

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 592

AC 003 293

By-Liveright, A.A.

CSLEA In Retrospect; A Final Report From the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Brookline, Mass.

Pub Date 68

Note-90p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.60

Descriptors-*Adults, Conferences, Evaluation, *Evening Colleges, Experimental Programs, Financial Support, *General Education, Higher Education, *Historical Reviews, *Professional Associations, Publications, Research, Special Degree Programs, Universities

Identifiers-*Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adu

Three phases have been identified in the life of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults (CSLEA); a search for relevance and purpose (1951-55); a period of involvement, innovation, and influence (1956-61); and an operational period of diversification, staff consolidation, and shrinking budgets (1962-68). CSLEA has produced interest and participation in program planning and experimentation in liberal adult education, a climate more conducive to change, increasing numbers of innovative programs at Brooklyn College and other institutions, a large body of pertinent literature, and publications and administrative structures for promoting professional and liberal adult education. Both the history and the demise of the CSLEA suggest several requisites for a change agent; a more or less independent organization; enough seed money for experimental and demonstration programs; active field involvement in testing and development; concentration of activities and energies on a reasonable number of concerns; a diversified plan of action and supporting services; a vigorous leadership role; and firm, clear-cut policies reflected in activities and methods. (Included is an evaluative summary chart of CSLEA special degree programs, seminars, and other activities.) (1y)

ED026592

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

CSLEA IN RETROSPECT

A Final Report

from

The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults

A. A. LIVERIGHT
PROFESSOR OF ADULT EDUCATION
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Doris Chertow

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

AC003 293

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....pg. 1

Introduction.....pg. 1

I. CSLEA AS A CHANGE AGENT.....pg. 3

 A. - 1951-55: Search for Relevance and Purpose

 B. - 1956-62: Involvement, Innovation and Influence

 C. - 1963-68: Diversification, Staff Consolidation,
 Shrinking Budget

II. IMPACT ON PEOPLE, CLIMATE AND INSTITUTIONS.....pg. 18

 A. People

 B. Institutions

 C. Climate

III. IMPACT ON PROGRAM INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.....pg. 36

 A. Taxonomy

 B. Application of Taxonomy to Special Degree Program

 C. Application of Taxonomy to Other CSLEA Activities

 D. Overview of Impact

IV. IN RETROSPECT.....pg. 65

 A. Did CSLEA Make a Difference?

 B. Essential Ingredients for a Change-Agent

APPENDIX - Chart Summary of CSLEA Impact.....appendix

PREFACE

C. B. RATCHFORD

Final Chairman of CSLEA Board of Directors

It is with heavy heart that I begin to write the introduction to the final report on CSLEA. While an avid participant in the Center's activities from its beginning, it was not until the declining years that I served in any official capacity with the Center. It was a heart-rending decision for the Board in December, 1967 to put the wheels in motion that would result in the termination of the Center in the fall of 1968. The decision was made more difficult because of the great capability and extreme dedication of the staff.

This report is in the best tradition of the CSLEA activities and publications. In spite of the author's high degree of personal involvement, the report is objective and hard-hitting. The Center has obviously been an important force in higher education. It pushed for liberal education at a time when most other forces in continuing education were stressing very tangible economic goals. The fact that a reasonable mix has been achieved is a very high tribute to the Center.

A question no one has really answered is why the CSLEA could not secure funds to continue in fact of its acknowledged success. The comments made to the Chairman of the Board - and perhaps more significant those not made - suggest three reasons for support not being forthcoming:

1. The propensity of foundations to drop support of existing activities and move to new projects. This policy has many good features; it allows them to start many activities which find other ways of obtaining financial support if they prove worthwhile. The weakness of this policy shows up when there is a project which has no chance of obtaining other financial support even if successful. The CSLEA falls in this category. Liberal education of an experimental nature and when the conducting organization works largely through other income receiving institutions cannot become self-supporting and maintain its original goals. The Staff and Board considered several plans which would have produced income sufficient to keep CSLEA alive; but they would have completely changed the purpose and nature of the organization and hence were rejected by Staff and Board.

2. The expanded role of the federal government in adult education. The federal establishment is spending billions of dollars for adult education. This leads many private interests to the conclusion that their help is not needed. Again a generalization is damaging to an effort such as CSLEA. While very large resources are available for continuing education, they are directed largely to achieving very specific economic and social goals and liberal education is not one of these.

3. An increased number of adult education organizations and increased strength of some existing ones. Continuing higher education has become big business and many institutions and organizations want a part of the action. CSLEA started operating almost in a vacuum; and while no one else is doing the specific job it set for itself, there are now many similar type agencies. Many are looking for support from the variety of sources.

The staff is now dispersed and the function of the Center dropped or taken over by others. Those who served with and for the Center should feel great satisfaction at having helped make a lasting contribution to higher education and continuing education in particular.

INTRODUCTION

Why is a new organization born? Under what auspices does it grow and develop? What kind of impact does it have on the field which it is set up to serve? Why does it fail in some areas and succeed in others? What has it accomplished and why is it finally terminated?

These are some of the questions which arise in my mind as CSLEA comes to a close after sixteen years of active intervention in the field of higher education. In this final report I attempt to give my answers. This is a personal statement based on my experience as Director of CSLEA for some eleven years. It is written in the hope that this interpretation will help make other organizations of this type more effective and useful. It is written to the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, which have provided major financial support, but in addition, it is directed to the many agencies and individuals who have provided financial and moral support and who have worked as colleagues with CSLEA toward the development of more effective higher liberal education for adults.

I hope it will be of interest to the many who have shared in the work of the Center and who have been involved in its activities in one way or another. At the same time I hope it will be of some interest and value to others planning to set up and operate other organizations which will try to influence the path and patterns of continuing education in the future.

Finally, this report may, directly and indirectly, answer some of the questions which were raised in letters received in response to our termination notice to the field. Many asked who CSLEA, which had been so active, energetic and innovative, and had become such an integral part of the field of higher continuing education, could not secure sufficient financial support to continue. Inbedded in this question raised by our friends were some underlying

implications and doubts: What had the Center done wrong? What had it failed to do? Was the demise of CSLEA an indication of strong forces of anti-liberalism or was it an indication of the fact that all private foundation and federal funds were going in other directions? Why didn't CSLEA shift its focus to deal primarily with such problems as inner-city or race and thus qualify for the increasing funds available for programs in these areas?

I. CSLEA AS A CHANGE AGENT

Implicit in the statement of the purpose and goal of CSLEA during most of its existence is the idea that it was an institution which was attempting to change the concepts, philosophy and actions of institutions of higher education in regard to continuing education and especially, continuing liberal education. Early in its history, the unchanging purpose of the Center became "to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults." This implied that it was the task of the Center to bring about specific and identifiable changes in the extension, evening college and continuing education arms of colleges and universities.

It is important, therefore, to examine how the Center, as an institution, functioned to bring about these changes and to understand the kind of institution that it was at different stages of development.

Whipple, in his history of CSLEA, identified three specific periods in the growth and activities of the Center. He calls the first phase, from 1951 to 1955, the period of study and reflection; the second phase, from 1956 through 1961, the period of operation and reflection (when the Center was truly a "quasi-independent" organization); and the third phase, from 1962 until its termination, an operational period combined with a search for a new synthesis and for support and continuation.

Looking at the same periods in broad terms, I view them first, as the period of search for relevance and purpose; second, as a period of involvement, innovation, and influence; and third, as a period of diversification, staff consolidation and shrinking budget.

A. 1951-55: Search for Relevance and Purpose

The first period, 1951-55, was a time when the field of higher continuing education was somewhat stunned and amazed at the comparatively vast amounts of money which were available for study and examination of liberal adult education. It was a time when the field was trying to find out what CSLEA was really about, and the members of the staff were seeking a way of implementing the core purpose. As Whipple mentions, they were trying to understand the present status of the field - who made the decisions and called the shots, what the key problems were and what CSLEA could do to deal with the problems that impeded the growth of liberal education for adults. During this period many people were involved in the shaping of purpose and program for the Center - adult education and interested scholars from other disciplines participated in this process of study and reflection. The staff was a highly imaginative one and it was a fluid and changing staff which then provided for the instant injection of new and fresh ideas into the thinking of CSLEA. The climate of CSLEA was one of search and innovation. The excitement of searching for a purpose and a program was heightened by the availability of generous financial support from the Fund for Adult Education. The Center operated with the comforting knowledge that it could count on FAE for core support of the staff and for experimental projects as well.

It was not all smooth sailing, however. This first period was also one in which the field was not quite certain what CSLEA was trying to do (nor was the staff of the Center). It was a time when some leaders in the field were suspicious of CSLEA influence and were concerned lest CSLEA usurp the traditional leadership of the official organizations in the field. As a result the Center was obliged to work extremely closely, at first with AUEC and later

with NUEA as well to offset these fears and to ensure that these influential associations would provide a locus for (or at least not interfere with) the programs and activities designed to advance CSLEA goals. In some ways both the staff and the field it was serving were aware that the Center was an organization which was, to a great extent, injected into the field from the top (Fund for Adult Education) down through AUEC and NUEA, to individual departments of adult education on college and university campuses.

Characterizing this period further, the Center was a small group of people trying to determine: what kind of an institution should be developed; what the operational goals were required to carry out its broad objective; what was really meant by the liberal education of adults; how such an institution should operate and what its programs should be. It was a heady time and as a result, there was much ferment, attractive to some leaders in the field for its provocative ideas and to many others, a slightly peculiar but glittering institution. In some ways it was considered an intellectual "enfant terrible", but no matter how intellectual or terrible it was, it was still an outgrowth and an appendage of the AUEC.

During the initial period there was a continuing tension within CSLEA between a highly experimental, and flexible approach to continuing education on the one hand, and on the other, some belief (greatly nurtured and supported by the Fund for Adult Education) that there was one best method to arrive at the desired goal of liberal education for adults. The one best method was study-discussion, based on the development of intellectually sound discussion materials.

Because of the dedication of the parent Fund for Adult Education to the study-discussion method, the Center devoted considerable time, energy and money

during the first few years to developing study-discussion guides. Experimental programs were set up in various institutions along these lines. Study-guides and instructors' manuals were developed in a number of areas including art, community development, world affairs, literature, science, and history. Faculty members from various universities, as well as core CSLEA staff contributed to the project and a number of excellent publications emerged. But efforts to have evening colleges adopt these study-discussion programs for use in their continuing education programs were somewhat less than successful. Only a very few evening colleges actually utilized any of the ten guides developed and published by CSLEA during its first four or five years of operation.

Well before 1955, the members of the Center Staff and Board realized that they did not have THE method and, as a matter of fact, shortly after it was set up questions were raised in CSLEA as to whether the discussion method and discussion guides were indeed the answer to the liberal education of adults. Nevertheless, during this initial period faculty members, deans of extension and some college administrators were beginning to worry that CSLEA seemed determined to sell them one specific method and various sets of materials to implement this method.

Actually there was no need for this apprehension. At the same time the Center was testing its earliest discussion guides, John Dickhoff and his staff were beginning what was to be the first of a number of major studies of high adult education. The findings, published in 1953 as Patterns of Liberal Education in the Evening College, emphasized the need for a broad attack on many fronts. The study left no question in the minds of the CSLEA Board and staff that a variety of approaches and diverse methods were required if they

were to have any influence on the field of higher education. Thus, as described in Whipple, attempts were made to deal directly with the faculty through a series of Faculty-seminars; meetings were held with the administration; conferences were held to get ideas and to stimulate the thinking of the practitioners in the field; and intensive studies were made to more clearly identify the practices, attitudes, and problems of the evening colleges and extension divisions. By the end of the first period, although there was no change in the ultimate goal of CSLEA, there was general agreement that the way to achieve it was to work with and through the key-leaders (the gate-keepers, in the field) to change attitudes, understandings and practice regarding many aspects of continuing education rather than to sell one specific method or approach.

In addition, by 1955 or 1956, there was an emerging understanding of the kind of institution the Center should be in order to stimulate universities and colleges to develop a greater feeling of concern for the liberal education of adults. It was at this time that the ingredients of a "quasi-independent organization" which the Center had become by 1956 were identified and spelled out. Commenting upon a staff paper, which identified CSLEA as a "quasi-independent organization", Whipple writes in his history:

It was dependent upon the AUEC (and later NUCIA) and its member institutions to get its ideas and materials tried out in the field and thus could not ignore the environment in which the evening college (and extension division) operated. At the same time it had another source of financial support which made policy and direction independent of the evening colleges (and extension divisions). In a like manner the Center was dependent on FAE for financial support and by implication limited to a concern for liberal education, but it was independent of the Fund in terms of its specific policies and directions which had to reflect the evening college (and extension) situation.

In other words at that time the Center's relationship to the field was one of healthy tension between the Center and the Fund and between the Center

and the evening colleges and extension divisions.

By the end of this first period, devoted to a search for relevance and purpose, both the Center Board and staff accepted the fact that its operation as a "quasi-independent organization" was crucial to its success at the same time, it was tacitly admitted that the "quasi-independence" was dependent upon four factors: a clear-cut mandate and sense of purpose; a generous source of funds; well-nourished roots in the field; and an active and imaginative staff.

B. 1956-62: Involvement, Innovation, and Influence

As the History of the Center points out, the staff and Board and its funding organization, FAE had pretty well accepted the role of a "quasi-independent organization" by 1956. The early period of study and reflection about the meaning of liberal education for adults, about the method of operation, about the discussion method as THE solution to liberal adult education and about the problems of the field were fairly well over. CSLEA was ready to move into action phase and to experiment with its ideas for the liberal education for adults. Furthermore the associations in the field, the key institutions and key leaders were ready and anxious to cooperate with the Center.

Well-financed by the Fund for Adult Education through the period until 1962, the energies of the staff were devoted to working with the field of new ideas, new programs, new methods and new organizational patterns aimed at the liberal education of adults. The budget of CSLEA soared to a level of \$247,000 for regular activities and reached a peak of some \$300,000 for regular budget and special projects during 1960.

Between 1956 and 1962, the Center enjoyed a high degree of acceptance by both the field and FAE. It enabled us to operate as a gadfly challenging outmoded traditions in university adult education. In 1958, we undertook to perform a similar role among Negro colleges in the U.S. In 1960, we helped

establish the International Congress of University Adult Education, serve to unite university adult educators all over the world around common concerns for continuing education. During these years we expanded and organized our communications network through an enlarged publications program, and the Newsletter, and we continued to influence leaders in the field through the Annual Leadership Conference, Liberal Education Institutes for Deans and Directors and a steady flow of visitors who came for periods ranging from a day to several months of study.

In my judgment, the influence of CSLEA on the field during this period was enhanced because it was not trying to sell one particular approach or method for the liberal education of adults. Its position as a gadfly and critic, as well as an innovator was strengthened by the fact that it did not have to ask for money. On the contrary, it was able to provide small grants to institutions interested in experimentation. Gradually we became an accepted part of the field of higher continuing education, so much so that no longer did the Associations feel obliged to pass annual resolutions thanking CSLEA for its contributions.

As a matter of fact, increasingly CSLEA was in a position where it was able to (and frequently did) publicly disagree and argue with the accepted leaders of the field. This stimulated a controversy and provided a channel both through its meetings and its publications for new ideas concerning liberal education for adults. In this connection, our publications became a major channel for ideas and reports about philosophy, research and innovative programs relating to liberal adult education.

It should also be pointed out that during this period CSLEA enlarged its scope moving beyond substantive aspects of liberal education becoming concerned with underlying institutional aspects and forces needed to provide a

favorable climate for the liberal education of adults. As a result, a growing number of studies, reports and conferences dealt with the organization and administration of adult education and of the responsibility of the university for continuing education. This was done because it became apparent that our ideas for program development could come to fruition only in a proper environment.

During this period, the major challenge to our quasi-independence took the form of discussions of a recurring suggestion that CSLEA should become more of a service organization for AUEC and NUEA. In each case, however, the outcome was agreement that CSLEA should maintain its quasi-independent posture; otherwise it would become a creature of the Associations and not be effective in bringing about change.

As far as program was concerned, there was continuing discussion about the need to shift emphasis to social and economic problems holding national attention. We did become involved in Negro continuing education, in programs of labor education and in studies relating to the social forces influencing continuing education. But, in general, the basic stance on program did not change, nor was any action taken to encourage support from other than foundation sources. In other words, during this period, CSLEA avoided the allure of shifting its base of support through possible financing from service activities or through changing basic program emphasis to fit into immediate national programs and interests.

By and large, during the period from 1956 through 1962, the Center not only continued to operate as a "quasi-independent" agency but it continued to operate as if the funds for support would be eternally forthcoming. In my opinion, such a stance was based in part on a feeling that unless we could operate in such a manner, we would not continue to have a significant influence in the

field. But beyond that, we continued to operate in this manner because we had an unstated faith that sufficient funds would come from somewhere for the continuing support of an organization which was almost universally acknowledged for its contributions.

Operationally this was a point of maximum interaction between the Center and the field. This came in part from staff turn over, thus continually bringing new persons and ideas into the Center and also sending persons imbued with CSLEA goals and concepts to the field. Second, the practical realities of operating an extension or evening college division, of meeting budgets or recruiting students were continually a part of our discussions and thinking as a result of the Visiting Staff Members who flowed through CSLEA from 1957 to 1961. Third, we had sufficient funds to carry on active and wide-spread field work (without charging our hosts for our visits) and to bring experts from the field to help us plan programs. Finally, interaction was achieved through our ability to provide grants for experimental programs either from our own funds or by our support of university proposals to FAE or other foundations.

In summary, the climate for experimentation in the liberal education of adults was favorable. We tried to make the most of it ranging far and wide with experiments in content or method for women, special degree programs, Negro continuing education, research methods and activities, liberal education for executives, or the arts. This program variety reflected the abandonment of packaged solutions to liberal education for adults.

The initial CSLEA focus on liberal education remained, but the perspective had been somewhat enlarged to include a concern for and activities in other than subject matter areas of higher continuing education. Among the many programs reflecting the expansion were: a conference on the role of the evening

college; a leadership conference on the responsibility of the dean for continuing education; a seminar for university presidents; and research published as Forms and Forces in University Adult Education.

With the announcement of the termination of the Fund for Adult Education in 1961, CSLEA was forced to re-examine the somewhat euphoric stance which characterized the period from 1956 until 1962. Although the sense of security for CSLEA had been threatened by the announced termination of FAE, it was not entirely shattered. The Fund for Adult Education indicated that it would consider making a terminal grant to the Center to carry its operation along for at least another three or four years.

Spurred by the promise of a terminal grant from FAE, the Board and staff of the Center took a close look at its program. After considerable study, we decided to maintain the overall goal and program. We hoped to be able to operate on a reduced budget by being more selective regarding priorities and more careful to concentrate on key leadership and key institutions which provided leverage as models for the rest of the field. The budget for this revised operation was set at \$150,000 a year (rather than the prior basic budget of \$247,000). Although it was realized that the continuing program with such a sharply reduced budget would require some rethinking of priorities and activities, we believed that with additional funds for special projects and programs it could be done.

The proposal for operating CSLEA at a reduced budget (with some additional funds to cover the Clearinghouse and Newsletter) was presented to FAE and a grant of \$600,000 to cover the basic budget for the period from 1962 through 1965 was approved. In 1962, then, CSLEA moved from its well-financed era into one of comparative austerity, with its existence assured through July 1965 and with at least stated expectations that it would do just about as much as it had in the past despite a drastically reduced budget.

C. 1963-68: Diversification, Staff Consolidation and Shrinking Budget

In the face of dwindling resources combined with ambitious goals and plans some tensions began to appear in CSLEA. I believed that it would still be possible to follow through on most fronts despite first, less foundation support, by dint of elimination of special expenses such as the visiting staff member program, grants to institutions, extensive field-work, subsidy of a variety of conferences and institutes, and second, through increased income by charging more for publications, charging for consultation formerly provided free, and contracting for special studies. Many of the staff were dubious, believing that it was unrealistic to attempt to carry forward on all fronts with a sharply reduced budget. The ever changing Board of CSLEA was not directly involved in the tensions but, in general, did not push for any drastic cut in operations or activities.

In addition to some continuing tension about the extent of activity which could be successfully undertaken, the need for new support for continuation beyond 1965 as well as for securing additional funds for current activities meant that much of my time was diverted either to fund raising for the future or to immediate tasks which would bring in supplementary income.

In 1963 we were able to provide for limited continuation of CSLEA beyond 1965 through arrangements involving affiliation with Boston University and a supplementary grant from the Carnegie Corporation. Thanks to the active cooperation of President Harold Case of Boston University and James Baker (then Dean of Continuing Education), and with the support of an energetic committee of the CSLEA Board, an agreement was reached, whereby CSLEA became an affiliate of Boston University. This move provided a home for the Center while Boston University assumed one quarter of the expenses for professional staff (buying

a quarter of their time for teaching or administrative responsibilities'. Along with the affiliation with Boston University came a five-year grant from the Carnegie Corporation for \$150,000. This enabled us to attenuate the balance of the terminal FAE grant, and to continue CSLEA at a minimum operating level through 1968 or 1969. 'The staff at Boston consisted of professionals, one junior professional and supporting clerical staff - as compared to a professional staff of from ten to fifteen in 1960.'

In other words, from July 1964 on, CSLEA attempted to move forward with only a slightly reduced program in the face of a smaller core staff (one quarter of whose time was devoted to direct Boston University responsibilities'. In addition to the continuing pressure for activity, productivity and the need to serve as a continuing change-agent in the field, members of the staff were increasingly conscious of the need to try to bring in additional income from studies and consultation work which, in some cases, went well beyond the clear-cut focus and goals of the Center. As a result, the energies and resources of the decreased staff were further fragmented and diversified and the focus on the major objective became less sharp.

These conditions tended to distract the Center toward issues and problems in the field of higher continuing education beyond our original goals, and thus widened the base of interest and activity. This broadening of the nature of activities also meant that members of the staff, of necessity, spent more of their time on activities and concerns which were more action than deliberation-oriented and on planning and involvement in areas beyond those limited to liberal adult education. Although this broadening emphasis and concern was welcomed by many university adult educators in the field (who felt the past CSLEA emphasis was too limited' it also tended to increase tensions in the staff and to

blur the central focus on liberal education for adults.

It should be emphasized that the Center never repudiated its obligation to liberal education. In effect, during this period CSLEA was trying to do more and more in enlarged areas and with less clear-cut focus, with less income and less available time.

Looking back to the four ingredients which were identified as characteristics of the "quasi independent" agency we find that from 1964 on, these ingredients were diminishing if not disappearing. As already mentioned, the required clear-cut mandate and sense of purpose became blurred, partly because of a belief that the goals of CSLEA must be broadened and, partly as a means of securing more income and support. The generous source of funds was rapidly diminishing. The Carnegie grant, although timely and life-saving in 1964, provided for decreasing funds from a maximum of \$50,000 in 1964 to a final allocation of \$10,000 for 1969. Despite a variety of attempts to identify new sources of funds, no major donors were uncovered.

The third ingredient, well-nourished roots in the field, was to some extent still provided through field participation on the Board and through continuing relations with AUEC and IWEA but the nourishment of these roots in terms of funds available for conferences, meetings, visiting staff-members, field-visits and grants for experimental programs had pretty well dried up by 1965.

The final ingredient, an active and imaginative staff was, in essence still present but, because of their fragmented responsibility, the over-extension of their resources, the complete absence of turn-over and thus the lack of injection of new blood into the staff, and the growing internal tensions, the Center was forced to be less active in meaningful ways and the innovation and imaginativeness which had characterized its early days was less in evidence.

The Consultant's Report, presented to the Board of Directors of CSLEA

by Robert Hudson in the Fall of 1967, tends to agree with my analysis. He pointed to the need for new staff and operating arrangements which would involve the field more highly and which would depend less on a long-term, continuing core staff. He suggested a broadening of objectives and goals which would, in effect, legitimize the already expanded areas of concern of CSLEA and which would make the expanded scope explicit and specific (a Center for Higher Continuing Education rather than exclusively for Liberal Adult Education). Operationally, Hudson recommended a much greater involvement of the field through the establishment of working-parties and planning-groups with CSLEA acting more in the role of catalyst and facilitator than the purveyor of all wisdom. Finally, Hudson suggested that a massive introduction of new and additional funds was required. Hudson's report has been published by CSLEA as an occasional paper, *Toward a Center for Higher Continuing Education*.

In summary, CSLEA went through a fascinating, exciting and highly creative initial period of goal-setting and direction-finding, which involved many persons in the field and which intrigued as well as confounded the key groups in university adult education. It then moved into a well-financed, clear-cut period of activity, involvement and creativity which had great impact on the thinking and action of individuals and institutions of higher continuing education. And, finally, it moved into a period of diminishing impact with goals and scope expanded rather than trimmed to fit the financial realities.

Possibly both the Director and the Board of CSLEA should have admitted the situation confronting it earlier than the Fall of 1968. Possibly the program and activities of CSLEA should have been drastically decreased in 1964. Possibly we should have faced up to the fact, shortly after moving to Boston University, that the crucial ingredients of a "quasi-independent" organization

no longer existed and we should have stopped trying to act like such an organization.

In retrospect, all of these possibilities might have been acted upon before 1960. It was our decision to maintain hope that somehow, sources of financial support would be forthcoming (either through renewed foundation interest in the area of higher continuing liberal education or through the joint government-foundation funding recommended by Alan Pifer of Carnegie which would enable us to continue our unfinished business at the level of activity achieved between 1956 and 1962.

The fact that both the Director and the Board finally faced up to the facts in 1960 and decided not to try to continue CSLEA on an even more attenuated basis and that the staff agreed is testimony to their dedication to the basic goal and purpose of the Center rather than to the continuation of an institution which could no longer perform the functions for which it had been established.

IV. IMPACT ON PEOPLE, INSTITUTIONS AND CLIMATE

Turning back to the initial and enduring goal of the Center, (to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults). I wish to examine the ways in which the Center went about trying to achieve it and to assess the degree to which it succeeded. In this chapter I will focus primarily on the attempts to develop a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults.

To develop such a sense of responsibility, CSLEA has consciously attempted to influence the general climate relating to liberal adult education, the people and key leaders in the field, and the specific institutions of higher education which could provide a base and support for the liberal adult education.

This chapter is therefore, primarily concerned with examining what the Center did to develop the atmosphere, and to fertilize the soil rather than with the cultivation of specific program seeds.

A. People

Center activities have always been characterized by a central concern with the people directly in the field of university continuing education as well as with those who influence and determine what happens in university extension and the evening colleges. At no time did it operate, at least by design, primarily as an Olympian, distant organization that was concerned more with ideas and abstractions than with people.

The style of its relationship to the Gate-keepers and to the leaders did change, however, during the years of operation, partly in terms of the people who made up the CSLEA staff, partly in terms of the styles of the various

Directors and in part as a result of the stage of development of CSLEA and the amount of money it had to spend.

During the first period, from 1951 to 1955 the initial concern was with the leaders of the Gate-keepers in the field. Understandably, a new organization which was the brainchild of a very few persons must first broaden its base of support if it was to have any influence on the field as a whole.

This focus on the leaders, including faculty and administration was implemented through a variety of ingenious and varyingly successful activities. It was during this period that CSLEA initiated its Leadership Conferences. These conferences from their beginning (in 1952) were aimed at the key leaders persons who were nominated by the AUEC (in the beginning) and later both by AUEC and NWEA. The early Leadership Conferences started out as meetings financed freely and generously by CSLEA with transportation, living accommodations, and all of the amenities covered by CSLEA. They were looked upon as rich fare intellectually, spiritually and physically. During the second CSLEA period the Leadership Conferences continued but gradually the Center passed on the expenses for transportation to the Associations, eliminated the budget for hotel expenses and, finally, after 1962, covered expenses only for the program aspects of the Leadership Conference. Nevertheless, attendance at the Leadership Conferences weathered these changes in the level of financing and they continued to be well attended. They were one aspect of the CSLEA program, which carried on with considerable field support and animation until the end.

In addition to concentrating primarily on the stimulation of leaders in the field and on directing attention to broad substantive problems, the Leadership Conference provided, for over fifteen years, a forum at which representatives from AUEC and NWEA could meet together informally as well as in

occasional formal and joint meetings.

The Leadership Conferences also provided meeting ground where the two Associations could meet together and share ideas and work out some plans for joint projects. For a few years a joint AUEC-NUEA Committee met officially at the Leadership Conferences, but discussions of a merger of the two Associations, which emerged from the Committee, were premature and the activity was abandoned.

Nevertheless, the provision of this common meeting ground did make possible relaxed and continuing communication between the two Associations, and it also resulted in a few very specific inter-associational results. In the first place it was at the Leadership Conferences that the problem of joint reporting of statistics about adult education activities was discussed. Aided by small grants from CSLEA, a committee, later known as the Joint Committee on Minimum Data, moved ahead to develop a plan for uniform reporting of enrollments by AUEC and NUEA institutions. Ultimately, it was effective in getting the system for such joint reporting adopted by the University Registrars and by the U.S. Office of Education. The outcome of this committee is the continuing annual report on registrations by AUEC and NUEA. (The only annual reporting of activities and registrations in the entire field of adult education).

It was also during the course of the Leadership Conferences that leaders representing the Adult Education Association of the U.S., the National Association of Public School Adult Educators, the Association of Junior Colleges and representatives of public and other private agencies joined AUEC and NUEA for informal discussions of common problems. Out of these meetings an Ad Hoc Committee of Adult Education Organization was formed. It resulted in a Committee of Adult Education Organizations which meets twice a year to discuss problems and interests of mutual concern to the field.

During the initial period, CSLTA also involved people directly in the field by making small grants to faculty as well as to administrators for program development, for the writing of discussion materials and, to a limited extent, for carrying out program ideas developed by Center staff. During this period the Board of CSLEA, made up primarily of the leading administrators in the field, was highly involved in setting the policy as well as in making a number of more detailed operating and staff decisions. Although it met only twice a year (except during emergency periods) the early years were the peak ones in terms of active Board participation in CSLEA activities.

In addition to attempts to involve and influence the deans and directors of university adult education, other programs were aimed at faculty members and at the top administration. A series of Faculty Seminars were started in 1952 and continued until 1956. These conferences were important in involving teachers, not directly concerned with the operation and administration of extension and evening college programs. At least in some cases they were successful in developing faculty members who continued to be interested in and available for higher continuing education.

In spite of their apparent success, the faculty seminars were abandoned in 1957. In my opinion the decision was typical of one aspect of the Center's method of operating which at least implicitly emphasized the experiment rather than change -- "we have tried the faculty seminar approach; it is time to try another experiment." It represented the feeling of some of the staff that CSLEA should merely demonstrate new approaches and then it was up to the field to grab the idea and run with it rather than believing that CSLEA had a responsibility for carrying through on the ideas until they had been successfully integrated and adopted by the field. This feeling of responsibility for only the initial

demonstration period characterized staff position with respect to other program activities which will be more fully discussed in the following section.

During the first period, then, the Center focussed on activities which involved and attempted to influence the key leaders in the field, the faculty members and, in one case, the College Presidents (through a conference which was held at Daytona Beach in 1956). These activities were invaluable in spreading the ideas of CSLTA, in gaining greater acceptance for the concept of the liberal education of adults and in identifying and building a small cadre of faculty and administrative allies in places of power and influence in the Universities and Colleges.

In addition during this first period, active and successful efforts were made to involve persons from other disciplines in the thinking and planning of the Center. In connection with both the Leadership Conferences and other special meetings on Social Forces in the field, on community problems, on the philosophy of adult education, a number of leading thinkers and theoreticians such as C. Wright Mills, Horace Kallen, Pevel Denney, David Riesman, and Robert Theobald were stimulated to focus their thinking and concern on the liberal education for adults.

During the second period, from 1956 through 1962, activities and situations which focussed primarily on the stimulation, development, and involvement of people in the field were: the Liberal Education Institutes for Deans and Directors; the Visiting Staff Member program; the turn-over of CSLEA staff; and the increasing involvement of persons in the field in planning and carrying through experimental and demonstration programs.

The Institutes for Deans and Directors were started in 1957 in emulation of the famous Louis Armstrong dictum about jazz, "If you gotta ask me what it is

you ain't never going to know". By the same token the staff and Board agreed that the time had come when we should stop talking about what liberal education meant and move into a situation which would provide for total immersion of the "operators" in a liberal education experience. As a result, the first of eight such Institutes was held at the Minnowbrook Residential Center of Syracuse University. The key officers of AACC and NUREA as well as the members of the CSLEA Board were invited to spend one week at Minnowbrook to participate in a reading and discussion program (supplemented by evening session on the dance, music, drama and painting) concerned with philosophy and with literature. A hard rule of the Institute was that operational problems such as budgets, parking and like were ruled out of order. The impact of this Institute on the participants (most of them practical and eminently successful administrators) was immediate and challenging. The Institute was uniformly welcomed and enthusiastically received. Most of the participants called vehemently for a follow-up session for themselves (an alumni program) as well as for the extension of the Institutes to other members of their staff and to other Deans and Directors who had not participated in the first session. The following year CSLEA assumed direct responsibility for running another Institute - this time for first-year participants and a simultaneous one for Alumni who were back for the second year - at Syracuse University's Sagamore Center. The reaction, similar to the first one, was general agreement that the program should be continued until all adult education administrators had been involved.

The staff agreed that the seminars should be continued, but as in the case of the faculty seminars, we decided we had accomplished our experimental purposes and had demonstrated the effectiveness of the program. Therefore we encouraged universities to pick up the subject and continue it without CSLEA

participation in planning or financing. Actually two universities carried on for two additional years with our staff serving as consultants. The fact that the Institutes did not continue after the fourth year was probably a combined product of a shift of staff interest to other areas of activity which meant complete withdrawal of CSLEA from the planning and promotion of the Institutes and the fact that many of the key leaders in the field had already participated.

The Visiting Staff Member Program was started in 1957 in an attempt to achieve several different but related objectives: first, to provide for a continuing reality-exposure for the CSLEA staff inviting administrators to participate in our planning and thinking; and second, to permit extension and evening college administrators to get away from their daily chores and responsibilities so that they could become involved in independent study in a sort of sabbatical leave. Thanks to a special supplementary grant from FAE, nine persons were involved in the program from 1957 through 1962. The way the Visiting Staff Members spent their time at CSLEA, the extent to which they read and studied or undertook direct CSLEA activities or planned programs for their own institutions varied in accordance with their own interests and needs. By and large we felt that the program was effective in both directions and it was terminated only because of lack of funds.

During these years CSLEA experienced its greatest turnover. Seven members of the full time professional staff with experience ranging from one to nine years left the Center. In most cases it was to assume responsible positions in higher continuing education. All told, a dozen former staff members or visiting staff members continue to be active in university adult education.

Other activities which were directly concerned with the CSLEA impact on people during this period were the increasing number of persons from evening

colleges and extension divisions who visited the Center offices in Chicago and the participation by CSLEA staff in professional development programs of WEA and AUTC. Particularly with WEA Divisions, our staff enjoyed continuing relations, often extending over several years. Furthermore, small planning grants permitted numerous face to face meetings which could not have taken place without CSLEA funds.

The high degree of cross-fertilization during this period resulted in a continually challenging and stimulating atmosphere within CSLEA itself and it touched and involved scores of persons from the field.

During the final period there was no conscious shift in the policy with respect to the Center's involvement of people in the field, but in my judgment, there was a distinct change in personal involvement. The Visiting Staff Member program was discontinued. The Institutes for Deans and Directors had been abandoned. A number of experimental programs which called for high involvement of persons from the field were discontinued in part because of lack of funds. For the same reason most conferences supported by CSLEA, except the annual Leadership Conference, were curtailed.

In addition, the active staff turn-over which characterized the early days of CSLEA ceased. Of the five professionals who were still with CSLEA when it terminated, two had been with the Center for fourteen years, one for eleven, one for eight, and the final member had been with CSLEA in various capacities for at least six years. Furthermore, due to a limited budget, no new members were added to the regular professional staff during the last six years of CSLEA operation. As a result, the cross-fertilization and the continuing dialogue, testing of ideas and programs and the direct staff participation of new members and representatives from the field was totally absent during the last years of

Center activity. Although the CSLEA staff carried with it much experience and expertise and although it continued to be involved with the practitioners from the field, inevitably the dialogue became more ingrown and less varied and less subject to continuing field-testing.

Despite the decrease in opportunities to work directly and in varied ways with the field, attempts were made to continue some activities directly focussed on people. Visitors were still welcome at the Center; field work continued; a few special conferences and meetings were stimulated by CSLEA; and some joint projects were undertaken - the point is these activities were on a much reduced scale due to lack of funds or limited staff or both.

Two exceptions to this decrease in impact on people are worthy of note. One, an outgrowth of the Negro College Committee on Adult Education, was a two-year program (1966-1967) arranged by CSLEA whereby two staff members from predominantly Negro Universities (Norfolk State and Tuskegee) spend a year studying and working at Syracuse and the University of Wisconsin and then returned to their campuses to carry on continuing education programs there. The other was the growing involvement of CSLEA since 1961 in planning and arranging visits of some twenty overseas adult educators who were on study-tours in North America.

B. Institutions

To some extent the shifting emphasis, amount of activity and change in focus which characterized CSLEA with respect to its activities with people also applied to those related to institutions and climate.

During the first period, CSLEA focussed primarily on the following: trying to identify and involve the leaders and institutions in the field; mapping out areas of activity and priorities; isolating and understanding major problems; and moving toward an effective stance and a sound operating procedure. During

the second period, there was some dilemma and disagreement as to whether emphasis should be placed primarily on stimulating new programs or on carrying through on tested and proven activities. But ample funds and staff in effect permitted the Center to do both. During the last period, as already mentioned in the first section, we tried to continue along the path blazed out during the second period without trimming our sails to meet staff and budgetary limitations.

During the first period emphasis was placed on work with and involvement of a rather limited number of institutions - those who were most accessible through the Board or through active leadership in the AVEC. During the second period an active attempt was made to enlarge the number of institutions with which we worked and conscious efforts were made to visit and to communicate with all of the major institutions in the field. During the final period although still eager to maintain a wide spread network of contacts, actual field work and involvement of institutions was per force limited to those who could afford to pay staff members to visit their campuses or who would pay for consultant work by CSLFA.

During the first period, visits to nine institutions were carried on in connection with the initial study of evening colleges. Although such visits were primarily for the purpose of analyzing the activities and identifying the problems of the field, many of them resulted in long-continuing and active relationships. During the second phase, CSLFA was involved in another major study (financed by a special grant from the Fund for Adult Education) aimed at determining the extent and nature of activities of institutions of higher education in the liberal education of adults and also at attempting to come up with some theories about and insights into the circumstances and situations in which institutions of higher education were most receptive to and active in liberal

adult education. In addition to sending questionnaires to several hundred institutions in the country, some twenty institutions were visited by teams of CSLEA staff members. Here again, although the visits were primarily for the purpose of securing data for the study, many of them resulted in continuing relations with leading universities and in their involvement in various experimental programs.

During the first two periods of its life field visits, in almost all cases, combined a realistic attempt on our part to learn more about the institution, its activities and its problems, with an attempt to stimulate them to undertake expanded programs in continuing liberal education. Visits were made not only to the extension and evening college divisions but also to the key administrative officers and faculty groups on the campuses. Insofar as possible, we suggested that these visits be utilized by the evening college and extension deans and directors as an opportunity to buttress their own position and relationship with faculty and administration by using the visitors from a "national organization" to help to sell the importance of continuing liberal education. It is unlikely that many of these visits resulted in miraculous changes in faculty or administrative attitudes or in the allocation of larger budgets to continuing education but, according to reports received, they did provide at least some outside support for the deans and directors in their own institutions.

During the second period from 1957 to 1959 field visits by CSLEA staff members were made to some 86 different colleges and universities. During this same period continuing education staff members from 45 different institutions visited the Center Office and met with Center members individually or in joint sessions. Since the field visit program continued at an active pace after 1959, at least through 1963 it is estimated that during its life Center staff members

visited well over a hundred institutions of higher education.

During the final period the nature of field visits by CSLEA changed markedly. Because of its limited budget, the Center was no longer able to seek out institutions and to make as many field visits on its own budget. Although a small item for field work was continued in the annual budget it was not sufficient to make an extensive or widespread field work program possible. As a result most institutional contacts were focussed on visits which were related to some specific study or activity underway at CSLEA. For example, a number of institutions in Ohio were visited in connection with a study which CSLEA undertook for the Academy for Educational Development. Other institutions were visited in all parts of the country in connection with the study of adult education in the United States carried on for the U.S. Office of Education in 1964 and 1965. Other visits were involved with special projects concerned with Negro College programs and with special consultations financed by the institutions themselves. As a result, the total number of institutional visits made by CSLEA was drastically reduced after the move to Boston University in 1964. At the same time those visits which were made were more focussed and specific in purpose. The nature of the activity was more in terms of pin-pointed studies or special consultations than in terms of broad crusading or general information-gathering.

Because of the generally recognized peripheral nature of continuing education in all educational institutions and especially in institutions of higher education, CSLEA from its earliest days was active in trying to influence the larger institution in which continuing education operates as well as the field of education as a whole. Letters received when the termination of the Center was announced and comments from the field at the time that CSLEA was requesting a grant from Carnegie mentioned a variety of specific activities that the Center

had carried on and definite ways in which it provided assistance to individual institutions but the major message in these letters was the fact that the mere existence of CSLEA was one of the most important ways in which the Center was useful in furthering the liberal education of adults.

C. Climate

Beyond this, the Center did undertake a number of specific programs aimed more or less directly at influencing the climate in favor of developments in continuing liberal education. Already mentioned were the faculty and administrative conferences operated by the Center during the first period. Also important in this respect especially during the early days, was the active involvement of persons outside of the field of continuing education and the stimulation of their interest in and support for continuing education.

During the second period of CSLEA's life attempts to influence the underlying climate were more direct. One major thrust was agreement on the need for a comprehensive study of the Role of the University in Adult Education - a Flexner-type report for continuing education. It was hoped that such a study and report might have as great impact on institutions of higher education as the Flexner study did on Medical schools many years ago. With the full concurrence of the Board, a major grant of \$150,000 was secured from the Carnegie Corporation. It provided that a mutually agreeable person be secured to direct the study. Fred Harvey Harrington, at that time Vice-President of the University of Wisconsin and later to become its President, was the unanimous and enthusiastic choice for the assignment. He immediately employed Donald McNeil, who had formerly been the Director of the Historical Society in Wisconsin, as his assistant.

Because of a variety of circumstance, the study has never been published.

Nevertheless, there were a number of important outcomes which significantly influenced the climate in the field. During the course of the study, President Harrington played a significant role on a task force appointed by John Gardner to work on the bill which became Title One of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Also during the period of his involvement in the study, Harrington served as the Chairman of the Commission on Academic Affairs of the American Council on Education. During his chairmanship of the Commission, it established for the first time a Committee on Higher Continuing Education, thus gaining official acceptance for continuing education in the most important Association in the field of higher education. Finally, during the course of the study, McNeil, who prior to it had not been directly involved in university extension and continuing education, became vitally interested in the field and is now carrying on an outstanding and pacemaking program in continuing education as the Chancellor for State Wide Extension at Wisconsin.

As indicated above, the Center has, for a number of years worked in a variety of ways with the American Council on Education in an attempt to stimulate them to develop greater concern for and activity in the liberal education of adults. Although CSLEA can probably claim no direct responsibility for developments in ACE, members of the staff and Board worked closely with Lawrence Dennis when he served as the Secretary for the Commission on Academic Affairs and later with Joseph Shoben who served in a similar capacity until June, 1968. In a number of ways, the Center cooperated with ACE in stimulating it to widen its interest in continuing education.

For a four year period from 1958 until 1962, CSLEA worked closely with the Commission on Liberal Education of the Association of American Colleges in an effort to stimulate the smaller liberal arts colleges to become more involved and

active in continuing education. Members of the Center staff sat with the AAC Committee, participated in various activities of this Committee and continually spread the gospel about continuing education. At one point, the AAC officially went on record in favor of cooperating with CSLEA in conducting a number of experimental continuing education programs. Experiments were planned with the understanding that a special grant from the Fund for Adult Education would be forthcoming. Unfortunately the project coincided with the termination of FAE and thus the funds were not available. Although some liberal arts colleges were undoubtedly stimulated to initiate or expand their programs of continuing education through this association, the real breakthrough was nipped in the bud because of the lack of support and finances.

During its second period, the Center also worked with the Extension Council of the Land Grant Association, with the National Commission of Accreditation (in terms of gaining official sanction and acceptance for the special degree programs), with the War College at Maxwell Air Force Base, with a number of other national groups in the arts and humanities and, of course, it continued its cooperative activities with the ANEC WNEA. On an unofficial basis, several CSLEA staff members worked with the Association of Junior Colleges (which some years later appointed a Committee on Continuing Education).

As the Fund for Adult Education phased out of existence it made a final grant to a group of twelve universities which had been highly active in the liberal education of adults. These universities set up the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility with a core membership of the Presidents of the universities involved. In the absence of other arrangements, CSLEA served as secretariat to this group in its early days and assumed major responsibility for implementing the decisions of the group as well as for the initial planning

of a joint program with NEA on "Metropolis - Creator or Destroyer". After three years of active participation as secretariat, CSLEA moved out of this central position but continued as the one non-university member of the "University Council.

During its final period the Center continued to be concerned about the climate which influenced the development of continuing liberal education but its activities became more focussed and specific in terms of carrying on a number of consultant and study functions related to continuing higher education. Through growing involvement with the Academy for Educational Development, CSLEA played a part in carrying on studies and making recommendations for continuing higher education in connection with Academy Study for a group in Northern Indiana, for the Board of Higher Education in Ohio and for the combined study of higher education undertaken for the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Science Foundation. A CSLEA staff member also contributed a chapter on continuing education to a book prepared by the Academy (Campus 1980) which is being used as background reading for the 1968 ACE Conference and another chapter on continuing education in a leisure society in a book edited by Robert Theobald.

In addition, T undertook a major study of Adult Education in the United States for the Commissioner of Education and as a follow-up to this study will undertake another study of new institutional forms for adult education after T transfer to Syracuse University. CSLEA staff members are also involved in consultation activities in connection with the recently formed National Council of the College Level Examination Program and on Visiting Committees for extension and continuing education at Harvard and the University of Pittsburgh.

In addition to these specific studies and consultations various staff members have been actively involved during the past years in specific programs

or on an advisory basis with groups concerned with continuing education in the National Council of Churches, with various Negro College groups, with national arts groups, in the Music Education field, in the continuing education of women, with several urban education groups, and with extension home economists in Missouri and Massachusetts.

In many ways, these consultant activities and special studies have helped to focus interest in, and activity about, continuing education and have resulted in the inclusion of activities and concern about continuing education in areas where such concern might otherwise have been overlooked. Such activities did, undoubtedly, help to create a better climate.

From the outset in 1951, the Center was aware of the need for developing a body of literature in the field of liberal adult education. Several journals, such as Adult Education and Adult Leadership provided the field with various kinds of articles, stories and some limited research about the broad field of continuing education but no publications were being developed which focussed on higher continuing education or, more specifically, on the liberal education of adults.

At first on a rather tentative, limited and irregular basis, the Center began to make various speeches, articles and studies about higher continuing education available to the field. It soon became apparent that these CSLEA publications filled a hitherto unmet but most important need in the field of continuing education.

During the first period, the Center published various speeches, and special articles based either on papers prepared for CSLEA conferences or commissioned especially by the Center.

During its second period, the various kinds of publications, occasional papers and philosophical writings which had been issued previously on a fairly

limited and spasmodic basis were organized into a series of three kinds of publications: Notes and Essays, Reports, and Occasional Papers. In 1960 CSLEA made a firm commitment to publish 8-10 publications annually and subscriptions for the annual publication series were solicited. At the time that it terminated there were some 800 subscribers to the annual CSLEA publications, with individual sales of some monographs running as high as 3000 copies.

Along with the expansion of these publications, the Center added a Newsletter in 1959 to provide the field with current reports about programs and activities in the field of higher adult education. Thanks to a special grant received from the Fund for Adult Education the CSLEA Newsletter, Continuing Education for Adults was launched. Starting initially with a fairly small and limited mailing list (primarily the evening colleges and extension divisions) the Newsletter at the termination of CSLEA was being distributed to a mailing list of 8000 in the U.S., Canada, and other countries.

Although it is difficult to measure accurately the impact of the regular publications and the Newsletter we do know that almost all responses from the field to the announcement of the closing of CSLEA remarked on the quality and value of the various kinds of publications and urged that some way be found to continue them after the termination of the Center.

Thanks to the interest of Syracuse University and a special interim grant from the Ford Foundation (Fund for Adult Education) all past publications will be transferred to Syracuse which will fill orders for those still in print. Syracuse has also made a commitment to continue the publication series during 1968-69 and will issue a Newsletter. Needless to say we are delighted that both the publications and Newsletter will continue.

III. IMPACT ON PROGRAM INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

In this chapter I wish to examine the extent to which the Center has been successful in achieving that portion of its stated objective which was concerned with helping higher education develop a greater effectiveness for the liberal education of adults. In other words, how successful has the Center been in stimulating innovation, in bringing about changes in existing programs and activities and in securing the adoption of new programs and activities concerned with liberal education of adults?

A. Taxonomy for Evaluating Program Impact

As a basis for examining the Center impact on program, I use a taxonomy which is based on ideas developed by Egon G. Guba in a paper given at a Summer Lecture Series at the College of Education at Kent State University on July 19, 1965. In his paper, *The Impending Research Explosion and Educational Practice*, Guba addressed himself to two questions: how new research can be related to practice in the field of education; and how to deal with hostility expressed by practitioners toward researchers and by researchers toward practitioners.

The Guba formulation (modified to allow for the fact that at CSLEA we were usually moving from a concept rather than from research to experimentation and adoption in the field) serves as the basis for the taxonomy used in this chapter to examine the Center's impact on the field.

Adapting Guba's basic taxonomy to the work of the Center I use the following conceptual framework in looking at our activities:

a. Concept or Idea Development

1. Identification of need or opportunity.
2. Preliminary statement of idea or program.
3. Refinement and revision of ideas in cooperation with operators from the field.

b. Experimental or Prototype Program

1. Development of idea in cooperation with specific institution for use in the institution.
2. Allocation or securing of special funds to underwrite the experimental program.
3. Operation and concurrent evaluation of program in the selected institution.

c. Dissemination of Idea and Experiment to the Field

1. Analytical description of the program including the needs, problems and opportunities, the essential elements of the program, the program itself and its effectiveness.
2. Dissemination of the idea, the program and the impact (through regular and special publication channels; through special meetings or use of already organized meetings; through planned field visits to institutions which have expressed interest).
3. Assistance to additional institutions in adopting or adapting the idea or program.
4. Securing or facilitating additional funds for further adoption of idea or program.

d. Adoption and Institutionalization of Idea and Experiment

1. Securing support and sanction for idea or program from the "educational establishment".
2. Provision of some mechanism for continuing communication evaluation and dissemination about progress in utilization of idea or program.

B. Application of Taxonomy to One Program - Special Degrees

To what extent has CSLEA met these criteria? As I review the various activities of CSLEA in one program area especially we included and made the most of all of the components of the taxonomy outlined above. This particular activ-

ity, the development of degree programs especially for adults, will therefore be examined at some length in the first part of the chapter while in following sections, we will look more briefly at other CSLEA program ideas and activities to estimate the extent to which the various components were actually utilized.

a. Concept and Idea Development

During most of its history CSLEA focussed its activities, resources and funds primarily on informal, non-credit programs, but there was considerable pressure from the field for us to do something in the credit area. Looking at possible kinds of activity John Schwertman, the second Director of CSLEA, and members of the staff suggested that there was a need to find ways to permit adults to work toward a degree in a special way which might include, for example, the awarding of credit for experience and learning gained outside of the regular classroom. At the same time, Edwin Spengler, of Brooklyn College became interested in a similar idea, and CSLEA and Brooklyn College joined forces to plan a Special Degree program for adults.

After an initial intensive planning period in which the needs of the program, the basic idea and concept and the general outline for action were spelled out, a specific proposal for the experiment was drawn up. This proposal was, in effect, the product of an initial idea concerned with a basic need which was refined through active consultation and discussion between CSLEA and Brooklyn College staff members. The major concept in the proposal, which was presented to the Fund for Adult Education in 1952, was the refined and revised version of the initial idea for granting credit for experience.* Although not based on extensive research the proposal did specify the problem, the possible audience for the program and suggested the methods and procedures to be utilized.

* For a complete report on the Brooklyn College experiments see Stern, F. and Missal, E., *Adult Experience and College Degrees* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Press, 1952).

b. Experimental Prototype Program. The Fund for Adult Education promptly made a major grant to Brooklyn College for the prototype program with the understanding that CSLEA would work closely with Brooklyn in further planning and operation of the program and in reporting its findings and results to the field. In 1953 the first degree especially for adults at Brooklyn got underway. In essence the program was based on several ingredients: the awarding of some credit toward the Baccalaureate on the basis of written and oral examinations which would determine whether a student had secured certain kinds of learning and knowledge either through experience or individual study; and later the inclusion of three interdisciplinary seminars in the fields of the Humanities, the Natural and the Social Sciences, based on the theory that this kind of inter-disciplinary knowledge and understanding could not be gained by adults without some special kind of seminar: the possibility of undertaking some of the required work towards a degree through independent study. Although the Brooklyn College program made no compromises with the old credit requirements, it did make it possible for adults to secure such credits in other ways than by sitting in class and it did emphasize the importance of inter-disciplinary seminars and understandings as an ingredient of a degree for adults.

During this initial period provisions were made for continuing observation of the program, for reporting of the actual program and its results, for undertaking a cost - analysis of the special degree program and for full documentation of all aspects of it. CSLEA staff visited Brooklyn College frequently, both during the planning stage and also to observe the program once it was in operation. There was a very high degree of cooperation between CSLEA and Brooklyn College both during the early days under Schwertman and after his death.

c. Dissemination of Idea and Experiment. The dissemination of the idea and re-

ports on Special Degree progress was a major and continuing activity (unmatched either in extent or activity in any other CSLEA program).

Shortly after the program was initiated and underway there was a popular report on the program in Time magazine. In addition, various mimeographed reports on the concept and actual program were made available for limited distribution and the Brooklyn College idea and program were reported and discussed at regular meetings of the AUEC.

In 1954, the first report published by CSLEA, How Much Does Experience Count was distributed to the field so that it might have a documented story of the program as it developed. A Center-sponsored conference was held in Chicago in 1967 to discuss the Brooklyn experience. Amongst others participating in the conference were representatives from the Universities of Oklahoma, John Hopkins, Queens College, New York University and Syracuse all of which were later to develop their own special degree programs.

Following the conference, a CSLEA staff member worked closely with a faculty committee at Oklahoma to develop plans there for a modified special degree program and in 1961, aided by a special grant from Carnegie, the Oklahoma Bachelor of Liberal Studies program was launched with forty-five students. Subsequent to the Oklahoma developments, John Hopkins moved off on its own (with no CSLEA participation but with a special grant from Carnegie) to develop the first MA program especially for adults.

During the period from 1960 to 1967 additional steps were taken to advance special degrees. Six publications were issued by CSLEA relating to the special degree programs. Staff members participated in various NUREA meetings, consulted at more than ten campuses and, in a few cases, worked with faculty committees in an effort to spread the special degree idea. An important conference was held in cooperation with the War College at the Maxwell Air Force Base

(partially financed by the Air College and the Department of Defense who were interested in seeing the special degree idea enlarged to make it possible for officers without degrees to work for a degree while still in the service) and additional universities interested in the special degree idea were exposed to the experience already gained by Brooklyn and Oklahoma. At this conference, there were participants from Boston University, Roosevelt University, the University of South Florida, Goddard College and the New School for Social Research. All of these schools have since developed or are planning special degree programs.

About this time another meeting was arranged for those interested in special degrees at the University of Oklahoma so that they might have an opportunity to meet with the faculty group and students there as well as to observe the seminars.

Shortly thereafter the second Master of Arts program in Liberal Education was launched by the New School for Social Research (with a special grant from the Ford Foundation) and another variation on the special degree program (for persons who had two years of college) was established at Goddard College (with no outside support). During this period New York University had developed and was offering a highly successful Associate of Arts program and another, but quite different, Associate in Arts program was put into operation at Syracuse University. The Syracuse program was expanded subsequently to a complete AE program for adults (assisted by a special grant from Carnegie).

Almost all possible resources for dissemination and further experimentation were used in this third stage of program development including special publications, reports in the Center Newsletter, reports in other educational publications, a variety of conferences and seminars, field visits and consultations

and, of the utmost importance, special grants to further experimentation. During the entire process CSLEA was the one organization which maintained major responsibility for nurturing the idea, for reporting on developments, for providing a common source of information, for helping to secure seed-money and for relating the activity to the educational establishment.

d. Adoption and Institutionalization of the Program. Some years after the Brooklyn College experimental program was launched we became aware of the need for relating this new experiment to the educational establishment to ensure that it would be accepted by the field of higher education. One step, taken in 1959 was to develop a close relationship with the National Association for Accreditation. The then Director of the Association, William Seldon, was briefed about the program in its early stages and he participated in a number of the conferences dealing with special degrees.

This Association assisted in gaining acceptance for the idea by disseminating information about the Brooklyn and Oklahoma programs to the various regional accrediting groups and the Director of the Oklahoma program presented the idea at several of the Association meetings. In general, the stance of the Accrediting Association was that the experiment was an interesting and important one and that the programs would not be questioned provided that they had the acceptance and support of accredited institutions of higher education.

In addition to this continuing liason with the Accrediting Association a similar contact was developed with the Association for Accreditation of Military Experience where Cornelius Turner, the Director, was helpful in giving his approval and support to it. Similarly the Acting Associate Secretary of the Division of Higher Education of the U.S. Pffice of Education was involved, participated in meetings and endorsed the program. To gain further acceptance of

the concept, an article reporting on the theory and application of the idea of special degrees appeared in the American Council on Education Journal, Liberal Education, and the Director of the Commission on Academic Affairs of the American Council (and later its committee on Higher Continuing Education) was kept currently informed of all developments in the special degree area.

To provide some continuing mechanism for communication about special degrees, the Center, for a brief period, published an informal Newsletter which was exclusively concerned with disseminating information about special degree programs and, until its termination, CSLEA staff members continued to provide consultation to additional institutions of higher education about such programs.

Buttressing and supporting the concept of special degrees for adults was the growing interest in the development of college level examinations and the increasing possibility for securing accreditation through examinations toward a baccalaureate degree for work done outside of the classroom. Aware of these developments, CSLEA worked closely, first with the New York program for accreditation of proficiency examinations and later, a CSLEA staff member served on the National Council, or the College Level Examination Program of the CEEB.

As a further stimulus toward institutionalization and acceptance of Special Degrees, CSLEA sponsored several meetings aimed at further evaluation of the programs as well as at making some provision for transferability from one program to another. Although no final outcome can yet be reported in this area, the Council of College Level Examination Program plans to call a meeting of all institutions now operating or planning special degree programs to discuss evaluation and transferability from one program to another.

At the time that this report is written the following special degree programs are still in operation (all that were launched):

The Brooklyn Degree Program for Adults
The Queens College Associate in Arts Program
The New York University Associate in Arts Program
The Oklahoma Bachelor of Liberal Studies Program
(as well as a special MA program for adults
which has just been approved by the Oklahoma
faculty) and the State of Oklahoma
The Goddard College Adult Degree Program
The John Hopkins Liberal Education MA Program
The New School for Social Research Masters Program
for Adults
The Syracuse University AB Program for Adults
The University of Wisconsin Articulated Instruction
Media Program (a creation of the Special Degree
approach)

In addition to the programs already in operation a number of additional institutions are now in the process of planning for variations of the special degree idea at either the MA, or BA level. Amongst these institutions are Boston University (recently approved a special MA Program); the University of Maine (a special AB in Extension); the University of South Florida (an AB Program).

C. Application of Taxonomy to Other CSLEA Activities

The foregoing report described our efforts to develop special degree programs in detail for two reasons: first, it was the area in which CSLEA probably had its greatest impact as well as our most complete and successful application of the Tuba principles; and second, it shows the various techniques that are available to a quasi-independent organization attempting to effect change. In other cases it should be recognized that our program objectives were various and that inevitably there were different levels of CSLEA intervention. In general our objectives fell into four categories: creation of new organizations; development of audiences for liberal adult education; development of methods; and development of new programs. The level of CSLEA activity varied not only in the different categories but in various programs for a

number of reasons, the most important of which were: decisions regarding priority; practical or theoretical obstacles (including financing) which appeared insurmountable; and, very frankly, the degree of staff or Board interest.

In spite of these differences, I believe it is useful to examine the relationship between the application of Guba's criteria and the achievement of change. The following description of CSLEA involvement in various programs is outlined according to the taxonomy already developed in narrative form and a summary chart which shows the extent to which the various elements of the taxonomy were included in each activity follows.

1. Center of New Organizations

a. Negro College Committee on Adult Education

Development of the idea. Since World War II Negro Colleges, deeply involved in strengthening their graduate and undergraduate programs, had little time or interest for adult education. CSLEA became interested in the problem largely through the efforts of G.W.C. Brown, Negro adult educator at Norfolk State College. At a conference of Negro College representatives we decided it was necessary to form an organization to build support for adult education among Negro Colleges and to prepare individuals for leadership in program development.

Program. CSLEA served as secretariat for such an organization, The Negro College Committee which provided the direction and sponsorship of a vigorous continuing program of workshops, conferences, research, designs for model programs, and internships. Our work in this area was made possible by a special grant from FAE.

Dissemination. Perhaps it was the involvement of influential Negro educators that provided our best form of dissemination. Beyond that our direct efforts included three CSLEA publications, regular reporting in our newsletter, participation in the official association of Negro Colleges, and innumerable speeches and consultations.

Adoption. Once again the fact that influential Negro College educators were involved at the outset helped gain support for adult education. Official endorsement was given by the Southern Association of Colleges in the early years. Formal support came from both Negro and white leaders, and Negro college presidents acknowledged a responsibility for continuing education. The major stumbling block has been the lack of adequate financing to employ staff and to underwrite experimental programs. In spite of this frustration, however, interest and support for the Negro College Committee remained high. As a result of a conference at Wisconsin (1963), plans were initiated for the development of proposals

to foundations for establishing another and continuing committee on continuing education for Negroes to be based in a predominantly Negro Southern College.

b. International Congress of University Adult Education

Conception of the idea. This activity emerged from a growing recognition that American adult educators could not remain as aloof from the international educational scene as had been the case prior to 1960. CSLEA provided leadership for a conference which resulted in the formation of the International Congress. The shape of the Congress was formed jointly by its members and especially by the ICUAE Executive Committee.

Program. At the formal level the program has consisted of conferences and meetings, a newsletter and a journal. In addition, the existence of the Congress has resulted in a significant increase in informal international exchanges, both by letter and by visits, among adult educators. In addition to CSLEA, which continued to give strong support, leadership and support have come from a number of universities here and abroad. Financing comes from membership dues, and it has been possible to obtain underwriting for special projects from Carnegie, FAE and UNESCO.

Dissemination. Growth of knowledge about and recognition of the Congress and its activities has been advanced by the CSLEA newsletter and other publications (other than Congress journals) and by word of mouth at numerous field visits, consultations and speeches.

Adoption. Formal sanction and support for the International Congress came when it was accepted in Category B status by UNESCO. Informally, the Congress is recognized by other adult education organizations around the world. At this point its continuation seems fairly well assured, and a second world conference will be held in Montreal, with UNESCO participation in 1970.

c. Seminar on Adult Education Research

Conception of the idea. The question of method and quality of adult education research has been a matter of deep concern among professional adult educators for many years. The seminar was largely a Center scheme for bringing professionals together to work on mutual problems relating to improving the quality of and expanding the scope of research in adult education.

Program. In 1960 we invited a group of professionals to meet with us at the Leadership Conference where plans for the organization of the seminar were perfected. Subsequently annual meetings were held to find common remedies to problems or to report on new research. During the first few years meetings were held in conjunction with Leadership Conferences with very modest financial assistance for program from CSLEA.

Dissemination. Outside of occasional reports in the CSLEA newsletter little was done to publicize the activity largely because it did not seem necessary.

Adoption. The seminar and its activities were supported from the outset by AUEC and NUEA. After 1964, the Center withdrew from active participation, partly due to other demands on staff time and partly because our support was not needed. The Seminar has continued and is now run in cooperation with the general education research meetings.

2. Development of Audiences for Liberal Adult Education

a. Labor

Development of the idea. The Center's contribution to American labor education was to push for the introduction of liberal education as part of programs that were primarily technical in nature.

Program. There was no sustained, integrated attempt to intervene in liberal education for labor comparable to our efforts to develop special degrees. Generally, we cooperated with universities and in one case with a specific union whenever and wherever the opportunity arose.

At Kutgers we provided consultation and modest financial support (1954-1962) to assist in the development of a certificate program which included liberal education.

At Wayne State-University of Michigan, we provided similar, but consultative and financial assistance (for a planning conference) to help inaugurate a long term liberal education program for labor.

At U.C.L.A. CSLEA provided funds and consultation for the planning and development of a liberal education for labor curriculum.

At Pennsylvania State we had our most spectacular success. Working with Emery Bacon, Education Director for the Steelworkers union, we helped add a fourth year to the union's leadership training program devoted exclusively to liberal education. Members of the CSLEA staff cooperated with the union and Penn State to develop the curriculum and served on the faculty during the first experiments. After the first year the program was also offered at several other universities as well as Penn State. Evaluation was part of the project with a report ultimately published by the steelworkers. Funds to support the project came from the Steelworkers.

At Indiana University we worked as consultant on another liberal education project for Steelworkers. This was an ambitious residential program extending over an entire semester. The experiment was partly supported by the Ford Foundation.

Dissemination. The Center made only minimal efforts to publicize liberal education for labor or to work for the kind of general adoption described in connection with special degrees. There were stories in the newsletter and two CSLEA publications -- a report, Reorientation in Labor Education (1962) and a description of the impact of the program on steelworkers by M.H. Goldberg who was a member of the original Penn State - Steelworkers faculty (1965).

Adoption. Such sanction as was achieved was in the form of endorsement from the trade unions rather than from universities - and CSLEA had little to do with it. Programs at Rutgers, Wayne State and U.C.L.A. continue. Ironically, the Steelworkers programs continue but at a much reduced level, perhaps the major reason being that Bacon, who had a strong commitment to liberal education, no longer directs the union's education program.

b. Secretaries

Program. The idea for liberal education for secretaries emerged from our discussion about "Operation Micro," which was an attempt to design liberally educative experiences for individuals whose education and occupation were largely specialized. Officers of the National Secretaries' Association expressed interest in the experiment and we prepared plans for a residential institute. Major ideas came from the Center but NSA participated in the planning.

Program. The first experiment took place at Vassar in 1956. Members of the CSLEA staff provided direction and some of the faculty. Funds for the experiment came primarily from CSLEA. A CSLEA staff-worker who served as a participant-observer was responsible for the evaluation.

Dissemination. For two or three years, the Center continued to assist in the development of programs for secretaries. There was a repeat program developed in cooperation with Michigan State and staff members served as consultant and program participant for both the NSA and universities. An article in the Vassar Alumnae Magazine and a CSLEA Report, The Vassar Institute for Women in Business (1957) represent the extent of our publicity.

Adoption. Any sanction that may have occurred came from the NSA. Its officers and especially those who attended the Vassar Institute became strong supporters. Although we occasionally hear of a project, liberal education has not continued to be a significant part of the NSA educational program. Interest appears to have diminished when the Center withdrew.

c. Executives

Development of the Idea. The major role in developing the ideas for liberal education for executives was not played by CSLEA but by A.T.&T. which commissioned several colleges and universities to offer programs for its middle management and by the Fund for Adult Education which attempted to expand on the initial A.T.&T. program.

Program. The Center was active, however, as an advocate consultant and reporter of liberal education for executives. Clark University, University of Denver, Wabash were the three institutions where we were most active.

Dissemination. The Center's major contribution came in our attempts to encourage the growth of liberal education. Reports, consultation and speeches were directed toward this end. Our largest effort was a conference at Gould House, with special underwriting by FAE. Here we assembled representatives from management and universities to discuss common problems and agree upon common objectives.

Adoption. Although both universities and business gave formal endorsement to liberal education for executives, the support was tentative and temporary. After a great flurry of programming in the mid-fifties, the interest and number of programs has decreased drastically.

d. Teachers

Development of the idea. This was another area where our activity developed in connection with "Operation Micro." The major program was developed in cooperation with Northern Illinois University. The assumption behind the program was that teachers needed liberally educative experiences to compensate for the increasing specialization needed to master subject matter.

Program. Northern Illinois University agreed to offer a liberal education seminar to its graduate students who were actually practicing teachers. The seminar carried credit toward a master's degree. A CSLEA grant underwrote the experiment. Center staff joined a faculty committee to undertake a year-long discussion which led to planning and approval of the course. We planned and conducted the evaluation.

Dissemination. Although the experiment appeared to be successful, the Center did little to push the idea forward. There was one published CSLEA report, The Human Enterprise (1964) and occasional references in our newsletter, but little more. Some of the staff held that a single semester was not long enough to do justice to the purposes and there were practical obstacles to allowing the student to devote more time to non-specialized courses. Beyond this, questions of priority and staff interest help explain our failure to promote the project with more energy.

Adoption. The program continues at Northern Illinois and the University was able to offer the same course as executive development at Motorola. Otherwise there has been no other general adaptation of the program or the idea.

e. Women

Development of the Idea. Although we had a long-time interest in education for women, CSLEA's activity in the area was peripheral. Following the pioneering efforts of the University of Minnesota, many institutions contributed ideas for women's programs. It was only with the publication of A Turning to Take Next (1965) that Freda H. Goldman produced an integrated formulation for continuing education of women.

Program. CSLEA was not active in the program development which was carried on vigorously by many colleges and universities often with foundation support (especially Ford and Carnegie). The closest we came was the Vassar Institute for Women in Business, but our true interest here was education for specialists. There was no attempt by CSLEA to implement the ideas developed in A Turning Point to Take Next. CSLEA's primary activity in connection with program was as a consultant and this increased significantly after the Goldman monograph.

Dissemination. CSLEA's major contribution came in spreading the idea. In addition to A Turning to Take Next, there were active participation in conferences, numerous speeches, and consultations. The CSLEA newsletter carried reports regularly and one feature issue devoted entirely to the continuing education of women was very much in demand.

Adoption. There has been informal acceptance of the idea of special continuing education for women and topsy-like growth of programs. But there appears to be no mechanism to coordinate or advance activities - and certainly CSLEA made no attempt to provide one.

f. Alumni

Development of the idea. CSLEA became interested in continuing education for alumni at least as early as 1958. We saw alumni as a homogeneous group which could provide a sound base for liberal adult education. Joint discussions to stimulate the idea were held with AUEC and NUEA, the American Alumni Council and individual universities. In a CSLEA publication, New Directions in Continuing Education for Alumni, commissioned by us, Ernest McMahon described major development and suggested important issues.

Program. CSLEA cooperated in the development of alumni programs at three institutions: Washington University (St. Louis), University of Wisconsin and Oakland University. At Washington we helped design the program and provided financial support. At Wisconsin and Oakland we provided consultation and we helped with the evaluation, which in the case of Wisconsin included financial support.

Dissemination. In addition to the McMahon monograph, reports were carried in the newsletter. We helped plan a conference at Oakland University designed to provide a rationale for continuing education of college graduates. The papers of the conference were published by us in 1966 (The Oakland Papers: A Symposium on Social Change and Educational Continuity). We were instrumental in arranging for discussions between representatives of the Alumni Council and NUEA. In 1966 we organized a program on continuing alumni education for the annual meeting of the Alumni Council, and the following year a CSLEA staff member served as consultant to a newly formed committee on continuing education of the American Council.

Adoption. CSLEA activities have helped to develop closer working relationships between NUEA and AAC. The formation of a regular committee on continuing education by the American Alumni Council represents formal sanction of education as an important alumni activity. These activities can be expected to continue.

3. Programs to Change Methods

a. Evaluation of Liberal Adult Education

Development of the Idea. The idea for evaluating liberal adult education came from CSLEA. We were inspired by the work which had been done in evaluation of other segments of education by men like Tyler and Bloom at the University of Chicago. In developing the plan for the project we consulted with scholars at Chicago and with our colleagues in higher adult education.

Program. The purpose of our project was to define goals of liberal adult education in behavioral terms so that instruments for measurement could be developed. The project was made possible by special grants from FAE. Objectives

were defined with the help of adult educators and faculty members concerned with the liberal education of adults, with over fifty persons participating in five major conferences (held at Princeton, Syracuse University, Washington University, New York University, and the University of Chicago).

Dissemination. Our report, Evaluating Liberal Adult Education (1961) was the major method of informing the field about the Evaluation project. Perhaps major support for the idea, however, came from the involvement of a large number of people in the project.

Adoption. The objective setting was planned as the first phase of a larger program. We wanted to develop and test instruments to measure achievement of our objectives, but we were unable to obtain financial support. The U.S.O.E. was interested but at the time it was not able to grant funds to an independent organization like the Center and we were unable to work out a joint arrangement with a university. Thus although the publication is still used, no further mechanisms or sanction materialized.

Uniform Reporting of Enrollments

Development of the idea. The need for uniform data became especially apparent to the CSLEA staff in conjunction with a research project (Forms and Forces in University Adult Education). We made a preliminary proposal in a memorandum to the field and the idea was refined in joint discussions with AUEC and NUEA.

Program. A joint AUEC/NUEA committee, chaired by Philip Frandson (UCLA) was responsible for developing, testing and gaining acceptance of a standardized system for reporting enrollment data. Underwriting came from CSLEA. Procedures were checked at each step with AUEC/NUEA institutions and with the Association of University Registrars, providing a form of constant evaluation of classifications and systems for reporting.

Dissemination. The continuing involvement of AUEC/NUEA institutions and others responsible for the collection of enrollment data provided the best method of evaluation. The project also received consistent endorsement at annual Leadership Conferences.

Adoption. At this point the system for reporting data is endorsed by AUEC/NUEA institutions, Registrars and appropriate government agencies and mechanisms exist to insure its continuation. An annual report on evening college and extension participation is published by the committee. (The only annual figures which appear any adult education activity on a nation-wide basis).

b. Teaching Styles for Adult Education

Development of the idea. Concern for teaching adults existed among CSLEA staff almost from the beginning. The early series of faculty seminars and publications such as Especially for Adults (1957), Psychological Needs of Adults, (1955) and On Teaching Adults: An Anthology (1960) reflect this continuing interest. Early in its history the Center rejected the notion of group discussion as THE method for adult education and this led us to an exploration of teaching

styles. The assumption behind the idea that there may be many styles and that either an effective one for any individual may be related to his personality, or that the content and objectives of the program may dictate the most appropriate style. Although there was some general discussion of the idea with the field, essentially it was developed internally.

Program. The first phases of the study consisted of open-ended interviews to develop categories of significant teacher behavior. The second phase applied the findings to observations of actual teacher behavior in adult classrooms and attempted to make connections between teaching style and students' learning. The program was financed by CSLEA. Although there was some informal consultation with the field and with other scholars, essentially, the project stayed within CSLEA.

Dissemination. Two publications came out of the research. Explorations in Teaching Styles (1961) reported on the first phase and Teaching Styles and Learning (1963) covered the second phase. There were no serious attempts to apply the research.

Adoptions. There is no evidence that the findings have been used or in any way adopted, at least by practitioners.

c. Counseling Especially for Adults

Development of the idea. Working with colleges and universities where counseling was more or less equated with academic guidance for youngsters, CSLEA had a long-standing interest in the development of an approach to counseling that was especially for adults. By and larger our ideas were general rather than pointed toward a specific program. There were many informal discussions with colleagues in the field but no formal meetings were ever called to share in the development of any approach to counseling for adults.

Program. Our activities during most of our history, as suggested above, tended to be informal and sporadic. In the early sixties, a member of the CSLEA staff began working closely with the AUEC committee on guidance and counseling and with the American Guidance and Personnel Association, serving as participant and panelist at annual meetings. Our major opportunity to develop the idea of counseling for adults came in 1965 when we joined the New England Board of Higher Education to plan and sponsor a national workshop devoted to the development and refinement of basic principles of counseling adults. The meeting was financed by a grant to NEBHE from the Carnegie Corporation.

Dissemination. A preliminary mimeographed report of the conference was distributed by NEBHE in 1966. A formal report by Virginia Senders, who represented NEBHE at the workshop, is anticipated. CSLEA made no further efforts to push the ideas developed at the conference.

Adoption. Obviously it is not possible to expect much formal sanction on the basis of a single workshop. No mechanism was established to continue the work and none is likely, particularly since the Center is terminating and Senders is no longer associated with NEBHE.

4. Educational Programs

a. The Laboratory College for Adults

Development of the idea. The basic idea for the Lab College was the product of one member of the staff, Harry L. Miller. It was his notion that the city could serve as a laboratory in which the every day experiences of urban life could be used to teach concepts of arts and sciences. The problem was to teach adults how to learn to learn from urban experience. A written proposal was discussed first by the staff and ultimately by the Center Board and other colleagues in the field.

Program. University College at Northwestern expressed an interest in conducting an experimental program and a joint project was undertaken. The project was financed by CSLEA and a member of our staff served as participant observer to provide evaluation.

Dissemination. Although there were a number of problems connected with the first year, the idea still appears to have merit. It was not continued, however, and there were no publications, conferences or other follow-ups.

Adoption. In view of the failures to continue beyond the first experimental year, (by either CSLEA or Northwestern), there were no chances for achieving sanction or for developing mechanisms for continuation.

b. Continuing Arts Education

Development of the idea. The CSLEA interest in arts education has been to discover and promote university programs for adults which are more than crafts on the one hand and more than variations on traditional undergraduate appreciation courses on the other. Ideas were developed in close cooperation with the field (and especially the NUREA Arts and Humanities Committee) and with consultation with practicing arts.

Program. During most of its history, CSLEA activities consisted largely of exploration (to discover effective programs) and promotion. Activities included collecting information through survey and actual field studies, a major conference at Brighton Canyon in 1958 and close association with the Arts and Humanities Committee of NUREA. CSLEA planned and financed the Brighton Canyon meeting and our funds enabled the Arts and Humanities Committee to hold numerous special meetings. Later the staff worked closely with the University of Wisconsin, helping to plan as well as participating in a series of conferences on the arts. These conferences were financed in part by the Johnson Foundation.

Our experience in this area culminated in our own proposal for Education of Audiences in the Arts. The proposal was developed and refined after consultation with both practicing artists and university art educators. It was submitted to several foundations and received a favorable response, but none were willing to undertake financing an experiment of this magnitude (in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000). During 1967-68, however, we did receive funds from Title One of the Higher Education Act which enabled us to experiment with one small aspect of the total project. Evaluation was undertaken by the project staff and participants and the results are included in the report to the Title One Agency.

Dissemination. As already suggested a major purpose of our conferences and our work with the Arts and Humanities Committee was to provide information and encouragement for an experimental stance toward education in the arts. Further, we published two monographs, University Adult Education in the Arts, and The Arts in Higher Adult Education (1966). In another publishing effort we helped underwrite Arts in Society, a quarterly published by the University of Wisconsin, and a member of our staff wrote a regular column on continuing arts education. No particular efforts were made to report on or promote our own experimental project.

Adoption. During the early years we had hoped that the NUEA Arts and Humanities Committee would provide the mechanism for continued programming growth and for building support from the establishment. As we withdrew Center staff and financial support, however, the activities of the Committee diminished significantly and it seems doubtful that it will undertake any major activities at this time.

c. Urban Continuing Education

Development of the idea. As in the case of the arts, CSLEA activities tended to concentrate on exploration and promotion. Throughout our work was done in close collaboration with university adult educators concerned with urban education and in consultation with urbanologists.

Program. After very tentative and occasional excursions into the area, CSLEA made a serious commitment in 1961 by employing a staff member, Kenneth Haygood, with major interest and expertise in urban education. Under his leadership: we undertook study and observation; helped plan and carry out a National Conference on Urban Life held in Washington, D.C.; served as consultant in the development of many university urban education projects. Then the Ford Foundation made its massive grants for experimentation with urban extension, we carried on some informal evaluation (at the request of the grantees, not the Foundation). After 1965, the Center played an active role in helping universities plan for community education and service under Title One of the Higher Education Act.

In 1965-66, there was one attempt to shift from our role of explorer and promoter when we developed our own proposal for metropolitan continuing education. Plans to mount the experiment in cooperation with Boston University did not materialize largely because of inability to locate financial support.

Dissemination. Major methods for promoting urban education were through active participation in the numerous meetings already mentioned. Beyond this there were publications - regular reports in the CSLEA newsletter and a CSLEA monograph, The University and Community Education (1962).

Adoption. While there is no question that urban education has the endorsement of important public and private agencies, CSLEA can not claim the credit. However, CSLEA has influenced the development of mechanisms within university adult education which help make for a more integrated educational approach to the problems of urbanism.

d. Backgrounds for Adult Education

Development of the idea. The idea for a series of conferences aimed at professional growth of university adult educators developed from informal discussions between Syracuse University and CSLEA. The result was the annual series of Backgrounds conferences. No other individuals or institutions were consulted.

Program. Programs were planned jointly by Syracuse and CSLEA. Syracuse has handled the administration. Participants paid their own room and board, but so far program costs have been underwritten out of funds available from an FAE grant to Syracuse University. Annually, scholars have been invited to prepare papers directed toward an area selected for consideration. At the conferences, university adult educators draw implications for continuing education. The programs have received strong support, but formal attempts at evaluation have not been attempted.

Dissemination. CSLEA had published the major papers of each conference in a series of Notes and Essays as follows:

- Psychological Backgrounds of Adult Education (1963)
- Sociological Backgrounds of Adult Education (1964)
- Institutional Backgrounds of Adult Education: The Dynamics of Change in the Modern University (1965)
- Political Backgrounds of Adult Education: The University in Urban Society (1967)
- Anthropological Backgrounds of Adult Education (1968)

Adoption. Although there is no mechanism or sanction for the Backgrounds conferences outside of Syracuse, there is general support for the series in the field and it can be expected that the series will continue as long as some form of financing can be maintained.

d. Overview of Impact

In terms of the taxonomy these data, which I have presented in narrative form may also be stated more precisely (although without the detail) in the form of the chart which is appended to this report.

4. Resume of Impact

A review of the chart indicates that all of the four components were present, at least to some extent, in eleven of the twenty programs or activities listed. These programs were: Special Degree; Liberal Education for Secretaries; Liberal Education for Teachers; the Backgrounds conferences; Liberal Education for Steelworkers; Alumni Education; Wayne State Labor Education; the Negro College Project; the International Congress; Uniform Reporting; and the Seminar for Adult Education Research.

Of the eleven programs and activities, eight of them (Special Degree, the Background Conferences, Alumni Programs, Negro College activities, the International activities, the Wayne State Labor Program, the Uniform Reporting and the Research Seminar) are still in operation in one form or another.

Three programs are no longer in operation, despite the fact that all of the four components were present. In my judgment they have gone out of existence primarily because of a lack of follow-up by Center staff. This is clearly the case with the liberal education programs for teachers at Northern Illinois University where continuing contact between CSLEA and the University dwindled in 1963, and with the liberal education program for secretaries, where active CSLEA involvement came to an end in 1960. In both cases the situation was complicated. At Northern Illinois administrative support at the University diminished as a result of key personnel changes and the interest of the people in extension dwindled as a result of changes in their staff.

As far as the Secretaries' program was concerned a combination of circumstances resulted in CSLEA pulling out of active participation in the program. To some extent CSLEA staff members involved in the program felt that after the initial program had been demonstrated at Vassar and after we cooperated closely the following year with the Secretaries in arranging and planning a program at the Gull Lake Center operated by Michigan State University it was appropriate for the secretaries to assume responsibility. This feeling was shared by some of the key leaders of the National Secretaries Association. As a result CSLEA became less active after two years.

With the United Steelworkers, the resignation of Emery Bacon, who had been a major participant and supporter of the program, resulted in a diminishing interest in the program within the union. Here again, however, the new Director might

have become more involved in supporting the continuation of the program had we been actively concerned with its continuation rather than in moving into new and different areas of activity.

In six programs or activities (Special Degree, Steelworkers, Negro College, Uniform Reporting, Research Seminars and International Activities) all of the twelve ingredients contained in the four components of the taxonomy (insofar as they were applicable) were present. Of these six programs or activities, all but the Steelworkers program were sufficiently institutionalized so that they are still in operation and will continue regardless of the termination of CSLEA.

Based on this analysis it would appear that when the four components of the taxonomy are present (and especially when all twelve ingredients are) there is an excellent chance that a program or activity will actually become a part of the field or of the institution in which it has been introduced and will continue beyond the life of the sponsoring or consulting organization. In the case of the Special Degree programs, the Negro College activity, and the International activities it was to a great extent the continuing interest and activity of the Center staff during the experimental period which kept these activities alive and made it possible for them to develop a life of their own. Insofar as the Wayne State Labor Program, Uniform Reporting, and the research seminars, all of these had been well institutionalized and adopted before the termination of the Center and were operating totally independent of CSLEA well before 1968.

Turning to the ten programs where fewer than four components in the taxonomy were present, we find that five of the activities are still in operation in one form or another (the Rutgers Labor Program, the Indiana Labor Program, arts programs for adults, women's continuing education and urban and community education). In four of these programs the major activity of the Center was to provide

some consultation or to play an active part in the dissemination of the idea or concept. In almost none of these programs, however, did CSLEA play a major part in the initial development of the concept or idea or in initiating the experimental program. Opinions might well differ as to the impact which the Center had on these programs. Certainly we were involved to some extent in all of them, but Center staff did not play the same role in shaping the nature or direction of activities in Continuing Education for Women, in Urban and Community education, in the Rutgers Labor Program, or in the arts programs as it did in the Special Degree or International area. In the Continuing Education of Women, the publication by Freda Goldman (A Turning To: Take Next), and her active participation in scores of meetings has undoubtedly had some impact on the kinds of programs being planned and considered.

In the arts area, the continuing publications of the Center, (the participation in the associational meetings and support for Arts Committees in NUEA) and our own proposals for education of audiences for the arts had some influence on developments in the arts education.

Similarly, the continuing concern about urban and community education by CSLEA, the participation of Kenneth Haygood in various conferences and meetings, the consultation and our publications has furthered the idea and emphasized the responsibility of universities for community and urban education.

In the Rutgers labor program the activity of the Center was not primarily in terms of developing an idea or concept but rather it was one of providing respectable outside interest, (and modest funds) for an idea which needed more exposure and some support if it was to develop and become institutionalized in an effective manner.

In the Indiana program for Steelworkers, CSLEA was not directly involved in developing or conceptualizing the initial idea. This had already been done

by members of the educational staff at the United Steelworkers Union in cooperation with Indiana University. Nevertheless the Center was involved to some extent in recommending changes and amendments in the program as well as in the other three components. Center staff was highly involved in cooperating in the operation and concurrent evaluation of the experimental program; it did not disseminate the idea to the field but did provide material to the Steelworkers union for use in disseminating the concept and the results to other Districts of the International; and it worked closely with the University and the union in helping to adopt and institutionalize the idea.

In other words in the above five activities although the Center was probably not the prime-mover or the initiator of the idea or activity, it did provide various kinds of support, visibility, consultation and legitimacy for these activities and thus played at least some part in their continuation or in their dissemination to the field.

The role which the Center played with respect to the five activities discussed above suggests that there is a need not only for an organization which dreams up new ideas itself but also for one which is ready and able to identify interesting ideas and break-throughs which emerge in the field and to provide counsel and assistance in helping that idea to grow both within the initiating institution or organization as well as in the field as a whole.

Turning to four other programs or projects in which CSLEA had a major interest (the Laboratory College, Counseling, the Evaluation Project, the Teaching Style project) we find that these did not come to fruition primarily because the Center did not follow through after the initial idea development and the early experimental stage. In terms of the chart there were less than four components present.

In the case of the Laboratory College, we gave up after the first experimental program at Northwestern not because we were convinced that the idea was unsound but rather because of the problems and difficulties involved in launching it, combined with the shifting interest and priorities in CSLEA. Insofar as the Laboratory College is concerned we gave birth to a sound idea for continuing education but abandoned it too soon in the face of minor obstacles.

On the counseling project, I believe we must assume major responsibility for abandoning an important and potentially effective program direction. We played an important part in the initial conceptualization of the idea, for the Chatham Conference, in helping to secure foundation support and in operating a conference which stimulated considerable interest in further experimentation. Despite all that we had going for the idea, we failed to follow up on the next steps and appear to have abandoned an important idea just when its time had come.

In the Evaluation Project we were active and energetic in developing the concept, in involving a large number of people in the field process of setting objectives and thinking about evaluation. We did a good job of communicating the concept and the method through a variety of meetings and conferences. The CSLEA publication on evaluation remains significant work in the field. But here again, we were not able to carry through to the final stages, much less institutionalization and adoption. The major obstacle here was our inability to secure adequate funds. Although it might have been possible to secure support after CSLEA had moved to Boston University, by then the size of the Center staff had been reduced, the prime-movers on the project had dispersed and members of the remaining staff were involved in a variety of other projects and activities. Thus the possibility of reviving the project was not even seriously considered.

As far as the Teaching Style Project is concerned the problem of its continuation and of making a major impact on the field was not so much in terms of lack of follow-up as it was that the initial purpose of the project (attempts to identify appropriate teaching styles and to experiment with their use) became altered to the point where the major interest in the project became one of pure research in teaching styles. The outcome of this shift in emphasis was a sound and scientific study and a respectable research report on teaching styles in continuing education but, because of the shift in direction, the outcome was a research report rather than particular changes in teaching styles for continuing education.

Turning to liberal education for executives, CSLEA operated at all times in a rather peripheral manner. The major sponsor of the idea was the Fund for Adult Education or A.T.&T. rather than CSLEA. To some extent the Center and FAE appeared to be working at cross purposes. In the Fund's opinion the Center was too much concerned with evaluation and too little concerned with promoting liberal education for executives. The Gould House Conference sponsored by the Center in 1958 could have been effective in helping to stimulate a penetrating inquiry into the objectives of these programs and in arriving at a more realistic application of liberal education for executives development. An unpublished report on the conference contained some excellent commentaries, raised some important and significant questions and made suggestions for further study and development. For various reasons, including the differences between the FAE and the CSLEA about the nature of the report, it was never published. It seems to me the differences could have been ironed out. Perhaps one reason it did not happen was because in the face of many competing interests, it did not seem worth the effort. As a result the opportunity to play a role in liberal education for executives fell by the wayside.

So far in this Chapter I have focussed entirely on twenty defineable program areas or activities which have either been spawned by CSLEA or in which it was involved in a major way. It would be unfortunate to create the impression that they represent the complete story of the Center. Field work is a notable example of another important aspect of our work. Field visits to over a hundred institutions varied enormously from merely providing general institutional support described in the preceding chapter to working with institutional staff over fairly extended periods on the development of specific program ideas and activities. (A complete report - as of 1963 - of the nature and impact of CSLEA on various institutions is available in the form of the Impact Studies which were prepared in 1960 and up-dated in 1963 in connection with proposals for support from the Fund for Adult Education in 1961 and from Carnegie in 1963.)

Some idea of the varied nature of these activities is also provided in the March 1967 Newsletter which includes an overview of Center activities, as well as in Whipple's History. No attempt is made in this final report to cover all such activities and outcomes of field visits and consultations but a few will be summarized here so that this aspect of Center activity may be acknowledged.

The following includes some (but certainly not all) operations and programs which resulted from Center field visits and consultations:

University of Washington - development of Community Liberal education Seminars (limited financial support) still in operation.

Syracuse University - In addition to Special Degree and Backgrounds Conferences, also faculty-seminars (limited financial support) still in operation.

Western Reserve University - General consultation on various liberal education seminars many of which are still in operation.

Queens College, Charlotte, N.C. - Consultation on development of new continuing liberal education program for women - still in operation

University of California at Los Angeles - Consultation on Liberal Education program for Union Officers (limited financial support) still in operation.

Roosevelt University - In addition to initial discussions about Special Degree programs, consultation on Continuing Education programs for Women - still in operation.

Oakland University, Rochester, Mich. - Consultation on alumni and counseling programs - still in operation.

University of Wisconsin - Consultations on multi-media, special degree, Alumni programs, Arts in Society - (limited financial support) - still in operation.

Cleveland State University - Consultation on plans for expanded extension program resulting in adoption of proposal, securing of local funds for planning and transfer of Haygood to CSU. - still in operation.

University of South Florida - Consultation over five year period on development of various liberal education programs as well as on development of Special Degree programs. - still in operation.

University of British Columbia - Continuing consultation over ten year period resulting in various experimental community arts, liberal education discussion and other programs - many still in operation.

Hofstra College - Consultation with ex-visiting staff member, Hy Lichtenstein on various counseling and liberal education programs - still in operation.

New York University - In addition to consultation on special Associate in Arts program, continuing consultation on other experimental liberal education programs.

University of Wyoming - Consultation and assistance on experimental liberal education programs operated through Agricultural Extension.

University of Chicago - Evaluation of Fine Arts Program and active participation during initial years in Summer Workshop for Administrators - still in operation.

Michigan State University - Consultation on various liberal education programs including active participation in early years (assistance in programming and evaluation) in winter seminars for leaders in adult education - still in operation.

University of Omaha - Helped to sponsor initial conference on use of Tele-Lecture in continuing education and publicized the method widely in the field.

Institute of University Studies - counseled on development of program, assisted in formulating and operating evaluation of initial program - still in operation.

Queens College, N.Y. - Consulted with, co-sponsored, provided financial assistance to and published commentary on experimental seminars in liberal education for adults.

New England Center of Continuing Education - Consulted during early days of development. Co-sponsored Conference on Comparative Study of Adult Education (Exter) and New England Conference for Extension Directors.

A number of additional examples of the Center's impact on individual institutions with respect to specific programs could be cited but the above provides a general idea of the manner in which Center field work and consultation has stimulated important instructional activity.

IV. IN RETROSPECT

Assuming that the major function and role of CSLEA was as a change agent in the field of higher adult education, how successful have we been and what have we learned from over fifteen years' experience that might be of some guidance to another agency or organization which tries to influence programs and directions in a specific area of education? Based on one or two fairly complete successes, a number of areas where we had some lasting influence and still more where we made a nice splash but had no continuing impact, I believe it is possible, in retrospect, to make some generalizations about the ingredients required to bring about changes in the educational establishment and its activities.

First however, let me attempt a very brief assessment of whether CSLEA has made a difference and if so, in what ways.

A. Did CSLEA make a difference?

Discounting personal involvement and resultant wish-thinking it does appear that during its life the Center did make some difference and bring about some changes in the field of higher adult education. The extent to which these changes are significant and important - and will continue to influence the field of higher adult education after its demise - can only be evaluated in the years to come. At the present, however, it does seem that CSLEA has had some impact on the thinking, attitudes and action in the field of higher education in the following ways:

1. As far as people - and their attitudes and actions are concerned - we believe that there are now significantly more people in the positions of power and influence in the field of higher continuing education who are interested in and willing to plan and experiment with programs of continuing liberal education than in 1952. Exactly how many people have changed their attitudes toward contin-

uing liberal education and how deep and enduring these changes will be - in the absence of a continuing gadfly in the field remains to be seen. I do believe, however, that the ex-staff members now active in the field will continue to plan, experiment with and develop important programs of continuing liberal education. I also think that a sizeable portion of those individuals who worked actively with the Center in operating experimental and demonstration programs and as visiting staff members will continue to be experimental and innovative and that their concern for the liberal education of adults will not diminish with the termination of the Center. It also seems that a sizeable portion of individuals - Deans and Directors - who took part in various conferences, seminars and meetings sponsored or operated by the Center have been influenced to some extent and will be more open to and acceptant of programming in liberal education of adults in the future. Viewing the various kinds of CSLEA activities I believe that the involvement of Deans and Directors in the Liberal Education Seminars was significant and important in changing attitudes and in influencing several score of these leaders to experiment with and to develop liberal education programs in their own institutions. Having involved individuals and institutions in this awareness of the importance of and satisfaction in liberal education programs on a personal basis, their continuing involvement in the annual Leadership Conferences, buttressed by the on-going flow of publications has helped to remind them of the possible satisfactions, gratifications and pay-offs in the liberal education of adults. The combination of the Liberal Education Seminars, the Leadership Conferences, the field visits to hundreds of institutions, the exposure to ideas and programs at the Center, the availability of CSLEA staff and funds to nourish attempts at liberal education combined with the development of a literature of liberal adult education did have a discernible impact, I believe, on scores of the leaders and operators in the field.

2. As far as the institutions of higher education are concerned - we feel that we have had a discernible influence upon this class of institutions and have helped to create a climate more acceptant of changes in continuing liberal education.

The large number of field visits which ordinarily included visits with the top administration of the institutions effectively supported and buttressed the interests and desires of the continuing education operators who wanted to expand and experiment with their activities in the field of liberal education of adults. The documentation of these ideas through the growing number of CSLEA publications and official Center involvement with the leading organizations and associations in the field also contributed to a growing acceptance of the concept of the liberal education of adults on the part of key administrators in the field. Whether additional or more focussed and concentrated activity in the area of developing such support for continuing liberal education could have been helpful and whether we actually did as much as might be desired is a moot question but certainly various aspects of our activities were important in supporting and providing some outside credibility and sanction for what the Deans and Directors wanted to do with respect to the liberal education of adults. In this connection the very existence of the Center and its consistent support for the liberal education of adults certainly provided the kind of intangible support to the Deans and Directors which aided and abetted them in their own desires for program development.

3. As far as experimental and innovative programs in continuing liberal education - evidence suggests that CSLEA activity has paid off in terms of more and more imaginative programs in a sizeable number of institutions.

Important as was CSLEA activity with respect to institutional and individual acceptance of the broad idea of liberal education of adults, in the final

analysis it is the actual program innovations and developments which indicate the extent to which the Center has been successful in achieving its initial and pervading objective. A review and analysis of university extension and evening college catalogues and a comparison of the offerings and programs in 1950 with 1968 indicates that scores of institutions have increased enormously the number and expanded and diversified the nature of their offerings in the liberal education of adults. How much of this is a direct and attributable result of the work of the Center and how much might have developed in the absence of CSLEA is, of course, difficult to determine. In scores of cases, however, it is possible to cite some kind of Center involvement (either through field visits, small grants, experimental programs, conferences, or the personal involvement of the Dean or Director in CSLEA activities and programs) in situations and institutions where there has been a distinct and discernible increase in liberal education programming and activity. Also, as reported on a summary basis in the preceding chapter, CSLEA has had some recorded impact on a variety of specific impact fronts thus evidencing a direct impact on the kinds of programs developed in a number of specific institutions.

4. With respect to the literature of adult education - CSLEA has had a distinct and discernable impact on the field.

In this area it is fairly easy to record the fact that prior to the emergence of CSLEA there was almost no body of literature and few individual writings which concerned themselves with the liberal education of adults. Although a very few articles did appear in the journals in the field there was no continuing literature and few important pamphlets or publications which focussed primarily and continuingly on liberal adult education. Reference to either the Index of the CSLEA Newsletter or to the list of Center publications suggest the wide variety of publications - both practical and philosophical - which now serve as the basic body

of literature in the field of continuing liberal education. The extent to which one or a series of publications have resulted in new program developments or expanded emphasis on the liberal education of adults is difficult to document but certainly the development of this body of literature has made the field of continuing liberal education a respectable and visible aspect of higher education. Fortunately, thanks to the interest of Syracuse University and the continuing generosity of the Ford Foundation both the CSLEA publications and the Newsletter will be carried on by Syracuse University after the termination of the Center in the Fall of 1968.

5. As far as mechanisms, committees, organizations and publications committed to and concerned with continuing liberal education, CSLEA leaves behind it a number which will carry on the drive for professional and liberal adult education, even after its termination.

A number of off-shoots of CSLEA activity during its existence will continue and are likely to have long-lasting and positive influence on the field of higher adult education. Examples of such committee activities or organizations are: The AUEC - NUEA Committee on Minimum Data which provides the only regular reporting of activities in adult education in the U.S.; The National Seminar on Adult Education Research - which provides for annual exchanges of information and reports about significant developments in adult education research; The American Council on Education Committee on Adult Education - which focuses the attention of the most potent and prestigious University Association on directions and developments in continuing education; The Annual Syracuse - CSLEA "Backgrounds Conferences" which bring together scholars from relevant disciplines with key adult educators; the International Congress of University Adult Education - which serves as the only international organization active in bringing together university adult educators from all parts of the world and which carries on a continuing publication program aimed

at international adult educators; The Negro College Committee on Adult Education - which is now liquidating but in the process will provide for the establishment of a Southern-based continuing committee which will carry on the work of stimulating Negro Colleges to expand and enlarge their continuing education activities; The Clearinghouse which serves to circulate information, publications, research and information about University adult education, started by CSLEA and transferred to Syracuse University in 1964. The CSLEA publications and Newsletter which will also be transferred to Syracuse University in the Fall of 1968; and various special continuing education programs which will continue to be offered by institutions of higher education such as the Special Degree programs and the liberal education programs for union members, long after the demise of the Center.

Despite the fact that the Center is being terminated and that the important gadfly role which it played for some seventeen years will no longer continue, the above brief summary suggests that the influence, leadership and stimulation of the Center will carry on after its termination with respect to: key leaders in the field; a number of leading institutions; experimental programs; a continuing literature of liberal adult education; and in terms of a variety of continuing committees and mechanisms which will support various concepts and aspects of the Center even after it terminates.

B. The Essential Ingredients for a Change-Agent.

Based on this overview of my impressions of the lasting impact of the Center and the foregoing report on its activities it seems possible to suggest what are the necessary ingredients for an organization which is trying to influence and change the educational establishment.

1. It must operate as a quasi-independent organization.

This means that the organization must have independent financing (i.e., not

financially dependent on the institutions it is trying to influence for basic support but at the same time having some organic or organizational relationship to the associations or official bodies which represent the particular area of education it is trying to influence.).

During most of its active life, CSLEA had representation from both AUEC and NUEA on its Board of Directors and it worked closely with other associations in the field. It also had staff representatives serving on various committees in the associations and thus had ready access to the leaders and the key associations in the field with which it was concerned. At the same time it was not dependent on the associations or the individual institutions for support and had ample funds available from FAE to carry on its work and even to provide some assistance to particular institutions which were willing to work along experimental lines of interest to CSLEA.

2. It must have sufficient seed money to invest in experimental and demonstration programs.

The quasi-independent nature and stance of the organization is not enough unless it is also able to either give or secure special funds to provide some financing and support for experimental and demonstration programs which it works out with institutions in the field.

During the period of major impact (1956-62) CSLEA had official representation from both AUEC and NUEA on its Board, it made a large number of small grants to institutions to carry on a variety of experimental programs in which it was interested, it was active in the meetings and committees of the two major associations in the field. During the initial period, the impoverished budget either prevented CSLEA from taking programs of central concern to it to the field on an

experimental basis, or it forced it to carry on programs already accepted by the field - and in many cases programs which could be financed by cooperating institutions.

The areas in which CSLEA was most effective in influencing change and in stimulating the development of programs, organizations or activities which will continue after CSLEA terminates were those in which the Center was able to invest some seed money (either from its own budget or from cooperating foundations) for experimental or demonstration programs. For example, this was the case in the areas of special degrees, international activities, research and joint reporting, liberal education for specialists, etc. During its final period, although the Center continued to spawn a number of interesting and important ideas, it did not have funds available to invest in experimental and demonstration programs, and thus, in a number of cases, timely and important ideas did not get off the ground (i.e. counseling, special liberal education programs for women, urban continuing education, etc.).

3. It must provide for active field involvement in the development and testing of experimental programs and projects.

Here again it was primarily during the second stage of its life that the Center was most active and successful in achieving a high involvement of the field in planning as well as demonstrating experimental programs. During the first period the Center was more interested both in selling and promoting specific approaches as well as finding out more about the field. During the final period it did not have the funds to involve the field nor to support their experimental activity in programs of primary interest or concern to the Center. Even during the second period, there is a noticeable difference in the continuing impact of CSLEA on programs which provided for high field involvement (in planning as well as in execution) as compared to those spawned by CSLEA without institutional participation or in-

volvement despite the fact that funds were available for experimentation.

For example, the special degree program, the liberal education programs at Northern Illinois and the secretaries, the programs carried on with the steelworkers, the committees developed with the field in the areas of joint reporting and research, the Negro College project and the activities in the interantional area were all developed with a high degree of field involvement and the experimental programs or developing activities were either carried out with ample field participation or by the field itself. By comparison, the Laboratory College and several other projects which were probably at least as exciting and challenging as some of these adopted by the field did not provide for or build in active field participation in either the development of the idea or during its experimental stages.

During the second period, field involvement -- both in carrying on experimental programs and also in dreaming up ideas and projects -- was emphasized and increased in most activities as a result of: the very active field work program carried on by the staff, the continual presence of visiting staff members at the Center, special conferences and planning sessions, and the high rate of field visitors at the Center office.

4. It must concentrate its activities and energies on a reasonable number of areas and focus its attention on a limited number of projects.

The experience of the Center makes it somewhat difficult to substantiate this hypothesis since there was practically no time during its existence when it agreed to focus on just a few activities and programs or to husband its staff and financial resources for just a few projects.. Nevertheless, during its early days a very conscious effort was made through staff, Board and field discussions to arrive at some focus and some definable and possibly limited areas of concentration.

During its second period, through the planned annual staff seminars there was a conscious effort to define areas of emphasis and target activities and the Board was highly involved in reviewing and discussing program activities and priorities. There was certainly some effort during this second period to at least define a number of areas of concentration. During the final period -- because of the need for garnering additional income and support, the focus was more diversified and diffuse as a result of moving into areas and activities for which support could be secured rather than focussing only on areas of primary concern and interest to the Center. In other words, during the first period there was a distinct effort -- in cooperation with the Board and field -- to define and demarcate areas of emphasis and priority. During the second period there was high involvement of both a changing staff, and active Board and the field in general in helping to shape direction and emphasis (and there was sufficient basic and supplementary support to make possible experimentation in a number of areas). During the final period, however, the staff was forced to move into a number of areas and activities -- some of them only peripheral to the major purpose and goal of CSLEA -- and thus it lost its major impact, thrust and influence on the field and minimized its impact in terms of its major areas of concern and its core objectives.

By comparison with the last years of the Center, one might look at the work and influence of the National Committee on Honors Programs which focussed all of its energies on the development and experimentation with programs of independent study in colleges and universities leading toward a baccalaureate degree. Because of this pinpointed focus and concentration, this committee achieved major results in the development of prototype and the expansion of additional honors programs in colleges and universities. Although it may not have been possible (or even desirable) for CSLEA to focus all of its activities in only one direction, it is likely

that it would have had more lasting impact if it had limited its goals and energy in fewer directions.

5. It must provide for a multi-faceted and diversified plan of action and supporting services to bring about change.

The areas and programs in which the Center had its greatest impact involved a great variety of activities and approaches. For example, in the special degree area it secured active involvement of the field in developing plans and experimental programs; it secured special seed money grants to support experimental programs; it sponsored a number of special meetings and conferences to interpret the experimental programs and to interest and involve other institutions in the concept; it published a number of reports, theoretical articles and evaluations about the activity both in CSLEA publications and also in other accepted journals in the field; it devoted a considerable amount of CSLEA field work time to discussing the idea and developing interest in it in a number of institutions; and the concern and activity of the Center in the special degree area continued over a long period of time.

6. It must secure formal and official sanction as well as active involvement from the official organizations and associations in the field.

CSLEA was fortunate from the outset in having the AUEC as an official and participating organization -- with formal representation on the Center Board -- and later in developing a similar relationship with NUEA. By dint of this official relationship and sanction, the Center had built in access to and support from the key organizations in the field and through the formal representation of members of these associations on its Board, it permitted these organizations to participate in its policy making and development. This relationship provided the Center with a semi-official hunting license, thus providing it with ready access to the member institutions of the associations. Attempts to enlarge this semi-formal relation-

ship with other associations such as the American Association of Colleges and some of the regional associations of higher education -- which might have expanded and facilitated the Center's area of influence in the field -- were attempted but did not come to fruition.

Although this formal kind of relationship with the AUEC and HUEA continued through the final period of CSLEA activity, the lack of core funds resulted in less active participation by the associations in the planning, involvement, and program activity of the Center and in less frequent and sustained participation by Center staff in the annual conferences and committee meetings of the key associations. In addition to the continuing association and official relationship to the two key associations in the field of higher adult education, the Center was successful in a number of programs (again the special degree as an example) in involving official organizations such as the U.S. Office of Education, the National Accrediting Association, the Department of Defense and the American Council on Education either in publicising the program, in cooperating in meetings and conferences about the program, or in providing it with official sanction and support.

Going beyond the higher adult education associations and specific programs, the Center did for a number of years and in different ways work closely with the American Council of Education and with the individuals who were the officers as well as the staff of the Committee on University Adult Education. This working relationship with the AAC permitted the Center to have some limited access to the Presidents and top university officials through the AAC, but it did not provide the official kind of sanction or entrees to the Presidents which CSLEA enjoyed throughout its life with the Deans and Directors. Interestingly enough, reviewing the institutions where CSLEA was most active and where it had a real impact and a lasting influence, in almost all cases the President or another top administrative

official was intimately involved in the program and Center staff worked closely with these top officials.

7. It must continually play a leadership role and assume a Position of agent provocateur in the field.

Unless the organization which is attempting to influence and bring about change plays a continuing role as a developer and stimulator of new ideas, unless it pushes for new programs and experiments and unless it is active in areas which constitute cutting edges and new directions in the field, it will end up more as a service agency than a change agent. Given the other ingredients outlined above, it is still possible for an agency to abdicate its leadership and agent provocateur role for one of service and accommodation unless it continually sees itself and is able to operate in that role. During the first two periods of its activity, the Center, building on the other essential ingredients, did indeed fulfill this agent provocateur role -- and it was able to do so because it had the money, the official relationships and sanctions, the involvement of the leaders in the field and a shifting and changing staff. During its final years -- primarily because it had to depend on financial support from the field to make its existence possible -- much of the leadership role and many of its innovative and highly experimental activities were sacrificed and subordinated to those activities which could bring in some extra income or basic support for the Center (and these were primarily service or basic study activities rather than highly original or creative projects).

At this point it is difficult to determine whether, in the light of this conceptualization of the essential ingredients for an effective and potent change agent, the Center should have gone out of existence in 1962 when its budget was drastically curtailed and its creative influence and gadfly role was resultantly diminished. It is possible to argue that between 1962 and 1968 the Center was,

on the one hand able to bring to fruition a number of projects then under way and on the other, to provide important and significant services in the more pedestrian consultant role but, whether it really became a different kind of animal and a different kind of organization as it lost some of the essential ingredients outlined above, it is difficult to evaluate entirely objectively at this time. It is hoped, however, that the above analysis may be helpful in thinking about the nature and financing of future change agents in the field of education.

8. Finally, and possibly most important, it is essential that it adopt a firm and clear-cut stance regarding goals and procedures, and that such stance be mirrored in its activities and methods.

It is true that CSLEA, over the years consciously reviewed its core objective and adhered to it. At the same time the tension between the concept of the Center as a 'Think-Tank' or a modified Center for the Advanced Study of Liberal Education for Adults on the one hand or as a conscious and active change-agent on the other was a continuing one and one which was never completely resolved (as is testified in Whipple's history and various staff documents and papers). There were differences among the staff as to whether the Center should be primarily responsible for following up on a sound and tested idea to the point where the idea was broadly disseminated and effectively adopted and institutionalized or whether the most important task for the Center was to dream up and talk about new ideas regardless of what happened after the idea was developed.

In a similar vein there was some continuing disagreement about the extent to which new ideas and concepts should be developed primarily by the staff or by them in active cooperation with the field. In Hudson's consultant report he emphasized the problem which grew out of concentration on ideas and concepts developed by a small group, apart from the field, and recommended that, in the future,

there should be greatly increased field involvement in developing ideas and in testing them as well as in translating them to the field.

As already pointed out both in this document and in Whipple's history, these tensions probably can be tolerated and may even be desirable in a large, well-financed operation where there is ample time, personnel and money for both kinds of approaches. But in a smaller operation with limited funds it is probably essential that there be total agreement on whether the operation should emphasize one direction or the other. I believe it is demonstrable that in the later years, as the tension became more acute, as the Center became less directly oriented to its change agent role, and as we did less to involve the field actively in planning and experimentation, it also became less effective and less of a factor in bringing about the desired changes in the field.

APPENDIX

Chart Summary of CSLEA Impact

Development of Organization to Support Higher Adult Education

	Negro College	International Congress	Seminar for Adult Education Research
<u>Development of concept or idea</u>			
Identification of need	X	X	X
Program stated in writing	X	X	NA
Reviewed by field	X	X	X
<u>Development of Experiment or Prototype</u> Special Institutions	X	NA	NA
Special funds available	X	X	X
Concurrent evaluation	X	NA	NA
<u>Dissemination to field</u>			
Publications	X	Y	X
Meetings, Conferences	Y	Y	Y
Consultation with others	X	X	NA
Additional funds available	X	X	NA
<u>Adoption and Institutionalization</u>			
Sanction from the establishment	X	X	.
Mechanism for continuation	X ¹	X	Y
Still Operating	X ¹	X	X

Key: X - some activity
 Y - considerable activity
 ZZ - little or no activity

Note 1. - Mechanism currently being developed which if successful will provide for continuing operation.

APPLICATION OF TAXONOMY TO CSLEA PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES
Development of Audiences for Higher Adult Education: Labor

	Steel- workers	Wayne State	Indiana	Rutgers
<u>Development or concept or idea</u>				
Identification of need	X	Z	Z	Z
Program stated in writing	X	Z	Z	Z
Reviewed by field	X	X	X	Z
<u>Development of Experiment or Prototype</u>				
Special Institutions	X	X	X	Z
Special funds available	X	X	X	X
Concurrent evaluation	X	Z	Y	X
<u>Dissemination to field</u>				
Publications	X	X	Z	X
Meetings, Conferences	X	Z	Z	X
Consultation with others	X	Z	Z	Z
Additional funds available	X	Z	Z	Z
<u>Adoption and Institutionalization</u>				
Sanction from establishment	X	X	X	Z
Mechanism for continuation	X	X	X	Z
Still Operating	?	X	?	Z

Key: X - some activity
 Y - considerable activity
 Z - little or no activity

APPLICATION OF TAXONOMY TO CSLEA PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Development of Audiences of Higher Adult Education: Others

	Secretaries	Teachers	Alumni
<u>Development of concept or idea</u>			
Identification of need	X	X	X
Program stated in writing	X	X	Z
Reviewed by field	X	X	Z
<u>Development of Experiment or Prototype</u>			
Special Institutions	X	X	X
Special funds available	X	X	X
Concurrent evaluation	X	X	X
<u>Dissemination to field</u>			
Publications	X	X	Y
Meetings, Conferences	Z	X	X
Consultation with Others	Z	X	X
Additional funds available	Z	Z	Z
<u>Adoption and Institutionalization</u>			
Sanction from the establishment	X	X	X
Mechanism for continuation	Z	Z	X
Still Operating	Z	?	X

Key: X - some activity
 Y - considerable activity
 Z - little or no activity.

APPLICATION OF TAXONOMY TO CSLEA PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES
Development of Audiences of Higher Adult Education: Others

	Women	Executives	Arts
<u>Development of concept or idea</u>			
Identification of need	X	Z	X
Program stated in writing	X	Z	X
Reviewed by field	Z	Z	X
<u>Development of Experiment or Prototype</u>			
Special Institutions	Z	Z	X
Special funds available	Z	X	X
Concurrent evaluation	Z	X	Y
<u>Dissemination to field</u>			
Publications	Y	X	Y
Meetings, Conferences	Y	X	Y
Consultation with others	X	Z	Z
Additional funds available	Z	Z	Z
<u>Adoption and Institutionalization</u>			
Sanction from the establishment	Z	Z	Z
Mechanism for Continuation	Z	Z	Z
Still Operating	Z	Z	Z

Key: X - some activity
 Y - considerable activity
 Z - little or no activity

APPLICATION OF TAXONOMY TO CSLEA PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Development of Programs for Higher Adult Education

	Special Degrees	Laboratory College	Backgrounds for Adult Education	Urban Education
<u>Development of concept or idea</u>				
Identification of need	X	X	X	X
Program stated in writing	X	X	Z	X
Reviewed by field	Y	Z	Y	X
<u>Development of Experiment or Prototype</u>				
Special Institutions	Y	X	X	X
Special funds available	Y	X	X	X
Concurrent evaluation	X	X	Z	X
<u>Dissemination to Field</u>				
Publications	Y	Z	Y	X
Meetings, Conferences	Y	Z	X	X
Consultation with Others	Y	Z	NA	X
Additional funds available	Y	Z	Z	X
<u>Adoption and Institutionalization</u>				
Sanction from the establishment	Y	Z	Z	X
Mechanism for continuation	X	Z	X	X
Still Operating	Y	Z	X	X

Key: X - some activity
 Y - considerable activity
 Z - little or no activity

APPLICATION OF TAXONOMY TO CSLEA PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Development of Methods for Higher Adult Education

	Education	Uniform Reporting	Teaching Style	Counseling
<u>Development of concept or idea</u>				
Identification of need	X	X	X	X
Program stated in writing	X	X	X	X
Reviewed by field	Y	Y	Z	Z
<u>Development of Experiment or Prototype</u>				
Special Institutions	Z	M	Z	Z
Special funds available	X	X	Z	X
Concurrent evaluation	X	X	X	Z
<u>Dissemination to field</u>				
Publications	X	X	X	X
Meetings, conferences	Y	X	X	X
Consultation with others	X	X	Z	Z
Additional funds available	Z	Z	Z	Z
<u>Adoption and Institutionalization</u>				
Sanction from the establishment	Z	X	Z	Z
Mechanism for continuation	Z	X	Z	Z
Still operating	Z	X	Z	Z

Key: X - some activity
 Y - considerable activity
 Z - little or no activity

ERIC Clearinghouse

APR 16 1969

on Adult Education