The transformation of DePaul from small, struggling St. Vincent's College to the second largest Catholic university in the United States is a story of the creation of a university and its search for identity. DePaul has been administered and governed by a number of persons and organizational entities, and its presidents, especially in the early days of the university, played broad and powerful roles in the development and design of the institution. Each of DePaul's first six presidents served in the dual role of president of the board of trustees and president of the institution, giving him wide authority over the development of university policies. As the university's governance structure became more complex in the years following World War Two, this arrangement changed. Today, like other large Catholic universities, DePaul has a multi-faceted system of internal and external governance.

The question of university governance is usually associated with boards of trustees. DePaul has had such a board since its incorporation as a university in 1908, and for much of its history—through a number of reorganizations—the majority of its members were Vincentians. To bring greater lay participation into the university, a board of lay trustees was formed in 1946. Though fundraising was the primary function of the lay trustees, a reorganization of that board begun in 1964 eventually gave lay trustees a more active role in the governance of the university. The two boards were eventually combined, but through most of the institution's history the board of trustees (later "Members of the Corporation") and the board of lay trustees linked DePaul to the Congregation of the Mission and to the larger world.

There is also the matter of the university's administrative structure. Since 1930, DePaul presidents have relied on advisory councils for suggestions and help with decision making. Three councils—the University Council, the Administrative Council, and the Joint Council—were established by presidents Corcoran, Cortelyou and Minogue. These councils, composed of senior academic and administrative leaders, set polices that guided and organized the university's
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internal administration. The University Council and the Administrative Council served slightly different functions, policy development and administrative coordination respectively. The university Senate, Faculty Council, and Staff Council were added in the 1960s to expand governance beyond the officers and administrators who served on the presidents' councils.

To focus exclusively on the mechanisms of internal governance and administration, however, would be to neglect a large part of the DePaul story. External organizations such as accrediting bodies and professional associations also played a major role in shaping the university, forcing it to transform itself to meet the standards they established. Finally, there was the influence of the Catholic Church, though it was less of a force than one might expect, given DePaul's foundation as a Catholic institution.

In short, the history of administration and governance at DePaul has been characterized by internal and external streams of influence. The internal actors and organizational bodies made the decisions that turned DePaul into a university, and the external forces were the models that shaped the early institution, challenging it to ask what it meant to be a university.

Internal Administration and Governance:
From Presidential Authority to Multiple Constituency Dialogue

Governance and administration in the broadest sense are defined as the decision-making processes and the structures for carrying them out. Many think that governance in higher education is limited to boards of trustees. In colleges and universities, however, governance is shared among a number of groups: trustees, administrators, faculty, and in some instances, students, though boards of trustees have taken to transferring some of their involvement in decision making to other groups.

There is a tendency for the literature on administration and governance in higher education to assume that these functions are mutually exclusive when in reality senior administrators and faculty, the groups who develop policy, are also most often responsible for the implementation of that policy. Especially, as front-line actors, administrators often find themselves having to create policy through their day-to-day actions. Throughout most of its history, DePaul has had a system of shared governance and administration (see list of DePaul presidents, table 1). While an arrangement that gave one individual so much control was not the usual pattern for American universities, it was rather common in Catholic institutions. The sponsoring religious orders in Catholic colleges and universities maintained control of their institutions until the 1960s when they transferred governance authority to boards composed principally of lay members. (1)

The colleges and universities that have survived over the course of the twentieth century have tended to adopt growth and diversification as strategies. While this has enabled them to endure, their continued existence has come at a cost. Burton Clark (2) has suggested that growth affected universities administratively in four central ways, with respect to size, value
systems, specialization, and bureaucratization. First, as they increased in size, colleges evolved from a unitary to a federal structure. The 20th century saw the development of professional schools and the proliferation of academic disciplines, which called for a departmental type of organization. Faculty were identified primarily with their academic departments rather than with the institution as a whole, and as a reflection of this change the authority structure became correspondingly more diffuse.

Table One Presidents of DePaul University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1898–1909</td>
<td>Peter V. Byrne, C.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909–1910</td>
<td>John Martin, C.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910–1920</td>
<td>Francis Xavier McCabe, C.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920–1930</td>
<td>Thomas F. Levan, C.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930–1935</td>
<td>Francis C. Corcoran, C.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935–1944</td>
<td>Michael J. O'Connell, C.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944–1963</td>
<td>Comerford J. O'Malley, C.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964–1981</td>
<td>John R. Cortelyou, C.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981–1993</td>
<td>John T. Richardson, C.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993–present</td>
<td>John P. Minogue, C.M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, when the central authority structure gave way, universities developed multiple cultures and value systems for faculty. In addition, other groups, especially administrators and students developed distinct cultures as well. Each of these three groups exerted its own demands on the institution. A larger faculty resulted in greater diversity of thought among its members with respect to disciplines, identification with the goals of the college or university, and compliance with the expectations of the institution. As the number of administrators grew, each having his or her own responsibilities, there was an inevitable separation into different functional areas that were often at cross purposes. Finally, students from all kinds of backgrounds started coming to colleges and universities. They often held widely different beliefs about why college was important (whether it was to secure a profession, become educated, escape the family, or a host of others). This diversity often put students at odds with faculty and administration thinking about what it meant to be college educated.

Third, the growth in the number of disciplines and different types of schools and programs made academic work increasingly specialized and the faculty more professionalized. Faculty members developed into experts who created knowledge as well as shared it in a limited area. These new faculty members, unlike their older colleagues—who had shared a less differentiated classical curriculum—had considerably less in common with others in the university community, even their faculty colleagues.
Fourth, the subcultures created by sheer physical growth, multiple value systems and specialization, required a bureaucracy to coordinate them. Since members of large universities tend to have little contact with or knowledge of others in their institution, broad-based collegial decision making was increasingly difficult. Shared decision making, even among such traditionally close-knit groups as the faculty, was increasingly replaced by rule-driven decision-making processes. Thus, as universities grew larger and more complex, they also became more bureaucratic.

As it grew larger DePaul, like most other American universities, became more differentiated. Clark's framework accurately describes the internal growth and development of the university during its first hundred years, a process that can be identified as DePaul passed through several distinct stages. These stages correspond to some extent to the periods described in chapter 1 and can be linked with particular university presidents. A general pattern in the development of governance structures emerges as each of these periods is examined individually. Consequently, the discussion that follows focuses on the evolution of the internal administrative bodies at DePaul over the past century, although certain external forces that helped to shape the university's growth and development will also be described. A more complete consideration of external influences will follow.

**The Era of Centralized Leadership: Early DePaul Presidents, 1898–1930**

Ten men have held the position of president of DePaul University during its first century. All have been members of the Congregation of the Mission, or Vincentians, the religious order that founded the university. With the exception of Father John Martin, C.M., who left the university after only one year, DePaul's early presidents embodied the dominant forces that built and sustained the institution. Each of these early presidents faced financial pressures and external threats, such as difficulty obtaining and keeping the accreditation that permitted DePaul to continue functioning as a university.

The Reverend Peter Byrne, C.M., became president of St. Vincent's in 1899 and remained in office until 1909. He was an especially influential figure. As Richard Meister and Dennis McCann have noted, Byrne presided over the transformation of St. Vincent's College into DePaul University and provided the initial academic vision for DePaul by attempting to model it after the leading colleges and universities of the time. The traditional liberal arts college in the late 1800s educated a small homogeneous student body, using a single common curriculum for all, and DePaul was established in this mold, even though it also featured a course in commercial studies and a boys academy. A small institution, it served primarily a local clientele. But Byrne, who had a more ambitious vision for DePaul, was hamstrung by the university's need for money. He unsuccessfully sought to establish a college of engineering and a medical school.

Byrne was the first president of both DePaul University and of its board of trustees, exemplifying the dual structure of administration and governance that characterized DePaul
during its early history. The board, organized to pay off the $400,000 debt that the university had incurred as a result of its startup, was also committed to expand curriculum offerings beyond the liberal arts and sciences, and engineering and to establish a department of economics to combat socialism and anarchism. While curricular issues were significant, the primary duty of this new group was fundraising. At their inaugural meeting, the trustees formed a committee consisting of President Byrne, Charles C. Mahoney, Walter J. Gibbons, William Dillon, John V. Clarke, and John McGillen. Mahoney, Gibbons, and Dillion were identified as attorneys. Clarke was president of Hibernia Bank and McGillen was a general agent for the United Surety Company of Baltimore, Maryland. They were “to solicit aid for the university from such persons as are able to contribute, without regard to their nationality or creed.” (3) Though they were men of some prominence in Chicago, they were unable to generate sufficient interest, and the fundraising campaign was ultimately unsuccessful.

Father Byrne was replaced by Father John Martin who stayed only a year. The Vincentian Visitor sent Martin to DePaul in hopes that the new president would be able to reduce the institution's oppressive debt. Martin's tenure as president was cut short, as Dennis McCann has noted, and he did not remain at DePaul long enough to institute any significant curricular changes. His departure opened the way for the institution's second charismatic leader and the next phase in its early development.

DePaul's third president, Father Francis McCabe, whose tenure (from 1910–1920) was longer than the presidencies of either of his predecessors, redirected the university's efforts toward less costly professional programs such as law, education, and business at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Under its two previous presidents, DePaul had explored the possibility of establishing schools of medicine and engineering as ways to distinguish itself, but these courses of study never provided the number of students required to offset the costs associated with their development. McCabe's presidency introduced changes in faculty composition at DePaul that eventually led to the departmental form of administration, primarily through the university's acquisition of free-standing professional schools. With several
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semi-autonomous schools, the unitary form of administration and governance had to give way to a federated structure, one that connected faculty members and other university employees more closely to their academic departments than to the institution as a whole. McCabe and the Vincentian community that governed DePaul had little choice but to move in this direction; the institution's long-term survival depended on it.

The addition and relative independence of its new professional schools brought new challenges to the university. Though DePaul reiterated its commitment to coeducation and religious diversity in 1910, the pledge to educate both sexes on a nonsectarian basis had been written into the university's original charter. The education of women at DePaul became a palpable reality, however, when President McCabe responded to Bishop Quigley's request that DePaul provide bachelors degree programs for Catholic laywomen to improve their chances for promotion in Chicago's public schools. These aspiring baccalaureates were not only accommodated in separate summer sessions at the uptown campus, they were also taught wholly apart from the male student body of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. As John Rury notes in this volume, when full-blown coeducation was finally put in place in 1917, despite the protests of Archbishop George Mundelein, DePaul became the first Catholic university in the United States to educate college men and women together. Here too, it was in great measure the need for additional enrollments that encouraged this departure from traditional Catholic educational policies.

When DePaul merged the Illinois College of Law and the Illinois Law School to create the new DePaul Law School, a large number of non-Catholic students were brought into the university. The addition of these students improved the institution's fiscal position, helping to reduce its debt by nearly doubling its size. In return, DePaul made Howard N. Ogden, head of the Illinois College of Law, the first non-Catholic member of the board of trustees.

At DePaul these new academic programs attracted more students, including women, who in turn contributed additional revenues that helped to control the university's debt level. A larger faculty introduced diversity of thought among its members. As women, students and faculty from other religious backgrounds began to expand and diversify the
value systems of the institution, the academic culture, administrative culture, and student culture—Clark’s categories—manifested themselves and placed different demands on the university. While still a Catholic institution, DePaul was now a university with a diverse faculty, an increasingly varied curriculum and a sizable number of non-Catholic students.

DePaul, like other American universities, experienced significant expansion during the 1920s. Father Thomas F. Levan, C.M., who assumed the presidency in 1920, held the office for a decade. Though its debt load continued to be quite high, Levan managed to keep the university functioning during this period of considerable growth. DePaul added a new classroom building to the uptown campus during Levan’s presidency (a building now named for him), and built a new “skyscraper” campus for its downtown programs in 1928. This made it impossible to retire the university’s financial obligations. Even so, Levan was able in 1926 to secure accreditation from the North Central Association of Schools and College (NCA), the regional accrediting body for most of the institution’s programs. This was a critical step, even though DePaul’s relationship with NCA was not a smooth one during the next several decades.

Inclusion on the list of approved colleges and universities gave DePaul increased credibility. But in 1929, three years after it had won official NCA approval, it had to submit to another review. Letters between President Levan and George E. Zook of NCA indicate that the hard fought battle for accreditation was an ongoing one, compelling the university to continue efforts to get and keep certification of its academic programs. In his December 23, 1929, letter, Mr. Zook informed President Levan that DePaul had to agree to reinspection because of the “percentage of classes not meeting North Central standards.” NCA was also concerned that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and DePaul Academy were too closely linked, especially since the high school was one of only four in the state that was not accredited. DePaul had an unusually high number of student athletes on scholarship (18 of 56 scholarships went to athletes), and NCA inspectors believed that the university’s practices with respect to granting extension credit were suspect. (6)

In letters to Zook in March (7) and April 1930 (8), President Levan argued forcefully on behalf of DePaul. He complained that the NCA reviewer was too harsh and unprofessional, and finally in November he pledged to revamp both teaching and administration. Levan assured Zook that the registrar had been warned to exercise “utmost care” in the admission of students, and he promised further that class size would henceforth be limited to no more than 35 students. (9)

Problems with the NCA were only the tip of the administrative iceberg, however. With over five thousand students on two campuses enrolled in eight different colleges and schools, the university had become too large and complex to be run by one person, no matter how authoritative or charismatic. A new administrative structure had to be developed to accommodate the institution’s growth. Creating an effective, responsive and innovative organization became the task of DePaul’s next generation of leaders.
The Beginnings of Shared Governance: The Middle Presidents
While it was President Levan who made the promises to Mr. Zook and the NCA, it was Father Francis C. Corcoran, DePaul's fifth president, who was responsible for keeping them. Father Corcoran was brought to DePaul to reorganize the university administration. In his November 1930 letter Levan made the following observation to NCA's George Zook:

The Administration of the university has changed at the beginning of the present scholastic year by the appointment of a new president. His primary task has been the reorganization of the school from within by the appointment of Boards and Committees, a more exact division of specialized tasks, and by the active function of the enlarged University Council. It is our hope that what is being done in this respect will meet the Association's fullest approval.

The reorganization of the university under Father Corcoran was the first of many attempts to improve administration and governance throughout the institution. In the decades between the 1930s and the end of the 1960s efforts were undertaken to limit the power that the institution's first few presidents had been given. DePaul's board of trustees was reorganized on two occasions, and internal and administrative governing bodies were put in place. During the presidencies of Father Francis C. Corcoran, C.M., Father Michael J. O'Connell, C.M., and Father Comerford J. O'Malley, who served in DePaul's middle years, the university became increasingly complex as it acquired new academic and administrative departments. Burton Clark has characterized this kind of expansion and differentiation as the third developmental stage: as academic work becomes increasingly specialized, it demands a more scholarly and professionalized faculty. When scholarship and teaching preclude faculty assumption of administrative responsibilities, the university's bureaucratic structure has to expand to assume these roles.

With the appointment of Father Corcoran in 1930, DePaul began its rapid transformation into a more complex university. It adopted up-to-date methods of management and public relations, creating the first of a number of administrative councils to coordinate the institution's multiple and diverse activities. Though the names of these bodies have changed over time, their functions have not. First as the University Council and later the Administrative Council and the University Senate, each entity advised the president, developed university-wide policies, and disseminated information. Of the three councils, the University Council is the most interesting because the battle to reconcile tensions between centralization and decentralization—as well as early efforts to form a credible university—took place during its existence.
The Rev. Francis V. Corcoran, C.M., President 1930–1935.

The University Council was formed in 1930 and not dissolved until 1970, when its functions were split between the Administrative Council and the University Senate. As the only internal university-wide policy making body until 1964, it included representatives from the various colleges and schools of the university: liberal arts, commerce, law, music and the Secretarial School. The roster of council members (see table 2) offers an insight into DePaul's relatively simple administrative structure at that time. With only one vice president, a registrar, a dean of the graduate school and a dean of women, there was not sufficient personnel to manage a large and complex institution. The University Council offers the first evidence that a federal structure had developed at DePaul as a result of growth. As the number of new schools increased, improved coordination among the deans and administrators was essential. The council became the forum for discussion of university-wide concerns, including questions raised by NCA or other external bodies. Significantly, since Vincentians were a minority of the council's members, at least through most of its existence, the leadership of the university was a mixture of priests and laymen.

Father Corcoran created the University Council as a way to bring some of DePaul's administrative problems under control. In his address to its first meeting in October 1930, Corcoran emphasized that the University Council was essential to the overall administration of the university. It was to focus on DePaul's general welfare rather than on specific departmental concerns. (11) Though the council was conceived as an administrative body, its function broadened to include academic matters and governance as well. In a pre-bureaucratic era when there were few institutional rules and lines of responsibility were often unclear, there were few issues it did not consider.

The early minutes of the council depict a group formulating rules and requirements that kept DePaul functioning as an institution. It created policies and was responsible for overseeing their adoption. In this respect, the University Council was typical of many senior-level groups for which the line between administration and governance was blurred. For example, the council's agenda at its fourth meeting focused on efforts to achieve uniformity and consistency for the university at both its Loop and uptown campuses. Each cam-
pus and the schools at each location had developed different methods and procedures for handling recruitment of students, making up its calendar for classes, and setting policies governing students and faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Two Initial Members of the University Council 1930–1931</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Reverend Francis V. Corcoran, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Thomas C. Powers, Vice President of the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. James M. Murry, Regent of the College of Commerce*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Daniel J. McHugh, Regent of the Secretarial College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Alexander P. Schorsch, Dean of the Graduation School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Martin V. Moore, Regent of the College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Thomas Devine, Regent of the School of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Emmett L. Gaffney, Dean of the Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Howard E. Egan, Associate Dean of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William F. Clarke, Dean of the College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Harry D. Taft, Assistant Dean of the College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Arthur C. Becker, Dean of the College of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Harvey L. Klein, Dean of the Secretarial College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William M. Murphy, Dean of the Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Margaret A. Ring, Dean of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John C. McHugh, Registrar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Much of the council's early work, therefore, involved attempts to reconcile these differences and create standards for the entire institution. This, of course, had been one of the NCA's concerns, and professional organizations and other groups outside of the university were also interested in promoting more uniform standards of performance.

The minutes of its meetings highlight the critical and the mundane issues that often were brought before the council. Among the critical problems these administrators faced were accreditation of the law school, strategies to handle declining enrollment and the reduced revenues associated with it, development of new degree and other academic programs, coordination of a common calendar, and a set of procedures to govern the schools and colleges.

Equally compelling, however, was the frequency with which this body concerned itself with seeming minutiae: producing bulletins with consistent language among the various

*Regents were responsible for the religious and moral tone of students and served as advisors to students. They were not to be involved with the administration of any of the schools or colleges.
schools; developing consistent purchase order forms; establishing schedules for baccalaureate and convocation services; striving for consistency in general information and announcements, even with make-up examinations. It performed such tasks in addition to supervising the formation of boards in charge of undergraduate and graduate education. Publicity, another concern of this group, marketed the university to the public as a way to increase enrollment and supply the funds to keep the institution open. In the absence of a bureaucratic organization to perform such tasks, attention to such issues was necessary. It was in these meetings that the processes and procedures that regularized critical administrative aspects of the university began to be hammered out. All of these matters, even those that may have appeared trivial for senior decision-makers, contributed to standardizing administration and governance in the university.

Though these issues were clearly administrative, the council also concerned itself with academic topics commonly regarded as more appropriate for deliberation by the faculty. It examined the criteria for setting academic ranks and involved itself in creating new courses to enhance the university's curriculum. By 1946, in the absence of a university-wide forum in which faculty could be heard, the University Council was dealing with both academic questions and administrative issues.

The council, consisting originally of both deans and regents from the various colleges, had a membership of 11 to 18, with commerce, music, the Secretarial School and the Department of Education each having one representative. Both deans and assistant deans from the larger colleges of liberal arts and sciences and law were on the council. The dean of women (the only female on the council), the registrar, and the vice president of the university completed the group. The president, who served ex officio, usually addressed only the first meeting of each academic year and did not attend thereafter. As new administrative positions were created, such as university examiner or director of athletics, these men joined the council. The deans were the only faculty representatives on the council, and there were no student spokespersons.

Though the president rarely attended council meetings, his presence loomed large, especially during Corcoran's tenure. Father Corcoran, who assumed DePaul's presidency during the Depression, sought to lead it toward improved financial health. He saw the University Council as a unifying body that could act for the university as a whole. The minutes of the University Council during the Corcoran presidency are peppered with requests and demands from the president exhorting the members to standardize procedures and to improve the way the university operated. Throughout academic year 1933-34, Corcoran urged council members to hold regular departmental meetings, clarify the range of responsibilities for department heads, reorganize various departments to reduce financial pressures, have faculty submit articles to local newspapers as a way to promote the university, and initiate procedures and
standards for governing student groups. (12) The first steps toward a federated organizational structure at DePaul were uncertain, even though the University Council was given broad powers. The members, at least at the outset, were still mindful of an authoritative president who took command, even telling them how often they should meet.

Corcoran's moves toward standardization of policies and procedures throughout the university initiated bureaucratic or rule-driven control. As enrollments grew, there were more student groups and, as John Rury has noted, the university needed policies to govern their behavior. As their numbers grew, faculty members looked for more traditional departmental organization. A growing and heterogeneous institution required a coordinating focus, hence the importance of departmental meetings. Rule-driven management and multifaceted control demanded leadership control throughout, however. DePaul still had to develop leaders who could act independently.

While the University Council's purpose was to improve the overall coordination and functioning of the university, it never seemed able to find the right mix of independent action to implement the president's ideas. Corcoran always opened the first council meeting of the year with a statement of the council's aims, laying out some of the issues on which he wanted it to act. But its performance remained tentative, even as late as 1962, when Father John T. Richardson, as chairman of the University Council, planned changes to its operation and makeup to make it more effective. (13)

When Father Michael O'Connell came to DePaul early in 1932 to serve as vice president of the university and chairman of the University Council under President Corcoran, he proposed that the council create permanent committees to review topics regularly brought before it. (14) He aimed to create a common administrative foundation for the entire university by establishing committees on admissions, curriculum and degrees, convocation, downtown building and public relations. Athletics, student relations, student activities and faculty relations were added to the committee structure later. The committees were precursors to many of the administrative units that conduct today's routine operations at DePaul. In addition, O'Connell suggested creating an Internal Survey Committee (a forerunner of DePaul's current Office of Institutional Planning and Research) to review ways of improving internal procedures and to reevaluate academic requirements for the faculty at each rank, establishing guidelines for admission, matriculation and program fees on all campuses.

Feverish efforts to expand and improve committee design, function and purpose, and ongoing attempts to set a course for the faltering university could not offset the financial crisis it faced during the 1932-33 academic year. Growth during the twenties had relieved some of the financial pressure but it by no means protected DePaul from the more extreme economic swings that affected the nation and the world in the following decade. The university endured financial hardship along with many other institutions during the Great Depression. By fall
1932, it was nearly bankrupt, the result of a sharp decline in enrollment. University Council minutes for December 15, 1932 (15) report that all departments showed a one-third drop in income below expected revenues, making further borrowing impossible until the banks saw evidence of retrenchment in the university. So DePaul set out to reduce expenses by decreasing the number of courses offered, reducing the number of assistants in deans’ offices, and reducing faculty salaries. The newly formed but untested council was forced to take on a major crisis.


Reverend O’Connell assumed the presidency in 1935, after Corcoran resigned due to illness. As in previous administrations, financial distress shaped much of the O’Connell presidency. Though enrollments stabilized for a time following the crisis of 1932 and the university achieved a tenuous solvency, they dropped once again as the United States geared up for war in the late thirties and early forties. O’Connell urged the University Council to advise students that those who stayed in school also served their country. There seemed to be no end to the problems faced by the university.

It appeared at first that World War II posed a mortal threat to DePaul, yet it turned out in the end to be the university’s salvation. O’Connell, and following him, President Comerford O’Malley, placed DePaul at the service of the federal government for training purposes. But after the conflict, DePaul—like many other institutions—became a site for educating returning soldiers. As noted in other chapters, these veterans doubled the student enrollment of the university and at last put DePaul in a position of financial strength. The new students required more administrators and faculty to look after them, sorely straining existing administrative structures and procedures. But with the basic bureaucratic apparatus of the university firmly in place by the end of the O’Connell presidency, subsequent presidents had only to modify, adjust and expand the existing structure, leaving them free to improve the university’s overall academic quality and to maintain its financial solvency. The institution’s fiscal stability was secure for the moment, but a new crisis loomed, this one having to do with its academic programs.

The struggle that had characterized the Levan presidency (1920–30)—earning and keeping North Central accreditation—resumed during O’Malley’s term. The term of
Comerford O’Malley, the last president to serve during the middle period of the university’s first century (1944–63), was marked by this threat, even though it was only temporary. The president and others in the university had to focus intensely on upgrading the institution’s educational program. In 1949, DePaul found itself threatened with the loss of North Central Association accreditation. NCA Director Norman Burns’ April 1949 letter to O’Malley indicates there were a number of serious issues:

As you will note, DePaul University stands quite low on a number of items in the area of faculty. Furthermore, the standing on the items relating to expenditures for library salaries and to educational expenditure per student is low in comparison with other institutions.

Nearly a year after the Burns letter, the NCA took action against DePaul. At the March 1950 meeting of the Commission on Colleges of the North Central Association, the members voted to remove DePaul from the list of accredited institutions. This plunge in DePaul’s fortune was featured in the local newspapers and caused the university widespread embarrassment. President O’Malley filed an appeal the day after the NCA’s decision.

Lean financial years had caused DePaul to spend little on its academic programs, resulting in standards below those for comparable institutions. DePaul was ranked in the 25th percentile with respect to stated purposes of the university and their usefulness in planning. The report’s text criticized the university’s statement of purpose, calling it vague and so inclusive that it would be of no help in “determining policies or activities.” Other criticisms were even more telling. The North Central Association ranked DePaul’s faculty at the 10th percentile or below for graduate training and educational experience of its teachers, membership and programs pursued in learned societies and the all-important faculty-student ratio. DePaul was at the lowest possible level for faculty members holding doctorates, and those with masters degrees (23rd percentile), publication of books (11th percentile) and articles (32nd percentile), and membership in professional organizations (23rd percentile) were also unsatisfactorily low. Not surprisingly, the NCA report found DePaul’s general education curriculum inadequate (18th percentile) and rated no student personnel services above the 29th percentile. DePaul fared better in some administrative areas, except for educational expenditure per student (18th percentile) and stable income per student (16th percentile).

Dr. George A. Works, director of study for the North Central Association (who had participated in the DePaul review process since at least 1934), regularly evaluated the university’s progress toward meeting the North Central Association’s demands. It was not until 1951,
however, that DePaul's NCA accreditation was finally restored. In a letter dated April 18, 1951, Manning M. Pattillo of the NCA listed the terms for reinstatement:

The report of the re-survey indicates that progress has been made in strengthening the institution in the year that has elapsed. However, the Commission wishes to assure itself that the improvements initiated during the year will be carried forward, and that other urgently needed changes will be made in the program of the institution. It therefore recommends that DePaul University be continued on the accreditation list for two years and that another survey be made in the Autumn of 1952.

DePaul was required to make regular reports to the North Central Association throughout the early 1950s. During the 1954–55 academic year, the university received accreditation for five years, relieving some of the intense pressure to perform to external standards. Still, as other authors in this volume have noted, the threatened loss of NCA accreditation was particularly traumatic and influenced DePaul's leaders for decades to come.

In addition to external threats, O'Malley had to contend with a decline in his authority when the board of trustees was reorganized in 1946 to reduce presidential power. Briton I. Budd, one of the five lay members of the board, initiated the appointment of an outside management consultant, Stanley Farwell, president of Business Research Corporation, in 1944, to reorganize the administration and governance of the university. Farwell proposed a plan for reorganizing the institution to make it more effective, and conceded to Budd's insistence that the university should be more successful in marketing itself and raising funds to support its academic programs. The reorganization plan included restricting the president's authority to the management of internal administrative matters and placing him at the head of the university, supported by a vice president and dean of faculties who would be second in command. The proposal retained the University Council and acknowledged its role as the highest internal policy body.

In a further administrative change, Farwell called for the creation of a “Board of Lay Trustees” (he later became a member of this newly formed board). It was a separate entity and exercised no authority to obligate the university financially or programmatically. That authority continued to reside in the board of trustees, henceforth called the “Board of Legal Trustees.” Whereas the legal trustees were the owners of the university, the lay trustees were primarily fundraisers and public relations advocates. The following statement of purpose spells out the role of the board of lay trustees:
The first meeting of the board of lay trustees was held on December 18, 1946. (22) Members were drawn from business, the law, and the DePaul alumni. A banker, a real estate executive, and a comptroller represented the business community. The legal profession was represented by a circuit court judge and a lawyer. Besides the president, the dean of the DePaul Law School, William F. Clarke, and a representative from the DePaul Alumni Association, Stacy Osgood, were members. Briton Budd set the work of the board of lay trustees in context, suggesting that DePaul was at a crossroads and that it needed to take aggressive action "to consolidate the university's position and to keep it moving forward." The lay trustees were particularly concerned about the deteriorating neighborhood around the uptown campus and about extricating the university from its lease on the Lake Street building. In addition, they began thinking about preparing for the institution's golden jubilee, about the need for faculty housing, the lack of an auditorium, and the need for an athletic field house.

During its nearly 20-year existence, the board of lay trustees addressed many of the important financial and physical plant issues that faced the university: whether or not to buy a building in the Loop during the 1948-49 academic year; it celebrated the university's release from debt when it paid off its last outstanding obligation, a coupon held by Northwestern Mutual Fund, in 1948; and it worried constantly about the fluctuations in enrollments that determined in large measure whether the university was in the red or in the black during any given academic year. Finances continued to be of concern to the lay trustees all through the 1950s. The $100,000 deficit the university showed in 1950 was due largely to a decline in enrollment. The 1953-54 academic year finally saw another balanced budget, although enrollment did not show a substantial upswing until 1955. Fewer college age students, the result of a decline in birth rates during the Great Depression, and military service (the Korean War) were cited as reasons for the drop in enrollment during the early fifties. (23)

DePaul could not afford to rely mostly on tuition to fund its operations, and President O'Malley and the board began exploring ways to raise money for the university. The board of lay trustees decided to launch a $5,250,000 fund drive in 1953 to focus on upgrading the university's physical plant by constructing buildings and acquiring land. The money raised by
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the campaign would be portioned out, with $4,250,000 for infrastructure improvement and the remaining $1 million for endowment. (24)

To improve its fundraising capability, the board of lay trustees increased its membership from 16 to 21 and added a committee on board organization in 1954 to coordinate the growing number of board committees. During the 1959–60 academic year, board size was finally fixed at 60, though President O'Malley had hoped for a 100-member board.

The board of lay trustees turned its attention to two pressing matters during the 1960s: raising additional money from corporations and the question of the Lincoln Park campus. In 1962, it established a Business-Industry Liaison Committee to solicit funds from corporations, motivated by a meeting between DePaul board members and Dr. Frank Sparks of the Council for Financial Aid to Education at which they discussed how to increase corporate support to higher education in Chicago. As Thomas Croak notes in chapter 7, DePaul made a commitment by 1963 to stay in the Lincoln Park area and to improve its uptown campus. The board of lay trustees reviewed proposals that called for purchasing an apart-

For decades, summer school enrollments at DePaul included many religious. Sisters teaching in Chicago's Catholic School System and
ment building for dormitories, building a library-classroom facility, a student union, and a power plant. Government funding for colleges and universities, and changes in urban renewal laws that allowed DePaul to purchase land at substantially reduced rates, facilitated the transformation of the Lincoln Park campus. By July 1963, the university had acquired all the land, except for one parcel, in the area bounded by Fullerton, Belden, Kenmore, and Seminary. (25)

The commitment to expand and refurbish the Lincoln Park campus and the arrival of a new president set the stage for changes in the administration and governance of DePaul during the middle and late 1960s. When he assumed the presidency, Father Cortelyou, President O’Malley’s successor, created the Administrative Council to manage the changes taking place on the Lincoln Park campus. The need for federal dollars brought about another reorganization of the lay board in 1967 in a further effort to increase lay participation and governance in the university. The era of strong presidents was giving way to the shared governance that characterized the administrations of DePaul’s next three presidents.
The Later Presidents: Creating the Modern University

The periods of continuing growth and change that marked the presidencies of John R. Cortelyou, C.M., John T. Richardson, and John P. Minogue, C.M., confirmed Burton Clark's prediction that specialization, multiple value systems, and increasing size would spawn numerous subcultures. Coordination and vigorous bureaucracies would become common in large universities as a consequence, Clark has argued. At DePaul, the University Council had been the dominant administrative group for more than thirty years, but beginning with the Cortelyou presidency in 1964 and continuing into the present, new administrative structures were added, even though they made DePaul's governance more rule-driven and fragmented.

Father John Cortelyou (president from 1964 to 1981) was the first DePaul president with an advanced degree in an academic discipline (biology) rather than in theology. As Thomas Croak notes, his commitment to the sciences served as a catalyst, inspiring a rise in the quality of all academic programs, but especially the sciences. Father Cortelyou also presided over the expansion and modification of the university's internal governance structures. The formation of the Administrative Council and the University Senate and the growing interest of the student body in the curricular and administrative issues that affected their education accelerated changes in DePaul's management structure.

A small group of administrators, concerned about the building program at the Lincoln Park campus and renovation in the Lewis Center on the downtown campus, formed the Administrative Council, a new university-wide body. The university was engaged in an aggressive building campaign on the Lincoln Park campus to build dormitories for 200 students, a new building for classrooms, faculty offices and a library, and a new central heating plant. With all of this construction activity, there was a need for close coordination of the projects and the costs associated with them.

The Administrative Council, consisting of President Cortelyou, Executive Vice President John Richardson, Vice President Theodore Wangler, Secretary-Treasurer Albert L. Dundas, and Comerford O'Malley, former president and now chancellor, held its first meeting in February 1964. (26) It undertook decisions about salary and benefit levels for faculty, administrators, and clerical staff, heard about proposed changes in the board of trustees, discussed the format for the inauguration of President Cortelyou and, of course, monitored progress on acquiring and developing property in Lincoln Park.

The structure of this body, including its limited size, was reminiscent of the old model of authoritative control in university affairs. The Administrative Council once again centralized decision making in the hands of a few individuals, almost all of whom were Vincentians. However, as the control exercised by Vincentian priests at DePaul continued to decline, Father Cortelyou recognized that the leadership of the institution was heading toward lay control. In a statement to the board on January 17, 1964 he said:
As the internal organization of the university developed, the Administrative Council expanded to include additional senior administrators who filled newly created vice presidential positions. The heads of enrollment management, student affairs, institutional research and planning, and development joined the Administrative Council as these departments came into existence. The decline in Vincentian influence and participation at the university is evident in the Administrative Council membership. Mostly Vincentian in 1964, by the end of the Administrative Council’s existence in 1993, the president and the “Senior Officer for Mission” were the only Vincentian priests remaining at the administration’s senior level. (28)

The Administrative Council oversaw most areas of administrative function. Father Richardson, executive vice president and chief academic officer for the university at the time of its formation, reported changes in academic programs to the council. In 1964, for instance, he was instrumental in its rejecting a nursing program, and he recommended adopting a quarter system for all schools except law in 1965. The council also dealt with faculty concerns. To help faculty members raise money to support their research, the Department of Sponsored Programs and Projects was proposed in 1970. At its final meeting (June 1993), plans for expanding DePaul’s international academic offerings were brought up. Even though the Administrative Council discussed and made recommendations related to academic concerns throughout its existence, it functioned more in an advisory capacity on academic matters than as a decision making body.

As regards external governance, another substantial change in the board of trustees was introduced during the Cortelyou presidency. Much of the drive to transform the board originated in DePaul’s need for government funds to help support academic and administrative programs. But it also corresponded to the drift toward greater lay participation in all areas of university life. As a corollary to increased lay participation in administration of the university, more lay involvement in the governance of the university was called for.

As early as 1963, Father Cortelyou, Father Richardson and members of the board of lay trustees discussed ways to improve the operations of both the lay trustees and the board of legal trustees. The trustees were not involved enough with the university and consequently
their efforts at fundraising were hampered. More outside or lay representation on the legal board of trustees was recommended in a 1963 self-study. A number of changes to both the legal board of trustees and the board of lay trustees were proposed between 1964 and 1967. Finally in 1967, the board of lay trustees was completely reorganized in accordance with a plan devised by Claire Roddewig and an ad hoc committee of the board that he chaired. The former board of legal trustees, renamed the “Members of the Corporation,” retained the authority to select both of DePaul's boards. In addition, as a way to retain their influence in the university, two-thirds of the Members of the Corporation were to be Vincentians. Governance and management of the university, however, was transferred to the newly formed board of directors, which replaced the board of lay trustees. The board of directors was given a degree of authority that put it on a par with traditional boards of directors at other colleges and universities. Specifically, the board was empowered to select the president of the university, a choice no longer limited by the restriction that the president must be a Vincentian. For the first time, DePaul University was an institution primarily under lay control. (29)

Finally, Father Cortelyou’s presidency saw a further set of changes related to administration and governance. The University Senate, created in 1968, expanded the number and type of people who were involved with the internal functioning of the university. This body represented an attempt to combat the fragmentation that Clark suggested is an outcome of growth, and was designed to bring faculty, staff, and students more fully within the governance of the university. Each of these three groups was represented on the senate, an entity that was emblematic of the new accessibility to governance structures that was occurring on college and university campuses in the 1960s. The University Senate eventually succumbed to its own ineffectiveness and was disbanded in 1983. Nonetheless, it consolidated the increasing desire for faculty involvement in administration and governance that had evolved over the past 20 years. In addition, the University Senate set the stage for the increased participation by faculty and staff, and to a lesser extent students, in leading and managing a new DePaul that was increasingly manifest in the closing decades of its first century.

As early as 1946, a faculty committee made recommendations to the University Council about matters affecting faculty members. This relationship was formalized in 1950 with the creation of the Administration-University Senate, made up of representatives from both the administration and the faculty. Vice President Krammer and Comptroller Sharer represented the administration, but faculty members varied from year to year (usually there were five faculty participants). During the 18-year history of this body, members addressed such matters as secretarial and other support services for faculty, salary and benefits, the role of academic freedom at DePaul, and policies related to tenure and promotion. In May 1965 (30) the faculty group reported considerable enthusiasm among its constituents about the possibility of organizing an academic senate to better serve faculty interests, a suggestion that contributed to the eventual formation of the University Senate.
Various committees and councils took up the issue of an academic senate over the next four years. In October 1965, members of the University Council learned that the faculty had requested a faculty senate but had not developed a formal proposal. At the same meeting, Father Richardson proposed that the Student Activity Council select some students to serve in "a liaison capacity with the faculty and administration, that the Faculty Advisory Council select three faculty members, and that the president of the university appoint three administrators to meet with duly appointed student representatives." (31) The idea of joint meetings between faculty, administrators, and students influenced the composition of the University Senate.

In April 1966, Father Richardson sent a memorandum to the University Council indicating the formation of a steering committee for the senate to guide the development of the University Senate, to ensure both faculty and administration involvement. (32) In addition to faculty members Father Joseph Brokers, William Hayes, Lawrence Ryan, Cornelius Sippel, and Robert Tiles, the steering committee included University Council representatives Father Richardson, Father Theodore Wangler (vice president for student personnel services), Jack Compare (budget and finances), and Martin Lowery.

In December 1967 Dr. Bunion, chair of the Faculty Advisory Council, proposed an academic faculty senate so that faculty and administrators could share authority in the operations of the university. (33) Faculty members, it was felt, should have authority over curriculum, degree requirements, and standards of student achievement. Further, control over standards for promotion, tenure, academic freedom and other areas that affect the life of the faculty were to be in faculty hands, along with the grievance process as it related to faculty members. In addition to the areas in which the faculty would have direct authority, there were other areas such as budgets, student affairs, physical plant, and public statements of the university, over which it was believed the faculty should have indirect authority.

In the end, the idea of a university governing body involving faculty, staff, and students won out over an academic senate consisting only of faculty. The University Senate Committee, which met first in February 1968, was chaired by faculty member Albert Erlebacher. (34) It spent approximately two years determining membership in and the structure of this body. On February 16, 1970, after the committee approved the final document, it voted to disband as a committee. Professor Erlebacher, who had been its chairman, assumed the presidency pro-tem of the University Senate in June of that year.

According to its by-laws, the University Senate was to consist of 26 faculty senators, 13 student senators, 12 administrators as ex officio members (vice presidents and deans) and 2 staff who were to represent all elements of the non-professional staff of the university. To make the University Senate a functioning and manageable body, a committee and subcommittee structure was put in place for faculty affairs, academic programs and regulations, student affairs, human relations, finance, physical plant and development. (35) Similar to the commit-
tees developed for the University Council in the 1930s, they dealt with aspects of administration and function that were becoming increasingly important.

The University Senate, with its combination of both advisory and legislative powers, was designed to permit individuals to contribute to the formulation of decisions, to make policy and to facilitate communication throughout the university. In its advisory capacity, it would counsel the president and through him the board of trustees. It would advise on matters both external (relationships with other institutions, finances, plans for physical expansion, and public relations) and internal (changes in curriculum and degree requirements).

The president delegated legislative powers to the University Senate and he reviewed senate decisions and retained veto power over them. Any decision not acted on by the president within 30 days became university policy. The University Senate’s legislative authority covered academic faculty and student affairs. Its control in the area of academic affairs dealt with academic programs, curriculum, and standards for student admission and achievement. Its role with respect to faculty gave the University Senate the right to create policies related to academic freedom, tenure, morale, and the welfare of the faculty. In the area of student affairs, it focused on counseling, paracurricular activities, discipline, and the general welfare of the students.

The University Senate attempted to develop collegial decision-making at DePaul by placing representatives of the various constituencies squarely within the decision-making process. As the language of senate by-laws demonstrated, however, the only way to activate collegial decision making given the growth in the university was through a rule-driven bureaucracy. Burton Clark has designated this use of bureaucracy the fourth stage of growth in a university, in which rules are promulgated to bind together different subcultures of the institution and dictate how they will interact with each other. At DePaul, there were very specific guidelines for faculty and students having to do with election to the senate and extent of authority as a member of this body. On the other hand, the by-laws were rather vague with respect to lower-level staff whose representatives were allotted only two of the 65 positions. The by-laws did not specify any area of legislative power specifically reserved for staff, nor were the provisions for electing staff as clearly laid out as they were for faculty and students. The University Senate was disbanded in 1983 during the Richardson presidency because it did not address the issues and concerns of each group of participants satisfactorily, and because its large membership and consequent unwieldiness interfered with its ability to function.

Father John Richardson, who was named president in 1981, was the first president to be chosen by the board of trustees under its new authority rather than appointed by the Vincentian provincial. Richardson had come to DePaul in 1954 and played a critical role in the university for many years before assuming the presidency. Father Richardson, like Father O’Connell, one of his predecessors as executive vice president, had been an influential academic administrator. As Charles Strain notes in this volume, Richardson oversaw a number of the curricular reforms initiated dur-
ing Father Cortelyou's presidency. In addition, during his term as executive vice president, he headed the University Council and was an active member of the Administrative Council.

Father Richardson had been an activist as second in command and he was an activist as president. Under Cortelyou and Richardson, DePaul put into effect doctoral level programs in philosophy, psychology, and computer science and brought to fruition the plan Richardson had developed during Cortelyou's presidency. During Richardson's tenure the university officially adopted the concept of growth as a means of upgrading DePaul's academic offerings. Growth meant more students, which meant more income for DePaul; this money was to finance improvements in physical plant and permit an increase in the size and quality of the DePaul faculty. Growth in the university also called for more administrators. By naming three women, including an African American and an Asian American, to vice presidential posts, Richardson pioneered racial and gender diversity at DePaul's senior administrative levels.

Early in his presidency, Father Richardson took the first steps toward elimination of the University Senate. (36) He appointed a committee consisting of Carol Abbinanti, Virgil Johnson, Barbara Lewis, James McGing, John Markese, Federick Miller, David Sonenshein, and Simone Zurawski and charged it with making specific recommendations for replacing or restructuring the senate. In February 1983, the committee released its “Report of the Committee on Replacing or Restructuring the University Senate.” (37) Opening with a discussion of academic governance, the members stated some of the basic assumptions that guided their recommendations: the University Senate can be effective only within the larger context of governance at DePaul; faculty, students, staff, and administrators should share in governance; and the board of trustees is the university’s ultimate authority. While the committee acknowledged the influence of such external agencies and forces as legislative bodies, regulatory agencies, courts, accrediting bodies, and other social forces, it chose not to deal with them. The report also noted that faculty members had become less involved in the University Senate and more involved in their departments and schools. In the section on governance at DePaul, the committee wrote:

> Among virtually all of the individuals consulted by the committee, and in every group interviewed, representing all constituencies on the campus, there is a clear consensus that the University Senate, as presently constituted, is ineffective as the principal mechanism for faculty, staff, and student participation in governance at DePaul. Inadequacies most frequently cited are that it is too large and unwieldy; the diversity of representation is a problem, particularly in view of the fact that there are not other structures for faculty participation in governance; it does not effectively represent staff.
In light of the disenchantment with the University Senate, the committee recommended that it be disbanded.

The committee is satisfied that the present circumstance is not the fault of any person or group of persons. Rather it recognizes that the University Senate is no longer adequate as a governance structure to deal with issues of the time. It is the recommendation of the committee that the University Senate be discontinued, and replaced with separate, discrete organizations to serve the four constituency groups that make up the campus community: faculty, staff, students, and administrators (39).

In place of the University Senate, the committee recommended that separate governance structures be created for faculty, staff, and students. The report described each of these structures. The suggestions made for faculty and staff became the blueprints for the Faculty Council and Staff Council, the bodies that replaced the University Senate.

The committee report recommended that Faculty Council members be elected by the faculty and advise the administration on those aspects that affected faculty, in which faculty might have expertise, or those with implication for the educational mission of the institution. Curriculum, instruction, academic programs, degree requirements, educational policies, faculty status (including appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure), and admission standards were to be the primary responsibilities of the Faculty Council. According to the report, faculty would routinely deliberate with the administration on such matters as the development of the budget, institutional priorities and planning, and selection and retention of administrators. The administration could request advice from the Faculty Council or the council could offer such advice independent of the wishes of the administration. Finally, the report suggested that participation on the Faculty Council be recognized in the reward systems of the university.

In the section on participation of students in governance, the report recommended that a "Student Association" be created, an instrument to communicate students' point of view rather than a "governing body." The Student Association would have primary responsibility for formulating the regulations that affect student life, student-sponsored activities and programs and student publications. The Student Association and the administration would work together to establish standards and procedures governing student discipline, student disciplinary procedures and appointments to key positions in student affairs. Like the Faculty Council, the Student Association could advise the administration in such matters as curriculum, establishment and development of programs, procedures for evaluation of courses, pro-
cedures for evaluation of students, the appointment and retention of faculty and administration, and quality of academic life as it affected students.

The "Report on Replacing or Restructuring the University Senate" attempted to address a major senate shortcoming: lack of involvement of staff in the governance of the university. As it had for faculty and students, the report recommended that staff have its own governance structure, with the establishment of a "Staff Council" to be elected by staff members. The staff would work with the administration to make decisions that affected staff, particularly with respect to working conditions. In addition, the Staff Council would advise the administration and faculty regarding the effect new programs would have on academic support resources such as library, computer services, and the like. By recommending the creation of the Staff Council, the committee members acknowledged that the staff had concerns that had not been addressed satisfactorily by previous administrations (deans and those who served on the Administrative Council) and, therefore, needed its own body to advance the interests of its constituents.

In light of the committee's recommendations to form separate councils, a faculty committee was convened at President Richardson's request. Its members, Joan Lakebrink (education, and chair of the Faculty Steering Committee to Establish a Faculty Council), Jurgis Anyasas (chemistry), James Belohlav (management), Patrick Callahan (political science), Edwin Cohen (accounting), Jeanne LaDuke (math), Raymond Grzebielski (law), John O'Malley (Goodman), and Stephen J. Leacock (law) who resigned and was replaced by Ray J. Grzebielski, set the structure and objectives of the Faculty Council. (40)

During January and February of 1984, this steering committee revised suggestions that had appeared in the 1983 report and offered more specific commentary on the rights and responsibilities of faculty. The document they produced divided faculty responses into three types: primary, participatory, and advisory. Primary responsibilities covered all governance in the area of academic and scholarly activities and faculty personnel matters within the university. Participatory responsibilities allowed the faculty to "participate regularly with the administration and other appropriate bodies in the University" to establish priorities and to formulate policies related to allocation and use of human, physical, and fiscal resources, selection and retention of administrators, creation of offices and other major changes in the university structure. Any matter of interest to the faculty or pertaining to the university and its purpose such as policies related to intercollegiate athletics would be within faculty purview. In an advisory capacity, the Faculty Council could counsel the administration whenever asked or when the faculty felt it was appropriate. (41)

Though the Faculty Council was designed and set up by a faculty committee, President Richardson was actively involved in its development. In his May 5, 1983 memo to Patricia Ewers (dean of faculties) and Howard Sulkin, another academic administrator, Richardson wrote:
Later that month (May 17) Richardson asked Deans Griffith, Meister, Miller, Ryan, Sarubbi, and Watts to distribute a final draft of the recommendations to each of their faculty members. Though Dean Justice at the School for New Learning received a copy of the memorandum, this school did not yet have full time faculty members, so the draft was not circulated in the School for New Learning. Richardson observed in a memo that accompanied the draft, “We are somewhat pressed for time because my calendar calls for getting the reactions of the faculty to the proposal before the faculty disperse for the summer. Hence the June 1 deadline. We have been at this too long already.” (43)

The Faculty Council held its first meeting on October 26, 1984. (44) Some members of this first council—for example, Professors Lakebrink and Sippel—had been involved in earlier attempts at faculty governance as members of either the University Senate or the committee to develop the Faculty Council. Junior faculty who were newer to the governance process at DePaul but who were part of the larger national movement to open governance structures in higher education also served on the Faculty Council. (See table 3, list of members of first Faculty Council.)

The Faculty Council addressed issues of its internal governance as well as issues affecting the larger university during its first year. At its first meeting, the council elected William Hayes (by a narrow 9–7 margin over Joan Lakebrink) chair and appointed members of the Committee on Committees (Sullivan, Lakebrink, Messmer, Vitullo, Bennett, and Flynn) to begin recruiting faculty to serve on its various and still-to-be-formed committees. Finally, the council assumed the responsibility (previously held by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate) to participate in the nomination of the president of the university and appoint faculty candidates to university-wide committees and boards. Hayes appointed Erlebacher to be temporary secretary at the following meeting. (45) Father Richardson, who attended the meeting, agreed to a course reduction for the president of the council to accommodate his additional administrative obligations and suggested that the Faculty Council consider making the secretary’s position a nonfaculty one. Richardson said that he was willing to explore a system of early consultation with the faculty to expedite decision making. Throughout the rest of that academic year, the Faculty Council continued to organize itself and became increasingly involved in academic governance issues.
It created the Committee on Status of Faculty, organized a process for consultation on the reappointment of David Justice as dean of the School for New Learning, and approved a Masters of Science in Management Systems, revision of the faculty handbook, the appointment of a faculty representative from the School for New Learning and the appointment of a student as a non-voting member of the Committee on the Status of Faculty. Over the next decade, the Faculty Council supplemented programs and policies with the aim of improving the university’s academic quality and its treatment of faculty. (46)

During this period, university staff members were organizing the Staff Council through their Staff Steering Committee which consisted of William Duffy (payroll), Portia Fuzell (admissions), Judith Rycombel (libraries), Georgette Rohde, (School of Music), and Brenda Sanders (Rehabilitation Services Program).

Founded in 1983, Staff Council was created to represent the staff and promote its concerns, to facilitate staff participation in governance, planning and decision making, to serve as a liaison between staff and faculty, students, and administration, and to preserve an atmosphere of personalism in the university community. Any staff member below the level of vice president was eligible for election to the Staff Council, which was made up of 12 exempt mem-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commerce:</th>
<th>Education:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Hayes</td>
<td>Joan Lakebrink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Kewley</td>
<td>Jack Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert O’Keefe</td>
<td>(alternate: Kopan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Sullivan</td>
<td>Law:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemma Welsch</td>
<td>Vincent Vitullo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(alternates: Luft, Markese, Waters)</td>
<td>David Coar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(alternate Ginsberg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Science:</td>
<td>Music:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Bennett</td>
<td>Donald DeRoache,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Erlebacher</td>
<td>George Flynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Fila</td>
<td>(alternate: Lyne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John (Jack) Leahy,</td>
<td>Goodman:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Sipple,</td>
<td>Janet Messmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Spalding</td>
<td>James T. Ostholthoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(alternates: Anderson, Bille, and Crossan)</td>
<td>(alternate: Fielding)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Three  Initial Members of Faculty Council
bers and 12 non-exempt members. Although the Staff Council was created to increase staff participation in the administration and governance of DePaul, it did not inspire the same interest among staff as the Faculty Council did among the faculty. Only one group of staff, the librarians, responded to the proposed establishment of a Staff Council. They wrote a memorandum responding to the “Report of the Committee on Replacing or Restructuring the University Senate,” voicing their opinions about the role proposed for the librarians on the Staff Council. (47) They argued for exempt and nonexempt staff representation on the Staff Council, adding that librarians, as the largest single group of academic professionals, should have permanent voting representation. But, they asserted, limiting participation of librarians to Staff Council excluded them from active participation in planning and developing academic programs. Finally, they pointed out that the library is the only large unit in the university whose chief administrative officer is not represented on any policy-making body.

In recent years the Staff Council has become more active, recommending staff representatives for most major university-wide committees and creating for itself a more active role in university governance. Since 1994, staff members have participated on the Joint Council, the Benefits Committee, the Sexual Harassment Advisory Board, and the Information Technology Academic Advisory Group. Current Staff Council president Kelly Moore has commented that the council is still working to fashion its appropriate role. (48)

Father John Minogue became president of DePaul in 1993. He was the second president elected by the board of trustees rather than appointed by the Vincentian provincial. The board chose the president, but the presidential selection committee first presented the three finalists to the university community for its comments. In contrast to Father Richardson, his predecessor, whose transition to the presidency was eased by his long tenure at DePaul, Father Minogue was new to the university and to administration in higher education. His professional training was in the area of theology and he had been a clinical professor of ethics at Northwestern University, where he had worked on a day-to-day basis with parents of unborn babies afflicted with severe medical illnesses. It was work that demanded quick decision making as lives often were at stake. Minogue’s propensity for action early in his tenure sometimes found him at odds with a university culture that was slow and collegial in its decision making processes.

Father Minogue made a number of administrative changes early in his tenure. He reorganized the senior administration into administrative and academic lines with an executive vice president heading each of these areas. This restructuring of the senior administrative leadership resulted in a number of long-term members of the senior leadership leaving the university or assuming new positions. He dedicated his efforts to expanding the number of suburban campuses and computerizing the university, increasing the staffing in these areas as a way to implement these plans.

Also, Minogue replaced the Academic Council with the Joint Council. The Joint Council, a larger group than the Administrative Council, had a membership that was closer in its makeup
to the old University Council. The two executive vice presidents (operations and academics), five vice presidents (planning, student affairs, enrollment management, development and university relations, and human resources), the deans of all the schools and colleges, the president of faculty council and the senior executive for university mission comprised the membership of the first Joint Council, though it expanded later to include the controller, the associate vice presidents for enrollment management and organizational development, and the special assistant to the president for diversity. For the first time since the demise of the University Senate, DePaul students were represented in a senior decision making body when the president of the Student Government Association became a member of the Joint Council. The Joint Council, with both policy endorsement and operational functions, touched all important facets of the institution. The early agendas of the meetings had sections for policy and procedure, academics and operations areas, strategic planning, deans and administrative councils, and ongoing effectiveness. (49) Each academic and administrative area was to present to the Joint Council its short- and long-term plans for operation. The council commented and made recommendations, though each of the deans and managers of the functional areas set individual agendas. Each unit made reports designed to increase understanding among the senior administrators of the university and to anticipate the strategic planning process that would occur over the next few years.

In some ways, the start of the Minogue presidency crystallized the transition that was taking place at the university. DePaul had been growing steadily for the previous 10 years, and there was a sentiment on the part of many long-term faculty and staff that the university was changing from “the little school under the El” to an organization different from what they were familiar with. There was concern as well that expansion to the suburbs was in conflict with the institution’s mission of serving Chicago students. Faculty were concerned that teaching on multiple campuses would weaken their connection to their home departments. Some wondered whether a commitment to multiculturalism would mean a commitment to quotas. Finally, many members of the DePaul community felt that focusing on computers, improving administrative procedures, and reducing the university’s operating costs would lead to a university climate in which the importance of the individual would be diminished. (50)

During the first years of the Minogue presidency, discussions about what DePaul had been and was to become took place in a number of university forums. Each of the councils—faculty, staff, and joint—allocated time to react to proposed changes and make recommendations of its own. Open sessions on the strategic plan and town hall meetings on diversity provided opportunities for a wide variety of faculty and staff to engage senior administrators about the future of the university. By the 1990s DePaul was no longer an institution built on and dominated by the larger-than-life presidents of its early years. Governance was now in the hands of the administration, the faculty, the non-teaching staff and, to a more limited extent, the students. In this respect, DePaul, like most other American higher education institutions of its
size, conformed closely to Burton Clark’s general model of institutional behavior. DePaul had moved from an institution where administration and governance was embodied in the president and a small number of priests, through stages that brought increasing differentiation in the faculty and administration. This process, while allowing more voice to people who were excluded from decision making in the earlier days at DePaul, resulted in clearly identified groups—faculty, staff, students—representing the interests of their constituencies. On the threshold of its second century, DePaul had become a fully modern university with all the benefits and challenges attendant to such a transformation.

External Factors Affecting the Life of the University
DePaul, like other universities, has grown substantially since its founding. Burton Clark’s model of the organizational dynamics of growth provided a framework for interpreting DePaul’s evolution. But this framework has two drawbacks. First, it fails to acknowledge the role of external forces in higher education in general (and DePaul in particular) with respect to administration and governance. Second, it fails to take note of the religious identification that plays such a significant role in an institution such as DePaul. DiMaggio and Powell (51) argue that organizations in a given field tend increasingly to resemble one another. They call this trend toward uniformity “isomorphism” and explain that there are three types: coercive, normative, and mimetic. Coercive isomorphism occurs when external agents with power over a given domain make the organizations in that domain comply with external standards. Accrediting bodies, local, state, and federal governments are primary sources of coercive isomorphism for colleges and universities. Normative isomorphism is most closely associated with professionalization. When a profession adopts standards of behavior for its members, these standards tend to become codified, limiting members’ freedom to explore alternative ways to deliver services. Finally, mimetic isomorphism addresses the tendency for new or less successful organizations to emulate their more successful counterparts as a way to increase their legitimacy. Mimetic isomorphism can save time for organizations that need to develop standard operating procedures quickly.

DePaul has been profoundly influenced throughout its existence by external forces. The direction the university took in its early days was determined by the expectations and requirements of external groups: the Catholic Church, the local Catholic bishop and regional accrediting bodies. DePaul’s resemblance to other colleges and universities is in part the product of coercive, professional, and mimetic isomorphism. The Catholic Church and the North Central Association were the most influential sources of coercive isomorphism in DePaul’s formative years.

When Chicago Archbishop Feehan asked the Vincentian Visitor, Thomas J. Smith, to open the day college in Chicago that became St. Vincent’s, it was because the archbishop wanted another institution to help educate the growing number of Catholic immigrants in Chicago.
The church hierarchy frustrated DePaul’s efforts to model itself after lay universities, and between 1903 and 1905 Bishop Quigley, who succeeded Feehan, influenced the educational philosophy of the college by pointing it back toward a more religious orientation for the training of priests. When Quigley permitted a Jesuit institution (which later became Loyola University) to be established north of DePaul, President Byrne of DePaul recognized the arrival of a threat to his university’s survival but was unable to alter Bishop Quigley’s decision. Quigley then suggested that DePaul become more effective in its ability to compete with Loyola by creating extension courses for Catholic laywomen to prepare them for principalships in Chicago’s public schools. Clearly, the decisions and recommendations of local Catholic leaders were extremely influential in DePaul’s early history.

The Vincentian Visitor had the authority within the Vincentian community to assign priests to leadership positions at the university. These appointments ensured that Vincentian and Catholic principles would pervade the university. When Rev. James W. Stakelum made himself chair of the board of trustees in 1954 in an attempt to exert greater Catholic control over the university, his tenure was cut short as the movement to bring more lay involvement to the governance of the university prevailed. But his efforts point out the strength of the relationship between DePaul and its Vincentian sponsors, who exercised direct control over DePaul for more than half of its existence. This measure of control by the Vincentians and the Church has diminished in the last half of the century for a number of reasons. First, reorganizing the board of trustees has transferred governance of the university to lay people. Though the board has chosen a Vincentian president of DePaul on both of the occasions it has had to exercise its new prerogative, it has been under no formal obligation to do so. Second, the trend toward religious diversity among students, which goes as far back as 1910 when non-Catholics entered the university with the law school, has continued. Current figures indicate that only 43 percent of DePaul’s student body identifies itself as Catholic. Third, the university faculty has become increasingly diverse with respect to religion and ethnicity. Finally, as Richard Meister has noted, the number of Vincentian priests has declined precipitously since the early days of the university. During DePaul’s 1997–98 academic year, there were only thirteen Vincentians out of a faculty and staff numbering more than two thousand.

The entity most responsible for pushing DePaul into a degree of conformity with other colleges and universities, however, has been the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges, the major accrediting body for high schools, colleges and universities in the midwest. Though approval by regional accrediting bodies is not mandatory, virtually all eligible educational institutions seek accreditation as a reliable and objective measure of the quality of their programs. Approval by accrediting bodies confers legitimacy on educational organizations.

The discussions between DePaul’s presidents and the accrediting bodies during the 1950s demonstrate that they significantly influenced DePaul’s academic program and administration. Philip Gleason makes the case that Catholic colleges and universities struggled
throughout the first half of the 20th century to adopt standards that accrediting bodies would approve.

DePaul's professional programs had been accepted by the NCA in 1932 and the entire university was granted unconditional NCA accreditation in 1933. On the occasion of this accomplishment, President Corcoran stressed the need for the university to work out "... its own destiny by doing everything possible to further its standing and its usefulness to the community." (59) The university's continuing problems with NCA were testimony to the challenge it faced in keeping accreditation while fulfilling its mission.

The North Central Association was a looming threat to the university that affected its internal functioning from almost the beginning. A year after official acceptance into NCA, for example, President Corcoran was regularly requesting the University Council to enact changes in general academic and administrative standards and to limit the award of what the accrediting team had criticized as an excessive number of honorary degrees (DePaul tended to give honorary degrees at each of its three graduation exercises). DePaul began creating its administrative positions with an eye to thwarting criticism from the accrediting bodies, and it created the position of "Inspector of Scholastic Records" in 1934 to assess courses from junior colleges "... to forestall unfavorable criticism by accrediting officers." Despite such efforts, the university almost lost its accreditation in the 1950-51 review period. DePaul responded to NCA reactions to its poor library facilities, inadequate space, and insufficient resources by increasing fundraising to direct greater resources into these areas. The 1952 campaign launched by the board of lay trustees specifically addressed these matters.

The second issue raised by the NCA team struck at the heart of DePaul's problems, attacking the quality and integrity of the university's academic program as delivered by its faculty. As noted earlier, the team expressed concern about the small number of faculty with advanced degrees. Since many of DePaul's faculty were part-timers or were teaching at the instructor level, the president pressured the deans of each of DePaul's schools and colleges to hire individuals who had degrees in hand and to encourage already employed faculty to complete their degrees, as Thomas Croak notes in chapter 7.

DePaul also made administrative changes internally and at the board level to eliminate practices that the report had labeled unsound when it questioned the propriety of having the president serve as chair of the board and the vice president and comptroller sit on the board of trustees and at the same time report to the president. (60)

The regional accrediting body and the Catholic Church, both powerful influences on DePaul's administration and curricular offerings, were not the only organizations that forced compliance to external criteria. In order to make itself attractive to students, faculty, and larger professional bodies, various colleges and departments actively sought membership in professional associations. These associations made conforming to their professional standards a
condition of membership. These newly emerging professional association standards affected both DePaul's academic and administrative programs and typify the isomorphism that is a result of normative pressures.

University Council minutes in 1930, for instance, (61) stated that the law school had been placed on probation because it did not meet the standards of the Association of American Law Schools. Among other questionable activities, DePaul was allowing examination credits in lieu of classes and was accepting nonacademic credit toward degrees. After a year's worth of hard work, the law school's membership was unconditionally reinstated. The School of Music became a member of the National Association of Schools of Music in 1933, (62) and in 1934 DePaul agreed to follow the rules set forth by the Western Conference with respect to athletic competition.

The university leadership sought membership in the growing number of groups and associations that, as corollaries to the professional academic organizations, were advocates for colleges and universities. DePaul was a member of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, the American Association of Colleges, and a variety of Illinois based consortia. Each of them had standards for admission and membership, and the university worked hard to transform itself to meet these requirements. For a number of years DePaul was denied membership in the American Association of University Women because it had too few women in leadership positions, prompting President O'Malley to express his dissatisfaction to the University Council at the university's inability to meet this organization's standards. (63)

The mimetic form of isomorphism has institutions looking to other organizations to see how they should appear and function. DePaul created its programs, set its tuition, and altered its curriculum most often with an eye toward what other colleges and universities were doing. For example, in 1933 DePaul adopted the process the University of Illinois had established for selecting honors graduates in the College of Liberal Arts and Science. (64) In 1934, the law school considered creating a law review publication in hopes of garnering the kind of prestige such publications gave to the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois, Northwestern, Harvard and other leading institutions. (65) In 1934, President O'Connell suggested that DePaul create a pool of faculty to comment on current social and political issues, and shortly thereafter DePaul faculty members joined colleagues from Northwestern and the University of Chicago on a local radio talk show to discuss social and religious issues of the day. (66)

The tradition of taking other universities as models dated back to the founding of the university. DePaul made adaptations to the university of Chicago's charter, using its terminology in the sections on incorporation and curricular direction. President Byrne turned to Harvard and its elective system as DePaul's guide into the world of universities. Local universities such as the University of Illinois directly influenced programs and academic policy at DePaul when their registrars occasionally refused to certify DePaul students' transfer credits. DePaul exer-
cised a corresponding influence on other institutions. Newly formed junior colleges and schools that trained women religious designed their courses to ensure that DePaul would accept their students' course credits.

DePaul seldom looked to other Catholic colleges and universities for models, however. Though on occasion Loyola was mentioned as a resource, it was usually in the field of tuition pricing and never with respect to administration or curriculum. Instead, the young university sought private non-Catholic institutions and local public universities as role models, since these institutions were also DePaul's direct competitors for students. On a number of occasions, DePaul looked to elite eastern universities such as Harvard and Yale, especially when the university sought models for its academic programs. When plans emerged to create an honor society, for instance, it was pointed out that Northwestern had such a society, and then DePaul proceeded to adopt much of Northwestern's honor society protocol.

While not the dominant forces in shaping DePaul's administrative and governance structures, external forces helped the institution conform to the design and structures of other colleges and universities in the area, a requirement for attaining legitimacy and success. (67) DePaul's reputation improved after it successfully met the challenges of accrediting bodies and professional associations. In this respect external factors exerted a very significant influence on the development of the university.

**Conclusion**

Administration and governance at DePaul University has developed thanks to internal actors and external agents that combined over time to compel the university to adopt conventional administrative and governance procedures. The power of the presidency diminished in proportion as others—faculty, staff, and lay people—became involved in the internal management of the university.

The unitary structure that, according to Burton Clark, characterized colleges and universities in the 19th century was evident at DePaul well into the 1930s. But at about that time a trend materialized that encouraged shared decision making and implementation among a growing constituency in the university community. Though at first only senior administrators and deans participated, by the 1970s governance was being distributed over a wider range of groups in the institution. Participation by these discrete groups brought previously excluded actors into university life. The University Senate's aim of reintroducing a more unitary approach to decision making had, by the 1980s, installed an entrenched federated structure at all levels of the institution. Growth, which had been a survival strategy, further fragmented the members of the university into distinct subcultures.

Accreditation pressures from the North Central Association in the 1950s and the need for federal money to support the development of the physical plant in the 1960s brought more board-level lay control to the university. External groups and associations, which had developed their own standards for admission to their ranks, required DePaul to make further changes...
to obtain certification from such organizations. The pressures of isomorphism made DePaul look administratively and academically like most of the other mid-sized American universities that had triumphed in their own struggle for survival.
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