. . . .

---

[1] Sleeper, December 6, 1973, p. 2.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

> Additionally, students admitted to the program, which we are now calling the Adult Continuing Education Program (ACE), will be required to take a special battery of placement tests and exemption examinations.

The memo went on to request special fees for testing and evaluation of the students for the special courses. Sleeper cited the precedent set by Brooklyn for both fees and program as justification for the special fees.[1]

A little more than a week later, Sleeper presented the plan for the ACE Program to the Advisory Council of SGS and announced that the specific curricular proposals were taking shape: both the science and social science seminars had been approved by the appropriate departments.[2] And on December 11, 1962, the full proposal, which included a foreign language sequence, unlike the Special Baccalaureate at Brooklyn, was brought before the Advisory Council for debate. The three seminars in arts, science, and social science were approved but the question of the proposed foreign language sequence as modified for the Program was deferred.

During the debate both the Bachelor of Liberal Studies program at Oklahoma and the Master of Liberal Arts program at Johns Hopkins were invoked by a faculty member other than Sleeper as evidence in favor of the approval of the ACE proposal.[1] This seems curious since neither the Oklahoma program, which will be described in detail in the following chapter, nor the Johns Hopkins program bear any marked resemblance to the ACE Program either in curriculum or in intent. Perhaps this is simply an example of the efficacy of citing outside sources when justifying new programs.

---

[1] Ralph W. Sleeper to Harold W. Stoke, October 23, 1962.

[2] Queens College, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Advisory Council, School of General Studies, November 1, 1962," p. 2.

After clearing the Advisory Council, the ACE proposal still had its most difficult test before it: approval by the Faculty Council. Just as the faculty at Brooklyn had found credit for life experience the most troublesome point in the Special Baccalaureate Program, so the Queens faculty tended to balk at approving the crediting of "life achievement." Sleeper seems to have employed substantially the same political strategy that had been effective at Brooklyn, but, since Sleeper was younger and less well known at Queens than Spengler had been at Brooklyn, Sleeper needed someone else to play Spengler's role. Fortunately, the new Director of SGS, James E. Tobin, resembled Spengler in the respect he commanded from other faculty members. Tobin had gained a reputation for promoting and upholding high standards when he was a member of the English Department at Queens and was known to be skeptical about the ACE proposal. Sleeper recalled that when he asked Tobin to support the proposal before the Faculty Council, Tobin questioned him thoroughly about the program and apparently found merit in the proposal. With Tobin's support and his own private discussions with many members of the Council, Sleeper saw the proposal through the Council successfully, although he admitted that the debate did not go smoothly especially on the point of credit for life experience. But once approved by the Faculty Council, the Board of Higher Education quickly gave its assent and the recruitment of students began.[1]

---

[1] Queens College, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Advisory Council, School of General Studies, December 11, 1962," pp. 1 and 2.

The Design of the ACE Program

At its start in Fall 1963, the ACE Program consisted of a special admissions process and three interdisciplinary seminars. The admission process included three steps, very similar to those at Brooklyn:

1. Prospective students completed a six page application form which had been adapted almost without change from the form devised at Brooklyn.[2]
2. All applicants for 1963-1964 were asked to take certain Area Tests from the Graduate Record Examination Battery which related to the areas covered by the seminars. The following year the newly constructed "Comprehensive College Tests," later re-named the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), were adopted and have been used continuously to the present. These achievement batteries were intended to ascertain the students' level of prior learning.[3]

---

[1] Sleeper, December 6, 1973, pp. 3 and 4.

[2] Letter with attached mock-up of an application form from Peter Meyer to Ralph Sleeper, January 22, 1963.

[3] Ralph W. Sleeper, "Annual Report, Adult Continuing Education Program Academic Year 1964-65," pp. 1 and 2.

3. All applicants for 1963-1964 were invited for a personal interview. In 1964-1965, however, Peter Meyer of the Counseling Office devised a group interviewing procedure which, he felt, both accomplished the goal of the individual interview--to assess the student's academic promise--and allowed the student to be viewed in a setting which simulated a seminar.[1] The group interview remains part of the selection process.

The selection processes at Queens College for the ACE Program and at Brooklyn College for the Special Baccalaureate were almost identical, yet from the beginning the selection process at Queens does not seem to have been as inherently discriminating as the process at Brooklyn. That is not to say that the first class of the ACE Program was not a carefully selected group: only about thirty of the 224 applicants were admitted for the Fall 1963.[2] But the intent of the ACE Program, the design of its seminars, its limited utilization of "life achievement credit," and its tremendous growth in enrollment in its first ten years of operation all seem to add up to a much more egalitarian bias than is demonstrated in the Special Baccalaureate Program at Brooklyn. Perhaps a hint of the more popular bias at Queens can be found in an early statement about the ACE Program which Sleeper made to the Dean of the extension program at New York University:

> One of the things that we had in mind in designing [the ACE Program] was the hope that it could become a "normal"

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[2] Ralph W. Sleeper, "Annual Report, June 1963," p. 1.

> program for adults. To that end it parallels, much more closely than does Brooklyn's program, the regular undergraduate degree curriculum.[1]

Never has the Brooklyn program claimed to have been anything but a highly selective program for remarkably well-qualified and highly motivated adults.

The more egalitarian bias of the Queens program also seems apparent in its initial seminars in the arts, science, and social science. While the Brooklyn seminars were meant to compress as much material into as little time as possible thereby enabling students in the Special Baccalaureate Program to complete all their core requirements in four semesters, the Queens program took a less accelerated approach. The proposal presented to the Faculty Council in December 1962 indicated that

> the 36 credits of the ACE Program are distributed as follows:

Arts Seminars 1, 2	Two semesters, 6 credits each ..	12
Science Seminars 1, 2, 3, 4	Four semesters, 3 credits each ..	12
Social Science Seminars 1, 2	Two semesters, 6 credits each ..	12
	Total....	36[2]

---

[1] Ralph W. Sleeper to Russell F.W. Smith, March 26, 1963.

[2] Queens College, "School of General Studies, Curriculum Proposals for the Adult Continuing Education Program, [December, 1962]," p. 1

The comparable seminars at Brooklyn were:

Humanities 10.2, 10.3	two semesters, 8 credits each ..	16
Social Science 10.2, 10.3	two semesters, 8 credits each ..	16
Science 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 10.5	four semesters, 4 credits each ..	16
	Total	48

And in addition to the seminars in the three broad areas of subject matter, a fourth seminar in communications was included at Brooklyn which brought the total number of credits typically earned in coursework by Special Baccalaureate students during their first two years to 56.[1]

Further, Brooklyn's program was based on the assumption that ". . . the products of a liberal arts education can be found in active, creative, and responsible adult living" and that ". . . the equivalence of life experience to academic credit can be measured and expressed in concrete form."[2] The consequence of this assumption was that students in the Special Baccalaureate Program, on the average, concluded their first two years of study not only with fifty-six credits earned in the seminars but also with an additional sixteen credits awarded after the assessment of their life experience.[3] Students at Queens, on the other hand, were awarded an average of 6.6 credits for life achievement and thus tended to complete their first two years having earned about forty-two credits.[1]

---

[1] Stern and Missail, *Adult Experience*, p. 106.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[3] "Middle States Report," pp. 125 and 126.

The smaller number of credits awarded to students in the ACE Program seems to be the result of two factors. First, the admission requirements for the ACE Program were and are not as stringent as those at Brooklyn and thus it may be assumed that Brooklyn admits a slightly more accomplished student who has had more relevant experience for which he may receive credit. Second, and of equal importance, awarding credit for life achievement is not as central a component of the ACE Program as awarding credit for life experience is of the Special Baccalaureate Program. The first question asked to guide the inquiry of the Committee on Admission and Evaluation of the Experimental Degree Project at Brooklyn was "How much does adult experience count?"[2] The Committee which designed the ACE Program seems, on the other hand, to have been primarily concerned with the seminars and, while credit for life achievement was included in the proposal as a component of the Program, procedures for assessing life achievement were not developed until students had been admitted and the ACE Program was underway. And initially credit for life achievement was to be awarded only for satisfactory performance on written examinations--a more formal procedure than the interviews at Brooklyn which were calculated to put adults at ease.[1] However, by 1966, a revised procedure based on the assessment by departmental personnel of portfolios prepared by the students was put into effect, but even then the number of credits that could be awarded for life achievement was limited to twenty-five.[2]

---

[1] [Ernest Schwarcz], Statement on the ACE Program written for the program's tenth anniversary publication, [1973], p. 15.

[2] Stern and Missall, *Adult Experience*, p. 3.

The Queens Program, then, although it bears a striking resemblance to the Brooklyn Special Baccalaureate on the surface, seems to have been designed from a different set of starting points and this difference in assumptions has led to wide variances in practices at the two institutions. The differences in approach to the question of crediting prior learning are certainly plain, but the conception of the total program at Queens is probably even more significant. As its current Director put it in the report he wrote at the end of the Program's five year probationary period:

> [The ACE Program] is not a special degree program but rather a program which enables the adult student to begin the regular program in a special way.[3]

All of the other programs studied conceive of themselves as complete degree programs for adults even though many of them utilize in their designs courses offered by other divisions of their institution; the Queens Program stands alone in considering itself an introduction to a baccalaureate program. But perhaps this should not be surprising since the Queens Program was the direct outgrowth of an Associate in Arts program for adults which was first intended to be terminal, then intended to be compatible with the baccalaureate, and finally was made a part of the baccalaureate.

---

[1] Sleeper, "Annual Report, June 1953," p. .

[2] Joseph Mulholland, "Annual Report, Adult Continuing Education Program, Academic Year 1965-1966, June 27, 1966," p. 2.

[3] [Ernest Schwarcz], "A report on the ACE Program submitted to the Curriculum Committee, March 11, 1968," p. 10.

Growth of the ACE Program

The ACE Program at Queens stands out from every other program studied because of its large enrollment. Nearly 1600 students were enrolled in the ACE Program in 1973 and almost 400 students were being admitted each semester.[1] Roosevelt University's Bachelor of General Studies program is the second largest program, enrolling more than 1100 adults each semester[2] but the Queens enrollment statistics are not wholly comparable to Roosevelt's nor to those of any other program studied.

Since the Queens Program views itself not as a special baccalaureate program but rather as an introduction to the regular baccalaureate, it includes in its statistics as its own only those students enrolled in ACE courses. Every other program includes in its statistics all students who are working toward the baccalaureate under its auspices whether or not those students are enrolled during a particular term in courses offered by the organization responsible for the special baccalaureate. Thus, if Queens used the same basis as the other programs for collecting its enrollment statistics, the ACE Program could almost certainly claim a student body in excess of three thousand.

---

[1] [Schwarcz], Tenth anniversary statement, p. 13.

[2] Roosevelt University, "Tenth Week Report, Fall 1973," p. 1.

But such size was not part of the plan for the ACE Program from its beginning. In his report after the first year of the Program's operation, Sleeper included this projection:

> It would seem that we will nearly reach the optimum size for the ACE Program in Spring 1965 when we estimate that one hundred and fifty students will be enrolled.[1]

Sleeper's projection was, in fact, quite accurate and remained so through the 1967-1968 academic year; about seventy new students were being admitted to the ACE Program each semester. In Fall 1968, however, admissions rose sharply to 134, remained relatively stable for two years, then rose sharply again during the 1970-1971 academic year.[2] The explanation for the sudden expansion of the Program seems unusually straightforward.

The ACE Program was instituted under a President who, according to Sleeper, was openly skeptical about it owing to his traditional attitudes about academic programs and the students they should serve.[1] And while Sleeper did not share the President's attitude about traditional programs and audiences, he was content to keep the Program relatively small. But with a new President and a new Director for the Program, the attitude changed. In President Murphy's words:

---

[1] Sleeper, "Annual Report, 1963-64," p. 3.

[2] /Schwarcz/, Tenth Anniversary Statement, p. 8.

> From the time I arrived at Queens College, I heard much more about ACE than its size would have seemed to dictate. The community spoke of ACE work with such enthusiasm that I asked its administration to expand enrollment and educational opportunities. I hope that this expansion will continue and will enhance not only our own ACE Program but also its impact on educational innovation elsewhere.[2]

The new Director, Ernest Schwarcz, concurred enthusiastically with President Murphy's request for expansion and began increasing enrollments as rapidly as budgetary resources and recruitment techniques would allow. Schwarcz made it a point, however, to maintain admission standards as they were before the start of the expansion, reasoning that the quality of the student body would remain the same regardless of its size if the criteria for the selection of students remained the same.[3] Experience seems to have born him out, even though the percentage of applicants admitted has risen slightly.

At least a portion of the community's positive response to the ACE Program about which President Murphy spoke in his letter can be accounted for by the efforts of Joseph Mulholland who directed ACE from 1965 through early 1967. Mulholland felt that the Program should be expanded to include a broader range of the racial and socio-economic spectrum of Queens. Schwarcz described Mulholland's contribution in his 1968 Report:

---

[1] Sleeper, December 6, 1973, p. 4.

[2] Joseph S. Murphy as quoted in "ACE at Ten" (the Tenth Anniversary Publication of the ACE Program), May 1973, p. 1.

[3] Schwarcz, December 6, 1973, p. 1.

> Since the very beginning of the ACE Program it was strongly felt that it should also attract adults from the disadvantaged communities who are potentially good students, but who may have built-in fears of the college environment. In September of 1966, the first such group called "Advance-ACE" . . . was organized by Mr. Joseph Mulholland, and 35 adults were admitted to this program. Of these, 17 are still in the ACE Program.[1]

After nearly two years as Director of ACE, Mulholland left that position to concentrate on special programs for racial and cultural minorities. From his initial modification of ACE came, in the late 'sixties, the "EXCELL" program designed for militant community leaders and "IMPACT" which is focused on minority workers in the civil service. As with Advance-ACE, both of the later programs provided special seminars which were intended to give the members of the target groups additional support to help them make a good start in a baccalaureate program. And in all three special programs, the minority students were encouraged to join the mainstream of the regular baccalaureate program as soon as possible.[2]

Through Advance-ACE, EXCELL, and IMPACT, the ACE Program has acted not only as the special beginning of a baccalaureate program for the adult student body at Queens but has also provided the leadership and the model for programs which encourage minority students to take advantage of the educational opportunities at Queens College. This is unusual because the special baccalaureate programs for adults have not, as a whole, been successful in attracting minority students. Of the programs studied, only Queens and Roosevelt have succeeded in recruiting substantial numbers of minority students into their adult degree programs.

---

[1] Schwarcz, "Report to the Curriculum Committee," pp. 7 and 8.

[2] Schwarcz, December 6, 1973, p. 4.

Elaboration of the ACE Design

Those responsible for special baccalaureate programs for adults seem to make the design of their program more elaborate for one of two reasons: either because their program is too small to support itself financially and they hope that an elaboration of design will attract more students or because their program has grown large and can generate a reasonable number of students for more activities than those included in the initial design. An example of the former case will appear in the next chapter. The ACE Program at Queens College is an example of the latter.

The initial design of the ACE Program, as approved by the Faculty Council, included a special admissions procedure, three interdisciplinary seminars, and, by its second year, procedures for the assessment of life achievement. The first elaboration would have been part of this simple design had the Faculty Council not voted to have it deleted from the proposal. The committee which shaped the ACE Program determined early in its deliberations that the Queens Program, in contrast to the Brooklyn Program and others, would retain a language requirement. Sleeper wrote:

> The committee is aware that adult education degree programs at other institutions waive the mathematics and language requirements entirely. This step would seem to weaken the baccalaureate degree considerably--although it is admittedly a step which is easy to rationalize. However, the committee is not prepared to recommend that this step be taken *if the means for adults to meet these requirements can be made more realistic than they are at present.*[1]

The mathematics requirement was included in the Science Seminar and a modified language requirement, limited to twelve semester hours, was written into the proposal, but the reference to the twelve semester hour limit in language was deleted during the debate in the Council.[2] ACE students were thus held to the same five semester language requirement as any other undergraduates at Queens.

As the Committee had anticipated, the ACE students had difficulty meeting the language requirement probably as much because of the long time they had been away from language instruction as because of the block many students, both older and younger, have against learning another language. But little could be done to remedy this problem until the Program had gained in enrollment and proved itself. The time seemed right by 1967 and Schwarcz, when he was appointed Director, reasserted the idea of a special sequence for ACE students. He proposed a four semester sequence involving four hours of instruction per week to classes composed solely of ACE students. The proposal was approved and the ACE language sequence was for a time much preferred by the adult students. But the language requirement in the ACE Program became, perhaps understandably, unpopular when Queens College abolished the language requirement for regular undergraduates. Paradoxically, the special language sequence was required of ACE students after it had been discontinued for the other students, but the ACE language requirement too was dropped in 1973.[1]

---

[1] Sleeper, "Committee to Review the A.A.," April, 1962, p. 3.

[2] SGS, "Curriculum Proposals for ACE Program," /December, 1962/, p. 1.

Three other elaborations of the ACE design, disregarding a combined Arts/Social Science Seminar offered only once,[2] include weekend seminars, introduced in 1967, "mini-courses" introduced in 1969, and tutorial groups introduced in 1970. The weekend seminars, which were proposed by Sleeper although developed by Schwarcz, are based on the Oklahoma model of independent study followed by intensive periods of instruction and collaboration. These seminars are duplications of the three interdisciplinary seminars but are scheduled on weekends, a time attractive to many working people and housewives with small children, rather than on weeknights.[1]

---

[1] Schwarcz, December 6, 1973, p. 3.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

The mini-courses, unlike the seminars, are based on subject matter, often of current interest, which may be used toward meeting elective requirements. The scheduling of these courses during breaks in the regular academic calendar, such as Christmas and Spring vacations, allow the adult students to use their discretionary time to greater advantage and to accelerate their progress toward a degree by increasing the number of credits they can earn within a calendar year.[2]

The creation of a system of tutorial groups in 1970 further elaborated the design of the ACE Program. Although the system of tutorial groups is one of the newest parts of the design of ACE, it calls to mind the monitor system developed in nineteenth century England to provide elementary instruction to poor children. And, not too surprisingly, both the old monitor system and the "new" tutorial groups were devised to multiply the number of students a single teacher could supervise in order to bring the cost of instructing the individual student down. The ACE tutorial groups are structured in three levels: professor, tutors, and ACE undergraduates. The professor sets assignments, meets with the students at least six times a term, and determines the final grades for the course. To provide personal attention and direction for the large number of students in the professor's "class," a group of tutors who are ACE graduates actively engaged in graduate programs, make themselves available to the ACE undergraduates both for telephone and face-to-face consultations. Of course, the key to the success of the tutorials lies in the ability of many mature students to work on their own. The greater flexibility of time the tutorials provide as compared with regularly scheduled courses is a major benefit to the ACE students which encourages them to work independently in this fashion.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1.

[2] Ibid.

The relative success of the ACE students as well as faculty recruitment and pay policies and further elaborations of the design of the ACE Program which occurred after 1970 are discussed in the final chapter in comparison with the same issues in some of the other programs studied. But now the focus of the study turns to the creation and development of the Degree Completion Program at Mundelein College in Chicago which, in fact, was concurrent with the emergence of the ACE Program at Queens College.

---

[1] Ibid, pp. 3 and 4.

Mundelein College--The Degree Completion Program

Mundelein is a small, women's college founded in 1930 by Sister Mary Justitia Coffey and sponsored by her religious order, the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (BVM's). The cluster of buildings which make up its lakefront campus on the far north side of the City of Chicago had, in the 'sixties, only one distinguishing architectural feature: a fifteen story tower known as the "skyscraper" which housed all academic offices and classrooms.[1] Two-thirds of the students at Mundelein during its founding decade were of Irish extraction, but by 1962, more than half came from a Slavic heritage and Italian-Americans were appearing with greater frequency as well. Two Mundelein students in three were the first in their families to attend college and the most common career aspiration of the students at Mundelein was public school teaching.[2]

The initial curriculum of the new college was a replica of that offered at the University of Illinois in 1930. Faculty committees made some changes in the initial curriculum over the years but these changes did not make Mundelein's curriculum distinctive. "In general the curriculum, particularly for the general education of Mundelein students, tended to follow the standard patterns of the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's."[1] Mundelein College, in short, seems to have viewed its mission as providing a traditional college education for the daughters of the Catholic, ethnic communities of Chicago rather than as attempting innovations either in curriculum or in teaching methods. But in 1957, with the appointment of Sister Ann Ida Gannon as President, Mundelein began to lose some of its instinct for following.

---

[1] Mundelein College, *Faculty Manual, 1973 Revision*, p. 1.

[2] Norbert J. Hruby, "Truth and Consequences," February 1, 1965, p. 7. (Mimeographed)

Mundelein had been autocratic in its administrative structure from its founding; the President set policy based on her own convictions and whatever advice she requested from her staff.[2] President Gannon set out to change that structure from autocratic leadership to democratic involvement of the staff in decision making. But even though President Gannon and the leadership of the Roman Catholic church, then headed by Pope John XXIII, were opting for a more democratic decision making process, such a drastic change could not be accomplished by decree.

President Gannon drew up a ten year program for change which she subdivided into two five year plans:

> In 1957, Mundelein began a program of development which was aimed at strengthening the faculty, improving its level

---

[1] Ibid., p. 4.

[2] Interview with Norbert J. Hruby, October 22, 1973, p. 4.

> of education and expanding its facilities to meet the demands of contemporary education.[1]

The first five year plan, 1957-1962, involved only staff and faculty which had been part of the institution when Sister Gannon took office; no new positions were created either to identify the needs of the institution or to meet them. For the second five years, 1962-1967, President Gannon decided that the College had to understand itself better if it was to set a wise course of action for the years ahead. To help the College understand itself better President Gannon created a Vice-Presidency, filled it by appointing Norbert J. Hruby, and authorized him to conduct an "Institutional Analysis" to specify with some objectivity what Mundelein College was both from a student and a faculty point of view.

Hruby, who had previously worked at Loyola University in Chicago and at University College of the University of Chicago, prepared three sets of extensive questionnaires with the help of seven faculty committees. One questionnaire was designed for the students then enrolled at Mundelein, another for the faculty, and the third for the alumnae. The response of the faculty was irregular but the students and alumnae responded in large numbers: ninety-seven per cent of the students and thirty-four per cent of the alumnae completed the extensive questionnaires as did virtually all of the husbands of the responding alumnae.[1] The cross-tabulation of the evidence gathered through the questionnaires and its subsequent analysis constituted the base of the data on which further developments were grounded. Among these further developments was a program designed to make degree completion a more realistic alternative for the half of Mundelein's alumnae who had not completed their degrees either at Mundelein or elsewhere.[2]

---

[1] Mundelein College, "Program for Academic and Physical Development, 1957-1967," p. 1. (Mimeographed)

Design of the DCP

The Degree Completion Program (DCP), as the special baccalaureate program for adults at Mundelein was first called, is virtually identical in design to the Special Baccalaureate Degree Program for Adults at Brooklyn and the ACE Program at Queens. The design of the DCP at Mundelein includes these components:

1. A special admission procedure which relies heavily on a lengthy application form much like these used at Brooklyn and Queens Colleges.[3]
2. A group of interdisciplinary seminars in humanities, natural science, social science, and communication which stand in lieu of the standard general education requirement and are open only to adult students.

---

[1] Hruby, "Truth And Consequences," pp. 3 and 4.

[2] Interview with Katharine Byrne, October 19, 1973, p. 1.

[3] Mundelein College, "Application for the Degree Completion Program," 1965. (Mimeographed)

3. A procedure, based on portfolios prepared and submitted by the DCP students, by which the adults may receive credit for life experience, although as at Queens College few credits are actually earned in this manner.[1]

4. A provision for completing the remaining degree requirements in the regularly scheduled offerings of the College.[2]

The distinctive feature of Mundelein's program, which was instituted more than ten years after Brooklyn's, is not its design but rather the process through which the program was planned and approved. Mundelein was in a transition from autocracy to democracy of governance as the Degree Completion Program was being instituted and the planning and approval process of the DCP seems to reflect, from time to time, an uncertainty about which form of governance was in effect.

Origins of the DCP at Mundelein

The Degree Completion Program seems to have started from at least four points. First, President Gannon, in her multi-faceted effort to renew the College, was determined to attract a more diverse student body from a wider geographical area than the north side of Chicago. She felt greater diversity would provide a richer environment for learning by increasing the range of views represented on campus and would also create a larger pool of potential students from which the College could draw. Whether she initially included adult women within her concept of a more diverse student body is not clear, but she certainly wanted to break free from the narrowness that Mundelein risked from a student body recruited largely from a single religious persuasion, a small geographical area, and a limited socio-economic range.

---

[1] On the issue of credit for life experience specifically, the record at Mundelein shows that between 1965 and 1969, the assessment of life experience accounted for four per cent of the total semester hours earned by DCP students. Katharine Byrne, "Report to the Faculty Senate, October 14, 1969," p. 1.

[2] Mundelein College, "Announcing Degree Completion Program," /1965/. (Initial brochure for the DCP.)

Second, whether or not President Gannon initially considered adults as one of the groups which might provide diversity, the Committee on the Organization of the College, one of the seven committees that helped Hruby construct and analyze the questionnaires used in the Institutional Analysis, included a concern for alumnae both in the questionnaires and in its report:

> [The Committee on the Organization of the College] believes that once having admitted a student to the community, Mundelein College has a continuing responsibility to her whether or not she chooses to exercise that option. Specifically we believe that Mundelein should offer in every plausible way continuing stimulation to her alumnae--and incidentally to other mature women who choose to put in with us--not only through such worthwhile Alumnae Association activities as "Back to College Day"--but through rigorous formal means.

By "rigorous formal means" the Committee stated later in its report that it meant, among other things, ". . . a Degree Completion Program for the benefit of that large number of former Mundelein students (and other ex-alumnae of other colleges and universities) who did not earn degrees."[1] According to evidence presented subsequently, the Committee does not seem to have generated this recommendation without substantial coaching from Hruby, but regardless of its source, a recommendation for a special baccalaureate program was stated clearly and forcefully at the conclusion of the Institutional Analysis and was enthusiastically supported by President Gannon.[2]

Third, the position that Hruby held at the University of Chicago's University College just prior to becoming Vice-President at Mundelein seems to have contributed ideas which were used in the creation of the DCP. The Basic Program was still flourishing as Hruby joined the staff at University College and while he did not pattern the DCP after the Basic Program, Hruby claims to have placed special emphasis on counseling in the design of the DCP because of the needs of adults for counseling, a need which he felt was largely unmet in the University College programs.[3] His interest in a special curriculum and teaching style for adults, however, seems to have been intensified owing to his experience at University College and this interest carried over to the design of the DCP.

---

[1] Norbert Hruby to Sister Mary Ann Ida, Dr. Russell Barta, Sister Mary Donald, Sister Mary Ignatia, Mrs. Betty Matula, and Mr. James Richards, December 30, 1964, p. 1.

[2] Norbert Hruby, October 22, 1973, p. 10.

[3] Ibid., p. 8.

Finally, Hruby seems to have been particularly sensitive to the difficulties women were having when they attempted to begin or complete a baccalaureate program after they married and had a family. He had watched his own wife struggle for years after she had returned to college to complete her degree. As he remembered the experience:

> Dolores and I were married in the middle of her sophomore year in college during World War II. After the War was over and our first child was old enough to be not actually underfoot, she went to work trying to complete that bachelor's degree and it took her eleven years to do it with the most contumelious treatment from the typical educational institution. All the bad things that happened to my wife I was resolved to solve by other means.

The keys to his solution seem to have been a counseling program designed especially for mature women coupled with a new set of general education requirements constructed, scheduled, and taught with mature women in mind.[1]

Creation of the DCP

As was mentioned earlier, the establishment of a degree completion program was one recommendation, emanating from the Institutional Analysis organized and carried out by Hruby at Mundelein. The seven committees set up to advise Hruby and the executive committee on the design of the questionnaires and to analyze the resultant responses met May 7-9, 1964 to present their findings and to make their recommendations to the executive committee, the faculty, and the administration. The executive committee then spent the summer of 1964 sifting through the 138 recommendations made by the committees and devising a plan of action.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

In September 1964, a Committee on Continuing Education was appointed from the membership of the newly formed Academic Board--a body composed of the chief administrative officers of the College, elected members of the faculty, and faculty members appointed by President Cannon--to design and implement the degree completion program.[2] The first meeting of the Committee was called by Hruby, its chairman, for November 12, 1964 and featured a visit by Roy B. Minnis, an adult education specialist from the U.S. Office of Education. Hruby seems to have been attempting, by bringing in an outsider for the first meeting, to broaden the perspective of the Committee's members on adult education and to determine from Minnis whether or not the Office of Education had funds to support the development of programs such as the degree completion program.[3] While he may have advanced toward his first goal, Hruby was not able to win financial support for the program either from the USOE or from any other external source.[1]

---

[1] Hruby, "Truth And Consequences," p. 8.

[2] Office of the President, "The Reorganization of Mundelein College," September 29, 1964, p. 2.

[3] Norbert Hruby to the Committee on Continuing Education, November 10, 1964, p. 1.

The Committee on Continuing Education did not meet again until January 1965 but in the meantime Hruby prepared an extensive memorandum recounting the recommendations of the Committee on the Organization of the College, which had recommended the adult degree program, and stating rather specifically his own view of what the shape of the degree completion program should be. The memorandum, released December 30, 1964 in anticipation of the January meeting of the Committee on Continuing Education, included the following statement under the heading "Design of a Degree-Completion Program for Ex-Alumnae:"

> Many American colleges and universities remain unconvinced that there is anything special about a degree to be "completed" by an adult. Proof of that statement lies in the attitude of the personnel in the admissions offices and deans' offices of these schools. Adult applicants are treated no differently than regular undergraduates and are held to the same regulations as regular undergraduates--just as though there were no difference between adults and adolescents! No recognition is given to the fact that persons of mature years, having lived longer than young people, have learned some things in direct consequence of having lived longer. They have, in short, what Brooklyn College has come to call "life experience"--a commodity which some adult educators believe may have academic value and should be recognized in the course of admitting adult students to a degree program.
>
> There is a second conviction strongly held by most adult educators, viz., that degree programs for adults ought not be simply more or less accurate carbon copies of the regular baccalaureate degree programs offered to adolescent undergraduates. The candidates for adult degrees, because they

---

[1] Hruby, October 22, 1973, p. 13.

> are adults, have different needs, different (and usually much richer) backgrounds than adolescents can possibly have, different (and usually much stronger) motives to study. Accordingly the mode of teaching differs greatly. (And the rewards for teachers, it may be noted, are very great indeed! Ask anyone who has ever taught adult classes about the difference!)
>
> Having certain convictions, then, I must warn you that I shall try to persuade you, on the basis of my previous experience in adult education, that our degree completion program (1) ought to take cognizance of the applicant's "life experience"--(2) ought not be the same as our regular undergraduate curriculum (not even the new curriculum just described by the Committee on Liberal Studies and Specialization!)--and (3) ought look to different teaching techniques which have special relevance for adult students.[1]

Hruby indeed had convictions and he seems to have convinced the Committee on Continuing Education to accept his position or, put another way, the Committee did not object to his proposals which became more specific and elaborate as the Spring of 1965 progressed.

When the Committee on Continuing Education met on January 8, 1965, its members accepted the goals set by Hruby in his December 30 memorandum and agreed to discuss first the establishment of a special counseling service for mature women who were considering a return to college.[2] But apparently the Committee was not moving at the pace which Hruby felt was essential if the new program was to be launched in Fall 1965. In the hope of picking up the pace of the Committee's deliberations, Hruby scheduled an unusually long meeting of the Committee.

---

[1] Norbert Hruby to the Committee on Continuing Education, December 30, 1964, pp. 3 and 4.

[2] Mundelein College, Committee on Continuing Education, "Minutes of the Meeting of January 8, 1965," p. 1.

> With time rapidly running, this meeting /on January 25/, intentionally scheduled on a free day in order to allow more open-ended discussion, may be one of our last opportunities to luxuriate in abstractions and generalities. . . . This meeting may be a long one (the noon adjournment may turn out to be optimistic indeed), but it ought to be of crucial importance.[1]

However, the movement of the Committee toward a plan for a special degree program appears still to have been too slow for Hruby's needs. While the Committee met during February to continue the democratic involvement of the faculty in the affairs of the College, the administration moved to expedite the planning process and to bring it to a swift and satisfactory conclusion.

In a memorandum to the Committee dated March 1, 1965, Hruby announced the creation of a new Division of Continuing Education by President Cannon and his appointment as its first Director. He then suspended meetings of the Committee and assumed the role of sole planner of the new program.

> The immediate implications of /my/ appointment would seem to be these: (1) that the principles of reciprocal responsibility and responsiveness now operating between the Academic Dean and the Committees on Liberal Studies and Specialization, of which she is chairman, can now be established between the Vice President /Hruby/ and the Committee on Continuing Education, of which he is chairman; (2) that the Committee on Continuing Education can now direct its mandate for action to the Vice President--and that he in turn can call upon the Committee and the rest of the faculty and administration of the College for the resources necessary to set up the new division; and

---

[1] Norbert Hruby to the Committee on Continuing Education, January 19, 1965, p. 1.

> (3) that the current series of meetings of the Committee may be temporarily interrupted in order that the Vice President may put together a tentative plan based on past deliberations.
>
> Specifically I propose that the Committee on Continuing Education not meet for the next few weeks, during which time I will draw up a plan of action for your examination. I think that I have detected a fairly clear consensus among the members of the Committee and that I am now in a position, both as chairman of the Committee and as the administrative head of the Division, to work out in some detail a blueprint for 1965-66, subject to your criticism.[1]

The historical autocracy of the administration thus reasserted itself at least temporarily owing to the need for decisive action. And no complains nor criticisms were noted from the faculty members on the Committee on Continuing Education.

In drawing up his plan of action, Hruby relied on a number of sources of information and advice. His ideas about an adult degree program for Mundelein seem, as he stated, to have been formed partly from his previous experience in adult education at the University of Chicago and Loyola University, but they were also influenced by his reading and refined by a visit he made in April 1965 to Brooklyn College and Sarah Lawrence. Hruby knew of the programs at the University of Oklahoma and at Goddard College as well as the Special Baccalaureate Program at Brooklyn and the counseling program for women at Sarah Lawrence. However, he chose to visit only the latter two programs reasoning that their metropolitan setting would be more relevant to Mundelein's situation than would the comparatively isolated environments of Goddard and Oklahoma.[1]

---

[1] Norbert Hruby to the Committee on Continuing Education, March 1, 1965, p. 1.

From Esther Raushenbush at Sarah Lawrence, Hruby ". . . learned the critical value of the key counselor" who could offer a wide range of services to women who were thinking about returning to college. Raushenbush's approach to counseling mature women included not only providing information about alternatives available at Sarah Lawrence but also offering personal support, information about employment, career planning, and in many cases, referral to programs at other institutions.[2] Spengler at Brooklyn College gave Hruby the details about the procedures for awarding credit for life experience which had been in operation in the School of General Studies for more than ten years.[3] Hruby returned from the trip even more convinced than he had been from the literature that these two innovations should be included in the design of the degree completion program at Mundelein.

On April 5, 1965, Hruby announced to the Committee that he had hired Catharine M. Byrne to serve ". . . as counselor-instructor in the Division of Continuing Education, effective

---

[1] Hruby, October 22, 1973, p. 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[3] *Ibid.*

April 15." And although the Committee on Continuing Education had not yet developed a program and had not, in fact, met for more than a month, Hruby was able to describe Mrs. Byrne's duties as follows:

> Mrs. Byrne's first task will be to organize the counseling service on which the Continuing Education Division is to be built. Toward this end she will meet with Mrs. Cooper (placement director), Miss McDonough (my secretary), and me on April 14 to lay plans for a fact-finding program in the areas of educational possibilities and vocational opportunities for mature women in the Chicago metropolitan area. Hopefully this indispensable information will be in hand by mid-May, at which time the first mailing piece announcing the opening of the Division's degree-completion program will be in the mail.

But he had not forgot the Committee as he was evolving the design of the program. After informing the Committee of his planned visits to Sarah Lawrence and Brooklyn, he concluded his memorandum with an assurance to the Committee that it would have an opportunity to deliberate on his plans.

> We shall resume meetings of the Committee on Continuing Education in early May, at which time a number of decisions will have to be made. Meanwhile I shall try to keep you fully informed.[1]

Again, apparently accustomed to being more often told than asked, no faculty member objected, at least for the record, to Hruby's autocratic decisions about the Division and its future program.

Nearly a month after his announcement of the appointment of Mrs. Byrne and two months after he suspended the meetings of the Committee, Hruby called the promised meeting of the Committee on Continuing Education. Fall was only four summer months away and Hruby was in a hurry to have his proposal reviewed by the Committee so that news of the program could be released to the public. His memorandum announcing the meeting conveyed a sense of urgency and implied that he did not anticipate extended deliberation:

---

[1] Norbert Hruby to the Committee on Continuing Education, April 5, 1965, p. 1.

> A critically important meeting of the Committee on Continuing Education will be held on Thursday, May 6, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 102.
>
> In preparation for this meeting you will receive within the next twenty-four hours a detailed memorandum describing the proposed form of the new Division of Continuing Education and its educational program. Please read the memorandum with great care before coming to the Thursday meeting so that appropriate discussion and decisions will be possible.[1]

The two page memorandum, dated May 3, 1965, described the counseling and admission process, the evaluation of previous educational experiences, the curriculum, the faculty, tuition and fees, physical space, and publicity.

Counseling received greatest emphasis in the proposal since Hruby considered it the foundation of the program. Both the liberal acceptance of transfer credit and credit for life experience were recommended and Hruby promised that "a full explanation of the Brooklyn method of evaluating 'life experience' /would/ be presented at the Thursday meeting." No elaboration was presented on the curriculum for the program save to say that it would include only subject matter in the general education component of the Mundelein baccalaureate program and would ". . . take the form of seminars and study discussion groups in the humanities, social sciences, communications, natural sciences, fine arts, mathematics, and psychology." No new faculty positions were proposed and all teaching in the program was to be considered part of a faculty member's regular teaching load. Tuition was set at a pro rata share of the full-time rate and a separate fee, not specified in the propos was recommended to cover the cost of evaluating previous educational experiences. A modest request for two classrooms for the program was included and Hruby confidently suggested that the program would need only to be announced, not advertised, to attract applicants.[1]

---

[1] Norbert Hruby to the Committee on Continuing Education, May 2, 1965, p. 1.

Hruby's proposal was ratified by the Committee on May 6, 1965 without amendment; by May 18 brochures had been printed and were in the mail. Later in the month, Sister Cecilia Bodman accepted the assignment to plan the first semester for the program and by the first week in June two other seminars were being planned, one by Russell Barta and one by Hruby himself.[2]

---

[1] Norbert Hruby to the Committee on Continuing Education, May 3, 1965, pp. 1 and 2.

[2] Norbert Hruby to the Committee on Continuing Education, June 8, 1965, pp. 1 and 4.

As the Fall 1965 term opened, the confidence Hruby had placed in the potential of the program for attracting students was proved justified. Hruby wrote in the early Fall:

> As you may have heard, the Degree Completion Program of the Division of Continuing Education is attracting a sizable clientele of impressive quality. As of this date we have 139 paid applicants for admission to the Program. Of this number more than one hundred should survive the screening process and be admitted to Mundelein College as degree candidates. Meanwhile another 25 or so mature students who have been special or part-time students at the College have now been subsumed under the DCP in order to benefit from the special counseling services and other prerogatives of the Program. Thus, as Mundelein College enters upon its thirty-sixth academic year, it does so with a student body of a significantly different mixture. Not only will we have more out-of-city and out-of-state resident students than ever before, but we will also have a student body ten per cent of whom are mature women! It is difficult to guess what effect these two important additions to the student population are apt to have on life and learning at Mundelein, but it is fairly certain that whatever the effect it will be of major proportions.[1]

The initial success in numbers that the Degree Completion Program enjoyed continued through the end of the decade and continues today. In 1965 about 100 women enrolled in the new program. Registration in Fall 1966 showed a fifty per cent increase and by 1969 more than 250 women enrolled in the program. Relatively few of the DCP students, as they were called, were former Mundelein students; in fact, both in the first semester and thereafter only about half of the adult women in the DCP were even Catholic.[2]

---

[1] Norbert Hruby to the Faculty and Administrators of Mundelein College, September 28, 1965, p. 1.

[2] Katharine Byrne, "Report to the Faculty Senate," October 14, 1969, p. 1.

But the Degree Completion Program clearly helped President Gannon meet her goal of diversifying the student body at Mundelein and also provided additional tuition revenue.

Mundelein College, then, in marked contrast to the process at both Brooklyn College and Queens College established a special baccalaureate program for adults with very little faculty involvement in the planning of the actual program and no formal approval of the program by the faculty at large or by its representatives.[1] The College had been caught up in a move toward the broader involvement of the faculty in the leadership of the College between 1957 and 1965 as demonstrated by the faculty development program instituted by President Gannon and by faculty involvement on the committees of the Institutional Analysis led by Hruby. But either because Hruby felt pressed to launch the program such a relatively short time after the results of the Institutional Analysis were in or because Mundelein had not yet incorporated democratic involvement of the faculty in decision making into its ethos, the Committee on Continuing Education did not shape the design of the Degree Completion Program to any noticeable extent nor was the program reviewed by a faculty legislature before it was offered because in 1965 no faculty legislature existed at Mundelein.

---

[1] Interview with Sister Cecilia Bodman, October 17, 1973, p. 2.

Yet the faculty seems to have accepted the program including its provision for the awarding of credit for life experience without serious question. No other program studied resembled Mundelein in this respect; Queens and particularly Brooklyn experienced a backlash against credit for life experience after their programs had been approved and were in operation. In contrast, the faculty at Mundelein seems to have been able to accept the autocratic institution of the Degree Completion Program even though the program was instituted long after Presi- Gannon had begun her ten year plan to make Mundelein more democratic. And in the case of Mundelein the acceptance of the autocratic decision to have such a program did not work against the program. No faculty backlash ever developed.

At Roosevelt University, the last of the institutions studied which created an adult degree program based on a resident model, the faculty was not formally involved in the planning process leading to the special program either, although the faculty at Roosevelt had the opportunity to challenge the proposal for the program in the University's Curriculum Committee and on the floor of the Faculty Senate. But the lack of faculty involvement at Roosevelt during the planning phase of the program led to a very different reaction to the program than had been experienced at Mundelein. Perhaps the major difference was that Roosevelt, unlike Mundelein, had been created at least partially out of the democratic and egalitarian ideals of its founders. Democracy had been incorporated into the University's

Constitution and Roosevelt's faculty had traditionally resisted autocracy with great vigor.

Roosevelt University--The Bachelor of General Studies Program

Roosevelt University is urban, private, and young. The University was established in 1945 as Thomas Jefferson College but its name was changed to Roosevelt College shortly after the College was chartered upon the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt.[1] Roosevelt University, when its special baccalaureate degree program for adults was instituted, consisted of three colleges and three divisions: the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business Administration, and the Chicago Musical College; the Labor Education Division, the Graduate Division, and the Division of Continuing Education.

The student body at Roosevelt has resembled from its earliest days a cross section of the metropolitan community measured by race, by ethnic origin, and by age. Most of its students work to support themselves while going to school and tend to enroll on a part-time basis; a large proportion of the students have transferred to Roosevelt from other institutions, particularly from Chicago's publicly supported junior colleges, and are upper-division students when they enter Roosevelt. The

---

[1] Daniel H. Perlman, "Faculty Trusteeship: Concept and Experience" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1971), p. 10.

University's "campus" has been, for most of its life, one large building, the Auditorium Theater building, designed by Adler and Sullivan in the late nineteenth century and located on the lakefront in downtown Chicago.

Roosevelt University was founded in the spring of 1945 after a series of disputes between the staff of the then Central YMCA College and the College's Board of Directors. The disputes, which centered on questions of academic freedom and admission requirements as well as on the financial control of the College, culminated in a vote by the faculty and administration in which they expressed their lack of confidence in the Board of Directors. After the vote, the President and more than sixty per cent of his faculty resigned from the YMCA College and proceeded to establish Roosevelt College.[1]

Creation of the Adult Education Division

Unlike most colleges and universities which offer evening courses, Roosevelt College did not create a separate administrative structure to oversee its evening program. Instead Roosevelt was organized in 1945 into two schools each of which offered degree programs both in the day and in the evening. The same curriculum and faculty were used for both. Later when Roosevelt College became Roosevelt University through the addition of master's programs, the schools were renamed colleges but the single time schedule remained.

---

[1] Ibid.

Edward J. Sparling, Roosevelt's founding President, and some of his associates at the YMCA College carried a strong interest in non-credit adult education over to Roosevelt College. But because of the extremely limited budget of the new institution and perhaps because non-credit adult education programs were already available in downtown Chicago through the University of Chicago's University College, no move was made in the early years of Roosevelt College to create an adult education program separate from the degree programs already offered. By the late 'fifties and early 'sixties, however, the financial condition of Roosevelt had improved and fewer non-credit adult education courses were available in the downtown area owing to the discontinuation of University College.[1]

At the same time that President Sparling was encouraged by the discontinuation of University College to act upon his long-standing wish for an adult education program at Roosevelt, Roosevelt's College of Business Administration was in the final stages of earning accreditation from the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). But the College of Business Administration had for some years offered programs in Real Estate, Foreign Trade, and Secretarial Practice. The AACSB included within its criteria for accreditation stringent ratios requiring that the preponderance of courses in AACSB accredited programs be taught by full-time faculty members and that the largest proportion of full-time faculty members in business hold doctorates. Since the Real Estate, Foreign Trade, and Secretarial Practice programs were taught almost entirely by part-time faculty members none of whom held doctorates, the programs either had to be discontinued or be transferred to some other division of the University. Rolf A. Weil, then Dean of the College of Business Administration and later President of Roosevelt, supported the establishment of an adult education division because it offered a solution to his problem of what to do with the parts of his program which could not be accredited by the AACSB.[1]

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Academic Conference Minutes, February 7, 1962," p. 2.

Weil also supported the establishment of an adult education division because, as Dean of the College of Business Administration, he was responsible for the business courses offered at various off-campus extensions of the University. The administration of the business courses offered through extension and the recruitment of students for those courses represented an administrative burden for Weil. The creation of an adult education division carried with it the promise of help in operating the extension program in business administration and this also attracted

---

[1] In fact, the Division of Continuing Education did assume responsibility for the Foreion Trade and Real Estate programs; the Secretarial Practice program went to the College of Arts and Sciences. (Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Senate, January 16, 1963," p. 3.)

Weil's support.[1]

The first official step toward the establishment of an adult education division at Roosevelt was reflected in the report of a Committee of the Faculty Senate on the "Future of Roosevelt University." The Committee made up of the academic deans of the University and the Director of the Labor Education Division was released on May 17, 1961. While the Committee recommended against the creation of a separate evening division it did point up the potential need for an administrator to oversee the offering of courses at remote locations. The report stated that

> the administration of extension work . . . represents a different and more difficult problem [than the administration of evening courses on campus] because of its separation in space from the "campus" and its special clientele. If extension work were to be further developed and enlarged in scope as well as in numbers, the present administrative apparatus would not be adequate, and a Director of Extension would be needed.[2]

Shortly after the report of the Committee, President Sparling began to talk to Robert Ahrens, an alumnus of the University and former Director of its Alumni Office, about the possibility of his returning to Roosevelt to head a new adult education division which would include within its scope both the off campus extension programs and special courses and activities offered on campus.[3] When these discussions were occurring late in 1961 and 1962, Ahrens was Executive Director of the Adult Education Council of Greater Chicago, an organization which had received support from the Fund for Adult Education and which had enthusiastically endorsed the programs of liberal education common in the 'fifties.

---

[1] Interview with Otto Wirth, March 22, 1973, pp. 5 and 6.

[2] Roosevelt University, "Report of Deans Creanza, Leys, McCallister, Watson, Weil, and Wirth to the Faculty Senate, October 11, 1961,' p. 8.

[3] Interview with Robert Ahrens, June 6, 1973, p. 4.

Both President Sparling and his Dean of Arts and Sciences, Otto Wirth, had taken special notice of Ahrens when he was a student at Roosevelt in the 'forties and felt that he had demonstrated his ability in organizing adult education activities while head of the Alumni Office at Roosevelt and director of the Adult Education Council. But Sparling's reasons for wanting Ahrens to lead an adult education program at Roosevelt seem to have gone much deeper. John Schwertman, who had been Sparling's assistant before joining the staff of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, had also been Sparling's protege. Schwertman had not only developed some of his views on adult education from his association with Sparling and others at Roosevelt but had in turn contributed, especially while Director of the CSLEA, to Sparling's view of the field. Apparently Sparling and Schwertman had discussed, over the years, the possibility of making Roosevelt to Chicago what the New School for Social Research was to New York.[1] Thus Schwertman's untimely death in 1956 came as a personal blow to Sparling and put an end, at least for a time, to his and Schwertman's dream.

---

[1] Interviews with Rolf A. Weil, April 9, 1973, p. 3 and Ahrens, June 6, 1973, p. 3.

When Schwertman left Roosevelt in 1952 to become Associate Director of CSLEA, both he and Sparling seem to have assumed that his departure was a temporary one. Rather than replacing Schwertman by [illegible] a new assistant, Sparling asked Ahrens to act as his assistant as well as the head of the Alumni Office. The relationship between Ahrens and Sparling grew stronger during the four years that Ahrens acted as Assistant to the President and, following Schwertman's death, Sparling seems to have transferred to Ahrens some of the feeling he had had for Schwertman.[1]

In early spring 1962, Dean Wirth brought Sparling's dream of an adult education division closer to reality by arguing in [illegible] Academic Conference, the major academic policy making body of the institution, that such a division could both fill the void left by the discontinuation of University College by the University of Chicago and provide an administrator to look after Roosevelt's extension programs. The proposition seems to have been somewhat controversial in the Academic Conference but,

> after considerable discussion Mr. Wirth moved, seconded by Mr. Watson, that the Academic Conference accept in principle this idea of establishing an Adult Education Division at Roosevelt University. Motion carried.[2]

---

[1] Ahrens, June 6, 1973, pp. 4-6.

[2] Academic Conference, February 7, 1962, p. 2.

Two weeks later Sparling included a strong endorsement for an adult education division in his report to the Faculty Senate.

> The Academic Conference . . . took under consideration the important issue of an adult education program at Roosevelt University. It was generally agreed that we should enter this field and that a Director should be made available and that in that position he could serve as co-ordinater of evening work as well as extension work. The Academic Conference moved to accept in principle the idea that an Adult Education Division be established at Roosevelt University.
>
> Let me state my position, that I strongly feel that the need for continued education is basic to the importance of an awareness of the traditions and fulfillment of the responsibilities of the individual in a free society and in a world of growth and change. . . .
>
> Here at Roosevelt we have more reasons that at most institutions for providing leadership in programs of adult education. We share with all other institutions the awareness of human needs and the nature of knowledge, but we have the special nature of our own commitment to education in the heart of a great city. We have the background of leadership in the field of adult education in our development. Let me mention the contributions of John Schwertman, deceased, and Robert Ahrens--the latter who these past years has done an outstanding job as Executive Director of the Chicago Adult Education Council. /sic/
>
> I believe Roosevelt University has before it an opportunity to serve the adult educational needs of the urban area. We have an opportunity to build a constructive program similar to what has been done at such institutions as Harvard, Brooklyn College and Syracuse.
>
> The establishment of an Adult Education Division would enrich our present program by reaching out into the community and into the various areas of educational, civic, and cultural activities. Such a program would reach out to meet the varied needs of individuals and groups. Cooperative efforts with other agencies can yield beneficial results for all. There is the field of home study to be investigated--there is the potential of institutes, conferences and lectures carried on systematically and in a sustained fashion. There is a challenge in residential education and the possibility of the strengthening of programs for our Alumni Association. We have an opportunity at this time to

> move forward in a field where there is a crying need for services and the possibility of developing a comprehensive and meaningful program of adult education.[1]

The enthusiasm that Sparling worked up over the possible establishment of an adult education division was enough to carry him forward without further consultation. Three months after his initial announcement to the Faculty Senate that an adult education division should be established, he reported to the Senate that such a division had been created in the budget for the academic year 1962-1963.

> There is . . . a budget allowance for the development of an Office of Adult Education and we have been fortunate in securing the services of Bob Ahrens, Roosevelt University Alumnus, former Alumni Director, and for many years the Executive Director of the Adult Education Council of Chicago to head this new office.[2]

Some of the faculty were incensed at Sparling's unilateral decision to create the Adult Education Division both because of a resistance to the idea of adult education and because of a feeling that the funds budgeted for the Division might have been applied with better effect to other programs in the institution.[3] Otto Wirth indicated that the adverse feeling that resulted from the decision being made without consulting the faculty was particularly unfortunate since Ahrens had many friends at Roosevelt and, given an opportunity for discussion, Ahrens probably would have been accepted enthusiastically by virtually all of the faculty.[1]

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Senate, February 21, 1962," p. 2.

[2] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Senate, May 16, 1962," p. 1.

[3] Weil, April 19, 1973, p. 4.

While acting without consultation was not unknown to President Sparling, in this case the atmosphere which had been developing in the few years before he created the Division may have been a factor. Perhaps because of its impulsive beginning and its liberal, if not somewhat radical ideology during the late 'forties and early 'fifties, Roosevelt was initially and continued to be very poor for the first fifteen or more years of its existence. The young College's strong identification with labor and its insistence on preserving freedom of expression for individuals and political groups of all persuasions did not convey a positive image to large, corporate donors, especially during the McCarthy era. In its early years, the institution was held together by Sparling who was a charismatic leader and by a highly committed faculty--academics who had resigned from secure jobs to found an institution which promised to be anything but secure.

But as the 'sixties approached, many changes were becoming apparent: the founding President was nearing retirement age, the initial commitment and idealism of the faculty had been diluted by the addition of faculty members who had joined the staff for perfectly acceptable, if less idealistic reasons than had the founders, and the financial condition of the University had moved from a level of near starvation to one of mild hunger. In this changed environment, key members of the faculty and administration became increasingly unhappy with the style of leadership provided by their President.[1] The pressure and intrigue resulting from this unhappiness ultimately caused Sparling to retire before he had intended and led to the selection of a new President who brought Roosevelt to the brink of disaster.[2]

---

[1] Wirth, March 22, 1973, p. 1.

In the face of the resistance to his leadership, it seems possible that Sparling was at least partially motivated to create the Adult Education Division not only by his wish to realize a dream of his own and to leave behind a memorial to John Schwertman but also to bolster his own position within the University by bringing Ahrens onto the staff. Sparling clearly felt he could count on Ahrens' support in his fight to retain the Presidency. What Sparling resulted in doing, however, was to alienate further some members of the faculty while not forestalling his own imminent retirement.

The Initial Special Baccalaureate Proposal

Robert Ahrens rejoined the staff of Roosevelt University in August 1962 as Director of the Adult Education Division. His first task was to assume the management of the extension programs offered at Ft. Sheridan, Great Lakes Naval Training Station, Fifth Army Headquarters, and Waukegan. He also began the rudiments of a non-credit adult education program on the downtown campus. But one of his major interests from the beginning of his tenure in this new position seems to have been the creation of a special baccalaureate program for adults.[1]

---

[1] Ahrens, June 6, 1973, p. 10.

[2] For an extensive treatment of the problems surrounding the term of the second President of Roosevelt see Daniel H. Perlman, "Faculty Trusteeship: Concept and Experience," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1971), pp. 230-245.

The University of Oklahoma had, in 1961, instituted a special baccalaureate program called the Bachelor of Liberal Studies (BLS) which had been designed de novo by a group of faculty members. The Oklahoma program unlike the programs described previously was not a modification of an evening college program but was based on a different set of assumptions about what an undergraduate program for adults should be.[2] Of the models then available, Ahrens seems to have settled quickly upon the Bachelor of Liberal Studies as the model for the program he wanted to establish at Roosevelt.

However, in marked contrast to the procedure followed at the University of Oklahoma where the proposal for the Bachelor of Liberal Studies was the result of four years of deliberation by a faculty committee, Ahrens did not involve any faculty in the preparation of his proposal for the establishment of a BLS at Roosevelt. Apparently assuming that the fruits of the planning process at Oklahoma could be transferred directly to Roosevelt, Ahrens requested that a discussion of special degree programs for adults be placed on the agenda of the Academic Conference of January 4, 1963, six months after his return to Roosevelt.[1] Ahrens then prepared a memorandum, dated January 3, 1963, in which he outlined the BLS program at Oklahoma and suggested that Roosevelt implement such a program in Chicago.[2] The matter, of course, was deferred for further study since the members of the Conference had had but one day to consider Ahrens' proposal.

---

[1] Ahrens, June 6, 1973, p. 5.

[2] An extended description of the Oklahoma program may be found in the next chapter.

Thus began a pattern of deferrals which lasted more than a year and which resulted in the death of Ahrens' proposal for lack of action. The proposal next appeared on the agenda of the Conference on February 15, 1963, but no discussion took place at that meeting.[3] On April 15, the Dean of Faculties, H. H. Sheldon, reported to the Academic Conference on a meeting on the subject of special degree programs held at Maxwell Field, Alabama, which he and Ahrens had attended March 25 and 26, 1963. As a result of his report, an Advisory Committee was appointed at that meeting to study the possibility of a special degree program at Roosevelt.[1]

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Academic Conference, January 4, 1963," p. 2. Since the Division of Continuing Education and Extension, the new name for the Adult Education Division adopted December 7, 1962, had no faculty of its own, the Academic Conference had been designated to act as its curriculum committee.

[2] Robert Ahrens to the Academic Conference, January 3, 1963, 8 pp.

[3] Roosevelt University, "Agenda, Academic Conference, February 15, 1963."

The question of a special baccalaureate at Roosevelt arose twice at meetings of the Academic Conference the following October. At the October 7 meeting, adult degree programs at other schools were discussed, the Advisory Committee on Adult Degree Programs reported orally on its deliberations, and a decision was made to engage in ". . . a more extensive discussion at a later date."[2] On October 21, the question of an adult degree program was again deferred on the grounds that the Advisory Committee was meeting later in the day.[3] Finally, the Advisory Committee's report was presented to the Conference on November 4, 1963. In its report the Advisory Committee complained of being rushed and recommended that no action be taken until the question of the need for an adult degree program at Roosevelt could be studied further. Ahrens, however, was asked to prepare a new proposal for an adult degree program ". . . adapted to the needs of Roosevelt University."[1] But before Ahrens had an opportunity to act on this challenge, President Sparling's successor, who had taken office January 1, 1964, abolished the Academic Conference in an attempt to streamline the organization of the University.[2] Thus one year and eight days after he had initially submitted it to the Conference, Ahrens' proposal to implement the Oklahoma plan at Roosevelt was effectively tabled. But the abolition of the Academic Conference was only the proximate cause of the disappearance of the proposal; the proposal seems to have died well before January 1964 for lack of support from and action by the Conference.

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Academic Conference, April 5, 1963," p. 2.

[2] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Academic Conference, October 7, 1963," p. 2.

[3] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Academic Conference, October 21, 1963," p. 1.

From the Founder to his Successors: A Transitional Period

The time between the disappearance of Ahrens' proposal in January 1964 and the re-institution of movement toward an adult degree program in fall 1965 was a tumultous time at Roosevelt. President Sparling left office in December 1963; his successor joined the staff in January 1964. By summer the successor was at loggerheads with most of the administration and faculty and in November 1964 he resigned. Rosevelt was deeply unsettled by the experience of these eleven months and entered 1965 with many wounds to heal. Rolf A. Weil, Dean of the College of Business Administration, had assumed leadership of the University with the title Acting President.[1]

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Academic Conference, November 4, 1963," p. 1.

[2] H.H. Sheldon to Members of the Academic Conference, January 13, 1964.

The Division of Continuing Education and Extension had grown substantially during its first two years of operation both by annexing already existing programs and by creating some programs of its own. To oversee the development and offering of programs in the Division, Ahrens proposed a new Faculty Council for the Division in May 1964.[2] The Administrative Council approved and the Faculty Council was elected in fall 1964. To bring it up to date, Ahrens briefed the Faculty Council in January 1965 on the scope of the program of the Division and on the Division's problems. The minutes of the briefing read in part:

> Mr. Ahrens reviewed /the/ development of the Division since its inception in August, 1962, noting that it had probably moved too quickly from the planning stage into the operational stage, but that there had been little choice on this. The scope of the Divison /sic/ activities now encompasses 1) Extension Centers at 5th Army Headquarters, Fort Sheridan and Great Lakes, 2) Isolated extension courses at Downers Grove and elsewhere, as arranged, 3) Conferences and Public Lectures, 4) Foreign Trade and Real Estate Programs, 5) The Reading Institute (on Adams Street), 6) Continuing Education non-credit courses in data processing, electronics, etc., and a special program for women (Discovery) and 7) Cooperative non-credit programs with other agencies, such as the present Parent Education program co-sponsored with the Chicago Region, Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers; and the Television Institutes, co-sponsored with the Chicago Chapter, Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

---

[1] See Perlman, "Faculty Trusteeship," for a more extensive treatment of this period in Roosevelt's history.

[2] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Administrative Council, May 14, 1964," p. 1.

> The Division envisions much growth in programs of continuing professional education aimed at alumni and others and is vitally interested in development of new programs for the degree-seeking part-time student. Presently, the Division feels it is important to organize its present gains and to review and to plan carefully for the future, rather than to attempt new programs at this time. The director has no professional assistance and the Division staff of one secretary was increased by a clerk-stenographer only last fall. The staff keeps to a rigorous schedule of community activity as a part of the Division's obligation to keep itself a leading and cutting edge of the University in the community and to advance avenues of cooperation with other community agencies. The Division must also bear in mind in its work that it is obliged to earn income equal to or greater than what it spends for non-credit program, and the credit extension programs are justified largely by the degree of net income they return as well as the service they perform.[1]

The Division Ahrens had created was similar to many other urban, adult education divisions. The Division of Continuing Education and Extension at Roosevelt in early 1965 was part credit and part non-credit, part community service and part income generating. Ahrens certainly needed staff given the scope and number of his offerings and he seems to have been beginning to suspect a lack of support for the Division from the institution as a whole.

A number of senior administrators who had been part of the administrative team of Roosevelt's second president resigned during December 1964 and January 1965 following the departure of their leader. This turn-over in the administrative staff left Acting President Weil with positions to fill in the Spring of 1965, among them the head of the development program. Weil found himself in an uncomfortable situation because he did not hold the full title of President yet had to be decisive and because some supporters of the founding president were bringing pressure to bear on the Board of Trustees of the University to re-insert Sparling into the University's policy making process. As Weil described the dilemma:

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "[illegible] of the Faculty Council, Division of Continuing Education and Extension, January 1965," p. 2.

> This was a very difficult transition period because either Jim Sparling himself or his friends felt that he should move back into a policy making role in the institution. In fact members of the Board of Trustees were approached and asked whether they didn't think that he would be a good mam to be Chancellor and take charge of fund raising and let Rolf Weil handle the internal things. I was very much opposed to that and made no secret of it because I felt that either I was going to be in charge of the total operation or I didn't really want it even on an acting basis. I also felt that if someone else was going to be selected President, which is what I had to assume because I accepted the Acting Presidency with the understanding that I would not seek the Presidency, but I wanted to at least create a situation so that whoever was going to be President--he wasn't going to have a former President, in fact, doing part of the policy making for him.[1]

In pursuit of an acceptable compromise between Sparling's return to an active policy making role and his total exclusion from the administration of the University, Weil settled on the appointment of Robert Ahrens as Vice-President for Development, hoping thereby to mollify Sparling's supporters by assuring representation of the old guard at the highest level of policy formation.[2] The plan seems to have been successful since Sparling remained

---

[1] Weil, April 9, 1974, p. 8.

[2] *Ibid.*

President Emeritus with solely honorary duties save his membership on the Board of Trustees.

As Ahrens moved into his new position in the Development Office and away from a [illegible] involvement in the Division of Continuing Education and Research, he needed help in directing the Division and especially in running the extension centers. He recruited a young Ph.D. candidate from the graduate program in adult education at the University of Chicago to help him. Weil announced her appointment to the Administrative Council in May 1965:

> Mrs. Lucy Ann Marx will assist in the Office of Continuing Education during the summer and is a candidate for Director of that office to replace Mr. Ahrens. She has been teaching in the Education Department and is about to receive her Ph.D. in Adult Education at the University of Chicago.[1]

Mrs. Marx assumed the directorship of the Division on a part-time basis over the summer and by August 20, 1965, Weil had appointed her to succeed Ahrens as Director.[2]

The Second Proposal

Special baccalaureate programs for adults were still generating excitement in extension divisions across the country in 1965. CSLEA had identified the encouragement of adult degree programs as one of its major goals. Discussion about existing special baccalaureate programs and about plans for special baccalaureate programs was lively during the summer workshops in adult education held at the University of Chicago. Thurman White had earned substantial recognition and publicity within the adult education community for the establishment of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies program in 1961 at the University of Oklahoma. Alexander Charters had been made a Vice-President at Syracuse University in recognition of his work in adult education, which included the institution of a special baccalaureate. Directors of adult education divisions had apparently begun to view adult degree programs not only as another way to serve their clientele but also as a way to move their operations more into the mainstream of their degree granting institutions. It was in this context that Marx began her first and only year as Director of the Division of Continuing Education and Extension at Roosevelt. It was also in this context that she made the creation of a special baccalaureate program for adults her first priority.

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Administrative Council, May 13, 1965," p. 1.

[2] Rolf A. Weil to the Staff and Faculty, Roosevelt University, August 20, 1965.

Marx described her interest in adult degree programs as originating at the University of Chicago:

> I had done two years work at the University of Chicago [By 1964] and was just completing a Carnegie Fellowship there and realized that I had to have some money. A proposal for my dissertation was accepted and I realized that I had to have some money to sustain me while I wrote the dissertation. I got a job teaching beginning education courses down at Roosevelt and did that for a year and during that time thought some about special degree programs for adults and indeed took a non-credit course with Cy [Houle]--a sort of seminar course where we talked a lot about non-credit courses and the beginning of non-credit

> courses around the country and he talked a lot about the Oklahoma program and I found it all very, very interesting.[1]

And as she moved toward the directorship of the Division at Roosevelt her ideas about adult degree programs seem to have become more concrete.

> . . . About the same time Cy /Houle/ was telling me about special degree programs for adults out at the University /of Chicago/ while I was finishing my degree, Bob /Ahrens/ was thinking about special degree programs for adults at Roosevelt in conversations with Otto Wirth who was then, I believe, Dean of Arts and Sciences about to become Dean of Faculties. I remember saying that I would like very much to have Bob's job but the only terms under which I was interested in taking it was that the Dean of Faculties, and the President of the University, and the other members of the Administrative Council (who were the other Deans) would recognize that my primary aim in the Division would be to establish such a program.[2]

While she described the responses she received from the members of the Administrative Council as ranging from "benign but affectionate contempt" to open enthusiasm, she apparently felt she had the support she needed. She took the job.[3]

Within two months of having become Director, Marx had defined the potential program well enough to have written a proposal for funds to support its development. She also had begun a campaign to educate the other members of the Administrative

---

[1] Interview with Lucy Ann /Marx/ Geiselman, March 4, 1973, p. 1.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*

Council about the special contribution she felt Roosevelt could make to adult students in Chicago. The objective of her educational campaign was clearly expressed in a memorandum she wrote in preparation for a visit by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. In the memorandum Marx argued that

> neither the extension nor the non-credit courses /offered by the Division/ meet an especially apparent need in Chicago: that of a degree program created especially for the part-time adult student. A proposal for funds to create such a program has been drawn up and is now being considered by one of the foundations of the city.[1]

And, fortunately, the proposal was funded late in the fall by the Sears Foundation for the modest sum of $4,000.

With this small, discretionary cache, Marx was able to relieve herself of some of her routine duties by hiring a graduate student and friend, George Dillavou, to assist her on a part-time basis. But before Dillavou officially joined the staff in February 1966, Marx and Wirth had outlined the program's curriculum and had taken their outline before the Faculty Council of the Division.[2] The proposal to the Faculty Council set forth a curriculum which was part conventional evening college in character and part radically unconventional.

---

[1] Lucy Ann Marx to Rolf A. Weil, October 26, 1965, p. 2.

[2] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Faculty Council, Division of Continuing Education and Extension, December 2, 1965," p. 1.

The lack of conventionality probably arose from two sources: First, Otto Wirth had been educated for the most part in Europe and thus was not by his own experience committed to an undergraduate degree curriculum tied to the American pattern of four years of full-time study or their part-time equivalent.

Second, Marx had written her doctoral dissertation on the implications of Alfred North Whitehead's view of education for adult education.[1] Whitehead asserted in his theory that learning begins with the unstructured enjoyment of a subject matter which appeals to a learner. He called this uncritical enjoyment the stage of "romance." Romance, Whitehead suggested, leads to attempts by the learner to gain specific and reliable knowledge of the subject. This second stage is focused on acquiring "precision." Finally, Whitehead saw a stage in which the learner attempts to relate what he has learned in his current learning episode to what he has learned in earlier episodes. This is the stage of "generalization." And once complete, the cycle begins anew with another subject matter.[2]

Marx indicated that she had this framework in mind as she and Wirth designed the Bachelor of General Studies program and following Whitehead's framework, the BGS program has three basic stages: the Pro-Seminar, the Concentration, and the

---

[1] Lucy Ann Marx, "The Use of Whiteheadian Principles in University Adult Education," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 196[illegible]).

[2] Harold Dunkel, *Whitehead on Education* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1965).

Integrating Seminars.[1] As early as December 2, 1965, these steps had been delineated and were proposed, as mentioned earlier, to the Division's Faculty Council:

> A plan for [illegible] program was described as follows:
>
> 1) Students would be given placement exams and on the basis of these exams, and consultation with appropriate departments, credit could be given for life experience.
>
> 2) [illegible] concentration would be taken in the regular undergraduate program now offered.
>
> 3) "[illegible] integrating seminars" would complete the Adult students' work in this program.[2]

This rudimentary plan was further developed during the winter of 1965-1966 resulting in a proposal for a special baccalaureate which was distributed to the Academic Conference, the University-wide academic policy committee, on April 19, 1966.[3]

The more complete plan seems to have emerged from discussions between Marx and Wirth with technical assistance from Marx's part-time assistant [illegible] who put Marx's and Wirth's ideas into words.[4] [illegible] Marx spent January, February, and March of 1966 talking informally with politically influential faculty members especially in the College of Arts and Sciences, in an attempt to win their support for the program, no further meetings were held with the Faculty Council of the Division of Continuing Education until the formal approval process was in its final stages.

---

[1] Interview with [illegible] Ann (Marx) Geiselman, May 12, 1974, p. [illegible].

[2] Roosevelt University, "Faculty Council Minutes, December 2, 1965," p. [illegible].

[3] Roosevelt University, [illegible] Academic Conference, April 19, 1966, p. [illegible].

[4] Geiselman, [illegible], 1973, p. [illegible].

As the spring progressed, two external forces seem to have influenced the way in which the special baccalaureate program was approved and instituted. First, Marx had begun negotiations with the Extension Division of the University of Chicago which culminated in her accepting a position as Program Director at Chicago's Center for Continuing Education. Her resignation from Roosevelt was announced by Weil in the Faculty Senate on April 20, 1966--the day after she had submitted her proposal for a special baccalaureate program to the Academic Conference.[1] Her negotiations with the University of Chicago and impending resignation from Roosevelt seem, understandably, to have compelled Marx to work even more assiduously toward the accomplishment of the goal to which she had assigned first priority when she was made director of the Division of Continuing Education at Roosevelt.

And second, during 1965-1966 the tempo of student unrest over the war in Vietnam was picking up. The demand of the Selective Service for class ranking, testing, and grades to assist it in deciding which male students to induct into the armed services inflamed the emotions of both liberal and radical student organizations. At Roosevelt, the protest against the rank took the form of confrontations with President Weil, demonstrations at the place of business of the Chairman of the University's Board of Trustees, a resolution in the Faculty Senate introduced by one of the student representatives on the same day that the proposal for the special baccalaureate was debated, and a sit-in at the University which began the next day.[1] The official records of that spring, especially those of meetings in April and May, show repeated instances of both special meetings of the Administrative Council and Academic Conference and the pre-emption of the agendas of the regular meetings of these bodies to deal with crises or potential crises resulting from student unrest. Even had the faculty been fully involved in the development of the design of the Bachelor of General Studies program at Roosevelt, the spring of 1966 would have been a difficult time for reasoned discussion. As it was their lack of involvement was further compounded by the disruptions which dominated that spring.

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Faculty Senate, April 20, 1966," p. [illegible]

The Design of the BGS

To reiterate, the design of the Bachelor of General

---

[1] Roosevelt [illegible]," May 20, 1966.

Studies program at Roosevelt seems to have resulted from information about other special degree programs which Marx gathered at the University of Chicago during her doctoral program and particularly during a summer workshop she attended in 1964, certain practices which Wirth had experienced in the German university system, Wirth's knowledge of the Discovery Program for Women at Roosevelt in the early 'sixties,' and Marx's interest in Whitehead's assertions about the cyclical nature of learning. Marx does not seem to have benefitted from Ahrens' work toward a special baccalaureate at Roosevelt both because his work in this area had little impact on administrative and faculty attitudes about adult degree programs and because Marx, by her own admission, did not review the materials on other special baccalaureate programs, most of which Ahrens had collected at the Maxwell Field conference in 1963 and which he had left for her use when he changed positions at Roosevelt.[1]

The Bachelor of General Studies program at Roosevelt differs from the special baccalaureate programs at the other eight institutions studied in that the BGS program provides for the awarding of a baccalaureate degree when a student completes four blocks of requirements without regard to how many credits he has acquired in meeting these requirements or for how much time he has spent in the program. This approach contrasts markedly to the approaches employed at the other institutions each of which either base the design of their special baccalaureate programs on the earning of approximately 120 semester hours or equate their special curricula to the typical 120 semester hour model for the baccalaureate degree. Roosevelt's striking departure from this practice owes its existence to Dean Wirth's experience in the German universities where emphasis was placed on the student's accomplishing certain major requirements without regard to credits earned in classroom study or the amount of time spent at the institution.

---

[1] Geiselman, [illegible], pp. [illegible] and 7.

Some of the problems encountered in winning faculty support and acceptance of the BGS program at Roosevelt seem to have been the result of a lack of clarity on this point in the written proposal as well as the lack of faculty involvement in the preparation of the proposal. The overview of the program provided in the proposal read:

> The Division of Continuing Education and Extension proposes to institute a degree program for adults in September, 1966. The degree would be granted by the Division of Continuing Education and would utilize the courses and facilities of departments already established, so that the adult student has access to all the intellectual resources of the university without regard to departmental lines. The unique contribution of the Division of Continuing Education would be the conducting of the pro-seminar in which the student's past experience, academic and non-academic, will be evaluated, as well as the special liberalizing seminars that must be taken in his junior and senior years. The administration of the degree program would be kept in Continuing Education with standards set in consultation with the departments.[1]

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Adult Degree Program Proposal," /May 18, 1966/, p. 1.

The blocks of requirements for the program--the Pro-seminar, Concentration, and Integrating Seminars--were identified in the proposal but a number of important relationships were not defined. For example, no parallel was drawn between the Integrating Seminars of the BGS and the general education requirements of the other programs. Neither was the relationship between a Concentration in the BGS program and a major/minor sequence in the other programs made clear. Further, the mechanism for awarding credit for prior, non-academic experience, mentioned in connection with the Pro-seminar, was to be left to the departments:

> We hope to have departmental tests that will determine /the student's/ level of understanding of subject matter that will give him credit for departmental courses that he has learned by some other method. For example, if a man has been an accountant for several years, it would seem unnecessary for him to have to take accounting 101, and credit for that course could be assigned him.[1]

Yet no workable system of credit for life experience existed within the departments at the time of the proposal and no agreement had been negotiated with the departments to create such a system.

The content of the Pro-seminar and the Integrating Seminars was not specified as part of the proposal to the Faculty Senate. Instead Marx, in her motion to approve the program, included the referral of the problem of curriculum to the Faculty Council of the Division of Continuing Education and Extension. The Concentrations, on the other hand, were spelled out in an appendix to the proposal. Six Concentrations were proposed initially in interdisciplinary areas entitled "Youth Services," "Study of Urban Problems," "Languages," "Political and Economic Institutions," "Literature," and "Computer Technology." Each Concentration consisted of fifteen or sixteen courses taken from the departmental offerings in the College of Arts and Sciences, with the exception of the Concentration in Computer technology which consisted of courses in computer programming and operation offered by the Division of Continuing Education and courses offered by the College of Business Administration. Most of the courses included in the Concentrations were designated "upper level" which meant courses in departmental sequences which were beyond the introductory level.

---

[1] *Ibid.*

Curiously, the Internship in Community Service, which apparently was the fourth of the four seminars mentioned in the brief outline of the program presented to the Faculty Council of the Division on December 2, 1965, did not appear in the proposal to the Faculty Senate. Its deletion from that proposal probably was an oversight since the Internship reappeared in the first brochure used by the Division to promote the program[1] and has been a degree requirement since the fall of 1966 when the program accepted its first students.

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Continue Your Education: Bachelor of General Studies Degree for Adults," Spring 1967, p. 6.

The name of the degree to be awarded at the completion of the program was changed during the debate on the Senate floor. Initially, either a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science degree was to be awarded to students who met the requirements in the special baccalaureate program, depending upon the nature of their Concentration. But the opponents of the degree program suggested that the graduates of the special baccalaureate program would not then be distinguishable from the graduates of the other baccalaureate programs of the University and since the special baccalaureate program was meant to be a terminal degree,[1] such a distinction was essential. The name was changed to Bachelor of General Studies.

Finally, the admission process for the Bachelor of General Studies program at Roosevelt, unlike the complex selection procedures developed for the programs at Brooklyn, Queens, and Mundelein, was not mentioned in the proposal to the Faculty Senate. In fact, the admission criteria used for the BGS program were and are identical with the criteria used for admitting any other undergraduate into the University: a score in the upper fiftieth percentile on the ACT, SAT, or SCAT examination or a minimum of twelve semester hours of transfer credit from an accredited institution of higher education. The simple admission procedure and Roosevelt's longstanding interracial character probably account for the large proportion of minority adults in the BCS program as compared to the other programs studied.

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Proposal," p. 1.

The Approval Process

As the final meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 1965-1966 academic year approached, Marx had to gather a series of preliminary approvals. She presented the proposal for the special baccalaureate to the Academic Conference on April 19, 1966. The Conference set discussion of the proposal for its next meeting, a month later, and indicated that the proposal would also have to be approved by the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate and by the Senate itself.[1] On May 6, 1966, the proposal was discussed by the Curriculum Committee of the Senate and

> . . . it was moved, seconded, and carried, that the Senate approve in principle the proposed program and refer curricular determination to the Faculty Council of the Division in consultation with the departments concerned.[2]

Next the proposal was brought before the Faculty Council of the Division of Continuing Education and Extension on May 13 and there received the endorsement of the President, five Deans, nine faculty members, and five other administrators. The list of those supporting the proposal was appended to the document distributed for Senate review on May 18, 1966.[1]

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Academic Conference Minutes, April 19, 1966," p. 2.

[2] Roosevelt University, "Proposal," p. ii.

The discussion of the proposal by the Academic Conference which had been deferred from its April 19, 1966 meeting to its next scheduled meeting on May 17 did not occur. Perhaps because of the pressure created on the Deans by student unrest or because Academic Conference meetings toward the end of the academic year often were cancelled, the meeting did not take place and the proposal did not officially receive the endorsement of the Academic Conference.[2] However, this omission meant little since virtually all members of the Academic Conference were also members of the Faculty Council of the Division and as members of the Council had had an opportunity to approve or disapprove the proposal on May 13.

The debate on the special baccalaureate program for adults in the Faculty Senate seems to have been substantially more animated than any of the earlier discussions of the proposal. Each person interviewed at Roosevelt remembered with unusual clarity the bitterness expressed at the Senate meeting by some of the faculty members who opposed the proposal. Daniel Perlman, then Assistant to President Weil, was typical in his comments:

I don't remember the specific questions. . . but I remember

---

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] Roosevelt University, "Minutes of the Academic Conference, October 11, 1966," p. 1.

> the tone and thrust and implications of the questions even though I don't remember the specific questions. There was a great deal of anxiety about this concept of a separate degree for adults. It's not clear what the motivation for the anxiety was completely although it was couched in terms of being concerned about a watered-down degree--a degree that'd be given away. Most of the faculty members were used to thinking of degrees as something that was awarded when people accumulated a number of hours--semester hours of credit--and this kind of mathematical notion was absent from the. . . BGS program by intention and this raised the anxiety level of a number of faculty members who didn't see how you could award a degree unless a student had earned 120 hours and their understanding was that if a student had less than 120 hours, it was a cheaper degree. And it would somehow thereby diminish their status, that is, the status or the self-esteem of the faculty members of the other colleges would be diminished by the activity in the Division of Continuing Education that was going to distribute these cheap degrees.
>
> There was some anxiety at that time too, I suspect, that the Division of Continuing Education was going to set up a competitive program that would steal students away from the traditional programs and so there was some concern about enrollments in the traditional courses and whether they would be stable.[1]

A particular faculty member was mentioned by name by each of those interviewed as the primary opponent of the program. His objections seem to have stemmed from a concern about how the Bachelor of General Studies program might cheapen the worth of a baccalaureate degree earned from Roosevelt. But he was taken seriously by only a minority of his colleagues, perhaps because he was well-known for his penchant for "upholding standards" almost regardless of the issue at hand.[2] The proposal passed by a large majority and the Senators referred it to the Faculty Council of the Division of Continuing Education for implementation.[1]

---

[1] Interview with Daniel Perlman, August 9, 1973, pp. 5 and 6.

[2] Weil, April 9, 1973, pp. 11 and 12.

The Early Years of the BGS Program

When Marx left for her new position in July 1966, responsibility for the program, still in an embryonic state, passed to George Dillavou who succeeded Marx as Director. Dillavou's position was not enviable since he was faced at one and the same time with the tasks of promoting the BGS program and recruiting students for it while attempting to construct a curriculum for the Pro-seminar which was scheduled to be offered first beginning in September 1966. In order to develop the Pro-seminar in time for the Fall Semester, Dillavou turned to a tactic which was to become commonplace in the program's early years: he hired part-time faculty members, none of whom were members of Roosevelt's full-time staff, and gave them their heads. The consequence was the almost immediate creation of curricula for five sections of the Pro-seminar all of which seem to have met the needs of the returning adults who registered for them but none of which was consistent either in content or method with any of the others.[2] Thus a pattern of developing curriculum for the BGS program without the involvement of the Faculty Council or members of the full-time faculty of the University was begun.

---

[1] Interview with George J. Dillavou, March 27, 1973, p. 2.

[2] Interviews with Ann von Hoffman, March 27, 1973, p. 2 and Geiselman, March 4, 1973, pp. 8 and 9.

This pattern which had extended virtually from the presentation of Ahrens' proposal through the construction of the curriculum for the Pro-seminar after the acceptance of Marx's proposal appeared to be changing when Dillavou recruited some full-time faculty members to design the curricula for the Integrating Seminars in humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. The pressure to set the content and teaching style of the Integrating Seminars was less intense than that to create the Pro-seminars since the Integrating Seminars were scheduled to come later in the program after the student's Concentration. Given this longer lead time, faculty members from the regular University staff were induced, by payment of stipends in addition to their regular salaries, to work on the development of the Integrating Seminars.[1]

But in the planning sessions for these courses the faculty members found that they had no clear idea about what these new courses should be and no vocabulary nor experience which would allow them to talk to each other about designing an "integrative" Integrating Seminar. In the face of this lack of direction and lack of vocabulary, the faculty members reverted to what they knew well: teaching survey courses within their own disciplines.[1] And the Integrating Seminars which Marx and Wirth had meant to be opportunities for "generalization" in Whitehead's terms became, in fact, a series of short survey courses offered one after another during the same semester. Team teaching which had been part of the intent of the designers did not materialize; faculty members followed one another in the classroom without any extended interaction.[2] And after the first offering of the Integrating Seminars, the full-time faculty began to drop away--to be replaced by part-timers.

---

[1] Dillavou, March 27, 1973, pp. 3 and 4.

The program seems, in short, to have suffered from the lack of involvement of the University's full-time faculty, from an absence of its own faculty, or at very least from a lack of time for planning. The stability, consistency, and deliberate action often considered the hallmark of higher education was largely missing in the early BGS program. What was excellent, and some of the early offerings seem to have been excellent, owed its excellence to serendipity. What was confused and less than excellent could be attributed to the rush with which it had been done.

---

[1] Geiselman, March 4, 1973, p. 12.

[2] von Hoffman, March 27, 1973, p. 3.

And the spectacular growth of the program only compounded the problems inherent in a truncated planning period. More than one hundred students registered for the first five sections of the Pro-seminar[1] and the number of new students was less than one hundred per semester in only one semester between Fall 1966 and Spring 1970. By the Spring Semester 1970, the BGS program accounted for more than five hundred enrollments, roughly ten per cent of Roosevelt's undergraduate student body.[2]

In recognition of the growth of the Division and in acknowledgement of its degree granting powers, the Faculty Senate approved the renaming of the Division in the Spring Semester of 1969. The new College of Continuing Education, however, was not given the same perquisites as the other three Colleges of the University both because it had no full-time faculty of its own and because of a residual distrust of the old Division and its growing program. The problem of no full-time faculty began to be resolved during the 1971 budget negotiations when the first full-time faculty line was created for the College of Continuing Education, but the long-standing distrust of the Division perhaps resulting from its origin, perhaps from its non-traditional and to some threatening program seems slow in dying. And the continuing growth of the BGS program in the face of declines in enrollment in the Arts and Sciences program does little to speed the acceptance of the BGS among Arts and Sciences faculty.

---

[1] Roosevelt University, "Tenth Week Report, Fall 1967."

[2] Roosevelt University, "Tenth Week Report, Spring 1970."

Summary

The special baccalaureate programs established at Brooklyn, Queens, Mundelein, and Roosevelt resemble on another in their reliance on classroom instruction as their basic mode of delivery and their reliance on existing courses for a large part of their requirements. The programs differ, however, in the processes which were used to bring about their institution. The Brooklyn Special Baccalaureate Program was created as an experiment for a small group of well qualified adult students. Its sponsors were or had been politically powerful and respected faculty members at the College and the program was solidly based on precedents set mainly during the War. At Queens, the ACE program was developed as an alternative entry mechanism for adults who wished to work toward a baccalaureate degree. The support of politically powerful faculty members was enlisted by the designers of the program at Queens but the more politically powerful faculty members were not directly involved in the process of designing the program. Also, the acceptability of the ACE program was enhanced since portions of the program were derived from the Brooklyn experience.

The faculty at Mundelein had had no tradition of involvement in either governance or program development at the time of the development of the Degree Completion Program there. A group of prominent faculty members was assembled ostensibly to design the program but in the press of time, the Director of the Division of Continuing Education (who was also a Vice-President) designed the program on his own and the faculty did not object.

Finally, the Bachelor of General Studies program at Roosevelt was put together by the Dean of Faculties and the Director of the Division of Continuing Education without the formal involvement of members of the faculty. Owing to effective informal consultations with key faculty members, the program was approved by the Faculty Senate which at Roosevelt is an unusually powerful voice of the faculty. Some evidence indicates that student unrest over the draft and the Vietnam War which led to disruptions at the University may have distracted many faculty members from thorough consideration of the proposal for the program and may account for the ineffective opposition the BGS program met in the Senate.

The various levels of faculty involvement in the design of the four programs seem to have led to substantially different environments in which the programs found themselves after they were established. The Special Baccalaureate Program at Brooklyn enjoyed the public support of the College's administration and faculty for the first years of its existence. It only encountered difficulties . the coalition of faculty and administration which had enthusiastically supported its creation was dissolved through retirement and normal staff turn-over. But owing to its grounding in precedent and the unusually high quality of its student body, these difficulties were short-lived and the Special Baccalaureate remains a prosperous program in its twenty-first year of operation. The Queens program has also received continuing support from the faculty and administration of the College but at Queens this is less surprising than at Brooklyn. The ACE program at Queens, perhaps because it was brought forth by a younger and less prestigious group of faculty members, was not as daring in its design in 1963 as Brooklyn had been in 1954 and thus by definition the ACE program presented less of a target for attack. And the ACE program, more than any other in the study, early developed strong support among the citizens of the Borough of Queens--a fact which has encouraged the support of the College's Presidents.

The Degree Completion Program at Mundelein was not controversial among the faculty of the College at its inception and has not become controversial since. Like Queens, its design did not represent a radical departure from other practices in higher education at the time of its establishment and the numbers of mature women it has attracted over the years have helped the College to survive in an environment which has been hostile to many other small, denominational colleges.

Roosevelt's Bachelor of General Studies program, on the other hand, was relatively controversial when it was established and has grown more so since. The abbreviated planning process which led to the program and the lack of faculty involvement in that planning process have resulted in misunderstandings about the intent and the design of the program. Declines in the enrollment of the College of Arts and Sciences have increased the tendency of some faculty members to try to find a scapegoat for the University's financial problems and the addition of faculty positions in the BGS program in the face of the loss of positions in other programs has made the identification of that scapegoat less difficult.

The programs at Brooklyn, Queens, and Mundelein have long since become integral parts of their respective institutions. In fact, the program at Queens has nearly become the ordinary rather than the exceptional way for adults to begin undergraduate study just as the ACE program's current Director, Ernest Schwarcz, had hoped. But the Bachelor of General Studies at Roosevelt, even though it has been the fastest growing program at the University, has to enjoy the confidence of many faculty members in other Colleges. Its integration into the total program of the University after eight years of operation is far from complete.

CHAPTER VI

THE INDEPENDENT PROGRAMS: OKLAHOMA, GODDARD, SYRACUSE, SOUTH FLORIDA

Introduction

After the funding of the Experimental Degree Project at Brooklyn College and the publicity that attended its early years, other institutions began seriously to consider modifying their evening college or extension degree programs to make them more suited to adult learners. Planners at these institutions spoke of how adult students differed from adolescent students both in the amount the adults had experienced and in what they had experienced. Their concern was how to design programs which would allow adults to take advantage of their longer and more varied lives in meeting degree requirements.

Brooklyn had attempted to meet the different needs of adult students with interdisciplinary seminars and a system of credit for life experience. The interdisciplinary seminars helped the students in the Experimental Degree Project to accelerate their progress toward a degree by packing more material into a semester than did the traditional general education courses. The system of credit for life experience allowed students to challenge course requirements when they felt that they had already achieved equivalent knowledge or skills outside the classroom. Many institutions which considered offering special baccalaureate programs for adults seemed willing to wander no farther from tradition than Brooklyn had. Most of these institutions did not carry their initial interest in special degree programs to fruition. Some that did, such as Queens College, Mundelein College, and Roosevelt University, stayed very close to the Brooklyn model in both their instructional methods and their subject matter. But a few institutions dared to go substantially beyond Brooklyn's example.

Two of these, the University of Oklahoma and Syracuse University, created special baccalaureate programs which were both unique in the country and had no clear precedents within either institution. Goddard College established a program which was unique in the United States but which grew directly out of Goddard's other programs. Finally, the University of South Florida transplanted Oklahoma's program into a new, public institution which had virtually no history of its own against which to judge its special baccalaureate program for adults.

As the Oklahoma program, the first of the independent programs, was being planned, interest in special baccalaureate programs was reaching a peak. The Brooklyn program was nearing its fifth birthday. CSLEA held its first Leadership Conference devoted solely to the subject of adult degree programs and was spreading the word to an even wider audience through its publication program. The Office of Education and the Department of Defense were searching for ways to help military officers to become not only honorable gentlemen but also educated gentlemen. And higher education was expanding both on and off campus.

The University of Oklahoma-- The Bachelor of Liberal Studies

The extension program of the University of Oklahoma, unlike Brooklyn's, followed the lead provided historically by the University of Wisconsin and not that provided by the University of Chicago. Oklahoma's general extension program was and is oriented to serving the people of the State with a wide range of educational programs; the University, located in a relatively small town in a sparsely populated state, has had little need for an evening college. And since the evening college was not central to Oklahoma's concept of extension, it is perhaps not surprising that the special baccalaureate program for adults developed at Oklahoma is not a modification of an evening program but rather was designed to meet the needs of a dispersed clientele.

Thurman White, then Dean of Extension at Oklahoma, used the clarity of hindsight to describe the four barriers to ready participation by adults that the Bachelor of Liberal Studies breached:

> While educational institutions may have created a popular desire for a degree, they have generally made it next to impossible for the adult to be satisfied. A major barrier is the ordinary class schedule. Very few adults are able to meet classes during the day; many can and will do so in the evening, and the successful evening college is one institutional answer. Still left unserved or partially served or inconveniently served are large populations of degree oriented adults. A second major barrier to adult participation in degree programs is the rigid prescriptive requirements of most institutions. The adult is required to enroll in a course and to attend class each time it meets whether he already knows the material or not. Very few adults can bring themselves to put up with such nonsense. Here and there, advanced standing examinations do enable knowledgeable students to leap-frog certain courses, but most institutional efforts along these lines seem to do little more than play peek-a-boo with the total problem. A third major barrier is the rigid senior year resident requirement maintained by most institutions. Very few adults in military or industrial careers are in one place long enough to satisfy the requirement. Finally, adults are frequently at at all interested in the course material as organized and offered.[1]

But while the Bachelor of Liberal Studies provides an antidote to these ills, the ultimate design of the program was not the result of a logical working out of solutions to these problems. The program evolved over a number of years from the persistent efforts of a small group of faculty members. Kenneth Crook, who inadvertently started the movement toward the program, denied that he and his fellows had any clear notion of where their deliberations would lead. Crook said, in fact, "It's a little distressing to me how little I saw of the end when we started out at the beginning."[1]

---

[1] Thurman White in the Introduction to Jesse E. Burkett and Paul G. Ruggiers (eds.), Bachelor of Liberal Studies: Development of a Curriculum at the University of Oklahoma (Brookline, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1965), p. vii.

The Daydreaming Committee

The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults under the direction of A.A. Liveright was in the habit of giving small grants of money to encourage thinking about liberal adult education on campuses around the country. The Extension Division at the University of Oklahoma received one such grant for $2500 to support a faculty seminar during 1957-1958.[2] Thurman White, Dean of Extension at Oklahoma, organized the year-long seminar around four events: two one-day conferences held on campus and two weekend, residential conferences held off campus at Roman Nose State Park and Lake Texoma State Park. The residential conference at Roman Nose State Park, November 1-3, 1957, involved about fifty faculty members invited by White. The agenda for the Roman Nose Conference was open. Building had begun for the south campus of the University and discussion revolved around how the new facilities could be used for extension activities.[3]

---

[1] Interview with Kenneth Crook, March 6, 1974, p. 16.

[2] University of Oklahoma, "Annual Report of the Extension Division, 1957-58," p. 2.

[3] Interview with J. Clayton Feaver, March 7, 1974, p. 1.

Apparently White had planned that a series of committees with specific charges would be formed at the Conference and would continue to work over the year. As the conferees selected the committees on which they wished to serve, Kenneth Crook, a senior member of the Chemistry Department, suggested the formulation of an additional group, a "Daydreaming Committee," and offered himself as chairman. J. Clayton Feaver, who later became Chairman of the Executive Committee of the College of Continuing Education at Oklahoma, recalled Crook's whimsical suggestion and the reaction of the group.

> We formed /the Daydreaming Committee/ right there and I don't know if there were a half dozen or eight of us who jumped onto that committee. . . .We met in the fall and . . . we spent just pretty much the rest of the winter meeting once a week over at Ken's house, and we asked just one question: What, if we had our druthers, would we do regardless of whether it's feasible financially or what have you? What would we do? And it was out of that that grew this notion that we probably above everything else we wanted to establish some sort of a degree program and a degree program in the area of liberal studies. And the initial suggestion was that it be on the master's level and out of that committee . . . another committee was formulated to study this recommendation from the Daydreaming Committee.[1]

The recommendation of the Daydreaming Committee, and the recommendations of some of the other Committees formed at Roman Nose, were reported at the second residential conference at Lake Texoma in April 1958. The recommendations of the faculty seminar as a whole were then passed on to the President and appropriate bodies of the University. The recommendation of the Daydreaming

---

[1] Feaver, March 7, 1974, p. 2.

Committee for a liberal studies degree program was, at that point, phrased in only the most general terms:

> Among its recommendations the Seminar requested that the President and the Extension Council of the University continue to study the feasibility of a liberal arts degree program for adults under the following conditions:
>
> 1. That the program maintain high academic standards.
> 2. That it be an experimental program.
> 3. That the program not weaken instructional activities on the campus and that it be financed from additional funds.
> 4. That the salary rate for faculty members involved in the program be proportionately not less than the rate for other academic work.[1]

In the fall of 1958, what had been the Daydreaming Committee was reconstituted as the Degree Committee of the Extension Council and charged with the responsibility of carrying out the recommendations of the Daydreaming Committee. Clayton Feaver, as Chairman, called the first meeting of the Degree Committee in November and three years of deliberations began.

The Degree Committee, 1958-1961

Initially the Degree Committee did not seem to feel compelled by a clear mandate. Asked if the Committee began with any assumptions, Crooks replied:

> I don't know where it started out; I didn't know what its intentions were from the very start. They soon became the working out of a plan for a liberal studied program.[2]

---

[1] Jesse E. Burkett, "Some Problems in Designing Experimental Degree Programs in Liberal Education for Adult Part-Time Students of the University of Oklahoma," /1958/. Dittoed.

[2] Crook, March 6, 1974, p. 3

But even though the Degree Committee had virtually the same membership as the Daydreaming Committee which had remained doggedly unstructured, the Degree Committee seems to have generated a sense of direction quickly. One explanation for this new sense of direction was the addition to the Committee of a new member of the Dean of Extension's staff, Jesse E. Burkett. Burkett had come in 1957 from the School of the Air, the mass media arm of the Extension Division; to Dean White's office as director of Extension Research.[1] He had been sent to the University of Chicago, White's alma mater, to attend a summer workshop for administrators of adult education programs which was directed by Cyril O. Houle. According to Burkett the trip was as much to use the University's library and to look into the comprehensive testing used in the College of the University of Chicago as it was to attend the workshop which was less focused on adult degree programs than it was on adult education more broadly defined.[2]

The Degree Committee began working steadily toward the Bachelor of Liberal Studies, although the name of the program had yet to be chosen. Thurman White did not attend the meetings of the Degree Committee except occasionally. Yet virtually everyone interviewed who was in a position to know assumed that White was present in the person of Burkett.[1] The "vague idea" for the special degree seems to have been White's as early as 1956 or 1957.[2] White identified Burkett and brought him into the Dean's office where he could oversee the elaboration of White's "vague idea" about a special degree as well as other projects. And, as Feaver put it, Burkett followed through in the Degree Committee with meticulous attention to detail:

---

[1] "Annual Report, 1957-58," p. 2.

[2] Interview with Jesse E. Burkett, March 5, 1974, pp. 2 and 3.

> . . . Jess was in on the development here right from the beginning. I used to, used to kid Jess who was the big "honcho" on this and for some reason or another /he/ let me be what they called Chairman pro tem. I said that this is a great arrangement--the expert serves the Chairman. And he functioned in such a remarkable way. He took notes and I often kidded him saying he knew what we were saying and what we should be saying and what we would have said if we knew what we should be saying.[3]

But this is not to say that Burkett was intrusive; the Committee deliberated at its leisure with Burkett writing the minutes, ready to lend a broader perspective on the state of the art of special baccalaureate programs and comprehensive testing when it seemed useful.

Burkett did set some of the tone for the Committee, however, with an extensive working paper he developed at the University of Chicago during the summer of 1958 and shortly thereafter. This paper, forty-seven pages in length not counting its bibliography and extensive appendix, offered a number of frameworks for approaching liberal studies or general education for adults and dealt with many of the design issues of a special baccalaureate program for adults which could be offered largely as independent study.[1] The paper was ready for the Degree Committee as it held its first meeting in November 1958 and ultimately became the core of the Proposal for the BLS program.

---

[1] Interviews with Cecil Lee, March 7, 1974, p. 2; Crook, March 6, 1974, p. 3; and Feaver, March 7, 1974, p. 6.

[2] Crook, March 6, 1974, p. 1.

[3] Feaver, March 7, 1974, p. 1.

Paradoxically, Oklahoma's radical departure from the model for adult degree programs which Brooklyn represented is simpler to describe than was Brooklyn's approach. Perhaps this is true because the Extension Council's Degree Committee did not start from precedent at Oklahoma as the Experimental Degree Project's planning committee had at Brooklyn. Oklahoma's Committee was able to start fresh from a notion of what an adult student was, what liberal education was, and how an adult student might best be able to earn a baccalaureate degree within the normal constraints of his life. A description of the Oklahoma program follows. Special attention is paid to the deliberations of the Committee and its rationale for the various program components of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies.

The Design of the BLS

The Bachelor of Liberal Studies is a program in which adult students earn their baccalaureates largely through non-credit, independent study. The program, in its earliest form, offered no opportunities for specialization but rather focused entirely on the problems of man in the twentieth century as viewed through the social sciences, natural sciences, and humanities. Students in the BLS program proceed toward their degrees through three cycles of independent study, comprehensive examinations, and residential seminars in each of the broad areas of subject matter. The cycles in the three subject matter areas are followed by the preparation of an integrative paper, an integrative residential seminar, and a final comprehensive examination. Faculty supervision is provided during the periods of independent study through three faculty advisers, one in each subject area, by seminar directors during the residential seminars, and by a faculty adviser during the preparation of the integrative paper. All advisers and seminar directors are drawn from the regular faculty of the University by invitation of the Executive Committee of the College of Continuing Education. Virtually all faculty members involved in the program are compensated on an overload basis.

---

[1] Burkett, "Some Problems."

Independent Study. The Degree Committee, as it began its weekly meetings, seems to have agreed that, whatever the design of the special baccalaureate program would be, the dominant mode of study for the degree would have to be independent study. Both the relatively isolated location of the University and the typical life style of adults led the Committee to this conclusion.

Thus the Oklahoma program promised, from the start, to be substantially different from the Brooklyn model which assumed that its students would be able to come to the College whenever necessary for guidance by the faculty and support from other students. The decision of the Degree Committee to use independent study as the basic learning mode in the BLS program seems to have been underlined by the invitation the Committee extended to Dr. Samuel Pauw to address its first meeting. Dr. Pauw discussed his experience at the University of South Africa with the use of correspondence study in degree programs and the use of comprehensive examinations to validate a student's competence.[1]

Liberal Studies. The ultimate decision to focus the degree program solely on liberal studies, however, was not as early a point of agreement among members of the Committee. Burkett in his working paper outlined three possible foci for the special degree program. He proposed:

> An experimental degree program for adults leading to the Bachelor of General Studies /sic/ and including three possible variations in curriculum.
>
> A. A curriculum consisting entirely of liberal education requirements distributed among the following areas: (1) Communication and Criticism, (2) The Natural Sciences, (3) The Social Sciences, and (4) The Humanities.
>
> B. A curriculum in which the liberal education content comprises at least half of the program but which permits some degree of specialization in two or more of the liberal arts fields.

---

[1] University of Oklahoma, "Meeting of the Extension Council Degree Committee, November 11, 1958," p. 1.

C. A curriculum in which the liberal education content comprises at least half of the program and in which technical or professional studies comprise not more than one-fourth of the program.[1]

Nine months later, the Committee discussed the question of variations within the curriculum of the degree program and reached a consensus that study of technical and professional subject matter should not be included as an option in the program.[2] By June 1959, when the Committee summarized its findings and recommendations, the possibility of specialization even within the liberal arts had been deleted.[3] The Committee had settled on four areas of study for the degree: social sciences, natural sciences, humanities, and an integrative area encompassing the three other areas.

Of the possible approaches to organizing a curriculum in liberal studies (at least six were considered)[4] the Committee decided to use a problem oriented approach and to limit the curriculum to the study of twentieth century man. The choice of man in contemporary society as the overriding theme of the program resulted from a suggestion by one committee member, Gail de Stwolinski, that the curriculum be organized around critical periods in history during which the relationship of man to society and man to his physical environment could be studied. A second committee member, Rufus Hall, modified de Stwolinski's proposal by agreeing with her notion of using historical periods but suggesting that the contemporary period would be of greatest interest to the adults who would populate the BLS program and that study of the present would inevitably encourage study of the past for the evaluative perspective it could provide.[1]

---

[1] Burkett, "Some Problems," p. 45.

[2] University of Oklahoma, "Meeting of Extension Council Degree Committee, May 5, 1959," p. 1.

[3] University of Oklahoma, "The Degree Committee's Schedule of Activities, Preliminary Findings and Recommendations," /June 1959/, p. 4.

[4] University of Oklahoma, "A Proposal for an Adult Program Leading to the Bachelor of Liberal Studies Degree at the University of Oklahoma," April 1960, p. 9. (Mimeographed)

Two weeks later, the suggestion again was made that the program might focus on contemporary man and that ". . . the study of Man in the Twentieth Century could comprise the entire liberal studies curriculum."[2] In support of that suggestion, Clayton Feaver, the Committee's Chairman, proposed ". . . that such a curriculum be based on two approaches: (1) A 'Central Problems' approach and (2) A 'Central Learnings' approach."[3] He defined central problems as those issues of critical importance to the welfare of contemporary man and central learnings as the knowledge available to help solve the central problems. After considerable discussion, the Committee tentatively accepted the proposals and each member agreed ". . . to identify 'central problems' he would recommend for the curriculum and to work on the 'central learnings' for the natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities."[1] Attachments to the minutes of subsequent meetings of the Committee chronicle the acceptance of central problems/central learnings within the twentieth century as the basis for the curricular design of the BLS program.

---

[1] University of Oklahoma, "Meeting of the Extension Council Degree Committee, March 24, 1959," pp. 1 and 2.

[2] Ibid.

[3] University of Oklahoma, "Meeting of the Extension Council Degree Committee, April 7, 1959," p. 1.

Comprehensive Examinations. Given the flexibility he hoped the special baccalaureate program at Oklahoma would allow, Burkett considered comprehensive examinations essential to the design of the program. In his working paper he indicated that

> . . . examinations offer about the only solution to the problem of establishing degree competency for adult degree programs which propose:
>
> 1. To give the adult the benefit of his prior experience and self-education.
> 2. To permit the adult to compress the traditional time requirements and thus complete a degree through part-time study in a reasonable number of years.
> 3. To allow the adult to make optimum use of the wealth of methods, agencies, and experiences available for his independent learning.[2]

Burkett went on to suggest the use of two kinds of examinations:

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Burkett, "Some Problems," p. 27.

1) comprehensive examinations constructed by the faculty at Oklahoma to measure student achievement of the specific goals of the program and 2) nationally standardized examinations, such as the Graduate Record Examination, to compare BLS students with students in other programs.[1]

During the summer of 1958, while he was attending Houle's workshop, Burkett visited the Examiner's Office at the University of Chicago to learn how comprehensive examinations were used in the College. Later, when Burkett and Feaver were attending the conference on adult degree programs sponsored by the CSLEA in January 1959, they met with Benjamin Bloom, University Examiner at Chicago, to discuss the use of comprehensive examinations in the Oklahoma's program which was then in the earliest stages of planning.[2] The information gathered at these two meetings as well as the technical assistance the Committee received from consultants both from the University of Chicago and the University of Illinois seem to have been key to the successful development of the tests used in the BLS.[3] And technical assistance seems to have been all that was necessary. The members of the Committee, like Burkett, seem to have assumed from the beginning that examinations were needed to validate what the students learned independently. The question was not whether to use examinations but rather how to construct valid and reliable instruments. Crook summed up the feeling of the Committee about examinations when he said:

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 27 and 28.

[2] Burkett, March 5, 1974, p. 6.

[3] Ibid.

> the comprehensive examinations. . . were our best guess as to some way to rate the students and also I think to give an aura of respectability to the program among our colleagues who were doubters. That is, if we can say, "Now here is an examination that the students did so and so on; how would you like to give this to the majors in your department?" So I think /the motivation behind the creation of the examinations/ was rating the students and having something "objective" to show our doubting colleagues.[1]

A large portion of nearly every meeting of the Committee during the spring of 1959 was taken up with questions of how the examinations would fit into the design of the program, what they would cover, and who would write them. When the question of comprehensive testing came up at the May 5, 1959 meeting,

> Dr. Crook suggested that tests establishing the candidate's qualifications for the degree should include four comprehensive tests in (1) the social sciences, (2) the natural sciences, (3) the humanities, and (4) an over all examination which would test the student's capacity to apply interrelationships among the disciplines and to demonstrate his capacity to integrate knowledge from the three major fields of study.[2]

A slightly more elaborate system of testing was suggested at the following meeting which would have incorporated shortened forms of the area comprehensives into the system as pre-tests to be used for counseling and advanced placement early in the program. A Graduate Record Examination was also suggested as a final validating measure.[1] But the pre-tests were not developed and instead placement in the program is determined by the student's performance on early independent study assignments.

---

[1] Crook, March 6, 1974, p. 10.

[2] "Degree Committee, May 5, 1959," p. 1.

Residential Seminars. The mention of residential seminars scheduled periodically through the program appeared first, as did many other components of the program, in Burkett's working paper.[2] Burkett had suggested two kinds of residential experiences: one for orientation and another for instruction and integration of what the student had learned.

> The Orientation Residential would serve the following purposes:
>
> A. Administration of tests to evaluate adult experience following by counseling and placement in the program.
>
> B. Orientation to the resources available for pursuit of the degree program.
>
> C. Orientation on the use of the special materials furnished the student for pursuit of the degree program, and on the use of such agencies as the public library in adult learning.

---

[1] University of Oklahoma, "A Possible Testing Program for the Adult Degree (bachelor's level)," p. 1. Document attached to the May 12, 1959 minutes of the Degree Committee.

[2] Burkett denied in his interview the assertion that his working paper influenced the Degree Committee to any great extent. "The Committee didn't pay an awful lot of attention to that as a working paper and it just gave them a point of departure but after working on it for two or three years, many of the things they came up with were very similar . . . because there's just so many ways you can slice this." Burkett, March 5, 1974, p. 3.

D. Orientation of the degree student on the comprehensive testing program for evaluating degree competency and on programs required for the degree.

. . . Integration Seminars:

A. As residentials of from 4 to 8 weeks of continuous conference to be held in the adult study center.

B. Seminars meeting weekly for two or more hours for a period of one or more semesters.[1]

In the final plan, the orientation seminar was reduced to an occasional informational meeting but the "integration seminars" became a major feature of the program. One such seminar was planned as the culmination of each area of independent study and a final seminar was planned as an integrative experience at the end of the total program. Putting the fact of his own recommendation in his working paper aside, Burkett indicated that the residential experiences

> came as a result of this committee of scholars raising the question /that/ regardless of how much a person knew, assuming he could develop cognitive information to the nth degree apart from any residential experience, how long does the University want him before they confer their residential degree on him. And, of course, this--after weeks of discussion--boiled down to the fact that we need him thirteen weeks.[2]

The thirteen weeks of which Burkett spoke consist of a three week seminar at the end of each of the three independent studies in the areas of social sciences, natural sciences and humanities and a four week "inter-area" seminar meant to integrate all three subject areas through the exploration of a central problem. These thirteen weeks are the total residence requirement of the BLS program.

---

[1] Burkett, "Some Problems," pp. 34 and 35.

[2] Burkett, March 5, 1974, p. 4.

Finally, the Degree Committee included the residential seminars in the design of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies for pragmatic rather than theoretical reasons. The Committee felt that it could not free the adult students in the program totally from residence at the University and yet, because of the wide geographical distribution of students for which the Committee had planned, residence had to be concentrated into periods which adults could fit into their life style, and this meant, practically speaking, into their vacations. The tradition of the Danish folk high school which played such an important part in the development of the program at Goddard College, described later in this chapter, played no part at Oklahoma.[1] At Oklahoma the residential seminars were organized to satisfy the faculty's wish that the students spend some time in residence.

The Faculty. The faculty role in the BLS program which most closely approximates the usual faculty role in American colleges and universities is that of the seminar director. Seminar directors work in teams of two to present the four residential experiences of the BLS program. For the larger part of the program, the independent studies, individual faculty members act as academic advisers and correspondents to the students who pursue their mastery of subject matter with the adviser's help.

---

[1] Lee, March 7, 1974, pp. 4 and 5.

Crook described the adviser's role well:

> . . . We felt that there had to be some substitute for the guidance and occasional help with difficulties that an instructor in a regular course should, and I think does furnish. And since these people were going to be non-residents, there had to be some substitute for regular contact with the instructor. So, correspondence and an occasional face-to-face meeting with students via this adviser system seemed to be the best solution to this problem that we could come up with.[1]

The Committee decided that the advisers and seminar directors would all be full-time faculty members of the University chosen for this special responsibility by the Executive Committee of the College of Continuing Education.[2] With very few exceptions, both advisers and seminar directors have been hired on an overload basis. The reasons for hiring regular faculty on overload rather than establishing a separate faculty for the College or hiring regular faculty within load appear to be multiple. Feaver indicated that

> we don't have a huge faculty and more than that, our salaries are . . . fairly modest. And I think that it was a gimmick to attract faculty that we wanted.[3]

Crook, on the other hand, gave three reasons for hiring from the regular faculty on an overload basis and his reasons were slightly less pragmatic than Feaver's:

---

[1] Crook, March 6, 1974, p. 6.

[2] The Degree Committee became the Executive Committee of the College of Continuing Education when the BLS program was approved.

[3] Feaver, March 7, 1974, p. 14.

> We were consciously trying to meet objections that we knew would be raised and this was one of them. That is, that if this /program/ was done by regular faculty, then there would not be the danger which some people envisioned of a second and by inference, inferior faculty built up down here. A second reason was that if the general liberal studies approach was of value then perhaps the people who did it would carry back some of that value to their regular teaching. And the third one was that this sort of a system would attract those members of the regular faculty who were genuinely enthusiastic about the idea and would consequently be of maybe better quality than if it were done by the chairman of the department assigning one of his people. . . that he thought he could get along without the easiest.[1]

In a vein similar to both Feaver's and Crook's comments, White pointed out that, by starting the program with full-time faculty members from the rest of the University who were paid on overload, the University faced a substantially lower risk in offering the new program. If students did not materialize, the University had no long-term financial commitment to the program.[2] But since students have indeed found the BLS attractive, the initial risk of which White spoke should have been greatly reduced after the program's first few years.

It may be that continuing to operate the program on an overload basis rather than developing a full-time faculty for the BLS helps to maintain the program in a favorable financial posture from which it can be used to subsidize other ventures. Or perhaps, as White contends, the involvement of faculty from the University at large has made the special baccalaureate program a ". . . part of the mainstream of the institution."[1] At any rate, the BLS program clearly is fully integrated into the total program of the University and enjoys an enhanced stature from that integration and from the faculty acceptance of the program out of which the integration grew.

---

[1] Crook, March 6, 1974, p. 5.

[2] Interview with Thurman White, March 5, 1974, p. 12.

The Audience for the BLS. Since the BLS program was designed to serve a group of students not served by any other degree program in the United States at the time, the Degree Committee discussed at length, beginning as early as January 1960, how to select the pilot group for the program.[2] The Committee had concluded, by reflecting on the typical constraints adults experience in life, that an audience existed for a program such as the BLS, but the practical question was where to find this special group of adults. As the program moved closer to its initiation date in spring 1961, the Committee

> turned to the discussion of recruiting adult students for the pilot group. The following sources of clientele were identified and discussed: Civilian and Military Personnel at Fort Sill and Tinker Air Force Base, FAA personnel, participants in business and industrial programs of Extension, wives of faculty and of other professional people, leaders in such women's organizations as General Federation of Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters, Business and Professional Women, etc.: participants in evening college programs of other institutions in this and neighboring states. The Committee discussed at some length the possibility of

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] University of Oklahoma, "Minutes of the Extension Council Degree Committee, January 19, 1960," p. 1.

> admitting four to six residence, /sic/ undergraduate students of the University to the program. These students would be matriculated for a regular degree program at the University of Oklahoma, but would take the BLS program as a kind of honors program in addition to their other academic work. The admission of these students would serve only as a research factor in testing the suitability of the BLS for an undergraduate clientele and funds would need to be provided to pay the tuition of the small group of residence /sic/ students participating.[1]

The Committee also expressed an intention to inform alumni of the University who had not completed their regular programs about the BLS program.

Two groups, in particular, struck the Committee as primary sources of students: women and the military. As Burkett said, "We got worried it'd be predominantly a women's program" since many women had leisure time, were potentially interested in a liberal arts degree, and had either not begun or not completed a degree earlier in their lives.[2] The military, on the other hand, was putting pressure on its officers in the late 'fifties to complete degrees as one of the criteria for promotion. While the liberal studies bias of the BLS would not necessarily have been the first choice of the officers, who tended to be more pragmatically oriented, the minimal residence requirement and the flexibility of independent study was particularly appealing because of the officers' frequent transfers from one duty station to another all over the world.[1]

---

[1] University of Oklahoma, "Minutes, Extension Council Degree Committee, July 12, 1960," p. 1.

[2] Burkett, March 5, 1974, p 11.

In the process of identifying potential students, the Degree Committee invited representatives of business and industry, libraries, civil service, and of course, the military to come to the campus to learn about the program. The military commanders at Fort Sills and Tinker Air Force Base, in fact, were so anxious to make the program available to their officers that they both visited the campus repeatedly and invited the members of the Degree Committee to spend a weekend at Fort Sills as their guests to discuss the implications of the program for the military.[2] The attention the Committee received from the military seems to have caused the Committee to overestimate the military's real ability to provide students. The Degree Committee, in July 1960, considered restricting the admission of military personnel to sixty per cent of the BLS student body.[3] The Committee's fears of too many military men in the student body were not confirmed, however; the military has never accounted for an unusually large proportion of the student body of the BLS program.[4] But the student body of the BLS was positively affected by another major factor in the development of the program: a substantial grant from the Carnegie Corporation.

---

[1] Feaver, March 7, 1974, p. 9.

[2] White, March 5, 1974, pp. 9 and 10.

[3] "Degree Committee, July 12, 1960," p. 2.

[4] Burkett and Ruggiers, The Bachelor of Liberal Studies, p. 94.

Outside Funding. As with most university adult education programs, and with all but one of the special baccalaureate programs studied, the Degree Committee at Oklahoma assumed that the BLS would have to support itself financially.[1] The Committee, with this in mind, discussed potential sources of outside money for the program and enlisted the aid of the Dean's office in their search. But, for a time, it appeared that the BLS would have to rely on University funds at least for its start. In June 1959, at a meeting of the Degree Committee,

> Dean White indicated that although there would be no grants available from the Fund for Adult Education, that the Extension Division would have remnants of grants which could be used to finance the completion of the degree program.[2]

But no grant funds were then available to underwrite the initial offering of the program.

However, White and Burkett pursued their contacts with the foundations and by mid spring of the following year had submitted a committee report on the BLS to the Carnegie Corporation for its perusal. Florence Anderson, in her response on behalf of Carnegie, evinced a mild interest in the project but added that

> the Corporation has no program at present which might include

---

[1] Crook, March 6, 1974, p. 12.

[2] University of Oklahoma, "Meeting of the Extension Council Degree Committee, June 13, 1959," p. 1.

> support for the pilot phase of this undertaking . . . /but/ it is possible that we may consider supporting some activities in this area in the future.[1]

And in this case, the future boded well for the BLS program since in January 1961

> Dean White distributed to the Committee copies of a letter from the Carnegie Corporation to President George L. Cross announcing approval of a grant for the pilot project of the BLS Degree Program in the amount of $61,000.[2]

The grant funds were used, beginning in March 1961, to support with full tuition grants the first seventy-five students in the BLS program and to provide partial support for a number of other BLS students as the program progressed. The grants, which made the program tuition-free for its first group of students,[3] offset the operating expenses of the new College of Continuing Education which had been created in spring 1961 by President Cross on the recommendation of the Council on Instruction to oversee the BLS program. The grant also indirectly paid the faculty members who acted on an overload basis as advisers and seminar directors in the new program. The Carnegie Corporation grant assured the successful beginning of the first of the independent special baccalaureate degree programs for adults.

---

[1] Florence Anderson to Thurman White, March 7, 1960.

[2] University of Oklahoma, "Minutes, Extension Council Degree Committee, January 3, 1961," p. 1.

[3] "Report on the Bachelor of Liberal Studies Program, University of Oklahoma, 1963-1964," p. 1.

Summary

The Bachelor of Liberal Studies program at the University of Oklahoma was designed between November 1957 and March 1961, initially by the Daydreaming Committee and later by the Degree Committee of the Extension Council. The program was and is intended to serve a wide range of adult students and unlike the resident programs presented in the preceding chapter, the BLS offers no major or specialty within its curriculum. The BLS curriculum instead is divided into four broad areas of subject matter: social sciences, natural sciences, humanities, and the "inter-area." All the curriculum in the BLS program is centered on "Man in the Twentieth Century."

Completion of the area studies in the social sciences, natural sciences, humanities, as well as the final "inter-area" is measured by comprehensive examinations. A final paper treating some topic in depth is also required. The comprehensive examinations are prepared for largely by independent study. The only residence requirement of the program consists of the three area seminars which are each three weeks in length and the inter-area seminar which is four weeks. Faculty for the program, who act either as advisers during independent study or as seminar directors,are selected from the full-time faculty of the University by the program's Executive Committee and serve on an overload basis. The program in 1970 counted more than one thousand students at the various stages of the program.

The first seventy-five students in the program were fully funded by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation in the amount of $61,000. The program enjoyed another, much smaller grant in its history. The CSLEA provided the "seed money" for the year-long faculty seminar from which the program developed and, in this way, the $2500 from CSLEA seems to have been at least as important to the development of the program as the Carnegie grant was to its first years of operation.

The creation of the BLS in 1961 rekindled some of the excitement that had attended the establishment of the Experimental Degree Project at Brooklyn in 1954. The initiation of the BLS was particularly encouraging for the CSLEA. The CSLEA had been helpful in the design and initiation of the program at Brooklyn but had been espousing, as its primary concern, non-credit adult education. The non-credit character of the Oklahoma program seemed to endorse the CSLEA's wish for a new kind of university adult education not dominated by the credits and courses of the evening college. Brooklyn had taken a great step forward by providing a system of credit for life experience for its students but Oklahoma had gone farther by creating a virtually time and space free degree program for adults with a curriculum focused on the problems of modern man. The BLS was truly a degree program "especially for adults."

And it was in this context of excitement that the CSLEA provided a small amount of money and a large amount of encouragement to Goddard College as Goddard began working toward the establishment of its Adult Degree Program. But, paradoxically, the visits to other programs that the CSLEA funds made possible convinced the planners at Goddard to design their program based on their unique, local experience rather than to join the incipient national bandwagon which was beginning to roll toward an adult degree movement.

Goddard College--The Adult Degree Program

Goddard College was established in 1938 as a small, liberal arts college. Its physical plant is a tastefully converted, two hundred acre country estate known formerly as Greatwood Farms which borders on the village of Plainfield, Vermont. The College is the philosophical offspring of Goddard Seminary, a high school founded in 1863 in Barre, Vermont to provide an education for the children of liberally-minded leaders in central Vermont. But Goddard Seminary fell on hard times and, after a brief metamorphosis as a junior college for women, Goddard's liberal spirit was moved to a new physical location by its President, Royce S. "Tim" Pitkin, who became the founder and first president of Goddard College in Plainfield.[1]

Pitkin, who while a graduate student at Columbia University had become a disciple of William Heard Kilpatrick, wanted

---

[1] Goddard College, Bulletin IX, 4 (January 1944) pp. 24 and 25.

Goddard to be a liberal arts college, but a liberal arts college with a difference. Pitkin and the group of advisers whom he gathered around him to plan the new college determined that the curriculum of Goddard would be focused on what Kilpatrick had called ". . . wholehearted, purposeful activity proceeding in a social environment."[1] According to Evalyn Bates who was one of the first two graduates of the College and who remained on its staff for more than thirty years thereafter,.

> the new College was designed to provide the student with an educational situation in which he would face the real problems of everyday living, in which preparation for a vocation would be regarded as a part of living and not as an end in itself, in which the life of the college and the community would be so integrated as to break down the barriers which usually separate school from life, in which students might see life as a whole rather than as a collection of unrelated parts, in which the provision of educational opportunities for adults would be an integral part of the program of the college.[2]

Unlike the liberal education at the University of Chicago under Hutchins and Adler in which the method was sensitive rehearsing of the great ideas of the past as they were put forth in the great books, liberal education at Goddard attempted to put into action the ". . . school of life, of actual experiencing" which Kilpatrick had been espousing.[3] This learning-through-action came to be called the "Goddard idea" and led to Bates' definition of liberal education at Goddard:

---

[1] William Heard Kilpatrick, "The Project Method," Teachers College Bulletin X, 3 (October 12, 1918), p. 4.

[2] Evalyn Bates, "Development of the Goddard College Adult Education Program," (Unpublished Master's Paper, The University of Chicago, 1957), p. 14.

[3] William Heard Kilpatrick, Education for a Changing Civilization (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1927), p. 112.

> Liberal Education can . . . be thought of as the process by which the individual changes himself through the formation of independent opinions, the freeing of himself from prejudice and narrowness through broadening and deepening his knowledge, his skill, his understanding, his appreciations. This does not require a particular subject matter content but rather a particular approach to subject matter. Liberal education at Goddard is regarded as the process through which the individual moves along toward this broadening and deepening, motivating him toward higher levels of achievement as an individual and as a member of society.[1]

But while the process of learning rather than subject matter itself was stressed at Goddard from its first days, courses were still a major part of the curriculum, especially in a student's first three years of study. Goddard students typically enrolled in three courses per term and did not engage in any extensive independent study until their senior year.[2]

The Experiment

Beginning in fall 1959, as part of an "Experiment in Curriculum Organization" funded by the Ford Foundation, Goddard began moving away from courses and toward independent study as its primary method of teaching and learning. Independent study seemed attractive to the Goddard faculty because it allowed the student to create learning situations which were directly and intimately related to his own interests and encouraged the student early in his college program to gain the sense of independence and self-directedness that epitomized the Goddard idea. In the new scheme, independent study was not reserved for the senior year but recommended to the student in his first year,

---

[1] Bates, "Development," p. 9.

[2] Goddard College, "Report of the President of Goddard College for the Quarter Ending September 30, 1960," p. 4.

> when he is looking for and eagerly expecting a study experience quite different from that of his high school years and before he has become habituated to the teacher-dominated lecture or discussion class routine.

And through independent study, the faculty hoped to evolve an "apprenticeship relationship" with students which would

> . . . require the student to give more attention to his purposes and plans for study in a given field and allow the teacher an opportunity to operate more as a consultant and guide than as a person who gives directions and provides the answers.

To accomplish the goals of the experiment, first year students were given the opportunity to commit two-thirds of their academic programs to independent study which involved a half-day meeting once a week with the other members of the "class" and allowed ". . . for independent study with a faculty member other than the teacher of the course in which the student enrolled." The subject matter for these independent study "courses" was not set ahead of time but rather was set by the students in consultation with the faculty based on the students' individual goals. Evaluation occurred from time to time as students, with faculty assistance, judged to what extent the students were meeting the goals they had set for themselves.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*

The Experiment in Curriculum Organization continued for six years, from 1959 through 1965, and resulted in a largely course-free program at Goddard for its regular undergraduates. The Experiment demonstrated that young undergraduates could both design their own curricula by setting their own goals and could sustain themselves during long periods of independent study. It was a short step from the Experiment to the application of its findings to more mature students. Thus the Experiment not only changed the primary mode of study on campus but also served as the model for the Adult Degree Program (ADP) at Goddard. The style of teaching that members of the faculty evolved during the Experiment and the mechanics for helping students set goals and evaluate their progress toward those goals were both incorporated into the design of the ADP. But the ADP had other origins as well.

The Danish Folk High School

At the University of Oklahoma, residential seminars were included in the program's design for purely pragmatic reasons: the faculty felt that the BLS students should spend some time in residence and the University was constructing its Center for Continuing Education under a Kellogg Foundation grant at the same time that the program was being planned. The periods of residence met a faculty (and probably a student) need and the Kellogg Center provided meeting space and transient residential accommodations. At Goddard College, on the other hand, residential conferences were a part of the tradition of the institution and were thought of as more than a convenient way to bring faculty and students together.

During his graduate study at Columbia, Pitkin became interested in the place of the folk high school in the social and economic development of Denmark. After studying the purposes and organization of the folk high schools, Pitkin concluded that the impact of educational programs, especially short-term programs, could be enhanced by having the students remove themselves from the regular pattern of their lives and concentrate on learning in a residential community. In planning the academic calendar of Goddard, Pitkin included two two-month recesses during the year, one in winter and the other summer. His idea was to have the regular undergraduates work away from the College during these recesses and to bring adults to the campus then for special programs.[1] As Pitkin put it:

> One of the ideas we had was to run a Vermont version of the Danish folk high school. We knew we couldn't possibly run a long period; we thought possibly we could get people to come for a month but that didn't work out. We settled for short periods: week-ends, two or three-day conferences--but always residential conferences so the people were there overnight and they got to know one another. They were away from their homes for that period, and they wouldn't be thinking all the time about "I've got to go out to do the chores, I've got to take care of the work in the house" and what not. And, also it provided a situation in which they could mingle in an informal way and not simply listening to a talk or engaging in general debate.[2]

---

[1] Interview with Royce S. Pitkin, October 31, 1973, pp. 1 and 2.

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

Initially, none of the conferences held for adults during the winter and summer recesses were connected with degree programs. The summer conferences tended to run to the arts and the winter conferences to social issues, especially education. But as the planning for the Adult Degree Program began in 1959, the College's experience with residential conferences for adults fit neatly into the vision of Evalyn Bates and the other program planners.

Bates' Visit to Australia

The year before the Ford-sponsored Experiment in Curriculum Organization began, Evalyn Bates who was Director of Adult Education and Community Services at Goddard as well as Assistant to President Pitkin went as a Fullbright lecturer to the University of New England in New South Wales, Australia. At the University of New England, Bates became acquainted with a program of teacher education which required teachers from all parts of Australia to attend the University during the summer for supervised study and to continue their studies independently during the course of the regular school year. This experience seems to have reinforced Bates' conviction that adult students could accomplish much of the work of a degree program on their own. And while the idea for the Adult Degree Program at Goddard did not arise from her experience in New South Wales, Bates indicated that the program at the University of New England ". . . was a kind of

ERIC

pinpointing of what could be done."[1]

Planning the ADP

When Bates returned from Australia, she organized an informal committee of four to work toward the establishment of a special baccalaureate program at Goddard.[2] In the initial stages of planning, the work of Bates' committee on the adult degree program could not have easily been distinguished from the work of the faculty as a whole. The Goddard faculty, still small enough to meet every Friday afternoon in President Pitkin's living room, had just begun its Experiment in Curriculum Organization and, as George Beecher, Director of Educational Experimentation, said, "At that time, everything was done in the total faculty group."[3] Bates reported that the committee on the adult degree program met separately but ". . . reported on its work from time to time or checked with the faculty about decisions it was making about the developing plan."[4]

Progress toward the ADP was slow, not because of any noticeable opposition to the plan among the faculty but rather because an adult degree program was not the faculty's first priority in 1959 and 1960 and also because the deliberative process at Goddard was designed for consensus not speed. But by December 1961, the committee and the faculty had apparently come to an agreement on the general shape of the program. Pitkin reported these preliminary conclusions to Liveright of the CSLEA in a letter he wrote asking Liveright's advice and requesting funds to complete the plan.

---

[1] Interview with Evalyn Bates, December 10, 1973, p. 10

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[3] Interview with George Beecher, November 1, 1973, p. 3.

[4] Bates, December 10, 1973, p. 25.

> We have been concerned with the increasing numbers of students whose college careers are interrupted before their undergraduate training is completed. It seems likely that the normal course of institutional higher education, for many women as well as some men, for the next decade or so at least, will consist of one or two years of college, interrupted by marriage, child-rearing, military service, economic necessity, followed by efforts to complete the requirements for the Bachelor's degree after the lapse of a few years.
>
> Our proposal is to establish a sequence of residence-correspondence courses through which qualified men and women whose college careers were earlier interrupted may earn the Bachelor of Arts degree. Each course would comprise three parts: 1) two weeks of residence at the College, 2) five months of individual study by correspondence, 3) another period of residence.
>
> The first period would include testing, counseling for course choices, group meetings, use of the library, laboratories, and learning aids center facilities. It would provide an opportunity for the student and teacher to establish a working relationship and to design a plan of study to be carried out independently at home. During the five months between residence periods the student would complete his plan of study, sending materials, written or spoken, to the instructor for comment as they are completed. Correspondence might be extended to include communication by the use of tape recordings and perhaps telephone conferences between the instructor and the students enrolled in the course. The final phase of the course would be a second period in residence, probably for one week, to be used for group reports and discussions on individual studies, and individual evaluation sessions with the instructor.
>
> Because of the way in which our undergraduate calendar is

> arranged, during the months of January-February and July-August our facilities, including some of our instructional staff, are available for such a correspondence-residence program. In the past three years our faculty has been experimenting with independent study for undergraduates. We have acquired some experience in helping students design plans for study which they carry out largely on an independent basis. We feel prepared to extend this mode of study to adults who would be spending the major portion of their time away from campus.[1]

By December 1961, then, the design of the program had emerged from the faculty and committee meetings, but some details remained to be decided.

In the same letter to Liveright, Pitkin indicated a need for modest support to determine more precisely what the audience for the program was and to gather mailing lists of potential students, to investigate what areas were of academic interest to adults, and to prepare and distribute recruitment materials. The target date for the initiation of the program mentioned in the letter was summer 1962.[2]

Pitkin met with Liveright and his Associate Director, James Whipple, in early March 1962 after some initial correspondence. Whipple and Liveright, at that meeting, apparently attempted to dissuade Pitkin from initiating the program during the summer of 1962 and suggested that Pitkin and his colleagues visit several other institutions with special adult education programs to broaden their perspective on the state of the art.

---

[1] Royce S. Pitkin to A.A. Liveright, December 12, 1961, pp. 1 and 2.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

In his letter following his meeting with Liveright and Whipple, Pitkin concurred with their suggestion that members of the committee on the adult degree program visit other institutions: in particular, the University of Oklahoma (the Center's showcase at that time), Sarah Lawrence, and the University of Minnesota. To cover the cost of these visits, Pitkin requested a grant of $800 from the CSLEA.

Pitkin indicated that he had hoped the visits to the three institutions could be made ". . . within the next two weeks" and that the following week a meeting might be arranged with Florence Anderson and possibly John Gardner of the Carnegie Corporation.[1] Whipple, by return mail, responded:

> As for your plans, Sandy and I think you are moving a bit too rapidly. First, we believe you have gone far enough with your plans for a preliminary discussion with Florence Anderson. It is our suggestion that one of the purposes for this first visit to Carnegie is to ask advice regarding ways to accomplish your purpose, or to perfect your plan.
>
> Second, we think it is important to give some very careful thought to plans for the visits to other institutions--both as to where you go and what questions you want to ask. I believe we can be of some assistance in this connection. Furthermore, it is our assumption that suggestions will come as a result of your visit with Florence Anderson. In other words, we would recommend not trying to rush through a series of visits prior to going to Carnegie, nor to look upon the first visit there as one for presenting a specific proposal.[2]

This letter and the earlier letters from Pitkin to

---

[1] Royce S. Pitkin to A. A. Liveright, March 12, 1962.

[2] James B. Whipple to Royce S. Pitkin, March 16, 1962.

Liveright suggest a curious interplay between the Center and Goddard on the issue of the special baccalaureate program. On the one hand, Pitkin and the Goddard faculty were satisfied with the design of the program outlined in Pitkin's letter of December 12, 1961. And in that same letter, Pitkin had indicated that the Adult Degree Program ". . . should be a self-supporting venture, once it is well launched."[1] His concern, at that time, seems to have been finding a small sum to finish planning and to launch the program. On the other hand, Liveright and Whipple apparently were not satisfied with the design and seemed to want to move Goddard more in the direction of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies program at Oklahoma. And while Liveright and Whipple were ready to give advice on the design of the program as well as sources for funding it, Pitkin and his colleagues seemed to want advice only on how to secure a grant to support the program's initiation.

Liveright's objections to the design of the Goddard program were, first, that the six month study cycles proposed by Goddard would be too rigid for some adults who might need more time to complete their independent study projects and, second, that the curriculum of the program and the program's requirements were not clearly spelled out.[2] He seemed to be suggesting that the more flexible study schedule and the four required areas of study of the BLS program at Oklahoma met these objections and should be adopted by Goddard. But Goddard had only two periods of time during the year, six months apart, when adults could come to the campus for residential conferences and Goddard, through the Experiment in Curriculum Organization, had developed its own style of individually determined curriculum which it intended to use in the adult degree program. In short, Liveright's and Whipple's suggestions about rethinking the design of the ADP were largely, if politely ignored by Pitkin and the committee at Goddard.

---

[1] Pitkin to Liveright, December 12, 1961, p. 3.

[2] A. A. Liveright to Royce S. Pitkin, May 4, 1962.

Pitkin, however, did accept the Center's advice to go slowly on his approach to Carnegie. He met first with Florence Anderson, who had been instrumental in having the proposal for the BLS at Oklahoma funded the year before, to discuss the possibility of an Adult Degree Program at Goddard informally in May 1962. Pitkin recalled that

> she was very supportive on the idea and she made several suggestions about how we should present this /proposal/ to overcome what she knew would be some objections from the rest of the staff there.[1]

Goddard's formal proposal to the Carnegie Corporation was submitted in September 1962 and rejected the following month. Pitkin reported this disappointing news to Liveright and asked if he had additional suggestions about possible sources of funds.[2]

---

[1] Pitkin, October 31, 1973, p. 11.

[2] Royce S. Pitkin to A. A. Liveright, October 26, 1962.

Liveright offered to speak to the Ford Foundation on Goddard's behalf but added, "I am afraid I don't have any other hot leads at the moment."[1] Later in the fall Pitkin, in fact, pleaded his own case before the Ford Foundation since he had contacts at Ford owing to the grant Goddard had received for the Experiment in Curriculum Organization. But Goddard's luck with Ford was no better than it had been with Carnegie: Pitkin's informal discussions with Elizabeth Pascal at Ford held out so little hope that he decided against submitting a formal proposal.[2]

Hope for outside funding disappeared after Ford's unenthusiastic response to Pitkin's inquiries. But the faculty at Goddard, led by Evalyn Bates, decided to proceed with the Adult Degree Program regardless. The visits which members of the committee had made to the other programs at Oklahoma, Minnesota, and Sarah Lawrence had not changed their minds about the design of the program. Goddard had decided, as usual, to go its own way[3] and the ADP accepted its first group of nineteen students in August 1963.[4]

Design of the ADP

The design of the Adult Degree Program at Goddard, much of which has already been described, is and was from its beginning remarkably simple. Initially, admission to the program was restricted to adults who had completed satisfactorily at least two semesters of college, were at least twenty-six years old, and had been away from school for at least five years.[1] The first program activity after admission was a week-long orientation held on the Goddard campus. The orientation was combined with an opening seminar, also a week in length. During the orientation week, students were counseled and tested in preparation for their first study cycle. The opening seminar was led by three members of the regular Goddard faculty. During the opening seminar, students were helped to formulate independent study projects which they were then expected to complete in the following five and one half months of independent study. At the end of the five and one half months of independent study, the students were expected to attend another week-long residential seminar at which reports were made and progress assessed. A second six month cycle then began immediately with another week-long seminar opening the second cycle of independent study.[2]

---

[1] A. A. Liveright to Royce S. Pitkin, October 31, 1962.

[2] Pitkin, October 31, 1973, p. 11.

[3] Beecher, November 1, 1973, p. 2.

[4] Data provided by Registrar's Office, Goddard College, October 31, 1973.

Students were told how many six month cycles would be required for graduation in each of their cases following the conclusion of their first study cycle. In the last six months of his program, each student was expected to complete a "culminating study" which was a ". . . major piece of work planned around the student's needs and interests, limited only by the resources available near the student's home and at the college."[1] At the end of the final cycle, each student was required to spend three weeks in residence at the College and, upon acceptance of his culminating study, received the Bachelor of Arts awarded at Goddard's next regular commencement.[2]

---

[1] Goddard College, Bulletin XXVIII, 4 (April 1963), p. 3.

[2] Ibid., pp. 4 and 5.

The design of the ADP has changed very little since the program began in August 1963. Students are no longer required to have completed a year of college for admission nor is a minimum age specified for purposes of admission.[3] The opening seminars of each cycle tend now to be much less structured than those in the early days of the program. And the opening seminars have no overriding theme such as "Science and Human Values," "Non-Western Civilizations," or "The Individual and Society" as did the early seminars.[4] Instead a broad range of presentations are made by the faculty members in attendance for the purpose of helping students focus their interests on an independent study project which they may then pursue with an appropriate faculty member of the next six month study cycle.[5]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 5.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Bates, December 10, 1973, p. 15.

[4] Bulletin, XXVIII, 4, p. 6.

[5] Interview with John Turner, October 30, 1973, p. 7.

The most striking change in the design of the ADP has been the inclusion of credit for life experience within the options open to ADP students. At the outset, students usually were awarded advanced standing for the two semesters or more of college they had to have completed to be admitted to the ADP. But ADP students who had completed, for example, two semesters of college elsewhere, regardless of their other accomplishments, were expected to complete at least six additional six month cycles or three years in Goddard's Adult Degree Program. The assumption, according to President Pitkin, was

> . . . that the degree of any college. . . means nothing more than that one has spent approximately four years at that institution doing what the institution thinks ought to be done. And when you've said that, I don't think you can say much more.[1]

Pitkin's point of view, which was shared by Evalyn Bates[2] among others, prevailed until 1970. But in 1970, the ADP began to recognize "critical life experience" as creditable toward the adult student's degree at Goddard.

The instructions given to students to help them apply properly for credit for life experience begin with the paragraph:

> In 1970, the ADP began to accelerate students toward the B.A. on the basis of petitions describing experiences which took place outside accredited academic institutions but which were nonetheless thought to be of significant educational worth. In the beginning our efforts in this direction were hesitant. We had no clear criteria of what was and what was not acceptable, nor did we feel confident about

---

[1] Pitkin, October 31, 1973, p. 14.

[2] Bates, December 10, 1973, p. 15.

> how much acceleration ought to be allowed for various sorts of experience. We did, however, have two definite standards which, however difficult of definition, we were determined to maintain. We were not willing to accept any experience which an individual thought worthwhile, i.e., simply living was not enough. And we did not propose to play God by trying to discriminate the intensity of interior feelings known only to an individual which could not be described through analytical language. For example, we could not deal with cases having to do with falling in love, falling out of love, bearing and raising children, et cetera. None of us who have served on petition committees doubts that these experiences are, in a broad sense, the most educational which people go through, but neither were we sufficiently arrogant to believe we had reasonable measuring sticks for them.[1]

Richard Hathaway, one of the counsellors in charge of assessing life experience and a former Dean of the ADP, mentioned two criteria by which he judges experience for credit: first, the experience which a student includes in a petition for credit must be of long enough duration to have had a serious dimension and, second, the experience must be closely related to the student's educational program at Goddard.[2] This means that walking through a museum could not be considered a creditable experience simply because it would not last long enough to have had a serious educational dimension. However, studying systematically in a museum of natural history might well be creditable for a student who is interested in the culture of primitive peoples.

The key to receiving credit for life experience at

---

[1] Goddard College, "The Adult Degree Program Critical Life Experience Petition," May 1973, p. 1. (Mimeographed)

[2] Interview with Richard Hathaway, October 29, 1973, pp. 12 and 13.

Goddard is the portfolio which students must prepare and submit for scrutiny. And the most important part of a portfolio is an essay required of each student petitioning for credit for life experience in which he must demonstrate both how a particular experience had a serious educational dimension for him and how that experience fits into his program at Goddard. Further, credit for life experience at Goddard amounts to a relatively small proportion of the programs of those students who petition successfully (although the proportion is larger than that typically awarded at Queens or Mundelein). Most students who petition for credit successfully are accelerated in their programs one or perhaps two cycles saving six months to a year of work. Fewer than five per cent of those who successfully petition are accelerated more than two cycles.[1]

Program Autonomy

As the ADP was being planned and implemented in the early 'sixties, many other things were happening at Goddard. The Experiment in Curriculum Organization, begun in 1959, was moving toward its conclusion. The size of the student body was on the increase from a total enrollment of ninety-two students in 1957 to a peak enrollment of 921 ten years later.[2] And the faculty size was increasing in parallel fashion.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 13

[2] Goddard College, "Report of the President of Goddard College for the Quarter Ending June 30, 1969," p. XVa.

Goddard's physical plant was also expanding. Pitkin proposed a construction program which would have created a group of small colleges clustered under the umbrella of Goddard. His December 1963 Report included a synopsis of the plan:

> To meet the criteria of an educational unit small enough to be effective--as Goddard views effectiveness--and a business unit large enough to be economical and stable. I propose that Goddard College Corporation make plans for the creation of three or four additional educational units for 250 each. Each unit would have its own campus and faculty, determine its own social policies, and develop its own ethos, but would operate under the Goddard College charter and be guided by the policies of the Goddard Board of Trustees. The new campuses would be developed on property now owned by the College or at other convenient places nearby.[1]

The following year, construction began on the Northwood campus. Northwood and the original Greatwood campus were to be the first of the "cluster colleges."

The faculty and students already at Goddard began choosing which campus to join, Greatwood or Northwood, during the 1964-1965 academic year. In the fall of 1965, Pitkin's plan went into effect even though the construction of the Northwood campus was not complete and the Northwood students had to be housed temporarily in Plainfield and the surrounding villages.[2] Both campuses quickly developed their own sense of identity and autonomy, the one very different from the other. And Goddard College was for a time two institutions instead of one.

But the creation of a new organization for Goddard based on cluster campuses was short-lived for two reasons: enrollment in the late 'sixties and early 'seventies declined sharply from Goddard's 1967 peak and in 1968 President Pitkin suffered a severe coronary which led to his retirement in June 1969.[1] His successor reversed the trend toward autonomous campuses set by Pitkin and rejoined the Northwood and Greatwood campuses into one college. He also instituted a trimester system at Goddard in an attempt to make more effective use of the expanded physical plant over a greater portion of the year. The new calendar, however, made it very difficult for regular faculty members at Goddard to teach in the ADP because the two month periods formerly used for the residential component were lost.

---

[1] Goddard College, "Report of the President of Goddard College for the Quarter Ending December 31, 1963," p. 4.

[2] Interview with Allan Walker, October 30, 1973. p. 5.

Even before the trimester calendar was initiated, the first members of a full-time faculty had been hired for the ADP.[2] The loss of the recesses during which faculty members attached to the resident undergraduate program could teach in the ADP increased the pressure for increasing the ADP's own faculty. The result has been the creation of an autonomous administrative unit with an independent faculty to offer the Adult Degree Program at Goddard. The concept of autonomous cluster campuses on which the undergraduate programs for resident students would be offered has, in effect, been modified to create, in the case of the ADP and a small number of graduate and community service programs, the concept of autonomous cluster programs which operate under the charter of Goddard College but which are self-contained and self-regulating.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 9.

[2] Hathaway, October 29, 1973, p. 4.

The ADP, then, while it has not changed substantially from its original curricular design has changed markedly in its pattern of governance. It has grown from a program of nineteen students which was administered from the President's Office by Evalyn Bates to a fully independent unit within Goddard College with its own faculty and administrative structure. Only Roosevelt University, among the programs studied, has developed in a similar manner, but Roosevelt's BGS program and its College of Continuing Education has not achieved the total autonomy of Goddard's ADP.

Syracuse University--The Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies

Syracuse University is a large, private, non-denominational institution of higher learning founded in 1870 in Syracuse, New York. The University has had a distinguished history of extension and community service work in central New York State. Its formal extension program began in 1918 with an evening session through which some of the credit courses offered during the day on the University's main campus were also offered off campus in the evening at a location nearer the center of the city.[1] The story of the special baccalaureate program for adults at Syracuse, however, dates not from the beginning of the evening session in 1918 but rather from the creation of University College by Chancellor William Pearson Tolley in 1946.

---

[1] Alexander N. Charters, The Hill and the Valley (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education, 1972), p. iii.

Tolley intended University College to be the conduit through which the programs offered on the main campus on the hill might flow down to the city in the valley and beyond. And the first dean of University College, Kenneth G. Bartlett, clearly agreed with him. Bartlett stated in his annual report for 1946-1947:

> The name University College means that it is our function to make most of the instructional facilities of the University available to the people of central New York through the offices of a single college. We are a catalytic agent between Town and Gown. In the next few years, we hope to offer such an attractive adult education program that it will attract one in every ten in this area to some form of learning activity.[1]

While no evidence exists that Bartlett realized his hope of one in ten, University College under his leadership and that of his successors combined effectively the various extension programs of the University which predated University College and generated a remarkable number of new programs, including special degree programs for adults on the associate, bachelor, and master's levels.

Syracuse Associate in Arts for Adults

Alexander N. Charters, Dean of University College at

---

[1] Kenneth G. Bartlett as quoted in Charters, Hill and Valley, p. 24.

Syracuse when planning for the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies began, came to Syracuse from the University of Chicago in 1948. Charters had entered the University of Chicago in 1946 after the War to earn his doctorate in adult education under Cyril O. Houle and had joined Dean Bartlett's staff at Syracuse immediately after earning his Ph.D.[1] While at Chicago, Charters had become very familiar with the Great Books Program and the Basic Program in University College[2] and, in fact, wrote his doctoral dissertation on the extent to which certain mental abilities could be developed through participation in Great Books discussion groups.[3]

The movement toward a special degree program for adults apparently began early at Syracuse. The first annual report of University College, written by Bartlett, contained a mention of a special degree program for adults but no details:

> We hope to announce shortly a degree program designed especially for adults--a program which will permit the worker who could not go to college to pursue an education coincident with his work and family responsibilities--a program designed for him, rather than a warmed-over campus program designed for younger people.[4]

Charters, as Bartlett's Assistant, became involved in creating that degree program in 1949 and 1950--well before the Brooklyn Experiment and before John Diekhoff and John Schwertman of the CSLEA began speaking of "time off for good behavior" and "degree programs especially for adults."

---

[1] Interview with Alexander N. Charters, October 5, 1973, p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

[3] Alexander N. Charters, "An Evaluation of the Development of Certain Aspects of the Ability to Think by Participation in an Adult Education Program" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1948).

[4] Bartlett in Charters, Hill and Valley, pp. 24 and 25.

University College was searching for ways to create an articulated program of adult education at Syracuse in the late 'forties in contrast to the fragmented offerings of courses which preceded the establishment of University College. The trend was away from individual courses and toward clusters of courses which provided short, medium, and long term goals for adults. The original Associate in Arts program for adults at Syracuse seems to have been one outgrowth of that trend. As Charters said:

> After I got /to Syracuse/ we started what we called certificates which were thirty hour programs and advanced certificates which were sixty hours. The feeling was that for people to start out on baccalaureate degrees and take three hours at a time, the goal was so far away that it was difficult for people to get excited about it. . . . It didn't provide very much motivation.

So the certificates were instituted as stopping or at least resting places for the adult students and, as junior colleges with their Associate in Arts degrees became more common, Charters and his colleagues simply changed the name of their advanced certificate to "Associate in Arts."[1]

The Associate in Arts degree program for adults offered by Syracuse in 1950, however, was not an independent study program as the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies later would be.

---

[1] Charters, October 5, 1973, p. 7.

The initial Associate in Arts

> was a more conventional kind of degree program. It was classes. . . . But it was a degree program that had been developed with objectives having in mind adult students, not eighteen to twenty-two year olds.[1]

Regardless of the intent behind it and its target audience, the initial Associate's program at Syracuse was not a success for very practical reasons. The staff of University College

> . . . concerned with other problems, failed to promote the degree, which did not find an adequate audience. The major reason for failure in final analysis was probably that the dean who developed and nurtured the program [Charters] could not devote enough time to it after additional responsibilities were placed upon him.[2]

But just as the first Associate's program at Syracuse was failing, the Ford Foundation was expanding its activities, the Fund for Adult Education was setting its goals, and the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults was being created to help improve evening college and extension programs.

The Associate in Arts program for adults lay dormant until 1958 when Jessica Boler, one of the program administrators within University College, took an interest in reviving it. In the process of bringing it back to life, the program was substantially re-designed and was taken before the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts for its approval. (The earlier

---

[1] Interview with Clifford Winters, October 26, 1973, p. 2.

[2] Charters, Hill and Valley, p. 38.

[3] Charters, October 5, 1973, pp. 3 and 4.

AA program had been brought for approval directly to the University Senate from University College.) And as it did so often, the CSLEA provided small sums of money, one thousand dollars in 1958 and two thousand dollars in 1959, to cover some of the incidental expenses connected with the re-designing of the program.[1] The second Associate in Arts in general education at Syracuse differed markedly from its predecessor. While the first program had consisted of regular courses taught with adults in mind, the second had four blocks of requirements, two of which consisted of regular courses but the other two of which were activities especially designed for the adults in this program.

The new Associate's program began with a "core" of three seminars, one each in humanities, social sciences, and science. Each of these seminars was interdisciplinary in nature and counted for eight semester hours. The core was followed by a period of "independent study and creative work." Adults in the program were expected to spend the equivalent of a three semester hour course working on a project in their community, the equivalent of a second three hour course creating a work of art or performing a scientific experiment, and the equivalent of a three semester hour course reading with a faculty member toward ". . . the development of a public and private philosophy."

The third block of the program consisted of a fifteen semester hour requirement taken in the classroom but involving five courses selected according to each student's interests. To make certain that the courses led toward some identifiable goal, faculty concurrence was necessary. Finally, students in the program were required to select four elective courses from the offerings of the University; with the four electives the student's interest could be his guide.[1] The second AA program, unlike the first, was assigned its own "Program Administrator" and seems to have been quite popular.[2] But in another sense, it seems only to have been a means to an end, and that end was the creation of a special baccalaureate degree program for adults.[3]

---

[1] Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, "Analysis of Center Activities to Implement Policy," n.d., pp. 46 and 47.

The Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies

Since the University already had a special degree program for adults, albeit on the associate level, Syracuse, with Brooklyn College and the University of Oklahoma, had become the focus of much publicity from the CSLEA. And when the CSLEA joined with the Department of Defense and Air University to sponsor the "Conference on Special Degree Programs" at Maxwell Air Force Base in March 1963, Syracuse as well as Brooklyn and Oklahoma was asked to describe to the conference participants its experience with the Associate in Arts in general education.[1] But Syracuse's representatives at the Conference--Alexander Charters, Dean of University College; Clifford Winters, his Associate Dean; and Frederick Kramer, Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts--were not totally occupied with giving during their visit to Maxwell Field. They were able, while at the Conference, to make contact with Florence Anderson who was also in attendance and that contact led to a $50,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation to support the planning of the special baccalaureate program at Syracuse.[2]

---

[1] Syracuse University, "Associate in Arts in General Education," n.d. This document is a twelve page brochure describing the second AA program.

[2] Charters, Hill and Valley, p. 38.

[3] Winters, October 26, 1973, p. 3.

The Planning Process. Charters and his staff seem to have learned a lesson from the planning process employed for the development of the second Associate in Arts program for adults in which they had involved faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts. Immediately after Charters, Winters, and Kramer returned from Maxwell Field, work was begun on the proposal to Carnegie to underwrite the planning of the special baccalaureate program and from the first stages of developing the proposal, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts was included.[3] When the grant was made by Carnegie, Winters, who had been appointed Dean of University

---

[1] Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, "Summary Report of Conference on Special Degree Program, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, March 25 and 26, 1963," n.d.

[2] Winters, October 26, 1973, p. 7.

[3] Charters, October 5, 1973, pp. 8 and 9.

College when Charters was made a Vice President in 1964, created an ad hoc committee to plan the program made up of well-respected members of the Liberal Arts faculty and chaired by Frederick Kramer who was reputed to be one of the most powerful members of the University Senate at Syracuse.[1]

Encouraged by the success with which Oklahoma had created a special baccalaureate program which was not based on courses and the accumulation of credits, the ad hoc committee at Syracuse set out to plan a program which would expand upon the interdisciplinary portions of the Associate in Arts and which would be entirely free of regular course work. Planning for the special baccalaureate program went on for two years during which time the committee, with Winters acting in somewhat the same role to it as Burkett had to the Degree Committee at the University of Oklahoma, initially determined the method and components of the program and then split into subcommittees organized by subject matter to design its curriculum.

Design of the BA in LS. The proposal for the special baccalaureate program at Syracuse includes mentions as precedents of the Basic Program at the University of Chicago, the Special Baccalaureate Program at Brooklyn, the BLS at Oklahoma, and the

---

[1] Winters, October 26, 1973, pp. 6 and 7.

Associate in Arts program already offered at Syracuse.[1] Of these four, the Syracuse special baccalaureate seems least like Brooklyn's program. The mode of delivery of the Syracuse baccalaureate resembles that of the BLS at Oklahoma: independent study with no fixed time schedule but with periodic residential meetings of students and faculty. The curriculum of the Syracuse program, on the other hand, owes more to the great books approach of the Basic Program at Chicago than to the "contemporary man" approach of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies program at Oklahoma.[2]

The curriculum of the special baccalaureate program at Syracuse was outlined in the proposal to the University Senate as follows:

---

[1] Charles Bachman et. al., "A Proposal for Establishing a New Program in General Education for Adults to be Offered Through University College and Leading to the Degree Bachelor of Liberal Studies," April 28, 1965, p. 1. NB: The name, Bachelor of Arts, had initially been proposed for the special baccalaureate program by the ad hoc committee but had met with resistance in the Curriculum Committee of the College of Liberal Arts and, consequently, had been changed to Bachelor of Liberal Studies. However, the Board of Regents of the State of New York, not wanting to proliferate degree names in the State, changed the name of the special baccalaureate program back to Bachelor of Arts during the approval process at the State level. The University Senate at Syracuse, then, complied with what had been the original wish of the committee and approved the name Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies for the program. Charters, October 5, 1973, p. 11.

[2] See the description of the curriculum and the reading lists appended to the aforementioned proposal, pp. 12-39.

THE PROGRAM

Level I	The Humanities	The Classical World
	Science	Introduction to the Physical and Biological Sciences
	Social Science	The Individual in Society
	Mathematics	Elementary Concepts of Modern Mathematics
Level II	The Humanities	The Orbit of the Renaissance
	Science	Continuation of Study in the Physical and Biological Sciences
	Social Science	The Community and its Institutions
	Mathematics	Mathematical Methods: Option 1. Methods of Algebra Option 2. Methods of Analysis Option 3. Methods of Geometry, including Topology
Level III	The Humanities	The Age of Reason and the Romantic Revolt
	Science	The Evolution of Scientific Concepts
	Social Science	Society, Culture, and World Community
	Mathematics	Mathematics in the Realm of Thought: Option 1. Historical Development of Mathematical Concepts Option 2. Foundations of Mathematics Option 3. Technique in Applications
Level IV	Required:	
	The Humanities	The Modern World of Arts and Letters
	Senior Essay	
	Electives*	
	Science Social Science Mathematics Foreign Language	Selected Problems

*The student will elect two of the four options.[1]

---

[1] Bachman, "Proposal," p. 7. This Schema is a facsimile of the corresponding page in the proposal.

The design of the Syracuse program thus involved four levels of curriculum which seem to correspond to the four years of a resident, baccalaureate curriculum. The unifying concept of the curriculum is history. Each of the four curricular components--humanities, social science, science, and mathematics--were included at each level with the exception of the fourth level in which the student's required senior essay stands in lieu of either further work in social science, science, or mathematics. Three levels of mathematics is required of all students in the Syracuse program. No other special baccalaureate program studied required an equivalent amount of mathematics and, in fact, most other programs make it possible for adult students to complete their entire program without studying mathematics.

The residence periods included in the design of the liberal studies program at Syracuse resemble those at Oklahoma both in duration and in scheduling. The committee described the required periods in residence as follows:

> The program is essentially non-residential in nature. It is based upon the belief that many adults have the capacity, the desire and the stamina to pursue such a course of directed self-study. Resident instruction and evaluation are provided during a three week session each summer and during week-end seminars at mid-semester and between semesters. The total time spend on campus each year is thus:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | In week-end seminars | 6 days |
> | In summer session | 18 days |
> | | 24 days |
>
> I~ addition all students admitted to the Bachelor of Liberal Studies course will spend an initial orientation session of three weeks on campus for evaluation, placement, and

program planning.[1]

The residency periods in the Syracuse program, like those at both Oklahoma and Goddard, are scheduled to take advantage of summer vacations enjoyed by many adults. The Syracuse design, in addition to the summer residency period, included additional brief periods of residency during the year to reinforce the efforts of its students who were working otherwise without the benefit of face-to-face interaction with faculty and other students. These additional week-end residential periods seem to be an improvement over the Oklahoma schedule which does not provide the same interim support for its students.

Although not specifically defined in the proposal, admission requirements for the liberal studies program were apparently intended to be stringent owing to the difficulty the committee felt students would face in their attempts to complete a baccalaureate degree largely on their own.[2] The proposal includes one brief statement about the general criteria for admission:

> Of primary consideration in the selection of program participants will be an evaluation of academic maturity and strength of purpose and commitment to higher education. Unique educational and work experiences will be given desired attention in selecting participants.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 5.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 9.

But beyond quoting federal statistics that ". . . there are several hundred thousand adults at the present time who fail to meet the degree requirements of their career fields in the Armed Forces, the Civil Service, in industry and business"[1] and implying that preference in the selection process would be afforded persons who could demonstrate a high probability of working effectively on their own, no further mention was made of the potential student body for the program in the proposal.

Problems with the BA in LS. Whatever the student body the committee hoped it could attract to the new program the problem has been that too few students have enrolled and fewer still have made their way through the program.[2] The low enrollment, given the fixed cost of a core faculty, has caused the expense of the program to outstrip its income from its earliest days. The current head of the program, Ruth Sisley, indicated that

> the goal was sixteen faculty for about two hundred students. That's a very good ratio of faculty to students. Seemed well within grasp. But it never happened, never happened. I think the highest we ever got with those sixteen faculty may have been somewhere around one hundred students.[3]

The committee's enrollment projections have not, unfortunately, proved accurate and, to compound the problem, both the design of the program's curriculum and the basis upon which its faculty have been paid did not provide the flexibility which would have allowed necessary adjustments.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2.

[2] The program has experienced a drop-out rate of more than sixty per cent since its beginning. Interview with Ruth Sisley, October 26, 1973, p. 6.

[3] Ibid., p. 7.

In the Syracuse program, since each curricular component appears at each level of the program, a minimum of four faculty members is needed to provide instructional services for each student during each independent study period. In the Oklahoma and Goddard programs, on the other hand, each student's progress is followed by a single faculty member in each independent study period. The Syracuse program, then, assuming the same rate of pay per faculty member in all three programs, has inherent in its design direct instructional costs which are four times higher than those of the other two independent study programs already described.

But the financial losses which the Syracuse program has been suffering since its inception could be reversed if the number of students enrolled could produce a faculty to student ratio of at least one to twelve or if the faculty costs could be dramatically reduced. Recent modifications of the program's design may make it more attractive to adult students and thus increase enrollments, but an increase of one hundred per cent or more is needed to generate tuition revenue sufficient to make the program self supporting. It remains to be seen whether such an increase in enrollment is possible especially in New York State with the proliferation of state supported external degree programs. And while some adjustments in instructional costs have also been made, these seem too small to rectify the financial situation of the program without substantially increased tuition revenues.

The financial problems of the Syracuse program which began to be recognized as the program moved into the 'seventies were the result of defects in the original design of the program. The defects seem to have resulted both from the perspective which the program's planners brought to their task and from the state of higher education in general and University College in particular in the mid 'sixties when the program was being developed.

Prestigious faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts were given their heads in planning the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies. They seem to have taken as their goal the modification of a traditional liberal arts curriculum to make it more accessible to adult students. But they emphasized modifications in the traditional delivery system more than modifications in the content of the curriculum. Even mathematics was retained in a prominent place in the curriculum on the stated grounds that it was ". . . an excellent device for learning critical and constructive methods" and because mathematics was ". . . useful, often necessary, in contemporary thought."[1] Too little attention seems to have been paid to what adult students might have wished to study and to what they would be able to accomplish on their own.

Further, the same highly respected faculty members who planned the program and shepherded it through the Senate were engaged to teach in it. The reputation of these men clearly assured a fair hearing for their proposal in the Senate but the creation of a faculty for the subsequent program which was made up of relatively highly paid, full professors resulted in the unusually high instructional costs the new program faced. And while the faculty members were compensated for their work in the program in a variety of ways, both within their loads and as overload, during the first year of the program's operation,[1] the pattern soon became extra payment as overload for work in the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies. This assured the continued involvement of the cream of the Liberal Arts faculty in the program but also added to the financial burden of the program since the professors were paid an overload rate based on a substantial percentage of their annual salary.[2]

---

[1] Bachman _et al_., "Proposal," p. 9.

BA in LS: A Part of the Whole. The financial problems of the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies must be viewed, however, in the context of the steadily increasing enrollments in University College during the 'sixties. University College enjoyed 1200 course enrollments in its second year of operation under that name; by 1962 University College accounted for almost 11,000 enrollments at Syracuse.[3] In comparison, then, even the overly optimistic enrollment projections of two hundred students for the liberal studies program would have made little difference in the total picture of the College and the fact that the projections were in error by a factor of two also made little difference.

---

[1] Frederick Kramer to Alexander Charters, July 13, 1966.

[2] Sisley, October 26, 1973, p. 5.

[3] Charters, Hill and Valley, pp. 23 and 73.

The Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies program is not now, nor was it when it was planned, one of the central programs of University College. Clifford Winters, Dean of the College when the program was instituted, denied that the liberal studies program was ever expected to be self supporting. He called the program, using marketing terms, a "loss leader" for the other programs of the College and a "prestige item."[1] But while the College could afford to support this small and prestigious program during the 'sixties, the University is apparently unwilling to do so in the face of the financial pressures of the 'seventies. Those in charge of the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies program have chosen to modify both the original design of the program and to restrict the amount that can be paid to the program's faculty for overload. Whether these measures will be sufficient to save the program remains to be seen but at present and for the last few years the program has been in dire financial straits.

Some of the modifications of the program's design are treated in the next chapter, but first a discussion of the Bachelor of Independent Studies program at the University of South Florida--another special baccalaureate program which seems to be facing financial hardship but for reasons very different from those at Syracuse.

---

[1] Winters, October 26, 1973, p. 9.

The University of South Florida-- The Bachelor of Independent Studies (BIS)

The Bachelor of Independent Studies program at the University of South Florida (USF) is the second youngest of the programs studied. Had all gone well in the process of its development, it would have been one of the oldest special baccalaureate programs in the country, but all did not go well. The University of South Florida, located in Tampa, was founded in 1956 and welcomed its charter class in 1960 . In March, 1963, Russell Cooper, Dean of Liberal Arts, and Calvin Miller, Director of Continuing Education, attended the Maxwell Field Conference on adult degree programs. They returned to USF interested in instituting a special baccalaureate program ". . . which would allow mature individuals to work toward a bachelor's degree almost entirely by means of independent study."[1] The new BLS program at the University of Oklahoma was their model.

By fall 1963, President John S. Allen had been persuaded to appoint an ad hoc committee to review adult degree programs at other institutions and to design a program for USF.[2] A preliminary set of recommendations was put forth by the committee in March 1964 and a fully developed proposal went to the Senate in July 1965. But approval was not forthcoming in the Senate: a motion to table ended the debate at least for the time.[1]

---

[1] Paul R. Givens and Calvin C. Miller, "A Proposal for the Establishment of a Bachelor of Independent Studies Degree Program at the University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida," March 4, 1966, pp. 3 and 4.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

The Carnegie Corporation had funded both the BLS at Oklahoma and the BA in Liberal Studies at Syracuse. Paul Givens, one of the authors of the USF proposal, had hoped to find support for his program as well but recognized the difficulty he would face if he approached the Carnegie Corporation with a proposal which did not have at least minimal support in the faculty. With this concern in mind, he returned to the Senate in September 1965 and argued for the approval of the proposal in principle so that he could continue his efforts with the Carnegie Corporation. The proposal was returned to the floor and the "concept" of the program was approved.[2]

While Givens was searching for outside funding, he also took the proposal before the State Board of Control, later renamed the Board of Regents, for approval and received it. The only change the Board effected was the change of the name of the proposed program from the Bachelor of Liberal Studies to the Bachelor of Independent Studies. "Liberal," it was feared, might invite the wrath of a conservative legislature regardless of the context in which the word was used.[1] But the two approvals meant little in reality because neither Carnegie nor any other foundation or agency agreed to fund the BLS. Givens and Miller tried once more to make possible the initiation of the program by resorting to the University's internal budgetary process in spring 1966. The program was not funded, however, and the proposal was allowed to become dormant.[2]

---

[1] Ralph C. Boston to Members of the BLS /sic/ Adult Degree Ad Hoc Committee, April 3, 1967.

[2] *Ibid.*

After a year had passed and Richard Brightwell, formerly a staff member of the Extension Division at the University of Oklahoma, had succeeded Calvin Miller as Director of Continuing Education, President Allen, who favored the creation of a baccalaureate program for adults, was persuaded for a second time to appoint an ad hoc committee. Brightwell, not overly subtle about his admiration for the Oklahoma program, recommended to the committee at one of its first meetings ". . . adopting the Oklahoma Bachelor of Liberal Studies degree program, adapting the material for USF terminology." And at the same meeting, Brightwell suggested bringing in ". . . . a distinguished professor from Oklahoma who had worked with their adult program, for consultation."[3]

Although the BIS program as finally proposed and approved was virtually identical to the BLS at Oklahoma, differing only in book selections and in specific admission criteria, the ad hoc committee deliberated for nearly a year on the design of the program. Clayton Feaver and Jesse Burkett visited USF in March 1967 to spend a day with committee members and other interested faculty and were apparently very persuasive in discussing some of the academic issues which had been troubling some committee members.[1] But generally the committee debated, meeting after meeting, on the mechanical details of the program. The documents available, and few are available after June 30, 1967 when the Continuing Education staff was drastically reduced, suggest that the committee suffered from a lack of structure and direction as compared to the Degree Committee at the University of Oklahoma. Perhaps the difference in the tone of the two sets of minutes and in the productivity of the two committees can be accounted for, to a great extent, by the difference in the ages of the two institutions and the length of time that the individuals involved in developing the program had been on their respective staffs.

---

[1] Interview with Kevin Kearney, May 6, 1974, p. 18.

[2] Ibid., p. 3.

[3] University of South Florida, "Minutes of the Ad Hoc Committee, February 20, 1967," p. 1.

Brightwell, for example, who chaired the ad hoc committee beginning in January 1967 was after three years at USF an "old timer," known more broadly within the USF community than most staff members because of his involvement in musical performances which drew large crowds from the University.[2] Kevin Kearney, who became Director of the BIS program, had joined the staff at

---

[1] Kearney, May 6, 1974, p. 4.

[2] Interview with J. Richard Brightwell, May 6, 1974, p. 3.

USF in 1964 as well.[1] And so it was with the other committee members. The University of South Florida in 1967 simply had no faculty members comparable in prestige and influence to those who had been on the Degree Committee at Oklahoma, for example, because in 1967 the University of South Florida had been in operation only seven years and had not yet developed a reasonably stable informal structure.[2]

The BIS at South Florida, then, which was approved by the University's Senate and re-affirmed by the State in spring 1968,[3] did not grow out of the established political structure of the institution as had been the case at Brooklyn, Oklahoma, Goddard, and Syracuse. The idea for the program had originated in the administration and was actively advanced by the administration. Further, Brightwell did not have the option of garnering support for his proposal from influential faculty members, as had Sleeper at Queens and Marx at Roosevelt, because the structure of influence among the faculty at USF had not yet evolved sufficiently to be useful. The BIS at South Florida, the long hours of deliberation by the faculty on the ad hoc committee notwithstanding, was primarily imposed on the faculty of the University just as the Degree Completion Program had been imposed on the faculty at Mundelein. And while this imposition did not generate any more overt faculty opposition to the BIS at USF than it had to the DCP at Mundelein, neither did the imposition of the program generate a sense of commitment to the program on the part of the faculty. Therein lie some of the problems that the program has faced and is still facing.

---

[1] Kearney, May 6, 1974, p. 3.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 3 and 4.

The Design of the BIS

As was stated earlier, the design of the BIS is essentially that of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies program at the University of Oklahoma which was described in detail earlier in this chapter. As summarized in the final proposal for the BIS, the steps in the program were:

1. Admission--Advisement--Enrollment--Orientation.
2. Supervised independent study in issues involving the Humanities, Natural Sciences and Social Sciences.
3. Three-week campus summer seminar in each of the three areas of study.
4. Inter-area independent study including completion of a thesis.
5. Final four-week campus summer seminar in inter-area studies.
6. Recommendation for the degree.[1]

Other than differences in the book lists provided for independent study few changes initially were made in the model provided by BLS. However, some changes have been made in the BIS program since it was first offered in spring 1969.

---

[1] "A Proposal for Developing a Bachelor of Independent Studies Adult Degree Program, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida," /1968/, p. 10.

The requirement that students be at least twenty-five years of age, which had been one of the entrance requirements at Oklahoma as well as at South Florida, has been dropped.[1] The examination procedure initially copied from the Oklahoma program has been changed from a heavy reliance on objective tests developed by committees to a reliance on subjective tests developed for each student by his adviser and graded by a committee of three with the adviser serving as chairman.[2]

Finally, the small numbers of students who initially joined the BIS program caused a revision of its design in the "inter-area" component. Oklahoma, thanks to its grant from Carnegie, had begun its program with seventy-five students and had added an equal number each year for the first few years. As a result, when the various seminars were scheduled a sufficient number of students was ready to take them. USF, on the other hand, had begun its program with no outside funding. Its students had to pay their own way and thus the initial enrollments were very small. As the first two students in the BIS approached the fourth component of the program, the inter-area independent study and seminar, Kearney began to look for alternatives to this requirement which would meet the students' educational needs but spare the program the cost of offering an inter-area seminar for two students.

---

[1] Kearney, May 6, 1974, p. 9.

[2] Ibid., pp. 5-7.

Kearney ultimately settled upon the preparation of a thesis and its oral defense as a substitute and the program's Council, after substantial debate, concurred.[1] The fourth area requirements of the BIS now include

> inter-area reading, thesis prospectus, researching of approved thesis topic, preparation of a provisionally acceptable thesis, thesis oral examination, revision and final acceptance of thesis.

The preparation of the thesis is supervised by a committee of three advisers, one each from humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.[2]

With these few exceptions, the BIS at the University of South Florida is as nearly identical to the BLS at the University of Oklahoma as the Director and his faculty committee can make it. It has, unfortunately, many problems which Oklahoma's program does not face and the problems at USF do not seem to flow from the design of the program as they do at Syracuse but rather from the manner in which the program was established and the position it now holds within the University.

Problems with the BIS

The initial problem which the BIS program encountered has already been mentioned. The program was not imposed upon the faculty against its will. The faculty does not seem to have come together sufficiently as of 1967-1968 to have exerted a "will." And thus the faculty neither strongly supports the program nor does it oppose it. Second, the founding President who favored the creation of a special baccalaureate program has since retired and his successor, while not opposed to the BIS program, is not an ardent supporter of it either.[1] Third, the ethos of the University of South Florida is markedly different from that of the University of Oklahoma where the BLS program works well. As Kevin Kearney, Director of the BIS, indicated

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 7 and 8.

[2] University of South Florida, "Modification of Inter-Area Requirements," November 1, 1972.

> This is not the University of Oklahoma. . . . We do not have a Kellogg Center; we are not landlocked. We are not in the middle of the country; we are in a cosmopolitan area. We have beaches. We have sailboats. We have fishing. We have tourism all around us and it's a whole different ball game. This is an urban university.[2]

The consequence is that faculty members are not willing to spend additional time advising students in the BIS program for a nominal stipend. About forty faculty members advise students but their advising load tends to be two or three students as compared to ten or fifteen for faculty advisers at the University of Oklahoma.[3] Should the program experience a sharp increase in enrollment, it is doubtful that sufficient numbers of advisers could be found unless stipends were raised substantially.

---

[1] Interview with Richard Berkley, May 6, 1974, p. 6.

[2] Kearney, May 6, 1974, p. 12.

[3] Brightwell, May 6, 1974, p. 4.

Fourth, enrollments in the program had not approached the projections contained in the proposal for the program. The proposal suggested a great need for the program and projected more than three hundred enrollments within the program's first three years. At that rate, the program, it was argued, would be self-supporting.[1] But enrollments have inched their way after five years of operation to approximately one hundred students and seem to be stalled there. Thus while the program does not show as great a dollar deficit as the Syracuse program, it clearly is not self-supporting.

Finally, the program is understaffed and underfinanced. When the program began, the Director was given one secretary to help him organize the advisers for the program and recruit students. Since then he has received one additional position.[2] Owing to State regulations which forbid the payment of overload to faculty members for anything but non-credit adult education, the Director of the BIS program has no budget to pay faculty members but must rely on his counterpart in the non-credit adult education program to make payments to faculty members working in the BIS program.[3] And, unlike the situation at the University of Oklahoma where a special college was created to oversee the operation of the BLS program, the Director of the BIS at USF must vie with Deans of Colleges for funds without the benefit of a position comparable to theirs in the formal structure of the institution.

---

[1] Proposal /1958/, p. 6.

[2] Kearney, May 6, 1974, p. 4.

[3] Brightwell, May 6, 1974, p. 7.

Thus while the design of the BIS at the University of South Florida is sound, judging from the success of the BLS at Oklahoma, the BIS has not been a success from an institutional point of view. Neither did it begin with sufficient financial support from the University nor has it generated large enough enrollments to make its presence felt at USF. Major adjustments will have to be made if the program is to survivive. But to say the program has not succeeded from the institution's point of view tells only part of the story. When asked whether the program was successful, Richard Berkley, a member of the second *ad hoc* committee and a faculty member in the program, was frank in describing the program's problems but also quick to assert that, from the point of view of those students who have completed or are completing the BIS degree, the program has been successful because it has changed their lives for the better.[1]

Summary

The four special baccalaureate programs for adults offered primarily through independent study have had a mixed record of success. Unlike the resident programs, all of which have achieved substantial success within their institutions, two of the independent programs have succeeded and two have not. The Bachelor of Liberal Studies program at Oklahoma, judged by the innovative character of its curriculum and the size of its enrollment, can clearly be called a success as can the Adult Degree Program at Goddard. The Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies at Syracuse, on the other hand, seems to have an internally consistent, well-planned curriculum which does not appeal to many adults and also seems to have established a financial structure which cannot support the program at less than optimal size. And finally, the Bachelor of Independent Study program at South Florida seems to have a workable curriculum but neither the financial support nor the support of the faculty needed to grow to stable size.

---

[1] Interview with Richard Berkley, May 6, 1974, p. 7.

The acceptance of the resident special baccalaureate program and the integration of these programs into the institutions which sponsor them seem to have been contingent on the early and full involvement of senior faculty members in the planning process. Brooklyn's program is an example of early and full involvement which resulted in the acceptance and integration of the Special Baccalaureate Program into the College. Roosevelt's program is an example of the lack of early or full involvement which has resulted in resistance to acceptance or integration of the Bachelor of General Studies program into the mainstream of the University.

The assertion that early and full involvement of senior faculty leads to acceptance of the special program seems to hold for the independent programs as well as the resident programs.

Oklahoma and South Florida seem to parallel Brooklyn and Roosevelt respectively. But early and full involvement did not assure the success of the Syracuse program even though the program certainly has been accepted by the University's faculty and integrated into the operation of University College. The BA in Liberal Studies has not been successful as a program because its planners seem to have focused too much on their own conception of an ideal liberal arts curriculum and not enough on the interests of the program's potential audience. And, further, the financial structure inherent in the design of the program has proved unworkable with the low faculty to student ratio which the program has experienced.

Early and full involvement of senior faculty, then, has been an important factor in the success or failure of each of the programs whether resident or independent. But the case of Syracuse supports the assertion that early and full involvement is not sufficient for success. And the case of South Florida seems to indicate that even a workable and appealing curriculum, without early and full involvement, is not enough to assure success.

CHAPTER VII

BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS: THEIR FUTURE

Since the oldest special baccalaureate program for adults has not yet reached its twenty-first birthday, it is much too early to judge whether or not this small group of programs had had any lasting effect on American Higher education or even on adult education. Instead it might be appropriate to attempt to guess where these programs are going and how they have changed from their establishment to the present. Specific instances of change have been mentioned from time to time in previous chapters. In summing up, some broader trends are suggested.

Trends in Program Design

At least two aspects of program design seem important to consider in identifying the direction of changes in design.

One aspect is the curriculum, what the students are expected to learn, and the other is the delivery system, how and where the students are expected to learn. The two program types, resident and independent, which were used to classify programs in the two preceding chapters were created on the basis of the delivery systems of the programs. But the eight programs already discussed do not fall into the same groupings if curricular innovation is used as the criterion for division.

From Increased Access to a New Curriculum

The Experimental Degree Project expressly avoided changing the goals of the liberal arts curriculum offered at Brooklyn College but rather attempted to increase the number of ways that adults would be allowed to demonstrate their achievement of the established goals.[1] The two major modifications of the delivery system for the Project were an expansion and redefinition of an existing system of credit by examination and the creation of accelerated courses. But no change was made in what was required for the degree and all requirements not met with credit for life experience had to be met in the classroom.

The designers of the second special baccalaureate for adults, however, dared to modify both the delivery system for their program and its curriculum. While the goals stated for the Bachelor of Liberal Studies program at the University of Oklahoma do not differ substantially from the goals stated for the Bachelor of Arts at Brooklyn College,[1] what is studied at Oklahoma differs greatly from what is studied at Brooklyn. The content at the University of Oklahoma is focused on man in the twentieth century while the content at Brooklyn College, and in other more traditional programs, is focused on the knowledge man has gained over the centuries and the disciplines which have helped him organize that knowledge.

---

[1] Bernard H. Stern and Ellsworth Missall, Adult Experience and College Degrees (Cleveland, Ohio: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1960), p. 6.

But while Brooklyn with its resident program maintained a traditional curriculum and Oklahoma with its independent study program created a curriculum designed "especially for adults," not all resident and independent programs followed their leads. The planners at Syracuse attempted to design a liberal arts curriculum of a most traditional kind but decided to best Brooklyn by offering the program through independent study.[2] And Roosevelt's program contains both regularly scheduled courses offered by the traditional departments and interdisciplinary seminars offered by its special baccalaureate program's own full-time faculty.

The tendency in the programs in general, however, has not been toward innovative curricula. With the exception of the

---

[1] For statements of objectives for the two baccalaureate programs see "A Proposal for An Adult Program Leading to the Bachelor of Liberal Studies Degree at the University of Oklahoma" (Norman: The University of Oklahoma, 1960), p. 6 and Myrtle S. Jacobson, Night and Day (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1970), p. 48.

[2] Interview with Clifford Winters, October 26, 1973, p. 3.

Bachelor of Liberal Studies program at Oklahoma and its offspring, the Bachelor of Independent (now Interdisciplinary) Studies at South Florida, the curricula of the special baccalaureates have been no more innovative than the curricula of undergraduate programs intended for younger students. But if the special baccalaureate programs for adults have failed, in general, to produce innovative curricula, they have succeeded in the creation of new delivery systems or in the modification of existing ones. The number of alternatives for meeting degree requirements open to adults has increased substantially with the advent of the special baccalaureate programs.

From One Method to Many

Each of the eight programs already discussed was initially designed around one predominant mode of delivery. Brooklyn set the pattern for the resident mode and Oklahoma for the independent. But over time, some of the directors of the programs have realized that a single mode of delivery, by definition, excludes those potential students who either cannot or prefer not to take advantage of it. As was mentioned earlier, the Adult Continuing (now Collegiate) Education program at Queens College began in 1970 to encourage its students to work independently if they wished and provided peer tutors and a master teacher to help them.[1] Roosevelt

---

[1] See pp. 171-173.

University is currently involved in the development of an independent study version of its resident program under a grant from the Lilly Endowment. Syracuse University has modified its approach to liberal studies so that students in the BA in LS program may meet some of their requirements in the classroom instead of on their own.[1] And the newest of the special baccalaureate programs studied seems to have benefited from the experience of the earlier programs. It has a multiple method approach as part of its design.

SUNY Brockport--The BA in LS. The Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies program at the State University of New York College at Brockport (SUNY Brockport) combines many of the features of the BLS program at Oklahoma and the BGS program at Roosevelt but it goes beyond both.[2] The Brockport program was developed between spring 1967 and spring 1969 by Richard J. Elton, then Director of the Office of Continuing Education, his Assistant Lynn Johnston, and a committee of the Faculty Senate. The program was to be part of a master plan for adult education at Brockport which Elton had devised in 1966.[3]

The BA in LS at Brockport resembles the Oklahoma program in its reliance upon large blocks of study in the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and an integrating area, each followed by seminars and examinations.[1] It resembles the Roosevelt program in its incorporation of courses already offered at the College in its requirements and in its use of an initial seminar, like the Pro-seminar at Roosevelt, to orient adult students on their return to formal education. But the Brockport program differs from the programs at Oklahoma and Roosevelt in the wide variety of means it provides for adults to meet their degree requirements.

---

[1] Interview with Ruth Sisley, October 26, 1973, p. 16

[2] Interview with Richard J. Elton, January 3, 1974, p. 7.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 4 and 5.

Adults in the special baccalaureate program at Oklahoma must meet all the requirements for their BLS through independent study and attendance at short-term, residential seminars. Students at Roosevelt must, at least at the present time, rely almost entirely upon residence course work to meet the requirements for the BGS. But adults in the BA in LS at Brockport may meet degree requirements in at least nine ways. Independent reading programs are available for both whole areas (each of which are the equivalent of twenty-four semester hours) and half areas. Televised courses, correspondence study, and classroom courses can be combined with independent reading to meet area requirements. Transfer credit from other accredited institutions, not recognized at Oklahoma until recently, may be substituted for part or all of an area and travel-study programs may be used toward the degree. Both proficiency examinations and credit for life experience may preclude the need for any of the foregoing methods of learning by validating the competency of individuals.[1]

---

[1] State University of New York College at Brockport, "The Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies: An Adult Degree Program," p. 4.

The variety of options open to adults in the BA in LS makes careful advising essential to the functioning of the program. In an attempt to insure that students entering the program understand the various alternatives open to them, an "Enrollment Seminar" is required of all students after they have been admitted to the program and have taken the CLEP General Examinations. Proficiency examinations are also available for the three areas of study as well but fewer than half the students take advantage of any of these examinations and fewer than one in twenty attempt all three.[2] The Enrollment Seminar, one day in length, is meant to help students understand and prepare for their programs. Typical learning difficulties experienced by adults returning to school are discussed. Verbal skills are assessed ". . . with special emphasis given to independent study techniques." And each student leaves the Enrollment Seminar with his previous college work, if any,evaluated and his future program planned.[3]

Following the Enrollment Sem ar, students in the BA in LS at Brockport begin a period of individual study which, unlike Oklahoma, may or may not be taken independently. And when twenty-four semester hours or their equivalent are earned, the related Area

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 8 and 9.

[2] Interview with Janet Beck, October 23, 1973, p. 14.

[3] "The BA in LS," p. 7.

Seminar may be taken. Area Seminars are constructed around current problems which may be understood more fully with the help of the disciplines in the area under study. Area Seminars are offered either on weekends during the fall and spring semesters and for three week sessions during the summer. These three seminars are each followed by an Area Project which is most often a paper but may take other forms. The Area Project must be completed within six months of the end of the corresponding Area Seminar.[1] The individual study periods for the three areas may, again unlike Oklahoma, be taken concurrently rather than in series.

The final requirement of the BA in LS at Brockport is the Integrating Area followed by a comprehensive examination and an Integrating Project. The Integrating Area Study Program includes a period of individual study or course work, an Integrating Area Seminar scheduled either on weekends during the academic year or in a three week period during the summer. The final Integrating Area Project is not restricted, as are the Area Projects, to any of the three areas of study but may be interdisciplinary in the broadest sense of the term. And, like the Area Projects, the Integrating Project is due within six months of the Integrating Seminar.[2]

The BA in Liberal Studies at Brockport, then, may range in its configuration, depending on the choice of the student, from a program which closely resembles the evening college programs established in the early part of the century to a program which is accomplished almost entirely on an independent basis. And, given the possibility of mixing the alternatives by which the requirements may be met, the BA in LS allows students a wide range of options between course work and independent study including televised courses, correspondence study, on the one hand, and proficiency examinations and credit for life experience, on the other.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 10 and 11.

[2] Ibid., p. 12.

The Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies program at SUNY Brockport, then, has the most elaborate design of any of the special baccalaureate programs for adults studied. But other programs, particularly those at Queens College, Syracuse University, and Roosevelt University, are moving in the directions of providing as many options for their students as they can. And although not all adults in these programs take advantage of the additional options open to them, the more elaborate the design of the program, the more adults potentially have access to it.

From Liberal Studies to a Vocational Orientation

Of the nine special baccalaureate programs studied, only Roosevelt had vocationally oriented specialties as part of the design of its original program. The other programs, either because of curricular limitations at the host institutions or because of the preferences of the designers of the special baccalaureate programs, offered only non-specialized, liberal arts programs. In some cases, it was possible to earn a teaching certificate while in the special degree programs but always the professional or vocational orientation was a secondary consideration.

However, with the increased emphasis on credentials in the job market and with the movement toward vocationally oriented undergraduate programs for younger students, a number of the special baccalaureate programs for adults have begun to include vocationally or professionally oriented specialties in their programs or have created parallel programs through which the specialized work is offered. Syracuse University's University College now offers, as one of its Independent Study Degree Programs, a baccalaureate in business administration and the University of Oklahoma, through the College of Liberal Studies, is also offering an independent study program with a specialty in business. And, although Brooklyn College, the first of the special baccalaureates, has not yet moved away from liberal arts as its sole concern, its sister institution Queens College has in a few cases made arrangements for students in its Adult Collegiate Education program to take course work at Baruch College, the institution within the City University of New York which offers business as its central program.

The special baccalaureate programs for adults thus seem to be reacting to the move toward a vocational orientation in undergraduate programs in much the same way that more traditional programs are reacting: the special baccalaureate programs are attempting to incorporate a vocational or professional option within their operation if they possibly can. And those institutions with special baccalaureate programs which have been able to offer vocational and professional programs to adults are benefiting from the sharply increased revenues which these programs are producing. Liberal studies programs may not have been the first choice of adults after all.

From Unique Designs to Compatibility

The resident programs at Brooklyn, Queens, and Mundelein, were designed from the start to be compatible with more traditional baccalaureate programs. The Bachelor of General Studies at Roosevelt, while not compatible in its totality with traditional programs, was constructed from components which individually were compatible with other baccalaureate programs as was the Brockport program. But the independent programs at Oklahoma, Goddard, Syracuse, and South Florida were consciously designed to meet the special needs of adults with little concern for compatibility. Adult students could conceivably transfer from the Syracuse and Goddard Programs to other baccalaureate programs without losing all recognition for the work they had done. But the programs at Oklahoma and South Florida were designed to be sui generis and, unless an exception were made by a receiving institution, the BLS and BIS could not be transfered.

This pattern, however, is changing with the increase in non-traditional curricula and grading systems at institutions in all parts of the nation. Without having changed at all, the special baccalaureate programs for adults which were formerly not transferable would not encounter the same problems now as they would have as few as five years ago. Furthermore, some of the special baccalaureate programs have changed. As was mentioned earlier, Syracuse has redefined its requirements in such a way that standard three semester hour courses may be counted toward the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies degree. And the University of Oklahoma has developed an alternative route to the BLS which makes use of prior work done in Associate in Arts programs in community colleges.

The trend thus seems to be away from the unique and consequently incompatible designs of a few of the special baccalaureate programs toward compatibility with more traditional baccalaureate programs. And the movement of some of the special baccalaureate programs toward compatibility is, of course, being greatly facilitated by the movement of many of the more traditional programs toward flexibility. With both sets of programs moving toward each other, the inevitable result will be much more open access to all programs for both younger and older students alike.

Trends in Staffing and Financing for Special Baccalaureate Programs

The most distressing aspect of the development of special baccalaureate programs for adults over the past twenty years is the continuing use of either part-time faculty members or full-time faculty members teaching on overload in these programs. Only two of the nine programs studied, those at Goddard and Roosevelt, can boast of any full-time faculty members whose whole teaching load is committed to their special baccalaureate programs. And even in thse two cases, full-time faculties were created only within the last five years and do not, as yet, account for more than a small fraction of the total number of hours generated by the programs.

Some administrators and faculty members claim that drawing faculty for their special baccalaureate program from their institution's full-time faculty helps to bring the special program to the attention of the total institution and to move it into the mainstream of their university's activity. This may be so, but even if it is so, the use of less than fully-committed faculty members to provide instruction in these special programs deprives the special programs of the stability and consistency enjoyed by the more traditional baccalaureate programs. Further, the lack of full-time faculties in most of the special baccalaureate programs also keeps the staffs of these programs from exercising authority commensurate with the number of students they serve or developing any substantial influence within the political bodies of their institutions, especially the faculty senates and curriculum committees which rule on academic policy. Finally, part-time or overload faculty members cannot be expected to provide the same service to students in the special programs or to the institution as a whole that full-time faculty members could.

But given the attractive cost to income ratio which most often results from the use of part-time and overload faculty members, the probability of a rapid move toward the establishment of full-time faculties for the special baccalaureate programs is low, especially in these times of generally declining enrollments at institutions of higher education. The special baccalaureate programs for adults are, for the present and most likely for the future as well, liable to be kept from realizing their full potential because of a practice of barely adequate staffing. In the past, the same staffing problem has plagued evening colleges and the evening colleges, lacking influence at the highest levels of policymaking in their institutions, have not been able to solve the problem. The circumstances facing the special baccalaureate programs seem equivalent to those which have faced the evening colleges and there is no reason to believe that the special baccalaureate programs are any more likely to solve the problem.

A Final Word

Special baccalaureate programs for adults are a small part of the larger movement toward the popularization of higher education in the United States. The nine special baccalaureate programs which were established between the end of World War II and 1970 were outgrowths of the university extension movement in the United States and abroad. The return of the veterans after World War II seems to have focused the attention of some educators upon the special needs of adult students and grant monies made available through the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, in particular, provided the necessary venture capital for some of the earlier programs.

The first of the programs at Brooklyn College was, in essence, a modification of an evening college program meant for an elite audience. The second baccalaureate program for adults, established at the University of Oklahoma, departed radically from tradition by creating both a unique delivery system and a unique curriculum designed with the needs of adults foremost in mind. Seven other programs followed these two leads and all but two of the special baccalaureate programs have achieved substantial success.

Since their establishment, the special baccalaureate programs have generally tended toward an elaboration of their initially simple designs and toward the offering of specialized curricula in addition to their initial non-specialized, liberal arts curricula. Prospects for the future of all but two of the special baccalaureate programs studied seem excellent. While the special programs have not been able to evolve stable staffing patterns in all cases, they tend to contribute to their institutions' operating budget, some of them substantially. and seem to serve their clientele well. On the other hand, given the proliferation of non-traditional programs in higher education for students of all ages and the increased access to higher education which these programs provide, it seems unlikely that many more special baccalaureate programs for adults will be established in the foreseeable future. Adults have become much more readily accepted as students and, in fact, are being actively sought out by many colleges and universities. Perhaps the special baccalaureate programs for adults played some small role in creating this new climate for adult students and if they did, those involved with the special baccalaureate programs can be justifiably proud. But, paradoxically, the willingness of colleges and universities to accept adult students into their regular programs and the growing flexibility of the regular programs themselves have sharply reduced the need for special baccalaureate degree programs for adults.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PERSONS INTERVIEWED BY INSTITUTIONS

Brooklyn College

Sol Amato
Rose Cabat
Antoinette Ciolli
Ellswerth Missall
John Pavona
John Quinn
Edwin H. Spengler
Sarah Wolpin
Peter Zanateas

Goddard College

Evalyn Bates
George Beecher
Corinne Elliott
Wilfred Hamlin
Richard Hathaway
Elizabeth Krakauer
Royce Pitkin
John Turner
Alan Walker

Mundelein College

Katharine Byrne
Cecilia Bodman
Norbert Hruby
Helen Halloran
Susan Rink

Queens College

Tadessa Araya
Arthur Boodaghian
Kalma Feinsod
Carl Hiller
Martin Kaplan
James O'Hara
Ernest Schwarcz
Ralph Sleeper

Roosevelt University

Robert Ahrens
George Dillavou
Lucy Ann (Marx) Geiselman
Daniel Perlman
Ann von Hoffman
Rolf Weil
Otto Wirth

State University of New York College at Brockport

Janet Beck
Joyce Budd
Richard Elton
Lynn Johnston

Syracuse University

Thomas Benzel
Alexander Charters
Harlan Copeland
Thomas Cummings
Lee Porter
Ruth Sisley
Betty J. Vaughn
Clifford Winters

University of Oklahoma

Jesse Burkett
Kenneth Crook
Daniel Davis
J. Clayton Feaver
Cecil Lee
Mary Ann Newcomer
Roy Trout
Thurman White

University of South Florida

Richard Berkley
Richard Brightwell
John Iorio
Kevin Kearney
William Stevens

Other

Robert J. Blakely
Cyril O. Houle

APPENDIX B

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books, Reports, and Manuscripts

Adams, Herbert Baxter. "Chautauqua: A Social and Educational Study," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1894-95, Volume I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1896.

________. "Educational Extension in the United States," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900, Volume I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.

________. "Public Educational Work in Baltimore," Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1899.

________. "Seminary Libraries and University Extension," Johns Hopkins Studies in History and Political Science. Baltimore: N. Murray, 1887.

________. "Summer Schools and University Extension," Monographs on Education in the United States, Volume II. Edited by Nicholas Murray Butler, Albany, New York: J.B. Lyon Company, 1900.

Ashby, Eric. Universities: British, Indian, African. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Association of University Evening Colleges. Proceedings. 1939-

Association of Urban Universities. Summary of Proceedings. Boston, Massachusetts, 1919.

Bartlett, Kenneth G. The Evening College and Its Relationship to Community Publics. Series of Papers on Adult Education, v. 17. Syracuse, New York: University College of Syracuse University, 1960.

Bates, Evalyn. "Development of the Goddard College Adult Education Program." Unpublished Master's Paper, University of Chicago, 1957.

Blakely, Robert J. Adult Education in a Free Society. ed. by J.R. Kidd. Toronto: Guardian Bird Publication, 1958.

Bryson, Lyman. Adult Education. New York: American Book Company, 1936.

Burch, Glen. *Accent on Learning: An Analytical History of the Fund for Adult Education's Experimental Discussion Project, 1951-1959*. New York: Fund for Adult Education, n.d.

________. *Challenge to the University: An Inquiry into the University's Responsibility for Adult Education*. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, v. 35. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961.

Burkett, Jesse E. *Comprehensive Programming for Life Long Learning: A Preliminary Report*. Norman, Oklahoma: Extension Division, University of Oklahoma, 1957. (mimeographed)

________. "Some Problems in Designing Experimental Degree Programs in Liberal Education for Adult Part-Time Students of the University of Oklahoma," /1958/. (Dittoed)

________ and Ruggiers, Paul G., eds. *Bachelor of Liberal Studies: Development of a Curriculum at the University of Oklahoma*. Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1965.

Burrell, John Angus. *A History of Adult Education at Columbia University: University Extension and the School of General Studies*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.

Carey, James T. *Forms and Forces in University Adult Education*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961.

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. *College Without Classes: Credit Through Examinations in University Adult Education*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961.

________. *Patterns of Liberal Education in the Evening College: A Case Study of Nine Institutions*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1952.

Charters, Alexander N. "An Evaluation of the Development of Certain Aspects of the Ability to Think by Participation in an Adult Education Program." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1948.

________. *The Hill and the Valley*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education, 1972.

"Conference on Special Degree Programs Sponsored by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults in Cooperation with the Department of Defense and Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, March 25-26, 1963." (Mimeographed)

Coulton, Thomas Evans. A City College in Action. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1955.

Creese, James. The Extension of University Teaching. New York: American Association of Adult Education, 1941.

Dawson, W.H. The Yearbook of the Universities of the Empire. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1921.

DeCrow, Roger. Ability and Achievement of Evening College and Extension Students. CSLEA Research Reports. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1959.

________. Administrative Practices in University Evening Colleges. CSLEA Research Reports. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962.

Diekhoff, John S. The Domain of the Faculty in Our Expanding Colleges. New York: Harper Brothers Publishers, 1956.

________. Many Opinions. Series of Papers on Adult Education, v. 20. Syracuse, New York: University College of Syracuse University, 1961.

________. Schooling for Maturity. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, v. 13. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1955.

Dunkel, Harold. Whitehead on Education. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1965.

Dyer, John P. Ivory Towers in the Market Place: The Evening College in American Education. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1956.

Fletcher, C. Scott. The Free University. Series of Papers on Adult Education, v. 18. Syracuse, New York: University College of Syracuse University, 1961.

Ford Foundation. Report of the Study of the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program. Detroit: The Ford Foundation, 1949.

Frandson, Philip E. Higher Adult Education, Its Present and Future: Analysis and Projections Based on Six Years of Program and Registration Data, 1960-1966. Joint AUEC-NUEA Committee on Data and Definitions, 1967.

Fund for Adult Education. Annual Report, 1951. Pasadena, California, 1951.

________. Annual Report, 1952-1953. Pasadena, California, 1953.

________. Annual Report, 1953-1954. Pasadena, California, 1954.

________. Annual Report, 1954-1955. Pasadena, California, 1955.

________. Continuing Liberal Education: Report for 1955-1957. White Plains, New York: Fund for Adult Education, 1958.

________. Liberal Adult Education. White Plains, New York: Fund for Adult Education, n.d.

________. 1951-1961: A Ten Year Report of the Fund for Adult Education. White Plains, New York: Fund for Adult Education, 1961.

Gilman, Daniel Coit. The Launching of a University. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1906.

Goodspeed, Thomas W. A History of the University of Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916.

________. The Story of the University of Chicago. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Gould, Joseph E. The Chautauqua Movement: An Episode in the Continuing American Revolution. State University of New York, 1961.

Gould, Samuel and Cross, K. Patricia. Explorations in Non-Traditional Study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972.

Grattan, C. Hartley. In Quest of Knowledge. New York: Association Press, 1955.

Hall-Quest, Alfred Lawrence. The University Afield. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926.

Harper, William Rainey. *The Trend in Higher Education*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1905.

Harrison, J.F.C. *Learning and Living, 1790-1960*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd. 1961.

Haygood, Kenneth, ed. *A Live Option: The Future of the Evening College*. Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1965.

Higher Education and the Adult Student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1972.

Hole, James. *Light, More Light*. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1860, reprinted in facsimile London: Woburn Books Ltd., 1969.

Hoppe, William A. *Policies and Practices in Evening Colleges, 1971*. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1972.

Houle, Cyril O. *The Design of Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1972.

________. *The External Degree*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1973.

________. *Major Trends in Higher Adult Education*. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, v. 24. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1959.

________ *et al*. *Purposes of the Evening College: Reflections in 1953*. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, v. 13. Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1967.

Hudson, J.W. *The History of Adult Education*. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longman, 1851, reprinted in facsimile London: Woburn Books Ltd., 1969.

Hudson, Robert B. "Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults: Consultant's Report," August 25, 1967. (Typewritten)

Hutchins, Robert Maynard. *Education for Freedom*. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1944.

________. *The Higher Learning in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

________. *No Friendly Voice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.

________. The University of Utopia. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Jacobson, Myrtle S. Night and Day: The Interaction Between an Academic Institution and Its Evening College. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1970.

________ and Offenbacher, Deborah I. Accent on Adults: The Small College Program at Brooklyn. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education, 1970.

Joint AUEC-NUEA Committee on Data and Definitions. Programs and Registrations, 1965-1966. Norman, Oklahoma, 1966.

Joint AUEC-NUEA Committee on Minimum Data and Definitions. Description and Analysis of Program and Enrollment Data, 1960-1961 and 1962-1963 and Projections of Future Enrollments. Minneapolis, 1964.

Joint Committee of University and Working-class Representatives on the Relation of the University to the Higher Education of Workpeople. Oxford and Working-class Education. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.

Kilpatrick, William Heard. Education for a Changing Civilization. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1927.

Kinnell, Galway. The Basic Program of Liberal Education for Adults. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, v. 11. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1955.

Knowles, Malcom S. The Adult Education Movement in the United States. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

________, ed. Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Chicago: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1960.

________. Higher Adult Education in the United States. Washington: American Council on Education, 1969.

Liberal Education. Summary of a Discussion by the Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (from the 1955-56 Annual Report) and Implications for University Adult Education. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1957.

Liveright, A.A. Adult Education in Colleges and Universities. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, v. 30. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1960.

________. *Strategies of Leadership*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

________. *A Study of Adult Education in the United States*. Brookline, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1968.

________. *University Adult Education: The Center of Experiment in Education*. Series of Papers on Adult Education, v. 21. Syracuse, New York: University College of Syracuse University, 1961.

________ and DeCrow, Roger. *New Directions in Degree Programs Especially for Adults*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1963.

________ and Goldman, Freda H. *Significant Developments in Continuing Higher Education*. Occasional Papers. Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1965.

Lockwood, Anne, ed. *Cumulative Indexes: Association of University Evening Colleges, Proceedings, 1948-58: National University Extension Association, Proceedings, 1915-57*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1960.

Moorhead, Hugh S. "The Great Books Movement." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964.

Morison, Samuel Eliot and Commager, Henry Steele. *The Growth of the American Republic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Moulton, Richard G. "University Extension as the University of the Future," *University Extension: A Series of Articles on Phases of the Movement*. Philadelphia: The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, 1891.

________. *The University Extension Movement*. London: Bemrose and Sons, 1885.

National University Extension Association. *Expanding Horizons . . . Continuing Education*. Washington, D.C.: North Washington Press, 1965.

National University Extension Association. *Proceedings*. 1915-

Ortega y Gasset, Jose. *The Mission of the University*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1946.

Peers, Robert. *Adult Education: A Comparative Study*. New York: Humanities Press, 1958.

Perlman, Daniel H. "Faculty Trusteeship: Concept and Experience." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1971.

Petersen, Renee and Petersen, William. *University Adult Education: A Guide to Policy*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1960.

Proceedings of a National Conference on Special Degree Programs. Tampa, Florida: Center for Continuing Education, University of South Florida, 1970.

Schwertman, John B. "A Brief Factual History of the Center," April 6, 1956. (Mimeographed)

________. *I Want Many Lodestars*. ed. by Harry L. Miller. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1958.

________. *Old Bottles, New Wine; Wine Old, Bottles New*. Series of Papers on Adult Education, v. 2. Syracuse, New York: University College of Syracuse University, 1954.

Shannon, Theodore J. and Schoenfeld, Clarence A. *University Extension*. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Incorporated, 1965.

Smith, Robert M., Aker, George F., and Kidd, J.R., eds. *Handbook of Adult Education*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1970.

Stern, Bernard H. *Never Too Late For College: The Brooklyn Degree Program for Adults*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1963.

________ and Missall, J. Ellsworth. *Adult Experience and College Degrees*. Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1960.

Storr, Richard J. *Harper's University: The Beginnings*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Thompson, Robert Ellis. "The Fountain-Head of University Extension," *University Extension: A Series of Articles on Phases of the Movement*. Philadelphia: The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, 1891.

Tolley, William P. Looking Ahead in Adult Education. Series of Papers on Adult Education, v. 24. Syracuse, New York: University College of Syracuse University, 1959.

Trout, Roy. Special Degree Programs for Adults: Exploring Non-Traditional Degree Programs in Higher Education. Iowa City, Iowa: ACT Publications, 1971.

U.S. Bureau of Education. "The University and the Municipality: Summary of the Proceedings of the First Session of the National Association of Municipal Universities," Bulletin, No. 38, 1915. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1915.

University of Chicago. The President's Report: July 1892-July 1902. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1903.

________. The Quarterly Calendar: University Extension Edition, I, Fall 1892.

Valley, John R. "An Inventory of External Degree Programs and Proposals." Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, March 3, 1971. (Mimeographed)

________. "A Supplement to An Inventory of External Degree Programs and Proposals." Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, May 7, 1971. (Mimeographed)

Van Doren, Mark. Liberal Education. Boston: Beacon Press, 1943.

Vincent, John H. The Chautauqua Movement. Boston: Chautauqua Press, 1886.

Whipple, James. "Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults: A History," 1966. (Mimeographed)

Whipple, James B. A Critical Balance: History of CSLEA. Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1967.

________. Especially for Adults. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, v. 19. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1957.

Periodicals

Adams, Herbert Baxter. "University Extension and Its Leaders," American Monthly Review III (July 1891).

________. "University Extension in America," The Forum XI (July 1891).

Blakely, Robert J. "Adult Education Needs a Philosophy and a Goal," Adult Education III (November, 1952).

Capen, Samuel P. "The Government and the Colleges in Wartime," Educational Record XXIII (October, 1942).

Diekhoff, John S. "Time Off for Good Behavior," Journal of General Education VII (October, 1952)

Education for Victory I (February 1, 1943).

/Holbrook, Josiah/, "Associations of Adults for Mutual Education," American Journal of Education I (October, 1826)

Kilpatrick, William Heard. "The Project Method," Teachers College Bulletin X (October 12, 1918).

Larned, J.N. "An Experiment in 'University Extension,'" The Library Journal XIII (March-April, 1888).

Lindquist, E.F. "The Use of Tests in the Accreditation of Military Experience and in the Educational Placement of War Veterans," Educational Record XXV (October, 1944).

Liveright, A.A. "Special Degree Programs: Liberal Education for Adults," Educational Record XLV (Fall, 1964).

McGhee, Paul D. "Three Dimensions of Adult Education," Educational Record XXXV (April, 1954).

McGrath, Earl J. "Research on Higher Education for Adults," Educational Record XLV (Winter, 1964).

Pifer, Alan. "Is It Time for an External Degree?" College Board Review 78 (Winter 1970-71).

Poole, W.F. "University Extension Work in Chicago," The Dial XIII (September 1, 1892).

Stuart, James. "The Origin of University Extension," University Extension III (July 1893).

Tolley, William Pearson. "Counterfeit Bachelor's Degree," Educational Record XXIII (July, 1942).

Turner, Frederick Jackson. "Extension Teaching in Wisconsin," University Extension I (April, 1892).

"University Extension: A Step Forward," University Extension I (January, 1892).