The story of curricular change in American higher education is often a litany of laments by the latest Jeremiah to appear in the pages of Newsweek, Time, or the New York Review of Books. In his best-selling work, The Closing of the American Mind, Alan Bloom argued that in the 1960s, when we will begin our story of curricular change at DePaul University, American higher education abandoned its commitment to a liberalizing education, succumbed to the siren song of moral relativism, and turned tail before the influx of the new barbarians. In short, it lost its way. (1) Bloom's lament has a long pedigree, with most variants placing the emphasis on separating the "pursuit of learning" from "preparation for modern professions." Thorstein Veblen gave this vision its classic expression as early as 1918 in The Higher Learning in America. Unless the two conflicting aims could be kept separate, Veblen thought the traditional vision of liberal learning would be crushed under the weight of professional training whose aim was self aggrandizement. (2)

A similar chorus of Jeremiahs within Catholic higher education has proclaimed an analogous dualism but one that is heightened by eschatological overtones. Here the pursuit of professional education is linked to the pervasive spread of secularism in American culture. Pitting the sacred against the secular, Catholic Jeremiahs urge Catholic institutions of higher education to resist the process that has eroded the religious character of their Protestant counterparts—-institutions such as the University of Chicago, Northwestern University and Illinois Wesleyan—that retain little more than mere shards of their religious foundations. (3) According to David J. O'Brien, those who see Catholic higher education poised on the slippery slope of secularization fail to perceive how purposefully American Catholics in general and Catholic higher education in particular willed their own explosive trajectory out of the confines of "ghetto Catholicism" during the period we focus on. (4) The conscious commitment of American Catholic universities to draw their strength from multiple cultural roots burst into prominence in the 1960s. To claim, as I will, that Catholic universities like DePaul have, for a long
time, exercised pluralism in both their ideology and curriculum (in fact if not in self-concep-
tion) is to dismiss the Jeremias as "profoundly misleading." (5)

To another group of commentators—who may be called "pragmatic adapters"—all of this
lamentation was beside the point. In the half-century since the end of World War II demo-
graphic changes were the driving force behind the transformation in American higher educa-
tion. In this familiar narrative, the G.I. Bill inaugurated a new era in which higher education
welcomed those whom Bloom could only perceive as the barbarians at the gates. Clark Kerr
refers to the period from 1960 to 1980 as the "third great transformation" of higher education
in America. The first occurred at Harvard and William and Mary in the 17th century, with
the founding of the liberal arts college based on a classical curriculum; the second took place in
the period from 1870 to 1910, when the German model of a departmentally-based research
university became the dominant force in higher education. Over the course of the third trans-
formation, the number of students in higher education rose from 3.5 million in 1960 to 12
million in 1980; the community college swept into prominence and federal money poured
into research institutions effectively harnessing them to the political purposes of the Cold War
and to the prevailing economic forces. (6) As early as 1964, Kerr coined the phrase "knowl-
edge industry" to signify this integration of higher education into the larger society. "What the
railroads did for the second half of the last century and the automobile for the first half of this
century may be done for the second half of this century by the knowledge industry: that is, to
serve as the focal point for national growth." (7)

The good news, according to Kerr and many others, was that higher education was
remarkably flexible in adapting to immense demographic changes at the same time that it re-
sponded vigorously to its enhanced role of preparing a professional workforce for the national
economy. (8) An unprecedented burst of academic reform accompanied these revolutionary
changes, he noted.

Never in the history of the United States, or for that matter any other
nation, has there been such a wave of academic innovation as during the
great transformation. There were "cluster" colleges and "without walls" colleges, also "work-study," "field-study,"
and "study abroad," and every other innovation that the mind could possibly
devisé. Few of the innovations survived, and those few had little general
impact on higher education—everything was tried, nearly everything failed.

(9)
In other words, when it came to curricular change, Kerr—a pragmatic adapter with long-range optimism—leaned decidedly in the direction of the Jeremiahs.

Bruce Kimball, a more consistent pragmatist than Kerr, accepts as a given the proposition that extensive changes in student numbers, age, gender, race and ethnicity have been the major force shaping the undergraduate experience, and he sees the flurry of experimentation as the triumph of a pragmatic temper in higher education. Viewed collectively, efforts at curricular change, especially in the contested arena of liberal education, affirm a commitment to epistemological pluralism, to the integration of knowledge and value, to tentative and self-correcting constructions of what we know and to the establishment of multiple communities of inquirers, each of which is a trait of the pragmatic spirit. (10)

There is a counterpart to Kimball’s view among commentators on Catholic higher education. It has found expression in those who emphasize the movement of Catholic institutions from self-protective marginality to willing involvement at the center of American culture. What this meant in practice was that Catholic universities were transformed when the ethos of professionalism was applied to every aspect of institutional life. O’Brien has pointed out some of the implications of this view.

Almost everyone agrees that professionalization is a key to understanding contemporary American Catholic higher education. Academic freedom, institutional autonomy, emphasis on research and publication within the disciplines, and problems with general education have all come with this process. So has the demand for structural reform to recognize the faculty’s primary responsibility for academic policy. (11)

The proponents of this view interpret this pervasive professionalization not as a form of secularization but as the manifest sign of a willed commitment to carry out the educational mission of Catholic universities from within the heart of the surrounding culture. The G.I. Bill, the post-World War II movement of American Catholics from ethnic enclaves to suburbs, Vatican II and the social and cultural revolutions of the 1960s were among the external and internal processes driving the change. (12) It is important not to overlook, however, how enthusiastically institutions like DePaul have adapted to American culture in the postwar period even when they worked to change it. Later in this chapter, we will see in DePaul’s emerging urban mission an example of efforts to embrace and transform the surrounding culture using the mechanism of curricular policy.
At the Threshold of the 1960s: Creating a Context for Innovation

In DePaul's case, movement toward the center of American culture was no easy task. Nor was coping with the huge influx of students in the immediate postwar period. A severe crisis over accreditation, in fact, almost shipwrecked the institution. On March 23, 1950, a Chicago Sun-Times front page headline blared: "DePaul U. Standing Periled." The article stated that on March 22 the North Central Association's Commission on Colleges and Universities had recommended dropping DePaul from its list of accredited schools. "Without accreditation," the article continued, in what must be read as either a masterfully diplomatic or a benignly ignorant understatement, "the university would lose prestige in the academic world and DePaul students might have difficulty in getting their scholastic credits accepted by approved schools." (13)

The university was acutely aware of the urgency of its situation. Comerford O'Malley, C.M., president of the university, filed an immediate appeal and a hearing date was set for May 8. (14) The bill of particulars, from an external NCA review of the institution in 1949, was quite detailed. Though it acknowledged that the university had not exploited the G.I. Bill for financial gain, the report suggested that rapid expansion of the student body in the postwar period had precipitated a crisis with respect to the size and competence of DePaul's teaching staff. (15) The report demanded a significant strengthening of the number of Ph.D.s among faculty responsible for graduate instruction. It raised questions about the adequacy of general education requirements for certain departments and programs, characterizing graduate programs in general as overextended, and calling the program of the "secretarial" department more characteristic of a "proprietary business college" than a four-year university. Other criticisms touched on the adequacy of library holdings and the relative lack of control that faculty exercised over academic policy. (16)

The university did not evade these criticisms. In a matter of weeks it developed an action plan to address each concern. It promised to add 20 new Ph.D.s before the beginning of the 1950-51 school year. Seventeen faculty whose progress toward the Ph.D. had been interrupted during the war years indicated that they would earn their degrees within a year. Within the space of two years the university planned to double its Ph.D. faculty. (17) Several under-enrolled graduate programs were dropped. A university faculty curriculum committee was appointed to review general education requirements in the departments and programs that were specific targets of NCA's criticism. The secretarial department was placed under immediate review and a team of external consultants was brought in to make an institutional study. (18)

Immediate and decisive action proved effective. The NCA deferred action that would revoke accreditation pending a review during the 1950-51 school year. (19) The immediate crisis passed but DePaul's efforts to sail into the mainstream of American higher education during this period of unprecedented expansion were hardly off to an auspicious start.

It is not easy to locate the truly auspicious beginning, the turn toward academic excellence at DePaul. My own sense is that in many ways it is connected with the career of one
man, Reverend John T. Richardson, C.M., who served the university for over forty years, first as dean of the Graduate School (1954–1966), next as executive vice president and dean of faculties (1960–1981), then as president (1981–1993) and finally as chancellor. While Father Richardson insists that the academic crisis of the early 1950s was resolved by the time he entered the university as dean of the Graduate School in 1954, it is clear that what he saw in the university’s graduate programs troubled him. (20) Responding to internal pressures to offer a few doctoral programs, Richardson pointed out in a memo to the graduate faculty in late 1959 that no school is stronger than its weakest link. Frankly recalling what must have been a painful memory, he insisted:

One sure sign of a broad-spectrum move toward excellence would be “positive evidence that the great majority of the graduate faculty are not only capable of, but actually engaged in, research.” Only then could “DePaul be a ‘university’ in fact as well as in name.” (22)

Richardson was afraid that Catholic higher education in general, and DePaul in particular, would remain in an academic backwater—ideas would circulate, changes would occur—but only within the immediate community, not through interaction with the larger currents of American higher education. (23) This sentiment, along with Richardson's criticisms of the graduate school, echoes the views of John Tracy Ellis, then a leading historian of American Catholicism. In his speech to the annual meeting of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs in St. Louis in 1955, Ellis made the most searching examination of Catholic higher education of the 1950s. Where are the Catholic “scholars of distinction?” he asked. Where are the Catholic intellectuals who could influence the larger culture the way renowned nineteenth century converts like Orestes Brownson had? Where were the Catholic scientists, the Catholic Nobel laureates? (24) Though he acknowledged that many cultural and internal
forces had hindered development of a vigorous intellectual life within Catholic universities, including most importantly their commitment to educate the masses of Catholic immigrants, Ellis argued that Catholic higher education had fallen prey to the American pursuit of vocational education with its anti-intellectual ethos. Above all, Ellis excoriated his fellow Catholics for their “frequently self-imposed ghetto mentality which prevents them from mingling as they should with their non-Catholic colleagues. . . .” (25)

Ellis’s dismissive view of mass education and his advocacy of a pure “intellectual apostolate,” put him squarely in the tradition of the Jeremiahs. But this aspect of his thought, this dualistic juxtaposition of the theoretical and the practical, did not have an impact at places like DePaul. Rather it was the awareness of being trapped in a self-enclosed and self-perpetuating backwater, of moving without going anywhere, that rankled. When he became executive vice president in 1960, Richardson felt that the time was ripe to lead the university out of that backwater and into the mainstream. Acknowledging the firm support of Comerford O’Malley and, later, John Cortelyou, C.M., the two presidents under whom he served before assuming the presidency, Richardson sees himself in retrospect as the “maverick” among the university’s administrative leaders. “But having had six years as dean [of the Graduate School] . . . I think I
had . . . gathered enough confidence [from] the other administrators of the university so that when I became executive vice president, dean of faculties [in 1960], I felt I had a strong base from which to move." (26) If this tale of curricular change has within it an auspicious moment when the university turned toward academic excellence, this was it.

DePaul did not wait for the official sanction that Vatican II provided for sweeping changes within all Catholic institutions, nor did it tack to the winds of the social revolution of the 1960s. Curricular modifications were well under way before these external forces made themselves felt. Again and again in my interviews, faculty members recalled the university encouraging autonomous innovation. In contrast to the stereotype of the Catholic university—where someone in robes lurks in the background sniffing out deviation from orthodoxy—DePaul trusted its own faculty and staff to develop sound programs. (27) The 1960s were a watershed in this regard. (28) In fact, Richardson sees it as one of the more important accomplishments of that period that the impetus to change, originally an administrative initiative, was handed to the faculty. (29)

Roberta Garner, a sociology professor and member of the faculty since 1971, notes that while flexibility and a commitment to change came to characterize the institution, the changes themselves were conservative. DePaul's scarce resources meant that there was always a narrow margin for error. Commitment to innovation had to be balanced against a largely first-generation college student body's desire for something "solid," an education relevant to the job market. Conservative change meant "intelligently seeing the match between our goals—our goals as faculty [and] students' goals—and available internal resources. And having some sense of how these fit together." (30) Garner's sense of conservative innovation characterizes most, if not all, of the curriculum changes examined in this chapter. Even when the innovations were decidedly more experimental, their implementation was "conservative in the best sense."

While the desire to escape the academic backwater was a powerful incentive, the confidence that Richardson and others exhibited as they crossed the watershed was remarkable. After all, they could have approached the situation differently: why not assume that what was called a backwater was really a port in the storm? Why not opt, as many other institutions have, for a "sectarian solution?" Why not maintain a Catholic university as an anchor against the inconstant sea, a bulwark against modernity where, in Marx's apt phrase, "all that is solid melts into air?" The first real test of the direction the university was to take occurred in the early 1960s with the decision to open the philosophy department to currents of thought other than scholastic philosophy. The story itself will be told in a later section, but Richardson's comments on the event tell us a great deal about DePaul's openness to curricular change. Given the traditional role of scholastic philosophy in integrating the curricula for Catholic higher education, I suggested in an interview with Richardson that a more common response might be expressed in an analogy: if you open the tent flaps of the university to change, it is very
important to have the truth nailed down in at least one corner, have at least one peg of orthodoxy lest the whole tent blow away. Richardson did not let me finish the thought. "I'd never buy that," he interjected. "No. I had no fear that open learning is going to conflict with the tenets of faith. Never had any fear." (31)

There is a sublime irony here of which Richardson was fully aware. The confidence radiated by Thomistic philosophy ("the only philosophy I ever studied," Richardson said) in the ultimate harmony of reason and faith was the source of inspiration that made it possible to let go of Thomism as the peg nailing the university's curriculum to a preconceived orthodoxy. Openness to curricular change stemmed from a religious confidence in the catholicity of truth; that is, the ubiquity of the divinely scattered seeds of knowledge. In practice, this religious confidence meant receptiveness to manifold sources of knowledge and, as William Shea expressed it, referring directly to Catholic higher education, the recognition that "we ourselves are plural." (32) As a matter of theory and hope, Richardson believed that all forms of knowledge would ultimately be in harmony. In actuality, the university would ride the epistemological crosscurrents of higher education's open sea.

**First Steps: The Curricular Design of 1964**

As Thomas Croak has noted, during the early 60s discussions continued about introducing doctoral programs into the graduate curriculum. Father John Cortelyou, C.M., a researcher in the biological sciences and a future president of the university, was developing plans for expansion in the sciences. A report of the Committee on Education to the Board of Trustees in early 1963 concluded that "the doctoral program appears essential and inevitable at DePaul." (33)

Nevertheless, Richardson had a different set of priorities. Having become dean of faculties in 1960, he set to work reforming undergraduate education. The highly decentralized character of university operations meant that each college had set its own policies with respect to both general and specialized education. Recall that the North Central Association had taken issue with widespread inconsistencies in the structure of general education requirements a decade previously. Richardson remembers some "warm discussions," as a clear message was sent to the professional schools: "Look, you controlled all your curricula until now but no more." (34) There were occasional confrontations, but Richardson and key leaders among the faculty and administration had a clear vision: "we wanted a university-wide philosophy of undergraduate education and . . . university-wide standards in basic areas of knowledge." (35)

The process moved slowly. Initial efforts to formulate the philosophy of undergraduate education began in fall 1962. A progress report and draft were submitted to the board of trustees in spring 1963. Discussion with board members culminated in a decision to develop the philosophy "in relation to the actual educational processes of the university, particularly curricular design." (36) A final version entitled *A Curricular Design for DePaul University* was submitted to the university community on April 13, 1964.
Few DePaul faculty members have ever heard of this document but it is hard to overestimate its significance. Richardson suggested that it “was the most fundamental and far-reaching curricular policy for as far back as my knowledge of the university goes and for the succeeding decades.” (37) To read this document in autumn 1997, as the university is about to launch a new general education program for undergraduate students, is to be struck by the common threads of issues and goals stretching across three decades. In one sense such continuity should not surprise us. The implied presupposition of the document was the hegemony of specialized and professional education. The Curricular Design asserted its principles in dialectical tension with this dominant factor—then and now—in higher education.

The document began by designating the philosophy of “Vincentian personalism” as the religious context and rationale for curricular design. Focusing on the “primacy of the person,” this philosophy asserted as its first educational corollary that a person has “the inherent right and the consequent responsibility to develop his own potential in an educational environment that permits him to be involved actively in his own becoming.” (38) This emphasis on personal development gave the entire document a student-centered character. The explicit focus of the design is what we call today “learning outcomes.” (39) The sections on educational principles and on curricular guidelines both began not by focusing on subject matter but on the potential of the student. Because of this developmental focus the Curricular Design stressed the importance of integrating ongoing learning with prior knowledge and experience. Wherever possible, students were to be able to accelerate the learning process. Self-directed study was a sign of “academic maturity,” and one of the most important outcomes of the learning process was a habit of life-long learning. “In the university a man only refines the education he must continue in the enterprise of life,” the document declared. (40) The Curricular Design affirmed that ordinary college-level students possess these central qualities in latent form; they were not seen as the monopoly of an intellectual elite: “The failure to develop the potential of the capable majority may rest with the educational theory and practice of the educators . . . .” (41)

The Curricular Design presented other educational goals that DePaul is still struggling to achieve. The university formally committed itself to what had long been practiced, namely, responding to the needs and goals of a diverse student body, particularly one that reflected varied religious commitments. Educating a diverse group for life in a pluralistic society was a central educational goal. “DePaul believes,” the document stated, “that the student's confrontation with diverse value systems [is] beneficial in orienting students to continuing intellectual inquiry and to understanding a variety of defensible values in a pluralistic society.” (42) As part of this endeavor, it called for the study of non-Western cultures and traditions. The curriculum was to “provide exposure to man's religious questionings . . . in all cultures . . . .” (43) To be sure, it was not until the early 1980s that a multicultural, globally focused education became a reality for all DePaul undergraduates—even at a basic level. The university was well ahead
of other Catholic schools, however, when it came to articulating this ideal. The Curricular Design, in fact, forthrightly presented a new model of the liberally educated person that was an alternative to scholastic philosophy's vision of "man" the rational animal, and that still conformed to the religious mission of the institution.

The Curricular Design also proclaimed what has become a major feature of undergraduate education at DePaul only in the 1990s: "The curricular design shall reflect the student's distinctive opportunities and privileges for education and service that exist in an urban culture and in an urban university". (44) Brokering connections between the classroom and Chicago itself as a site of learning received an early formulation in this document: "The curricular design should utilize the resources of the metropolitan area which, in effect, constitute the total university campus." (45) But the curricular initiatives to put this educational goal into action were not articulated. The clearest step towards its realization was a firm commitment to the importance of the behavioral and social sciences in investigating the relationship of the human organism to its environment. (46) When DePaul College was created, requirements in philosophy and theology, heretofore seen as the principal agents of curricular integration, were reduced, and space in the undergraduate curriculum was carved out for the social sciences to carry out this role.

In other respects the document reflected changes in the philosophy of general education that were percolating through higher education. A case in point is the emphasis throughout
the document on "ways of knowing." What the Curricular Design mandated for the scientific disciplines—that emphasis was to be placed on direct "experience with the dynamic or exploratory aspect [in contrast to the static or descriptive]"—applied to all areas of inquiry. (47) Integration of knowledge, another battle cry of curricular reformers in the 1960s, was established as an educational goal not in competition with specialized knowledge but as applying to both general and specialized studies. All educational offerings were to be assessed using the criterion of "integration of knowledge in a liberally educated person." If the university was "unsuccessful" in its pursuit of this goal, it at least articulated an ideal which did not place liberal and professional education in sterile opposition. (48) The Curricular Design's most important accomplishment, however, was that it provided the rationale that enabled the university to develop and retain a solid set of university-wide core requirements in liberal education during the very period of the later 1960s when other institutions were abandoning theirs. (49)

While the work of the Curricular Design Committee went on quietly, another curricular revolution—the effort of the philosophy department to transform the way philosophy was taught at DePaul—received national attention. In October 1964 Time magazine trumpeted an event that it considered "probably the most significant attempt to overhaul Catholic philosophy teaching since 1789, when Georgetown . . . opened its doors." (50) But Time also quoted one DePaul philosopher who lamented: "It is selling your philosophical birthright for a mess of existential pottage." The controversy roiled over the introduction at DePaul that autumn of "Philosophical Horizons" as an option for students, a program that was to run parallel to the traditional scholastic track.

The effort to transform the philosophy curriculum was led by Gerald Kreyche, the first lay chairman of the Department of Philosophy. It is important to remember that scholastic philosophy was—with few exceptions—regarded as the integrating factor in a Catholic college education until the 1960s. Catholic schools claimed to offer a "unified vision of life" as their distinguishing characteristic and the part of the curriculum that expressed this vision was "was not theology or history but scholastic philosophy, which was defined as the only 'Catholic philosophy.'" (51) Prior to the development of DePaul College in the late 1960s, philosophy at DePaul commandeered what Kreyche acknowledged was an "awfully big chunk" of the undergraduate curriculum—18 semester hours in liberal arts and sciences and 12 in commerce. Kreyche, with the enthusiastic backing of Richardson and President Cortelyou, embarked on a different course. (52)

Though DePaul may not have been the first major Catholic university to make radical changes to its philosophy curriculum, Kreyche—despite, or perhaps because of, his status as a layperson—emerged as a national spokesperson for those who shared his vision that a philosophy department in a Catholic university should be fully engaged not only with the multiple currents in contemporary philosophical inquiry but also with the natural and social sciences. Absent this broader involvement, a philosophy department could claim only historical
interest for its subject, not contemporary relevance. More bluntly, Kreyche argued that it could not really claim to be involved in philosophical inquiry as such. (53)

In a presentation at a national meeting for Catholic educators, Kreyche characterized the philosophy curriculum in Catholic colleges as simply a diluted version of the seminary model of education for Catholic clergy. No one had paused to consider whether this was appropriate for the masses of lay Catholics, to say nothing of the non-Catholic student. “We have yet to institute a restructured curriculum [in philosophy] which has the needs and desires of the Catholic layman as its primary concern—I mean the layman whose apostolate is in the world.” (54) Driving his point home, Kreyche asked, “When will we learn that a college education involves an existential risk?” When it introduced the new, “Philosophical Horizons” track in autumn, 1964, DePaul opened itself and its students to that “existential risk.” In 1967, when DePaul College opened, the traditional option was dropped. (55)

The new program, and the notoriety that accompanied it, signified a definitive exodus from Catholic backwaters. DePaul history professor James Krokar recalls that it was the Time article that prompted him to enter DePaul as an undergraduate. Coming from a family where ideas were freely exchanged around the dinner table, Krokar concluded that “DePaul seemed to [have] a much more open atmosphere than the competition.” (56) Riding the crest of this wave of attention, Kreyche collaborated with a colleague from Georgetown University in 1966 to edit and publish three anthologies of primary sources—Perspectives on Reality, Reflections on Man and Approaches to Morality—which were to be the foundational texts for the new approach. Each book focused on five different currents of philosophical thought: classical and scholastic philosophy, modern continental philosophy, American pragmatism, analytic and positivist philosophy, and existentialism and phenomenology. By 1966 the editors could appeal to the Second Vatican Council’s reforms to support new approaches:

An openness to truth wherever it may be found is revealed in various documents promulgated at the Second Vatican Council. The pluralistic attitude affirmed by the Council has, in recent years, been the direct approach in many Catholic colleges and universities in the United States. The significance of the aggiornamento in philosophy is that the philosophical pluralism initiated by some is now enjoined upon all . . . . Students of philosophy must know the dynamic currents of thought which are expressed in a free society. (57)

Kreyche’s and DePaul’s own “existential risk” had become a national movement.
Within a few years the ferment in the Department of Philosophy had spread to all of the departments involved with general education for undergraduates. Following publication of the *Curriculum Design*, an implementation committee began translating its principles into a general education curriculum and devising a new administrative structure—to be called DePaul College—to deliver that curriculum to all undergraduate students. (58) Everyone involved in the process remembers this as a time of tremendous excitement. DePaul College was the magnet attracting immense amounts of creative energy. (59) Groups of faculty clustered into four divisions (philosophy and theology; humanities; behavioral and social sciences; and natural sciences and mathematics) met for weekend retreats and extended weekly sessions in the years preceding and immediately following the inauguration of the college in the fall of 1967.

Within the disciplines of each division, the participants undertook a serious search for common ground in modes of inquiry and subject matter. In the humanities division a year-long sequence focused in successive quarters on the classical, romantic and syncretic (or modern) temper in art, literature and music. Faculty from each of the three disciplines shared the course and split the teaching of each section. “Logistically,” says Patricia Ewers, then a faculty member in English but eventually vice president for academic affairs at DePaul and now president of Pace University, “it was . . . a nightmare.” (60) Shuttling in and out of three sections of a course did not work, but the course sequence remained an ideal, a point where noble reach exceeded practical grasp.

In the history department a more successful experiment was under way. History was converted from a one-year survey course in Western Civilization—“from Adam to the atomic bomb”—to a single course, “Man and History: Ideas and Method,” focusing on the nature of historical inquiry and on contending visions of the historical process. (61) To teach the course, faculty who had been trained in traditional graduate history programs had to make a radical shift in their approach. Albert Erlebacher, professor emeritus of history, recalls that those who planned the revisions assumed that high school students who were coming to college would be familiar with the kind of knowledge a survey course offered.

*Why repeat the same thing that they had already adequately learned in high school? So let's... teach them about history in terms of a learning experience... For me, it was somewhat new too... Because in graduate school... you were what they called a carpenter: You learned how to use the tools of history, you built something that was an article or a chapter in a book... You didn't think too much about why it was you were doing this... And that's what this course was supposed to deal with.* (62)
Ironically, Erlebacher contends that the assumption on which this revision was built turned out to be inaccurate. Students did not have a detailed knowledge of the past to use for testing the validity of historical theories and methods. (63) In fact, the historians found themselves relying on specific case studies of historical events or crises (using such topics as the rise of fascism and the history of the Vietnam war) and examining them in detail to ground their sallies into the philosophy of history. The course worked because of the vitality of this dialectic between concrete cases and theoretical inquiries. (64)

In the Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM), turbulence was the order of the day as faculty struggled, in seemingly endless meetings, to create a new science curriculum for general education. “I think that [the inauguration of] DePaul College was the first time,” recalls Tony Behof, now chair of the physics department, “that all of the sciences got together and tried to decide . . . just what it is they should be teaching in science courses [for the non-major].” (65) One group, representing several disciplines, sought a complete turnabout in the way science was taught. According to physicist Edwin Schillinger, during the previous two decades, the specialized and technical introductory sequences in many of the departments had been designed with an eye to recruiting science majors. The reformers were convinced that those sequences were not working. (66) Others, however, sought to affirm the hegemony of their particular science or to defend disciplinary boundaries. (67) These battles came to a head over a proposal to develop a year-long integrated sequence for the nonmajor with physics in the first quarter and chemistry and biology in subsequent quarters. This effort in the NSM division soon foundered, as had the design for sweeping integration in the humanities. (68)

The onset of a general crisis in science education in America exacerbated the problems the NSM faculty faced in trying to shape a new curriculum, according to Avrom Blumberg, professor of chemistry and the first person to lead the division. Blumberg argues that the early 1960s represented the apogee of scientific literacy in American college-age students; DePaul College was born on the down slope. In his view, scientific literacy began plunging in the late 1960s and the new NSM program was an effort to resist the ineluctable decline of scientific knowledge among the general populace. The scientists committed to reform saw educating citizens to make informed judgments in a scientific and technological age as their goal. “We wanted to show in each of these courses . . . what it was that scientists did, what are some of the practical applications and utilizations of the sciences, and how does it affect the way man thinks of himself in his own society.” (69) In working toward these goals, Edwin Schillinger argues, DePaul was not following the lead of other institutions but pioneering a new approach. “[I]n Physics we were coming along with the society-oriented courses three to five years before places like Chicago or Carleton or other places that are well-known for this sort of thing came along.” (70)

Schillinger himself pioneered a course epitomizing these efforts that continued to be offered into the 1990s. Originally entitled “Reason and Unreason in Science,” the course ap-
plied critical reasoning to the evolution of science itself. It examined how scientific investigators used self-correcting methods to uncover the “unreason” in previously touted “scientific” formulations. (71) The success of this course over the years inspired subsequent efforts to develop what the initial attempt of the NSM faculty had initially failed to do; that is, to present an integrated vision of the nature and accomplishments of the sciences. (72)

The heady ferment of curricular innovation lasted roughly from spring 1966 through the very early years of the 1970s. (73) In many cases it was younger faculty members who were the developers of the new curriculum, another instance of the degree of autonomy DePaul was willing to grant faculty in the field of curricular development. Although Patricia Ewers, when she was dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences in the late 1970s, emerged as the major critic of DePaul College and the instigator of a second wave of reform in general education, she is the first to concede that the process of developing the DePaul College curriculum fostered a faculty culture open to curricular innovation.

In this specific sense the development of DePaul College was, as Richardson puts it, “transitional and served its purpose well.” (75)

**Riding the Orbit of Sputnik: Development of the Ph.D. Degree**

While the intense and protracted efforts to transform undergraduate general education dominated the institution during the middle years of the 1960s, the earlier discussions about launching the Ph.D. degree at DePaul continued. The post-Sputnik surge in government funding for scientific research was more than enticing: the fox was on the loose and the hounds could not help but pursue. Returning from a trip to the National Science Foundation in 1959, Reverend John R. Cortelyou, C.M., chairman of the biology department, wrote to President O’Malley, “There is no doubt that academic institutions with reputations for good and continuous research efforts are in the driver’s seat with respect to grants . . . . DePaul is hampered with its lack of a
Ph.D. program in the Sciences and Mathematics." (76) Aspiration turned to exploration in 1962–63 when the Graduate School Council appointed a committee to evaluate the potential of several departments to offer the Ph.D.

The natural sciences, spurred on by John Cortelyou, had jump-started the process. Cortelyou led the committee, and by February 1963 he presented a preliminary report to his brother William Cortelyou, C.M., dean of the Graduate School. Mincing no words, he argued, "It is perfectly clear that in our existing circumstances, the three [natural science] departments under discussion are, at the present time, in no position to offer the Ph.D. program. This means that certain improvements must be made." (77) The departments being considered had analyzed the research production and potential of their faculty members closely, and had made assessments of personnel, equipment and library resources that would be needed in order for a successful Ph.D. program to be launched. With a dispassionate objectivity concerning a topic about which he felt most passionately, Cortelyou had measured the difference between the university's reach and its grasp. Clearheadedness about "existing circumstances" did not dampen the aspirations of either Cortelyou or his committee. According to Dolores McWhinnie, a professor of biological sciences, the "idealism" of John Cortelyou and of Professor Mary Ann McWhinnie, his eventual successor as chair of biological sciences, propelled the department toward the Ph.D.—that and the hope for "manna from heaven" that would enable the university to close the equipment gap created by an explosion in the technologies for biological research. (78)

In November 1963, the board of trustees sanctioned the active exploration of the Ph.D. and by spring 1966 the contestants had been reduced to three: biological sciences, psychology and philosophy. These three worked closely with consultants chosen in dialogue with the North Central Association. In November 1966 the board of trustees approved the three proposals, which were then submitted to the North Central Association in January 1967. (79) In August, the NCA indicated to John Cortelyou, then president of the university, that it would extend accreditation to include the Ph.D. in biology, psychology and philosophy. (80)

The NCA review was appropriately cautious about prospects for the Ph.D. in biological sciences. It noted the lack of sufficient funds to support research at the appropriate level and the combined strength and narrowness of the department's focus on physiological endocrinology. Yet it concluded that while the proposed program "is ambitious and may be excessive, . . . the faculty appears to have the maturity to deal with problems as they arise." (81) In fact, the program really never had a chance. The hoped-for manna from heaven evaporated even before the program began as the nation's priorities for funding shifted from science and moon landings to wars on poverty at home and wars against poor people abroad. The hoped for critical mass of students never materialized. The faculty themselves became convinced that the program consumed immense energies without being of real service to its students. (82) After a decade of effort the Ph.D. program was discontinued.

The proposal by the Department of Psychology met a happier fate. As graduate dean,
William Cortelyou had recruited the chair of the department, Edwin Zolik, in 1963 with the express intention of exploring the creation of a Ph.D. program. (83) The department carefully prepared for this step by raising admission standards in its M.A. program, building a training program into the work of the Mental Health Center, and reducing the teaching loads of faculty engaged in research, to cite a few of the coordinated endeavors. The program was also responsive to market demands. The proposal cited a report by the American Psychological Association that claimed there were four job openings for every Ph.D. graduate. (84) The NCA agreed: “The proposed program initially calls for work in clinical psychology, September, 1968, and counseling psychology and general experimental psychology in September, 1969. Clearly, the need for such a program exists in the greater Chicago area as well as in the nation at large. The continuing national demand for Ph.D.s in these areas has been well established.” (85) Here the university’s gamble paid off in a program that continues to flourish.

Philosophy, as we have seen, was the symbol and champion of curricular change at DePaul through most of the 1960s. It was only appropriate that it be selected as the humanities entry in the Ph.D. competition. As the NCA noted, Kreyche had recruited a faculty that represented “the best single concentration of existential and phenomenological scholars in America.” (86) The philosophy program consciously set out to be different. It made its mark by bucking the
main current of Anglo-American analytical traditions, and by "providing graduate training in a . . . field that has only token recognition at other universities." (87) Over the years the program has sustained itself not through the demands of a vigorous market but by a periodic, full-scale renewal of its original mission to be a distinctive voice on the American philosophical scene. Only by means of such renewals could it stay engaged with real cultural concerns, as Kreyche had hoped, and keep from becoming increasingly esoteric. (88)

From today's perspective it is hard to assess the effect on the institution as a whole of this immense, concerted and partially successful effort to create Ph.D. programs. In terms of curricular change, the impact of the new programs was confined to the departments concerned. Claims that the programs would support work in other areas were not upheld by the results. (89) Still, the university was designated "a doctoral granting institution" in the higher education classification schemes then becoming important. We can imagine what that meant to individuals like Richardson, who were determined to move out of the academic backwater. To be a Ph.D. granting institution must have meant becoming a real university. Finally the university would be accorded, in Richardson's words, "the status that many of us thought it deserved." (90) Richardson, however, is the first to agree that it was DePaul's restraint, its refusal to encourage proliferation of Ph.D. programs—due, no doubt, to fiscal common sense—that freed the university to make its mark through other, less traditional forms of curricular innovation. (91) Having weathered this rite of passage, DePaul would not establish another Ph.D. program for over two decades.

**In Pursuit of the Non-Traditional:**

**Meeting the Needs of Adult Learners Through the School for New Learning**

Earlier I quoted Clark Kerr's affirmation that although the "third great transformation" of higher education (1960–1980) did not, in general, have a profound effect on curricula, it was not for want of trying: "[E]verything was tried; nearly everything failed." But Kerr pays scant attention to one group that was part of the demographic revolution he charts: adult learners. Creating DePaul College and establishing a few Ph.D. programs were traditional curricular transformations, firmly anchoring both ends of a well-established educational trajectory. Moving out of academic backwaters, DePaul could have held its course to such well-traveled lanes. But it did not. Soon after completing the push to establish several Ph.D. programs, the university focused on a new issue—the education of adult learners. In this rapidly emerging field it was not a belated follower playing catch-up, but a pioneer.

As early as January 1971, Richardson proposed creating a new unit to be called "The Experimental School of DePaul University." Drawing on recent reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education that called for new ways to meet the needs of those who had "stopped out" of college or who were not traditional-aged students, Richardson wanted to
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establish a unit that would consciously experiment “with different approaches to learning and different methods for marking achievement in learning.”

Established course structures and programs leading to degrees have proved their value; new approaches to learning, however, are constantly being developed and there should be the opportunity within the university to apply these developments or devise ones distinctive of DePaul without the restrictions that tradition and outside agencies have imposed on the other units of the university. Well “developed” colleges and universities have relatively fixed patterns for learning and degrees; whereas “developing” institutions are more open and flexible. DePaul would do well to have both the “developed” and “developing” aspects. (92)

This visionary outlook coincided with an evaluation by a group of university administrators consisting of DePaul’s president and executive vice president and Irma Haftler, an administrator with extensive experience in adult education. They expressed growing dissatisfaction with the way University College—a separate arts and science evening college with its own dean and faculty—was meeting the needs of adult learners. The Curricular Design, with its focus on adapting curricula to students’ diverse developmental needs, provided the framework for change. Cortelyou, Richardson and Haftler were convinced that DePaul could advance to the forefront in higher education by being boldly experimental, by taking account of the rich and complex experiences that adults brought to the learning process. (93) The curricular experiments of the 1960s paved the way for this new endeavor but so did the prevailing ethos at DePaul of attentiveness to the individual student, which we call Vincentian personalism. David Justice, former dean of the School for New Learning (SNL) and now vice president for lifelong learning and suburban campuses, argues that this Vincentian personalism made DePaul “a naturally comfortable place for an adult program oriented toward individualized learning to reside.” (94)

Opinions were divided among key university leaders about just what action to take. Conflict did not result in paralysis but, rather, in willingness to turn the process of invention over to someone entirely new to DePaul. The university recruited Howard Sulkin from the University of Chicago and soon thereafter Marilyn Stocker to be his assistant. They were given carte blanche to develop a new program. To this day, Sulkin shakes his head bemusedly over the extent of the freedom he had. But without that freedom to break with tradition, to discard
what others saw as indispensable to higher education, and without the year he had to work on the design, he is convinced that the School for New Learning would never have materialized. (95)

Sulkin set to work in September, 1972. High level academic studies on adult learning were in their infancy. But several principles—"heresies," Sulkin calls them—were emerging and guided the planning process:

- In developing a new curriculum, emphasis had to be placed on the student first and the institution second.
- Learning, particularly for adults, can be legitimately derived from an almost unlimited variety of sources, and can take place in many settings. If that learning can be responsibly assessed, then it is legitimate to give credit for that learning.
- Everything has to be done to reduce barriers to learning, i.e., time, place, methodology.
- Higher education needed to be reoriented away from credits to a renewed emphasis on competency. (96)

The last of these principles became the integrating factor in the curriculum. "What SNL worked very hard to do," Sulkin argues, "was to define their bachelor's degree in a new way: . . . it was not to be defined as a compilation of courses, but instead as a set of learning outcomes, i.e., competencies. Once this was done and the five-part framework [of required competencies] developed, then everything done was based upon this framework." (97) Although DePaul was not the first institution to develop a competence-based program, it was the first, Sulkin insists, not to hedge its bets. Other institutions assessed adult learners' previous experiences for indications of competency but correlated those experiences within an existing course framework. "We said that was an unacceptable conceptual breakdown for our design." (98)

Sulkin and Stocker developed that design with the aid of focus groups that included faculty, business and community leaders and potential students. (99) Claiming to end the era of the adult learner as the "second class citizen of higher education," the design offered a competence-based program of individualized study, geared to lifelong learning that broke with the "traditional rigidities of campus life such as time, space and systems of academic accounting." (100) Curricula would be organized around five "domains of knowledge," not departmental or disciplinary divisions. (101) In addition to the competence framework most of the struc-
tural components of today's SNL curriculum were developed in this original design: (1) an “entrance experience,” later named the Discovery Workshop, where “the adult student can confront himself, ‘gather himself together,’ to assess what skills he has, what his personal goals are, and what educational alternatives are available to him;” (2) an advisory committee including a faculty member and a professional advisor to supervise the student's preparation for the world of work; (3) the use of learning contracts to negotiate the means by which competencies would be demonstrated; (4) a fieldwork experience and a “major piece of work” to consolidate a student's ability to be a self-directed learner; and (5) an “exit experience,” later called the Summit Seminar, whose purpose was “to provide closure on this phase of the educational process, to help the student digest, reassess and re-set his sights.” (102) Sulkin believes that SNL's subsequent success was due to the strength and soundness of its original curricular design. (103)

In a continuing effort to enhance accessibility, SNL became the first unit in the university to develop a suburban site, which it opened in only its second year of the operation. (104) The competence framework evolved gradually; later revisions were designed to provide both “base-line standards” and greater flexibility for students to meet these standards. Gaps in the area of scientific inquiry were plugged, and more attention was given to the dialectic between theoretical proficiency and the practical ability to apply knowledge. (105) In 1985 SNL proposed a new competency-based Master of Arts degree. A grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education allowed SNL to build on David Schon's concept of a “reflective practitioner,” defined as a professional who understands the theoretical underpinnings of work, the skills necessary for its conduct, its organizational framework and cultural context, and its ethical challenges. “It is [the] process of reflection-in-action which Schon sees as central to competent and effective practice in the turbulent changing environments of professionals.” The prospectus declared, “The SNL Master's Program seeks to generate in its practitioner-students the skills of learning by doing, and of thinking about something while doing it.” (106)

David Justice, the third dean of the school, originally thought that a majority of SNL students would be enrolled in the M.A. program. Though the program remained fairly small, it led to a more momentous change: a full-time, tenure-track faculty within the school. Vice president for academic affairs Patricia Ewers believed that a faculty in residence was necessary to ground the graduate program. Justice agreed to move the school in this new direction. The first full-time faculty members were appointed in 1987. (107) The importance of this change can be gauged by the range of conflicting opinions swirling about it. Sulkin saw it as a fall from grace, forsaking an entrepreneurial commitment for the inveterate conservatism of a tenured faculty. Ewers saw it as essential to the establishment of quality control at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. In contrast to both of these senior administrators, Richardson believed that a full-time faculty would give SNL the credibility it needed to function as a leaven within the larger university. (108)
The unequivocal result was a greater professionalization of education within the school. As John Rury, one of the first tenured faculty members in SNL, puts it, professionalization is not to be equated with narrow specialization. In SNL's case it meant just the opposite: moving from the marginality and isolation of a school that saw itself as both experimental and embattled into engagement with the larger academic community. "Professionalization, in my view, is a dialogue that occurs around questions within a group of people who are doing the same thing." Rury argued, "the very structure of SNL insures a distinctive institutional culture . . . And professionalization enhances it . . . by things like bringing questions of knowledge . . . into the forefront and entering into those debates . . . [R]eally looking at the groundwork [in learning theory] and saying, 'Well, did we really do what we say?" (109)

This very attentiveness to learning theory, a hallmark of SNL, led to a more complicated process of professionalization. The dialogue and the battles were not just over theories for framing subject matter. In fact, a dialectic ensued between those who brought their scholarship in learning theory and adult development to bear on curricular change and those who upheld particular disciplinary traditions of inquiry. (110) "[B]oth positions are within the faculty itself . . ." David Justice comments. "[T]here's no way to draw a line down the middle of the faculty and say these [are] on one side and these [are] on the other, because on any given issue they will line up somewhat differently . . . . [I]t's an interesting tension." (111) But Justice is also convinced that this tension reflected the perennial struggle within higher education to stay focused on the learner on the one hand and on what is to be learned on the other, and to negotiate the difference. (112)
Despite tensions among the faculty, perhaps because of them, the school successfully passed from the era of charismatic founders through institutional consolidation to a new maturity, and along with this transition came a whole new set of challenges. When he resigned the deanship to take on some of these challenges as vice president for lifelong learning and suburban campuses, Justice told his faculty:

At age twenty-five SNL had become a seasoned center for continuing experimentation.

**A Place for the Fine Arts: Creating a Multidimensional Presence in the Urban Milieu**

Each of the innovations of the late 1960s and early 1970s that we have been studying—DePaul College, new Ph.D. programs, the School for New Learning—must be understood against the background of the dominance of professional training especially in law and business. As John Rury and Chuck Suchar have shown, students came to DePaul in search of nuts-and-bolts preparation for the practical world. And the university delivered it.

After launching SNL, Howard Sulkin became vice president for institutional research and planning. Like Richardson, Sulkin was not the type to be confined either philosophically or practically. As Thomas Croak has noted, in 1977 DePaul had broken out of its confined area in the Lincoln Park campus and purchased the adjacent property that had been the McCormick Theological Seminary campus. Now, Sulkin believed, the university had to break out of the
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confines of the public’s perception of it as the nuts-and-bolts university under the El. Frederick Miller, a new dean who had been recruited for the School of Music in 1976, was beginning to turn that college inside out, and the art department was strengthening its role in liberal arts and sciences. “But it wasn’t enough,” reflects Sulkin—not enough to fashion a new image and reality for DePaul as a “leader of the urban milieu.” (114)

In 1978 a rare opportunity presented itself. The Goodman School of Drama, associated with the Art Institute of Chicago for over fifty years, was about to lose its affiliation with that venerable institution. Sulkin and Richardson led the fight to bring the Goodman School to DePaul’s recently acquired McCormick campus. They were confident that this prestigious alliance would not only give the university a weightier presence in Chicago’s fine and performing arts community, but would also add another dimension to DePaul’s complex engagement with its urban milieu. Controversy raged over the wisdom of targeting scarce resources to a unit dedicated to an expensive, conservatory model of education, and even more over this new vision of a multidimensional, multilateral presence in the metropolitan context. (115)

The university’s “rescue” came just in the nick of time, in January 1978, just months before the Goodman School was to hold its final convocation. But as dean of the theater school John Watts puts it, in September, when the “small band of nine or ten itinerant gypsies jumped
out with their props and their costumes and their file cabinets and their very little bit of re-
sources and hung up their sign and said, “We’re back. We’re open for business again,” they
had precious little idea how they would adjust to their new home, and the university was
equally at sea about what to do with its new acquisition. (116) The Theater School moved in
next door to the music school which was also undergoing a tumultuous transition. Change, it
seems, was the order of the day on the old McCormick campus.

“When I accepted the invitation to become dean in 1976,” recalls Frederick Miller, who
served in that position for 20 years, “I came to DePaul with a clear charge to initiate changes
that might lead to overall quality improvements in the school.” (117) What Miller found was
a school with very few full-time faculty, no selective admission process and a curriculum that
was woefully out of date—consisting of a very “narrow repertoire” of Western music and lack-
ing a core program in musicianship. A program designed to fit the needs of the band and choir
directors in Chicago’s Catholic schools and churches, it provided a set of prescribed exercises
for students: workbook or manual-based education. (118) Behind Miller’s charge, in effect, to
start over, was Richardson’s same iron-willed determination that had been evident all along:
no remaining in any backwater, no matter how comfortable. What Miller saw was the raw
potential of a school of music in the heart of a city, not only a city boasting the Chicago Sym-
phony Orchestra and the Lyric Opera but a city teeming with accomplished musicians. He
also recognized the McCormick Seminary campus’s potential to provide decent facilities for
study and performance. (119)

Within months of Miller’s arrival a team from the North Central Association arrived at
DePaul for one of its periodic accrediting visits. The NCA report noted the “state of intense
activity in the music school and praised the school for the “high level of enthusiasm” with
which it was engaging in “extensive self-analysis and long-range planning.” (120) Within a
year the music school’s dean and the faculty had moved to its new home on the Lincoln Park
campus, established new admission standards (including an audition), and had instituted a
new curriculum built around a “musicianship core.” The core would be shared “by all stu-
dents, whether they aspired to be performers, teachers, [or] composers.” Integrating theoreti-
cal, historical and analytical studies, the core stressed “the building blocks common in all
music: melody, rhythm, texture, architecture;” not “contrived examples and experiences cre-
ated for texts and workbooks” but the works themselves would teach the students: from
Gregorian chants to Broadway tunes, from Bach fugues to Dixieland jazz. “The thought,” ac-
cording to Miller, “was that with a thorough understanding of these fundamental elements,
we should be able to approach the music of any genre, any style, period or any culture.” (121)

Miller observes that this type of curricular foundation, designed for a new kind of profes-
sionally oriented student has, with minor modifications, maintained its integrity for two de-
cades. During that period the School of Music was gaining a national recognition for its per-
formance-oriented programs, and it strengthened its connections with the Chicago Symphony
Orchestra and other musical groups through its part-time faculty. (122) A look at the most recent planning document for the school, however, indicates that new forms of interaction with the musical scene—forms that acknowledge the complexities of the musical industry—are emerging. While the plan calls for reviewing the content of the musicianship core and makes specific recommendations for traditional performance areas, it also moves aggressively into new curricular areas like recording technology and arts management. The document deplores the fact that the study of technological applications in music has been largely restricted to specialized curricula. "As a consequence," it states, "it is possible that large numbers of undergraduates majoring in performance or music education may be ill-prepared to function effectively in the technological world in which they will live and work. The issue must be addressed in the musicianship core." (123)

The current emphases are intriguing for two reasons. They indicate that the commitment to a core curriculum as a way to enhance the quality of education persists. Yet the document also spells out the intention to use core-based education as a platform from which to launch a more complex preparation for the world of work. The striking qualitative improvements in the School of Music that began in the late 1970s only intensified the school's and DePaul's concern with education as practical engagement.

When John Watts arrived in August 1979 as the new dean of what eventually would be called The Theater School, he found a faculty trying to adapt a three-year conservatory education to the four-year undergraduate model. During his first year in office, Watts, like Miller in the School of Music, convened his faculty for an intensive review of the curriculum. "[W]e started," Watts says, "with what it's now fashionable to call outcomes. When someone graduates from here, what should they be able to do and . . . going backwards, what should be the makeup of the last year of their work with us . . . . So we redesigned the whole thing backwards." (124) The Theater School, like the School of Music, struggled to deal with a rigid set of general education requirements not tailored to its B.F.A. degree or conservatory model. Only when a new liberal studies program was developed in 1981 was the problem alleviated. It was another hard struggle to convince the university Promotion and Tenure Board that costume or set designers' portfolios of photographs were the record of their work and to overcome the incomprehension of colleagues in other colleges who asked "why haven't they written anything?" (125)

Unlike the School of Music, the Theater School did not have to struggle to create a national reputation; it had to resurrect it. So far as the world of theater was concerned the Goodman School, in Watts' words, "was dead, was gone. It was closed. It was over." It took a decade to reestablish the reputation of the school. Resurrection also meant reconnecting the students with the profession and revitalizing an alumni network. Each year for the past eighteen years Watts has presented the graduating class in a showcase for casting directors and agents, first in Chicago and then, in more recent years, in New York or Los Angeles as well. "When we did it in Los Angeles [in June 1996], we had two hundred and fifty-six casting
directors and agents . . . that came to see the work because of the reputation of the school." (126) Professional preparation meant that students’ performance skills had to be seen, not simply noted in a résumé. After an event like the Los Angeles showcase, Watts could finally say “We’re back.”

The integration of the school into the university has taken just as long as the task of reconnecting with the profession—longer, actually, because in a real sense this is unfinished business. The attempt of the university to force the school into structures designed for very different academic programs has largely ended. But the opportunity to use the Theater School faculty with their distinctive pedagogies to invigorate liberal education has yet to be realized. Watts acknowledges that in the early years at DePaul, the Theater School had to keep its attention squarely focused on developing its conservatory training program for its own students. Early efforts to collaborate with departments in the fine arts and humanities soon withered.
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Yet Watts is the first to insist that experience in the theater, “this most ancient of human forms, the business of being somebody else and the business of not telling but doing stories,” is a truly liberating art. (127)

The most successful attempt to integrate the pedagogical skills of the Theater School with the academic goals of other programs in the university came in 1995–96 when James Ostholthoff, then chair of performance and one of the original “gypsies” who came from the Goodman School, took a David Mamet play, Oleanna, into classrooms in the colleges of liberal arts and sciences, commerce and law. Because Oleanna is a highly controversial play, focusing on the issue of sexual harassment, Ostholthoff drew a lot of criticism from people who didn’t agree with Mamet’s “take” on the subject. Arguing that precisely because the performance highlighted a conflict of values, Ostholthoff insisted that it was more than appropriate for a university context; the Oleanna project exemplified DePaul’s mission. What surprised even him, however, was that, performed in the intimate setting of a classroom with the opportunity for discussion afterwards, the play revealed something new not only to its student audience but to Ostholthoff himself. “Which, of course, goes to the essence of what theater is,” he noted. “[T]his is not literature that you read; it’s meant to be performed . . . . [O]ne of the exciting things about doing this work is you get surprised all the time. You think you’ve got it figured out and something new happens.” (128) Expanding on the insights that came out of the Oleanna project, Ostholthoff argues that what theater has to offer to a liberal education for DePaul students is visceral learning and a prod toward “visceral maturity.”

The very effort—relentlessly demanded of Theater School students—to tap into their own humanity viscerally releases a revelatory power that complements and grounds what the intellect reveals through research and scholarship. (130)

The tinge of frustration in Ostholthoff’s plea echoes Miller and Watts when they speak of how the university keeps their schools at arm’s length. Conservatory model notwithstanding, Ostholthoff insists that the theater school is categorically different from elite, largely graduate
programs in theater that focus on a narrow slice of the talent pie. DePaul is much more willing to give a chance to students whose talent may be as raw as it is strong. "It strikes me that that's what DePaul is about and it would strike others . . . that that's what the city of Chicago is about." (131) If we want to think of ourselves as a distinctive Catholic university, Miller suggests that we ask what other Catholic institution has made such a place for the arts. (132) The message from these schools is clear: We may not seem to act the part to you. In our isolation we may not think about it as often as we should. But we too express the ethos of this university.

**Integrating Professional and Liberal Education: Reforming General Education Once Again**

The complaint from the performing arts schools that the university had placed them in a curricular straitjacket focused a spotlight on DePaul College. Faculty in the College of Commerce were particularly concerned about students' inadequate skills development. The creative energies that had established the university-wide general education program in the late 1960s had dwindled by the late 1970s, and faculty new to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LA and S) were genuinely befuddled about what they were supposed to accomplish through DePaul College's often ill-defined courses. The self-study report prepared for the NCA visit in early 1977 echoed these and other concerns. At the same time that it backed up the need for a university-wide program, it bemoaned the one-size-fits-all requirement of the structure. It called for a system of requirements tailored "to serve a heterogeneous group of . . . students with wide variations in academic skills and backgrounds and with significant differences in career choices." The program, the document concluded, lacked "a cohesive and permeating means of transmitting cultural heritage." (133) The critique pointed out that DePaul College was operating on the mistaken assumption that it served a relatively homogeneous student body, "the capable majority," whose elementary and secondary educational background equipped it with adequate skills and knowledge. In reality, it was dealing with a student body at all levels of academic preparedness. Furthermore, each of DePaul's colleges had its own distinctive learning agenda. Plurality had taken on new meaning.

The NCA team confirmed that "dissatisfaction with [DePaul College] is quite high" and that some of the criticisms had merit. But it cautioned the university against hasty decisions or quick-fix solutions. Only a careful reexamination of the entire general education program in the context of a continuing commitment to a university-wide program would work. (134) DePaul took the admonition to heart and assembled a new group, the Undergraduate Curriculum Revision Committee, shortly after receiving the NCA report. During the next year, the committee developed a "working paper," largely through the efforts of Patricia Ewers, dean of liberal arts and sciences at the time, and L. Edward Allemand, then division head of philosophy and religion (and soon to be dean of DePaul College). It provided a framework for a subsequent faculty committee which created a new model for general education. The working
paper called for attention to both remedial and college-level skills development; it suggested providing a historical foundation to meet the evident lack of cultural literacy and to be a source of curricular cohesion; and it argued for closer integration of general and specialized education. In its most controversial edict it recommended dissolving DePaul College and restoring responsibility for general education offerings to the departments. (135)

Between the time the “Ewers-Allemand working paper” was released and the faculty committee was formed to devise a new model for liberal studies, Harvard University issued a proposal for a new “core” curriculum, stimulating a national wave of curricular reform. DePaul’s response to this document was emblematic of its consistent practice of taking into account trends in higher education while hewing to its own course. First, as chair of the committee that was to devise the new program, I remember that we began to look at national reform movements only after analyzing our own circumstances and the needs of our own students. The Harvard report, therefore, was interpreted primarily as legitimizing our own effort, which was already under way. Second, the report’s emphasis on skills development and historical grounding did buttress the arguments of those who, like Ewers and Allemand, wanted to strengthen those aspects of the program. Finally, the report’s recommendation to establish a core curriculum was regarded as irrelevant to our circumstances. As Ewers notes, DePaul, unlike many other institutions—including the most prestigious ones—had never given up on the notion of a core curriculum. While other colleges and universities were debating whether or not to follow Harvard’s lead in restoring a core, DePaul was concentrating on reforming its core. (136)

A new liberal studies program was implemented in autumn 1981. Among the new program’s principal breaks with the past was the recognition that while all undergraduate students needed to meet university-wide goals, the paths they took would necessarily vary. (137) It addressed the different levels of student preparedness through a skills assessment and skills development program. It also provided distinct models for each college with a requirement structure more closely integrated into the professional programs in each unit. Individual students’ needs and the variation among academic units were taken into account, keeping intact such key liberal learning goals as developing the power to communicate, acquiring broad knowledge, integrating many kinds of knowledge, and developing both a reflective cast of mind and an awareness of value issues and conflicts. (138)

This acceptance of plural paths to arrive at common goals subsequently legitimized efforts to meet the special needs of particular groups of students. An example of these efforts was the establishment of an honors program with a distinctive set of liberal studies requirements in L A and S. The university’s highly successful “Bridge Program,” inaugurated in 1985, helped those students most at risk to make the transition into and through the freshman year of college. Under the charismatic leadership of Janie Isackson, students in this program were soon achieving higher GPAs on average than their non-bridge peers and graduating at similar rates. (139)
The new program also introduced a "Common Studies" requirement that linked a two-course world history sequence with a college-level writing and research class. The planners hoped that Common Studies would be the magnetic core integrating and providing cohesion to work in other divisions, but their hopes were not realized. (140) In fact, the two departments largely responsible for Common Studies, English and history, were not able to establish a long-term cooperative relationship. Common Studies achieved an unforeseen but important triumph, however. The presence of a world history sequence in the new curriculum encouraged several departments to develop a more multicultural, global perspective while avoiding the agonizing "culture wars" that later wrought havoc at such institutions as Stanford. (141) Though the new requirement initially met with resistance from the history department faculty who were trained largely in Western areas, the work of creating a common exam and later, a common text proved to be an incredibly successful retraining experience. In a remarkable display of decentralized leadership, the history faculty created their own version of a graduate seminar in which they took turns as teachers and as students. (142) Both the common exam and the common text soon succumbed to telling criticisms, however, and in a mid-1990s revision of liberal studies, the world history survey itself disappeared. But it had done its job: history faculty members acquired a global perspective that altered their approach to the past. "So, for example, as someone who is trained in European history," argues James Krokar, "I realize that much of the work that's done [in that area] . . . on the issue of technology is done by people who have no conception of the comparative technological levels of Europe with the rest of the world, and . . . it's just because they've never bothered to look . . . . [W]hile I don't think I'll wind up teaching any kind of world civ survey, I intend to use a world civ perspective in whatever I teach, [and] try to do something cross-cultural." (143)

The religious studies faculty underwent a similar transformation as they developed a core course in the comparative study of world religions that was consciously designed to complement the Common Studies program. The self-designed retraining of the religious studies faculty occurred when they prepared a common reader for their comparative course. At that time, no member of the department specialized in non-Western religious traditions. I recall, as a member of its faculty, recognizing that if we intended to become a religious studies department with a comparative focus in reality as well as in name, we would have to teach ourselves. Grabbing hold of our own bootstraps, we succeeded in making that transition. (144)

The learning goal of integrating different kinds of knowledge has been the will-of-the-wisp of virtually all efforts to reform undergraduate education. Ewers and Allemand set the synthesis of liberal and professional studies as a primary objective for general education reform and the needs of DePaul's largely first-generation college student body made this goal an imperative. "For DePaul's faculty to attempt to dissuade students from professional careers," Ewers argued, "might be as irresponsible as trying to dissuade them from intellectual ones. Our solu-
A major effort to integrate the liberal studies goals of developing a reflective consciousness and a value consciousness with the goals of professional studies focused on professional ethics. Responding to the demands of its accrediting association, the College of Commerce wanted to set up a required course: "Business Ethics and Society." Much energy went into developing a model syllabus for the course, which was to be taught by faculty from religious studies, philosophy, and eventually, it was hoped, by College of Commerce faculty as well. A new dean of commerce, Brother Leo Ryan, made the course a priority and in the early 1980s the Institute for Business Ethics became the focus of faculty development and supplementary programming. But the hoped-for collaboration between commerce and liberal arts and science faculty members to staff the undergraduate course failed to materialize. Although business ethics became an excellent course, it remained isolated from mainstream professional study. In this regard it met a fate similar to other experiments that yielded such courses as "Science and Ethics," "Biomedical Ethics" and "Computers, Ethics and Society."

At their most utopian, the designers of the new "Liberal Studies" program, as the new general education program came to be called, had hoped that the university might become "a community of moral discourse."

The university is the one institution in our society which can provide a public arena for the interrogation and adjudication of a plurality of value systems and the world views that ground them. In its own faculty it contains the accumulated knowledge, the plurality of outlook, and the habit of reflection which are the conditions for sophisticated discourse about values in an age when any groundings of values in an objective order [have] disappeared. (148)

In the mid 1990s, management professor Laura Pincus, working with a colleague in philosophy, Daryl Koehn, resurrected the virtually defunct Institute for Business and Professional Ethics. Under their leadership the institute began what might be called a series of guerilla operations. Pincus and her associates popped up everywhere with case studies and resources for classes, faculty development seminars, videos and a web site. They looked for the "crossroads" where faculty's own interests might coincide with the possibility of infusing ethical reflection more broadly into the curriculum. Pincus worked with Dean Ronald Patten to promote Ethics Integration Grants among faculty who were interested in developing ethics mod-
ules in their courses. (149) While these efforts did not alter the marginality of the whole ethics enterprise and did not establish a single “community of moral discourse,” they did create numerous small communal pockets where ethical reflection flourished.

**Education for a New Workplace:**

**Responding to the Cult of the Professional in American Culture**

As he prepares to give the keynote address to the State Association of Real Estate Boards, Sinclair Lewis’s George Babbitt mulls over the difference between being a “realtor,” that is, a professional, and a “real estate man,” someone with “a mere trade, business or occupation . . . a fellow that merely goes out for the jack.” (150) Lewis surely meant to satirize George’s pretensions but, in fact, he characterized accurately a dominant force for change in the American workplace, one that has supported and affirmed other changes for well over a century, namely, the professionalization of work through, as Babbitt puts it, “trained skill and knowledge” and the claim to be providing a “public service.” (151) The cult of professionalism emerged as a practical implication of the eighteenth century Enlightenment and replaced experience-based knowledge and apprenticeship training with an educational process that was formal, theory-based and upheld by certified evaluators. (152) Babbitt, like most twentieth-century Americans, was part of what David Levine calls a “culture of aspiration.” Institutions of “higher” learning in the twentieth century have all been profoundly shaped by the fusion of the very practical aspirations of ordinary Americans with the Enlightenment mystique. At DePaul there has always been an acute awareness of this “culture of aspiration.”

---

In the United States argues Margaret Oppenheimer, chair of economics, there’s an historical route into the middle classes through business. DePaul has always had people coming whose parents were not middle class... who sacrifice... work two jobs or even three... to get their students to come here. That business degree is supposed to be their ticket into the middle class... So, I think there is a commitment at the undergraduate level to encourage students like that... to get them to see themselves as a successful person in a profession... (153)

For the first 90 years of its existence, that is, until the mid to late 1980s, DePaul University was dominated by its professional schools, particularly law and commerce. As Richard Meister has noted, even in liberal arts and sciences, the professional preparation programs, nursing and computer science, were the dominant majors in the 1970s and early 1980s. (154)
In this context the turn toward academic excellence which we have been examining throughout this chapter meant a determination to professionalize the training of professionals. Curricular changes in the law school, College of Commerce and School of Education in the 1970s and early 1980s arose largely from this aspiration.

Major external forces affected this internal objective. Changes in various industries influenced the way DePaul trained professionals. But the cultivation of professionalism originated in the professions themselves. Accrediting agencies became powerful factors in determining curricular change, especially in the 1980s. As dean of faculties at DePaul during that decade, Patricia Ewers notes that the major thrust of those agencies was to encourage a greater degree of homogeneity in professional education. Though standards of educational quality certainly made a quantum leap during the period, the accrediting agencies deferred to the particular definitions of quality that major research institutions had set. Hence, institutions were rated on how much of their faculty publication was related to the development of new theoretical models rather than applied research. Only in the 1990s, Ewers argues, was there a shift toward more flexible standards that were attuned to a variety of institutional missions.

Most faculty in the professional schools, however, were of the opinion that pressures to standardize criteria had a positive outcome by ensuring that students received a high quality education. They also have argued that major components of the "standard model" in areas that linked, for example, legal education and practical training in the profession came from institutions like DePaul. External forces might dictate certain aspects of a curriculum—a focus on ethics or international education, for example—but it was left to local institutions to implement distinctive curricula within a nationally established framework.

At the suggestion of a new dean, Ronald Patten, the College of Commerce began a review of its entire undergraduate curriculum in 1989. After extensive discussions, the new curriculum was finally adopted in 1993. Associate Dean Robert Peters sees the new curriculum as the culmination of a twenty-year shift of focus among faculty from a formulaic, cookbook approach to a theory-laden education. This shift reflected national trends and it brought economic theory into the limelight. "[W]e’re all... pivoting from economics as far as I can tell," Peters argues. In a parallel development fields like marketing that were less closely related to finance began taking their lead from social scientific research in psychology and sociology.

The new program linked liberal studies and commerce through such "bridge" courses as "Writing for Business" and a quantitative methods course designed to demonstrate the use of mathematical skills in decision-making processes. The new program also required two "Interdisciplinary Senior Seminars" that served as a capstone experience. These seminars were designed to "integrate the societal, political, economic, legal, ethical and other aspects of a world society with the functional areas of business." They established the cultural context within which business decision making occurs, and at the same time, they prepared students to function within a multicultural workplace.
The major departure in the new curriculum was the introduction of an international perspective. Dean Patten initiated this change. Shortly after he arrived at DePaul, following a stint with a multinational corporation, Patten began interviewing Chicago's business leaders about the direction they thought education for business professionals should take. "I was struck," he comments, "by the number of times internationalization was mentioned. [Typically, CEOs said,] 'our employees must adopt a mind-set which shows they understand there is a world beyond the United States. Our employees must understand that they will be in contact with persons from other countries in the course of their career'." (161) In the new curriculum, students can choose a foreign study program, instruction in a foreign language, or they can assemble a package of courses in a given cultural area to satisfy the requirement for developing an international perspective. (162)

Building on its reform of the undergraduate curriculum, the College of Commerce established an M.B.A. in "International Marketing and Finance" well ahead of its prestigious competitors. In this program students from the United States do internships in a foreign country while non-U.S. citizens do one in this country. Both undertake a final project working with a Chicago-based multinational corporation. To prepare faculty for this new curricular emphasis in the college, DePaul developed a number of programs with the assistance of the U.S. Information Agency for DePaul faculty to teach abroad, particularly in Eastern Europe.

In fact, Patten may have underestimated the number of faculty involved. Margaret Oppenheimer suggests that nothing short of a profound sea change in faculty attitudes and approaches to teaching and research resulted from these experiences. If working on a textbook in history or a reader in religious studies resulted in a new global awareness in those departments, the task of figuring out how to offer condensed versions of Western economic theory and practice to people from a fundamentally different culture had the same effect in commerce. (164)

The law school underwent a process of professionalization similar to the one at commerce and not unlike the pattern at work in the School of Music which began in the mid-
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1970s. In the legal profession, however, the pressure for uniformity began around the turn of the century with increased insistence by the American Bar Association (ABA) on conformity to national standards. Under the guise of a push toward professionalization, the ABA was, in fact, defending "the Christian Bar" against schools that were teaching Jewish minorities, of which DePaul was one. In consequence, it was involved in accreditation battles with the ABA through the 1930s. (165)

The shift to theory-based learning coincided with the development of a national market for lawyers and law professors particularly in the early 1970s. The law school had been affected much more profoundly by the social movements of the 1960s than other schools in the university. Politically active law students pushed for greater curricular variety and elective freedom. The school's Legal Clinic was started in 1972 in response to student demands for a more engaged form of instruction. DePaul was ahead of many other institutions in starting an extern program in 1975. The program placed students with "not-for-profit organizations, governmental agencies, and members of the judiciary." In a given semester more than 70 students participate in the program, with well over 1,000 placements since it began, making it one of the largest in the country. This program has provided both public service to the Chicago community and practical training for many more students than the traditional mechanism of a legal clinic could have involved. (166)

A new twist in combining professional preparation with practical engagement was taken in 1990 with the founding of the International Human Rights Law Institute. Doug Cassel, executive director of the institute, asserts, "By establishing an institute dedicated not only to teaching but also to research, public advocacy, training, technical assistance and litigation support, we were able to offer students not only classroom courses but practical work both in Chicago and overseas." (167) The president of the Institute, M. Cherif Bassiouni, was appointed by the United Nations Secretary General to investigate war crimes in the former Yugoslavia while Cassel himself was a member of the Truth Commission appointed by the United Nations as part of the peace process in El Salvador. "The case that meant the most to me was solving the murder of Archbishop Romero," Cassel commented. Under the Jeanne and Joseph Sullivan Program for Human Rights in the Americas, DePaul students have served as legal interns in Guatemala, El Salvador, at the Inter-American Court in Costa Rica and with the Canadian Human Rights Commission. While DePaul students interned abroad, lawyers and judges from Spain, Poland and several Central American countries were visiting fellows at the institute. (168) The institute became one of a number of programs, which, in the 1990s invented new approaches to professional education and also expanded the concept of a “learning community” to embrace others besides the degree-seeking student.

The programs developed by the School of Computer Science, Telecommunications and Information Systems (CTI) represent other emerging approaches to professional education.
The university's computer science faculty became a department in 1981 and a separate college in 1995. In quick order it has evolved into one of the largest programs in the university; its Ph.D. program was approved in June 1990 and admitted its first students in 1991.

The computer science program began at a time of declining enrollments at DePaul, and the department played a critical role in reversing the slide. In fact, the key to CTI's success is that it has ridden the crest of the newest wave of technological change in American society, unimpeded for the most part by the constraints that other programs attached to engineering schools have experienced. In 1982 the Department of Computer Science established its Executive Program, the first of a series of certificate programs. Beside producing capital to expand non-degree education, these certificate programs, acutely sensitive to market demands, have put the multiple curricula of the department and later the school on a new footing.

According to David Miller, professor in CTI, the school has learned to keep a sense of balance while institutionalizing a permanent process of review and revision for all programs, something few if any other fields in higher education have managed to do. CTI recognizes that the half-life of any of its programs, degree or non-degree, in an environment of constantly accelerating change is exceedingly brief. Faculty members teaching at present must work with the knowledge that they must prepare to teach new and, in some cases, wholly unforeseen subjects five years down the road. (169) Beyond the quality of its individual programs, it is this ability to be ready for change that is CTI's distinctive contribution to the evolving character of a DePaul education. In the summer of 1997 one of the questions posed at academic planning meetings was how do we adapt CTI's model to all of our professional programs?

The School of Education, more than any other professional school, has had to weather volatile shifts in public attitudes toward teachers as professionals. Precisely during the period we are studying, America put its teachers at the center of a hurricane of problems: racism, poverty, and fractured families. Then it subjected them to "savage inequality" in the distribution of the resources they needed to do their jobs, and finally it decided that teachers must do more than cope—they must prepare children "for life in the twenty-first century," whatever that might possibly mean. The School of Education's fortunes have reflected this volatility. Richardson established education as a separate school in 1962 as part of the overall effort we have been examining to professionalize the training of professionals. (170) In 1988 it was reduced to a department in liberal arts and sciences during a period of extensive public criticism of teacher education, only to be restored as a free standing school in 1990 when enrollments surged once more and the determination "to do something about our schools" was rekindled.

As part and parcel of this volatile environment, curricular reforms have swept through schools of education like so many weather fronts. At DePaul, three broad shifts in approach have not passed through but have taken hold: (1) a change in the role of a school of education
to focus on meeting the needs of inner city children; (2) development of community-school partnerships to further the education of future teachers; and (3) creation of a new "clinical model" for teacher preparation that connected with those partnerships.

In the early 1980s Patricia Ewers puzzled over DePaul's low enrollment of Latinos, a seemingly natural constituency for a Catholic, urban university. A needs assessment showed that Latino students were applying to DePaul but low SAT/ACT scores kept them from being admitted. DePaul proposed that the Joyce Foundation fund a college preparatory program for Latino students that focused on science and mathematics and business-related subjects. In 1981 the Students, Teachers, Educators and Parents (STEP) program began working with Juarez High School. It deliberately chose students who were middle achievers in a neighborhood high school to participate in the program; not the top achievers siphoned off to one of Chicago's "magnet" high schools. It is still going strong, and involved 267 students in 1996. A number of studies have shown that STEP students' ACT scores are competitive with Illinois averages. The McPrep summer program, funded by the McDonald Corporation, was designed for children in middle schools that are feeder institutions for the STEP high schools. This program tests the effectiveness of early intervention strategies by bringing students to a college campus for intensive study during their grade school years. (171)

Along with STEP and McPrep, the School of Education has launched a number of ambitious interventions to assist the Chicago Public Schools in their system-wide commitment to reform. Some of these programs are led by Barbara Radner, a professor of education, and originate in the Center for Urban Education. In the early 1990s a new dean, Barbara Sizemore, developed a novel form of cooperation with the Chicago Public Schools called the School Achievement Structure (SAS). By 1997, SAS was working with 25 Chicago public schools involving 1,370 teachers and 19,538 students. (172) True to its name, the program emphasizes a highly disciplined approach that is centered on students' learning. The principal sets the tone and communicates through her every action that, as Sizemore puts it, "all children can learn. I expect these children to learn. And it will happen here." (173) An SAS coordinator works with the school to implement "The Routes for High Achievement" that include ongoing assessment of student skills, pacing and accelerating their skills development, developing a coordinated cohesive curriculum and working with the staff to implement it. Discipline and high expectations are the key. "Kids who are from a disorganized community and a disruptive family life need a very structured school life," according to Sizemore. "If they can't get this from their teacher, then they won't get it at all." (174)

While these programs show the School of Education working with Chicago's schools as an agent of change, a partnership with a suburban school district provided the first model for a new type of teacher preparation. In the late 1980s the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) collaborated with Glenview School District and designed a clinical, site-based teacher preparation program for college graduates working toward both teacher certification and a graduate
The student residence hall University Hall opened its doors in 1986, Lohan Associates, architects.
degree. When UIC dropped out of the program, DePaul stepped in as a collaborator with Glenview and actually implemented the model. (175)

Students in the first year of the program begin with a summer of intense academic work. During the regular school year students intern at Glenview going through “rounds,” that is, rotating through different levels of instruction working with small groups of students and teacher mentors. DePaul faculty teach classes on-site several evenings a week. In the second and third years students are “residents” with responsibility for their classes though they still work closely with their mentors and prepare a thesis with an applied research focus. Three full years of classroom apprenticeship replace the typical 100 hours of classroom observation and 10–12 weeks of student teaching. Both DePaul faculty and student interns discover whether the theories under discussion in the seminars actually work in the classroom. Mentors, juggling the difficult task of teaching their own students and preparing their interns, realize that both they and their interns experience a transformation. “It is one of the nicest marriages between a university and a public school system that I’ve seen to date,” suggests one principal. (176)

The Glenview model influenced schools in other parts of the state. The Chicago school system, its teachers union, ten universities, including DePaul, and the Golden Apple Foundation banded together to create the “Teachers for Chicago” program. Modifying the Glenview program slightly, Teachers for Chicago works every year with about 100 new students who are spread out among the ten universities. Both programs have influenced the traditional curriculum of the School of Education, especially in the graduate programs, where adult learners have flocked to DePaul in search of new careers in teaching. Faculty members struggle to balance the increasingly intense expectations for traditional research at DePaul with the demands of the clinical model for hands-on involvement. (177) Occasionally in the School of Education, as elsewhere in the university, different models of professional education grind away at each other like massive tectonic plates, while teachers and students alike stand with feet firmly planted on both sides of the rift.

From the Little School Under the El to the New American University

Location. Location. Location. From the late 1980s through the 1990s, the success of the School of Education came from paying careful attention to its urban context. The School was clearly out in front of the rest of the university, but others were not far behind. The Curricular Design of 1964, as we saw earlier, called attention to the opportunities for education and service that exist in an urban culture and an urban university. When urban historian Richard Meister arrived as dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences in 1981, he saw a university bobbing in the midst of the energy flows of a very dynamic city, educating a primarily metropolitan constituency as it always had. Though some faculty had an urban focus, the university neither
encouraged nor capitalized on their interests. “I felt the need to try to articulate [the urban dimension],” Meister recalls, “to try to bring some substance to that.” (178) Others agree that Meister tapped something deeply rooted in DePaul’s culture and brought it to the surface. “But it’s not totally new,” suggests Roberta Garner, “[It’s] something that's been organically grown all along. So . . . [while it] appears to be an innovation, it’s an innovation that's really rooted in, probably at [the point when Meister arrived,] seventy-five years of reality.” (179)

In 1986 Richard Yanikoski, then Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, now president of Saint Xavier University, published an article that analyzed a mutation in this organically growing mission. The title of the article, “DePaul University, Urban by Design,” captures the shift. “DePaul is an urban institution,” Yanikoski argued, “in the obvious sense that it is located within a major city and serves substantial numbers of urban residents.” Because it chose to remain accessible to its traditional constituency, the university developed a variety of programs, like the STEP program, to remedy deficiencies in preparation for college among urban populations. To become “urban by design,” however, meant more than aiding a new cohort of first-generation college students to succeed at DePaul. Yanikoski discussed a variety of ways through which the university was promoting its urban focus. First, it was increasing the number of courses with an explicitly urban subject matter. Second, a still greater number of courses had begun to use Chicago and its institutions as “a living laboratory.” Third, at the pedagogical level more students were encouraged to undertake applied research projects. Focusing on the creative efforts of adult learners in SNL, Yanikoski praised the “police lieutenant [who] developed a physical fitness plan that was put into effect at his station,” a student whose assessment manual for future lay ministers was adopted by the Joliet diocese and the student who created “a handbook for judicial aides in the Illinois Appellate Court.” Fourth, he noted that some programs, in an effort to mine the knowledge and talents available outside of the university walls, had developed reciprocal relationships with key urban institutions. The associations between the School of Music and members of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra and the Lyric Opera were only the most obvious examples. Finally, Yanikoski cites a wide range of projects, ranging from the Mental Health Clinic to the Theater School’s “Playworks” series for Chicago’s children, that are integral to the education of DePaul students and provide a service to the larger community. (180) The Small Business Institute established in the early 1970s illustrates this same synergy between traditional research and our Vincentian mission of service—between enhancing the education of our traditional students and reaching new groups of eager learners.
In 1984-85, it ran five public seminars for aspiring entrepreneurs on how to start a small business effectively. It provided individualized counseling and management assistance to approximately fifty small businesses, not-for-profit organizations, and Chambers of Commerce. The institute also conducts research on small business concerns, and serves as a field laboratory for the newly created M.B.A. concentration in entrepreneurship.

Given the length of time that the Small Business Institute had labored in the shadows, Roberta Garner's image of an organic process slowly ripening makes sense. As Yanikoski's phrase "urban by design" indicates, by the mid-1980s there was a new self-consciousness about the whole urban commitment and a multi-pronged effort to expand it into a fuller range of educational activities and educationally related services. At a deeper level we can see that "urban by design" marked a new phase in DePaul's efforts to escape all backwaters. If we can mix our spatial metaphors, the "little school under the El" was by definition a backwater. We have already examined Howard Sulkin's contention that becoming a "place for the arts" repositioned DePaul in Chicago. Yanikoski's "laundry list" of programs and activities reflected a new multilateral determination to redefine the university itself.

Beginning in the mid-80s DePaul also committed itself to a sustained expansion of its undergraduate student body. Enrollment growth enabled the university to add dramatically to its physical plant and create a residential campus in Lincoln Park. Growth sparked a rapid increase in the number of full-time faculty, to more than 500. In liberal arts and sciences the impact on curriculum was immense. Enrollment growth meant that departments that had previously performed service functions through the Liberal Studies Program now had viable majors, and growth in the number of faculty members led to a proliferation of new specialty areas. In many departments new faculty with special knowledge of different parts of the world and different cultures in America created curricula with a decidedly more international and multicultural character.

During this period of rapid expansion, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences also added a number of interdisciplinary programs: honors, women's studies, American studies, and international studies. A graduate program for adult learners, the Master of Arts in Liberal Studies (MALS), was created in 1981-82. It became an influential model for interdisciplinary education. In the MALS three-stage model a set of team-designed, interdisciplinary core courses form the foundation on which electives selected from different departments across the college build. Students then synthesize their educational experiences in a final seminar or research paper.
It was with women's studies, however, that the integrative vision achieved its fullest expression at DePaul as elsewhere. Here the development of an interdisciplinary program flowed from the theoretical commitment of feminist scholarship, an activist agenda, and individual odysseys of feminist scholars at DePaul from relative isolation within their departments to collaboration within a network of like-minded colleagues. "A breaking down of boundaries between fields was considered a mission of feminist studies," comments Midge Wilson, professor of psychology and a former director of the Women's Studies Program. For feminist studies, crossing boundaries was more than a theoretical exercise, for "in doing that we would be seeking ways to help women, not just study women . . . . So there was a real switch from research on women to research for women." (183) Jacqueline Taylor, former director of the program and now an associate dean of the college, confirms Wilson's analysis, but adds that the women's studies curriculum was the culmination of initially isolated spiritual journeys whose goal was to connect scholarly inquiry about how we view the world with the central issue of how we live in that world. The efforts of these feminist scholars to create a common core for the Women's Studies Program reflected what the feminist poet Adrienne Rich calls "the dream of a common language." (184) As Wilson and Taylor see it, the program was another way of accomplishing the university's Vincentian mission and, despite the tensions and conflicts inevitable within a Catholic institution, they concur that the university has continued to support divergent interpretations of that mission. (185)

Though women's studies may have tested the limits of pluralism allowable in a Catholic university context, one of the most recently developed interdisciplinary programs is an ironic illustration of the depth to which that pluralistic ethos has penetrated. In winter 1995, a group of eighteen faculty from eleven different areas assembled to create a Catholic Studies Program. This was no rearguard effort to impose orthodoxy. (186) Their report stated bluntly, "Catholicism is not reducible to structures, doctrines or practices." It cannot be adequately understood or conveyed by any one discipline like theology.

Catholicism consists of multiple images of experience and meaning centering on the person and message of Jesus Christ. It includes doctrinal, attitudinal, organizational, aesthetic and historical layers. These layers overlap, culminating in a dense body of shared symbols . . . and other elements of shared community. (187)

The Catholic studies faculty wanted to offer students a "comprehensive analysis" of this multilayered tradition. It created a program unique among comparable programs in other in-
stitutions for its curricular diversity and in the range of perspectives these varied offerings represented. Against the Catholic Jeremiahs who decry what they see as the relentless "secularization of the academy," David O'Brien has urged Catholic universities to move away from the polar opposition of the secular versus (orthodoxy's version of) the "sacred" and to hew to what a colleague has referred to as the "radical middle." (188) The Catholic Studies Program epitomizes that commitment with its spirit of openness to a variety of perspectives and interpretations in a manner that reinforces Richardson's earlier confidence in the ultimate harmony of faith and reason.

The faculty collaboration that brought the flowering of interdisciplinary programs in so many areas of the university set the stage for a third round of reform of liberal studies early in the 90s. The centerpiece of the new program, inaugurated in autumn 1996, is a strikingly new kind of course called "Discover Chicago." Offered to incoming freshmen, the course involves a week-long immersion in some aspect of the city's life. Charles Suchar, an associate dean of liberal arts and sciences, remembers that the idea for the course arose while he was attending a conference on experiential education in November, 1994.

As a fluke, I'd walked in on a round table discussion with a professor from Australia, the university of Sydney. I think it was, who had an outward bound program for their freshmen. Incoming students were sent literally into the outback... After he told us about his program, he challenged people around the table to say what they might do if they had a program like this. And I indicated I was from a big city, and he got very excited and said, "Well, what would you do?" I said, "There must be opportunities out where you are..." By the time I had come back to Chicago, I was very excited about an outward bound experience in the city... (189)

Students focus on topics ranging from Chicago's art community to Latino immigration in Chicago, from violence and hospitality in Chicago's sacred spaces to empowering Chicago's women. During the week all of the participants visit one of seven neighborhoods where local leaders and residents discuss the issues that confront their communities.

Each of these courses signals to students at the very beginning of their college career that the vibrant, complex urban world that surrounds them is their classroom. Just as important, every section of "Discover Chicago" requires collaboration among faculty, staff and student mentors, which is breaking down the traditional segregation of roles in the university. The period of immersion concludes with a day of service during which students reciprocate the
generosity of the groups and communities that have been their teachers (190) Recall, if you will, the imperative articulated in the Curricular Design of 1964: “The curricular design shall reflect the students’ distinctive opportunities and privileges for education and service that exist in an urban culture and an urban university.” (191)

Incorporating a day of service into the Discover Chicago program was emblematic of another wave of pedagogical innovation that was rolling through the university. Units like the Legal Clinic, the Mental Health Center, the Theater School’s “Playworks” and the Small Business Institute had combined service to the community with the education of DePaul students for over 20 years. We have just seen that programs such as women’s studies were developing courses that involved applied scholarship or what is sometimes referred to as “action research.” Now these scattered endeavors were being replicated all over the university. “Theory is just immeasurably enriched by going out and seeing parts of the real world and, of course, you can do that in a lot of different ways,” Roberta Garner argues, focusing on the many ways a “service learning” course can be beneficial to our students and the communities they serve.

I think that [service-learning] is one way that is often very thought-provoking for students and also, and this is important, it gives students a sense that they have something valuable to offer other people. ... I think there is too much of a sense ... that students are just kids, who are best sitting in the classroom, listening to someone else, or reading things other people have written ... [In many ways, what students at DePaul, or any good four-year institution, have to offer is the fact that they’re very good writers; they’re very good readers; they’re good at math skills. That’s one of the reasons why they got in here ... and those skills have become so important. ... People without them are really coming down to the margins ... and [students] can help other people develop them.” (192)

If Garner represents a whole group of faculty and staff seeking to get students connected with various community organizations who ask for their services, Anna Waring, a professor in the Master of Public Services program, is typical of those who introduce the community into the classroom. In her course on the management of not-for-profit institutions, Waring has brought in the leaders of fledgling organizations, people who are “big on energy, big on commitment, big on emotion but still trying to put the nuts and bolts of an organization together.” Small groups of students assemble a strategic plan for building an organization after in-depth discussions with the community leader. The students learn how to plan in a real situation and
the community leaders walk away with six or seven full-fledged strategic plans that they can plunder for the best and most workable ideas. (193)

The number of courses and programs involving new pedagogies, new forms of engagement with the surrounding urban communities, new patterns of collaborative learning and instruction that Yanikoski had written about in the late 80s had increased exponentially by the mid 90s. Liberal arts and science dean Michael Mezey sees these once isolated efforts as now creating a self-sustaining transformation, fueled by the enthusiasm of both students and faculty. “When we give students an exciting first year program [through] the [focal point] seminars and Discover Chicago . . . , these students will come to expect [the same] sort of thing in the major areas of study. I think our students will become less tolerant of . . . a passive role, and the faculty . . . will respond to that.” (194)

Even before the new Liberal Studies Program was fully up and running, the university had begun to respond to or, more precisely, to acknowledge that the changes we have documented here were, in fact, transforming the character of the university itself. In spring 1996, Richard Meister, executive vice president for academic affairs, launched a discussion about the future of DePaul whose message continues to percolate through the university.

I believe that DePaul can be the New American University, a model of a university that serves the “public good” . . . . In this university, teaching and learning are primary, scholarship is broadly defined; interdisciplinary work is encouraged and service to the larger society is part of the mission. Faculty, staff and students are representative of the larger society. The definition of faculty is also broadened; faculty are both mentors and the academic leaders of this university, with the responsibility for learning being shared with staff and students. (195)

Clearly Meister was extrapolating from the kinds of programs that we have just been examining. Just as clearly, he was putting a new “spin” on the call of Ernest Boyer, late director of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, for the establishment of a “New American College.” Boyer, who earlier had led the movement to broaden the meaning of scholarship, now called for a renewal of American higher education’s commitment to the common good. “I’m convinced,” Boyer argued, “that higher education must respond to the educational and health and urban crises of our day, just as the land grant college responded to the needs of farmers a century ago—a commitment which can be viewed as a dimension of scholarship itself.” (196) Boyer’s plea recapitulated a long-neglected challenge made by Clark
Kerr over thirty years earlier to create "urban grant" institutions of higher learning. (197) In effect, Meister was suggesting that DePaul should become one of Boyer's pioneer institutions because of its Catholic, Vincentian and urban mission and despite its limited resources and dependence on tuition revenue.

The ensuing debate brought to the fore all of the complexities, the assorted and conflicting purposes that are so characteristic of DePaul. There were some who contended that this new vision deviated too sharply from the traditional mission of research and teaching—which was what higher education stood for. In a university like DePaul with heavy teaching loads, carrying out a research agenda was taxing enough, without placing the burden of new demands on faculty. (198) Others argued that American higher education, the "knowledge industry" that Clark Kerr had foreseen three decades earlier, was functioning increasingly as a "wedge institution" widening the rift between the haves and the have nots. In such a situation, a Catholic, Vincentian and urban university had no morally defensible choice but to transform itself into an agent for healthy social change. (199)

This debate was temporarily suspended in January 1997 when an NCA team was on campus for its periodic accreditation review of the university. Ten years of qualitative change linked to quantitative growth had bred a new degree of self-confidence in DePaul about the value of its academic programs. No backwater nervousness about external inspectors characterized this visit. The NCA team's report was also strikingly different from the one in 1950 that reflected the institution's shaky entrance into a new era. In contrast to the earlier document it praised a faculty that is "well-educated, student-oriented, [and] service-minded." It noted the "broad acceptance" of the university's Catholic, Vincentian and urban mission. Academic programs, it said, "have shown continuous, sometimes, striking improvement." Finally it singled out DePaul's many partnerships with its surrounding urban communities. These partnerships "have strengthened both the educational experience of the students and of the institution. DePaul has become a 'cornerstone for Chicago.'" (200)

Before the NCA team had set pen to paper, Father John Minogue, C.M., president of the university, was working with his leadership team on the next phase of DePaul's academic planning, a phase that would carry it to and through its centennial year. In spring 1997, Minogue, Meister and Kenneth McHugh, executive vice-president for operations, announced three educational goals for the university to consider:

Goal One: To provide all full-time students a holistic education that will foster extraordinary learning opportunities through a highly diverse faculty, staff and student body, extensive use of technology, a wide range of
The first goal heightened DePaul's commitment to (1) new pedagogies in programs like Discover Chicago, (2) interdisciplinary programs that complemented work in traditional majors and (3) experiential and service learning opportunities in all colleges, not just the School for New Learning. The second goal reflected the quantum leap in the quality of professional programs that we have seen occurring from the 1970s forward. The third goal activated the Boyer- Meister pioneering strategy. As part of being “urban by design,” DePaul had created numerous centers, institutes and programs through which the university entered into the partnerships with communities, a process that the NCA had commended. We have already looked at the work of units like The Human Rights Law Institute and the School Achievement Structure Program. Now DePaul was saying that these units would no longer be considered “satellite operations.” They would become integral to the whole educational enterprise and be more closely linked to the work of faculty and students while they were pursuing goals one or two. Putting goal three on a par with goals one and two unequivocally announced the birth of a new American university.

Henry David Thoreau said that he left Walden Pond because he “had other lives to live.” It is instructive that the one person who has had the greatest impact on DePaul over the past forty years left the university late in the summer of 1997. Sensing that he had other lives to live, Reverend John T. Richardson, C.M., chancellor of the university, flew to Kenya to take up a new post as a theology instructor in a Vincentian seminary. Richardson’s departure came at precisely the moment when the university—now far removed from any academic backwaters—felt more confident than ever before, secure in its mission to do more than hew to the established sea lanes of traditional higher education. Moving into uncharted seas, DePaul University was declaring that it too had other lives, multiple lives, to live.
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