

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



8409411

**Neumann, Florence Margaret**

ACCESS TO FREE PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN NEW YORK CITY:  
1847-1961

*City University of New York*

PH.D. 1984

**University  
Microfilms  
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**Copyright 1984**

by

**Neumann, Florence Margaret**

**All Rights Reserved**



ACCESS TO FREE PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN

NEW YORK CITY: 1847-1961

by

FLORENCE MARGARET NEUMANN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1984

COPYRIGHT BY  
FLORENCE MARGARET NEUMANN  
1984

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Jan 26, 1984  
date

Joseph P. ...  
Chairman of Examining Committee

Jan 26, 1984  
date

Robert Smith  
Executive Officer

Professor Sidney Aronson

Professor David Lavin

Professor Bernard Greenblatt  
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

## Abstract

ACCESS TO FREE PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN  
NEW YORK CITY: 1847-1961

by

Florence Margaret Neumann

Adviser: Professor Joseph Bensman

This work examines the relationship between educational policy and social policy. Determinants and processes effecting access to free public higher education in New York City, from 1847 through 1961, have been identified and analyzed. A social history of admissions criteria and considerations related to The City College of New York (CCNY), the original municipal college, has been presented. Documents examined include minutes of the proceedings of CCNY's governing boards, as well as records of the College's key executives.

A continuously-evolving element was responsible for the growth and expansion of access to New York's colleges. The mission of CCNY articulated by its administrators encompassed the provision of a quality curriculum as well as vocational training; the instilling of manhood and citizenship in its students; teacher training; the socialization and acculturation of immigrant students; and the engendering of class mobility. The mission was periodically ex-

tended to serve additional groups of students. CCNY's notion of "service to the public" depicted higher education as fostering the attainment of the American dream.

Access to the College was a constantly controversial issue. Several themes exerted an ongoing influence on admissions considerations. Questions regarding student merit and the availability of facilities were paramount. These factors determined transformations in modes of access, as well as incremental modifications of admissions standards. Secondary themes effecting access included the relationship of CCNY to the remainder of the City's schools, to government institutions and political leaders, and to civic groups.

Social and economic crises tended to engender the climate and circumstances favorable to the broadening of access to the municipal college system. The utility of long-range planning and the impact of "technically-neutral" administrative exigencies are also examined.

It is suggested that the Open Admissions' proposal generated a crisis of unprecedented dimensions because it represented the convergence of every unresolved admissions issue apparent in CCNY's history; the appearance of new volatile themes; and the rapid and massive mobilization of numerous and diverse civic groups around the issue of student admissions.

## PREFACE

It has taken six years to assemble, organize and analyze the pieces of the story of access to The City College of New York. Other events have transpired during this time; yet since 1978, no other endeavor has been more central to my existence. This work could never have been completed without the love, assistance and guidance of certain people.

First and foremost, my parents. Over the years, they have nurtured me, taught me the importance of attention to detail and instilled in me an appreciation of historic events and forces. They have afforded me the luxury of this accomplishment; they have tolerated my erratic, often frenetic lifestyle. The words "thank you" are grossly inadequate.

Professor Joseph Bensman has held loosely but ever so reassuringly the reins of his chairmanship. He has been there for me, but has not been on top of me. He has acted as a catalyst, helping to develop a conceptual framework and structure for this mass of details. His professional support and personal faith in me have been most gratifying.

Professor Sidney Aronson has championed not only my interest in this topic, but also my historiographic efforts. Professor David Lavin piqued my scholarly interest

in the topic of access and exposed me to the relevant literature. All three committee members have been incredibly patient and wonderfully supportive.

I thank Dean Bernard Greenblatt for his critical reading of this work and his twinkling eyes.

Professor Barbara Dunlap, CCNY's tireless Archivist, has been an invaluable friend "for the duration." More than anyone else, Barbara grasped the sheer bulk and vast dimensions of the documents I was attempting to conquer. She permitted me unrestricted access to CCNY's holdings, and entry into the Archives at irregular hours. She was there to commiserate with me and to celebrate with me.

John Lesser encouraged me, advised me, was my "sounding-board" and allowed me use of his office facilities. He has been a steadfast and an invaluable friend.

Many loving relatives and dear friends have sustained me during this taxing period. Others who have assisted me include: Gerald Barrett, typist par excellence; the staff of The Campus; Charles DeChico, CCNY, Office of Public Relations; Pearl Friedman, CCNY Department of Psychology; Professor Lillian Lester, Archivist, Brooklyn College; The Honorable Albert V. Maniscalco, CUNY Board of Trustees; Dr. Donna Morgan, Director, CCNY Office of Institutional Research; Dr. William Omelchenko, Archivist, Hunter College; Paul Perkus, Archivist, Board of Higher Education; Peter Prehn, Registrar, CCNY (Retired); Renee

Reinitz, Brooklyn College Archives; Bea Soofer, City College Archives; Richard Tiorata, New York Public Library, Office of Adult Services; Dean Norman Wagner, CCNY, School of General Studies; Paula Wilkes, Registrar, CCNY.

Last but not least, Chapter I is dedicated to Dr. Harvey A. Siegal. Harve saw me through the Spring 1969 crisis: Harve understood. His friendship and support have been and are very precious.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|         |   |    |
|---------|---|----|
| Chapter |   |    |
| I.      | INTRODUCTION . . . . .  | 1  |
| II.     | THE FIRST FIFTY YEARS: CCNY, 1847-1896 . . .                          | 36 |
| A.      | The Free Academy . . . . .  | 36 |
|         | 1. Establishment and Governance . . . . .                             | 36 |
|         | 2. Admissions Policy: Early Provisions . . . . .                      | 37 |
|         | 3. Key Themes: Student Merit and Space . . . . .                      | 38 |
|         | 4. Key Themes: The CCNY "Mission" . . . . .                           | 40 |
|         | a) High-Quality Education . . . . .                                   | 41 |
|         | b) Service to the Public . . . . .                                    | 41 |
|         | (1) A Practical Curriculum . . . . .                                  | 42 |
|         | (2) Service to All Classes . . . . .                                  | 44 |
|         | (a) Structural Components . . . . .                                   | 44 |
|         | (b) Normative Themes . . . . .  | 45 |
| B.      | Higher Education and Elementary Education<br>in New York . . . . .    | 47 |
|         | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 47 |
|         | 2. The Normal College for Women . . . . .                             | 48 |
|         | a) Establishment . . . . .  | 48 |
|         | b) Admissions Requirements: The Me-<br>rit and Space Issues . . . . . | 48 |
|         | c) The Hunter College "Mission" . . . . .                             | 50 |
|         | 3. The Attendance Pre-requisite. . . . .                              | 52 |
| C.      | The "Open College" Measure . . . . .                                  | 52 |
|         | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 52 |
|         | 2. The Executive Committee Debate . . . . .                           | 53 |
|         | 3. Chapter 143, Laws of 1882 . . . . .                                | 56 |
| D.      | CCNY Adjustment: The 1880s and the 1890s . . . . .                    | 57 |
|         | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 57 |
|         | 2. The Merit Issue . . . . .  | 57 |
|         | 3. The Space Issue . . . . .  | 60 |
|         | 4. The Dual Mission . . . . .   | 61 |
|         | a) A Quality Curriculum . . . . .                                     | 61 |
|         | b) Service to the Public . . . . .                                    | 61 |
|         | (1) Curricular and Technical<br>Elements . . . . .                    | 61 |
|         | (2) Normative Goals . . . . .   | 62 |
| E.      | Summary . . . . .   | 66 |

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| III. | CCNY IN AN EXPANDED METROPOLIS . . . . .                            | 77  |
|      | A. Introduction . . . . .   | 77  |
|      | B. The Regulation of Access . . . . .                               | 78  |
|      | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 78  |
|      | 2. Admission to the Sub-Freshman Course . . . . .                   | 79  |
|      | 3. Admission to the College Course . . . . .                        | 80  |
|      | C. The Space Issue . . . . .  | 83  |
|      | D. The Extension Movement . . . . .                                 | 84  |
|      | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 84  |
|      | 2. CCNY Extension Programs . . . . .                                | 85  |
|      | 3. Extension in Brooklyn . . . . .                                  | 87  |
|      | 4. Extension in Queens . . . . .                                    | 87  |
|      | E. Expanded Schedules . . . . .                                     | 88  |
|      | 1. The Evening Session . . . . .                                    | 88  |
|      | 2. The Summer Session . . . . .                                     | 90  |
|      | F. New Academic Divisions . . . . .                                 | 91  |
|      | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 91  |
|      | 2. Engineering and Technology . . . . .                             | 91  |
|      | 3. Business and Public Administration . . . . .                     | 92  |
|      | 4. Education . . . . .  | 92  |
|      | G. New Student Categories . . . . .                                 | 95  |
|      | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 95  |
|      | 2. The Municipal Student . . . . .                                  | 95  |
|      | H. Summary . . . . .  | 96  |
| IV.  | THE EARLY BHE YEARS: CCNY, 1926-1941 . . . . .                      | 107 |
|      | A. Introduction . . . . .   | 107 |
|      | 1. The Board of Higher Education . . . . .                          | 107 |
|      | 2. Admission Requirements, CCNY, 1926 . . . . .                     | 108 |
|      | 3. Admissions and Access, 1926-1961 . . . . .                       | 110 |
|      | 4. Chapter 226, Laws of 1929 . . . . .                              | 113 |
|      | 5. The Creation of Brooklyn College . . . . .                       | 114 |
|      | B. The Great Depression and CCNY . . . . .                          | 118 |
|      | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 118 |
|      | 2. Austerity Measures: The "Limited-Matriculated Student" . . . . . | 120 |
|      | C. The Space Problem . . . . .                                      | 123 |
|      | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 123 |
|      | 2. The Creation of Queens College . . . . .                         | 126 |
|      | 3. Higher Education in Staten Island . . . . .                      | 126 |
|      | 4. Coping Measures . . . . .  | 128 |
|      | 5. The Space Problem and Access . . . . .                           | 130 |

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| D. | Expansion of Access: Non-United States<br>Citizens and Non-New York City Residents | 132 |
| E. | The Regulation of Access . . . . .   | 135 |
|    | 1. Introduction . . . . .  | 135 |
|    | 2. Legislative Provisions . . . . .  | 135 |
|    | 3. Executive Directives . . . . .  | 136 |
| F. | Student Status Allocation . . . . .  | 138 |
|    | 1. Introduction . . . . .  | 138 |
|    | 2. Brooklyn College Innovations, Septem-<br>ber 1941 . . . . .                     | 140 |
|    | 3. City College Imitations, September<br>1941 . . . . .                            | 141 |
|    | 4. The "Composite Score" . . . . .   | 143 |
|    | 5. The "Special Student" . . . . .   | 144 |
| G. | Summary . . . . .  | 146 |
| V. | THE WAR YEARS: 1941-1945 . . . . .   | 157 |
| A. | Introduction . . . . .   | 157 |
|    | 1. The United States and World War II . . . . .                                    | 157 |
|    | 2. Selective Service Laws, 1940-1947 . . . . .                                     | 158 |
|    | 3. Student Deferments, 1940-1945 . . . . .   | 158 |
|    | 4. The Closing of Townsend Harris High<br>School . . . . .                         | 160 |
|    | 5. Effects on Admissions, Enrollment and<br>Access . . . . .                       | 160 |
| B. | Quantitative Admissions Requirements . . . . .                                     | 162 |
| C. | Reduced Enrollment . . . . .   | 164 |
|    | 1. The Admission of Women . . . . .  | 165 |
|    | 2. Qualitative Admissions Requirements . . . . .                                   | 166 |
|    | 3. A De-stabilized Evening Session . . . . .                                       | 168 |
| D. | Expansion of Access: The Non-Matriculated<br>Student . . . . .                     | 170 |
|    | 1. Commerce Center Innovations . . . . .   | 170 |
|    | 2. Expansion of CCNY's Mission . . . . .   | 171 |
|    | 3. Main Center Programs . . . . .  | 172 |
|    | 4. The Adult Education Program . . . . .   | 173 |
|    | 5. Economics and Idealism, CCNY in 1944 . . . . .                                  | 175 |
| E. | The Space Shortage . . . . .   | 176 |
| F. | Summary . . . . .  | 178 |

|      |  |     |
|------|--|-----|
| VI.  | THE WORLD WAR II VETERANS . . . . .                            | 187 |
|      | A. The Issue of Merit . . . . .                                | 187 |
|      | 1. The National Context . . . . .                              | 187 |
|      | 2. The Local Situation . . . . .                               | 189 |
|      | 3. CCNY Accommodations: Administrative<br>Directives . . . . . | 192 |
|      | 4. CCNY Accommodations: Administrative<br>Provisos . . . . .   | 193 |
|      | 5. CCNY Admissions in the 1940s . . . . .                      | 196 |
|      | B. The Space Crisis: 1946-1947 . . . . .                       | 198 |
|      | 1. Introduction . . . . .                                      | 198 |
|      | 2. Coping Tactics . . . . .                                    | 199 |
|      | 3. Retention and Admission . . . . .                           | 201 |
|      | 4. Budgetary Considerations and Enroll-<br>ment . . . . .      | 202 |
|      | 5. The Post-WWII Mission and Space Needs . . . . .             | 203 |
|      | 6. Capital Improvements . . . . .                              | 205 |
|      | C. The Adult Education Program . . . . .                       | 206 |
|      | 1. Introduction . . . . .                                      | 206 |
|      | 2. State Law and Adult Education . . . . .                     | 208 |
|      | 3. The Intensive Business Training Pro-<br>gram . . . . .      | 209 |
|      | D. Summary . . . . .   | 213 |
| VII. | THE STRAYER REPORT . . . . .                                   | 227 |
|      | A. Introduction . . . . .                                      | 227 |
|      | B. The BHE and the Mission of the Colleges . . . . .           | 229 |
|      | C. The BHE and Policy-Making . . . . .                         | 230 |
|      | 1. Procedural Recommendations . . . . .                        | 231 |
|      | 2. Organizational Recommendations . . . . .                    | 232 |
|      | D. Student Access . . . . .                                    | 236 |
|      | 1. A Plan for Expansion . . . . .                              | 236 |
|      | 2. Admissions Considerations . . . . .                         | 238 |
|      | 3. New Programs . . . . .                                      | 240 |
|      | E. State Responsibility for Higher Education . . . . .         | 242 |
|      | F. The Measurement of Merit . . . . .                          | 244 |
|      | G. Summary . . . . .   | 247 |

|       |   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| VIII. | REACTION TO THE STRAYER REPORT . . . . .                          | 252 |
|       | A. The Rogers Committee . . . . .                                 | 252 |
|       | B. The Administrative Council . . . . .                           | 253 |
|       | C. The Joint High School-College Articulation Committee . . . . . | 256 |
|       | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 256 |
|       | 2. Admission Requirements . . . . .                               | 258 |
|       | 3. Admission Procedures . . . . .                                 | 259 |
|       | 4. Admission Policies . . . . .                                   | 259 |
|       | 5. The Measurement of Merit . . . . .                             | 260 |
|       | a) Pre-Admission Tests and Measures . . . . .                     | 261 |
|       | b) College Admission Tests and Measures . . . . .                 | 262 |
|       | c) College Placement Examinations . . . . .                       | 264 |
|       | D. The Pearman and Reid Report . . . . .                          | 265 |
|       | E. Summary . . . . .  | 268 |
| IX.   | CONSOLIDATION AND PLANNING . . . . .                              | 273 |
|       | A. Student Admissions . . . . .                                   | 273 |
|       | 1. General Procedures . . . . .                                   | 273 |
|       | 2. Admission Requirements . . . . .                               | 275 |
|       | B. The BHE and State Funding: Teacher Training, 1948 . . . . .    | 278 |
|       | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 278 |
|       | 2. The Board of Education Connection . . . . .                    | 281 |
|       | 3. Non-New York State Residents . . . . .                         | 282 |
|       | 4. State Responsibility for Higher Education . . . . .            | 283 |
|       | C. The Cottrell Report . . . . .                                  | 285 |
|       | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 285 |
|       | 2. Post-High School Education: "A Must" . . . . .                 | 286 |
|       | 3. Capital Expansion . . . . .                                    | 287 |
|       | D. The Strayer-Yavner Report . . . . .                            | 288 |
|       | 1. Introduction . . . . .   | 288 |
|       | 2. Higher Education for Whom? . . . . .                           | 289 |
|       | 3. Higher Education for Richmond . . . . .                        | 291 |
|       | 4. Inadequate Financing . . . . .                                 | 293 |
|       | 5. State Monies: Assistance or Control? . . . . .                 | 294 |
|       | E. Summary . . . . .  | 297 |

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| X.   | ACCESS IN THE 1950s: THE SECOND-TIER STUDENT                        | 306 |
| A.   | The School of General Studies . . . . .                             | 306 |
| 1.   | Establishment . . . . .   | 306 |
| 2.   | The Associate Degree: Accreditation                                 | 307 |
| 3.   | Associate Degree Students . . . . .                                 | 309 |
| 4.   | Non-Matriculants . . . . .  | 314 |
| B.   | High School-College Articulation . . . . .                          | 314 |
| C.   | The Community Colleges . . . . .                                    | 319 |
| D.   | Summary . . . . .   | 325 |
| XI.  | THE MUNICIPAL COLLEGE SYSTEM AT THE TURN OF<br>THE DECADE . . . . . | 332 |
| A.   | The Space Problem . . . . .   | 332 |
| B.   | State Funding . . . . .   | 335 |
| C.   | Attacks on the Municipal College System                             | 337 |
| 1.   | The Free Tuition Issue . . . . .                                    | 337 |
| 2.   | The City/State Struggle for Control .                               | 342 |
| D.   | The Committee to Look to the Future . . .                           | 343 |
| E.   | Toward the 1960s . . . . .  | 346 |
| F.   | Summary . . . . .   | 349 |
| XII. | CONCLUSION . . . . .  | 357 |
|      | APPENDIX A . . . . .  | 382 |
|      | APPENDIX B . . . . .  | 383 |
|      | APPENDIX C . . . . .  | 384 |
|      | BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .  | 387 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 1.  | Free Academy Admissions Requirements . . . . .                        | 39  |
| 2.  | Changes in Admissions Criteria: CCNY, 1926-1961 .                     | 111 |
| 3.  | Enrollment and Admissions, Spring 1936 . . . . .                      | 130 |
| 4.  | BHE Bylaw Revisions, 1926 to 1971 . . . . .                           | 136 |
| 5.  | Methods of Admission, Spring 1936 . . . . .                           | 139 |
| 6.  | Composite Score, Sept. 1941 to Sept. 1945 . . . .                     | 143 |
| 7.  | Enrollment - CCNY - Both Centers, All Schools,<br>Fall Term . . . . . | 164 |
| 8.  | Qualitative Admissions Requirements--CCNY,<br>1940-1950 . . . . .     | 197 |
| 9.  | Admissions Requirements 1950-1961<br>CCNY-Uptown Campus . . . . .     | 278 |
| 10. | Municipal College Applications, 1953 . . . . .                        | 317 |

## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

In Spring 1969, The City College of New York witnessed a series of student demonstrations, campus shut-downs and riots. By May 1969, the College had taken on the air of a combat zone, with nearly 300 riot police appearing daily at the College to maintain order. On May 8, the auditorium of CCNY's student center was burned; on May 9, the College's President, Buell G. Gallagher, resigned.<sup>1</sup>

The events at City College occurred in the milieu of the student rebellions of the late-1960s: one of its concerns was equality for different social and ethnic groups. In particular, the 1969 confrontations at CCNY arose in response to a series of demands issued by groups wanting increased access to higher education in New York City. By July 9, 1969, the Board of Higher Education (BHE) of the City of New York, the administrator of the fifteen-unit City University of New York (CUNY), had announced the initiation of an "Open Admissions" policy: admission within the CUNY system would be offered to all New York City high school graduates, effective September 1970.<sup>2</sup> By November 10, CUNY Chancellor Albert H. Bowker

had announced a plan for the allocation of students to CUNY's junior and senior colleges.

The creation and implementation of the Open Admissions policy drew nationwide attention to The City University. The new policy represented a dramatic departure from existent selective access regulations. Yet the policy was accepted in New York City not only because it appeared to be the only politically-feasible solution of the moment. In 1966, the BHE had targeted the year of 1975 as the date when an "open enrollment" plan would be instituted at The City University of New York.<sup>3</sup> The implementation of Open Admissions in September 1970 was thus depicted as a "moving up," an acceleration of the inception of the novel policy.

The institution of Open Admissions occurred, however, almost overnight. Additionally, the 1969-1970 policy differed noticeably from the original 1966 plan. What events brought about this dramatic and unprecedented change in access to higher education in New York City? What were the issues and processes involved in defining, negotiating and resolving the admissions question? And who were the key actors in these actions? A brief review of CUNY access policies and plans of the 1960s and of the events of 1968-1969 at CCNY may provide some clues for answering these questions.

In 1963, Albert H. Bowker was appointed Chancellor of The City University of New York. Under Bowker's leader-

ship, the BHE would assume increased policy-making powers. The municipal college system would expand dramatically, growing from seven to nineteen units in eight years. Access to post-secondary education in New York City would be extended to an enlarged and more ethnically-heterogenous population.

The transition from the exclusive admissions practices of the early 1960s to the Open Admissions policy of 1970 began modestly enough. In 1963, funding was obtained from the State for an experimental minority admissions program, College Discovery, to be initiated in the community colleges.<sup>4</sup> In 1966, a similar program, known as SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge) was established in the four-year colleges. The two programs provided compensatory work preparatory to the entry of these students into traditional college programs. They immediately became the major avenues of minority entry into CUNY's colleges.

In 1966, the BHE revised its Master Plan for the City University. Noting the need for the training of immigrants to the City from the South and from Puerto Rico, the University proposed that by 1975, a place be offered within the municipal college system to every New York City high school graduate.<sup>5</sup>

An allocation plan stratifying incoming students was incorporated into the 1966 Master Plan. The top 25% of graduates would be offered accommodation in a senior

college; an additional 40% would qualify for entry into the community colleges. About 10% would be admitted into the SEEK or College Discovery programs and all others could enroll in "educational skills centers" which would provide job-oriented technical training. Even this highly-stratified proposal took a great stride forward, relative to CUNY's selectivity in the 1960s. But in the light of what was to come, it would appear quite modest.

During 1968, the political ferment in minority communities changed from the nonviolent tactics of the civil rights movement to greater militance and even riots. It was in this climate that Bowker and the BHE enacted in August 1968 an "One Hundred Scholars Program." This program, designed to further expand minority enrollment, would admit to CUNY's senior colleges the top one hundred graduates of each high school class, regardless of actual secondary school average. This stipulation was made in recognition of the fact that students in the City's ghetto high schools typically earned lower averages than did students holding the same class rank in nonghetto schools. Thus students graduating from schools serving predominantly minority students would be admitted even if they had not attained the matriculation average required for admission.

In setting forth this program, the Board stated its ultimate intent: minority groups should be represented at CUNY "in the same proportion as they are represented among all high school graduates of the City." This state-

ment served to crystallize what had been a growing concern among whites in the City: that during a period when admission to the University was highly selective, places were increasingly being allocated to students who did not meet traditional criteria--at the expense of other qualified students.

Racial tension was exacerbated in New York City during the Fall 1968 teachers' strike. The budget cuts of early 1969 threatened to reduce the size of the Fall 1969 Freshman class: a measure which would either cut regular admissions or reduce the size of the SEEK and College Discovery programs. By Spring 1969, there seemed no obvious way out of the University's dilemma: whatever might benefit one group would be perceived as a loss by the other. As events unfolded, every action of CUNY appeared as a choice between "merit" and "quotas." But if an impasse had developed at the Board of Higher Education, other parts of CUNY were generating their own action. Particularly at CCNY, a crisis was brewing which promised to push the entire University into a new trajectory.

The immediate stimulus for change came from within the CCNY student body. In 1968-1969 CCNY students represented a fairly wide range of political shadings, from the relatively conservative, professionally committed engineering students, to various leftist groups of predominantly white membership such as Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). In addition there were a number of minority-group

clubs and organizations, which, for the most part, operated independently of the left-oriented white groups.

The first inkling of what was coming occurred in November 1968, when the Marxist and predominantly black DuBois Club circulated a petition among the student body. Stating that nearly 55% of pupils in the public schools were black and Puerto Rican, compared with less than 10% in CUNY's senior colleges, the petition contained a list of demands, the key ones being that the racial composition of future entering classes reflect that of the high school graduating classes in the city; that the SEEK program be quadrupled; and that facilities be built to accommodate all students graduating from high school. About 1,500 students (around 10% of CCNY's student body) signed the petition, which was addressed to City College President Buell Gallagher.<sup>6</sup> He responded by letter, expressing agreement with the aims of the petitioners but noting that CCNY was already committed to greater ethnic representativeness and that expansion of programs and facilities was largely a matter of money.<sup>7</sup> At the time it appeared that the DuBois Club had engaged in a one-shot episode: the matter remained dormant from November through the December holiday period and final examinations in January 1969.

However, in early February a new minority organization surfaced, representing a coalition of black and Puerto Rican students. Calling itself "The Committee of Ten," it called upon the CUNY administration to alleviate

"conditions that deny the very existence of the Black and Puerto Rican community."<sup>8</sup> The students issued five demands and insisted that Gallagher "utilize whatever means necessary" to meet them. These demands, listed here, became the agenda for negotiations in the confrontation that was to come.

1. A separate school of Black and Puerto Rican Studies.
2. A separate orientation program for Black and Puerto Rican Freshmen.
3. A voice for students in the setting of guidelines for the SEEK program, including the hiring and firing of personnel.
4. That the racial composition of all entering classes reflect the Black and Puerto Rican population of the New York City high schools.
5. That Black and Puerto Rican history and the Spanish language be a requirement for all education majors.<sup>9</sup>

President Gallagher met with the Committee, but no specific agreements were reached, and the group, apparently angered by the response, occupied a major part of the administration building for several hours in an effort to show that it could shut down the College if it decided to.<sup>10</sup>

Later in February a second event indicated the increasing activity of the black and Puerto Rican constituency. For the upcoming student government elections, Blacks and Puerto Ricans formed a new party, called the New World Coalition (NWC).<sup>11</sup> Apparently in an effort to broaden its constituency to include whites, the NWC included in its platform a demand for "universal free higher

education."<sup>12</sup> In the actual election, this party made a strong showing, coming in second in the overall voting.<sup>13</sup> These results revealed a split within the student body. Among engineering and natural science students, the NWC did very poorly; but among humanities and social science students, it came in first, indicating broad support among the latter for an expansion of access to the College.<sup>14</sup>

In March 1969 the University's budget crisis intruded upon events at CCNY. The fact that the University faced a budget reduction for the coming academic year presented a dramatic disparity: student demands for broader access were being made at exactly the time that the prospect of cuts in enrollment loomed large. Bowker initially had suggested that these cuts could exacerbate racial tensions. In his efforts to build political pressure, he later modified his position, stating that if adequate funds were not forthcoming, there would be no Freshman class in the Fall. Throughout CUNY this had the effect of uniting various student and community groups and focusing their attention upon Albany.<sup>15</sup> At City College a minority organization, now identified as the BPRSC (Black and Puerto Rican Student Community--an outgrowth of the Committee of Ten which had issued the five demands), announced its willingness to join white student groups to fight the budget cuts.<sup>16</sup> The result was a series of massive demonstrations, the most dramatic being a rally of 13,000 CUNY students in Albany on March 18.<sup>17</sup> Delegations met with

various legislators and with Governor Rockefeller, who claimed that CUNY officials had overestimated the impact of reduced state aid.<sup>18</sup>

The flurry of collective activity subsided as City College broke for Spring vacation on April 1st. Shortly after school resumed, there was news that although the state allocation would be higher than that given to CUNY in 1968, it was still about \$20 million less than had been requested. Bowker reiterated his warning that there would be no Freshman class, and President Gallagher submitted his resignation (effective June, 1970) in response to the budget cuts.<sup>19</sup> In his letter of resignation, he stated:

I am now asked . . . to stand in the door and keep students out. I shall not accede. I will not do it. I will not turn my back on the poor of all races. . . .

My hope, however, is that my departure may serve to symbolize the public outrage which echoes from the brutal and insulting slamming of the college-entrance door.<sup>20</sup>

Adding to a sense of the legitimacy of student demands for broader access, 23 of the 27 department chairs supported Gallagher by submitting their resignations, "unless a budget adequate to the functioning and development of the City University is provided."<sup>21</sup> The BPRSC, fearing that the budget shortfall would result in "virtually no Black or Puerto Rican students in the University," called for a strike of classes in support of the five demands on Monday, April 21. The boycott was reported as

30% effective and about 1,000 persons, including high school students, rallied on the campus. As one might expect given the earlier student election results, support for the strike was greater among social science and humanities students than among science and engineering students.<sup>22</sup>

In the early morning of the next day, 150-200 members of the BRPSC entered the south campus (where the social sciences and humanities were housed), evicted whoever was already on the campus for an early class, chained off the gates, and posted "sentries"--sealing off half of the College's territory and 8 out of its 22 buildings.<sup>23</sup> Now calling the south campus, "The University of Harlem," it was announced that the campus would remain sealed off until the administration met the five demands which had been presented by the Committee of Ten in February. Meanwhile, in the science and engineering buildings of the north campus, classes continued. Reactions of white students were mixed. Radicals were supportive, while others, especially in science and engineering, were outraged at the seizure. On the following day a white group took over another building in a show of support for the BPRSC.<sup>24</sup> President Gallagher stated that no police would be called onto the campus, and he announced that representatives of the administration, faculty, and the occupants of the south campus would commence negotiations.<sup>25</sup> He also ordered classes suspended on the north campus, an act

which so incensed those in the engineering school that there was talk of its imminent "secession" from CCNY.<sup>26</sup> Not only was the College closed, it was polarized.<sup>27</sup>

The propriety of closing the College became an issue in the campaign for the upcoming Mayoral primary in which Mayor Lindsay sought renomination. His power base consisted of blacks, Puerto Ricans to a smaller degree, and a good number of Manhattan-based, high-status Jews and Protestants, along with a sprinkling of affluent Catholics. His main rival, New York City Comptroller Mario Procaccino (a CCNY alumnus), attracted a constituency saturated with working-class and lower middle-class Irish, Italians and Jews, residing largely in the boroughs outside of Manhattan.<sup>28</sup> The campaign had one overwhelming issue:

Had Mayor Lindsay done too much for Negroes, and in lesser degree, Puerto Ricans? Could this charge be pinned on him, not directly, but by the fairly unobtrusive messages that political candidates . . . will use: Had he favored Manhattan over Brooklyn and the Bronx, what had he done about crime in the streets, what was his role in the teachers' strike (over school decentralization), and even more directly, had his tenure in office increased racial and ethnic hostility?<sup>29</sup>

In short, did his policies favor poor blacks at the expense of working- and lower middle-class whites?

Responses to the CCNY confrontation paralleled positions on this larger question. Lindsay supported the closing of the College and Gallagher's conciliatory efforts. Others saw the closing as "appeasement." On May 1, Congressman Mario Biaggi, representing a white working-class constituency, and the militant Jewish Defense League ob-

tained "show cause" orders against the College for shutting down. Procaccino won a court order setting May 5 as the date for reopening the campus.<sup>30</sup> In the opposing camp, Congressman Adam Clayton Powell of Harlem urged the insurgents to defy the injunction.<sup>31</sup> But by the early afternoon of May 5th, white radicals departed from the building which they had occupied in support of the BPRSC. In the evening the black and Puerto Rican students left the buildings which they had been holding.<sup>32</sup>

What had been a tense but "orderly" confrontation to this point now became violent and chaotic. With the College open the next day, there were incidents ranging from false fire alarms and class disruptions, to fistfights, assaults, bottle and rock throwing, and mass demonstrations of hundreds of students. While some of the clashes threw minority students against whites, the major eruptions were between conservative and radical white factions, each of which had different views about the reopening of the College and about minority demands. Over the next three days a new pattern emerged: students would arrive for classes, violence would break out, and Gallagher would close the College until the next morning. Between 100-300 police outfitted in riot gear appeared on the campus every day in order to clear buildings. The single event which drew the most attention was the burning on May 8 of the auditorium of the College's main student center.<sup>33</sup> In a sense this may have been the event which settled the eventual

outcome: the then Deputy Chancellor of the University, Seymour H. Hyman (a City College alumnus), reported rushed to the campus after hearing reports of the fire. He was so shaken by the event that at a meeting with Bowker and other staff that night he said, "I was telling people about what I felt when I saw that smoke coming out of that building, and the only question in my mind was, How can we save City College? And the only answer was, Hell, let everybody in."<sup>34</sup>

With the College seemingly in a state of siege, negotiations between Gallagher and the BRPSC were brought to a complete standstill. His efforts to effect an orderly conciliation now a shambles, the President asked to be relieved of his duties immediately. His letter of resignation reflected his sympathy for the demonstrators and his anger at "the intrusion of politically motivated outside forces [which made it] impossible to carry on the processes of reason and persuasion."<sup>35</sup>

On May 12, Joseph Copeland, a CCNY faculty member, who had been a member of Gallagher's negotiating team, was designated by the BHE as Acting President. A new negotiating team was formed and the BPRSC agreed to meet with it if police were removed from the campus. Copeland assented. On May 23rd, the City College Faculty Senate received for approval a document representing the results of the negotiating sessions. It proposed what was, in effect, an ethnically based "dual admissions" plan: 50%

of CCNY's entering class, beginning in Fall 1970, would be drawn from poverty areas or designated ghetto high schools. The other 50% were to be admitted under the traditional competitive criteria (i.e., high school grades and scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test).<sup>36</sup>

Even before the Faculty Senate had the chance to discuss the agreement, public reaction was scathing. All major mayoral candidates vehemently attacked the dual admissions proposal. Procaccino threatened to initiate legal action to prevent implementation of the plan, claiming it was "unfair and discriminatory" and that it would exclude "intelligent, qualified and ambitious students" from CUNY.<sup>37</sup> Bronx Borough President Herman Badillo, a Puerto Rican, claimed that the proposal "would merely constitute an extension of the educational disaster of New York City public schools into the system of higher education, with no benefits to the children involved, whether they be white, black or Puerto Rican."<sup>38</sup> Mayor Lindsay was initially noncommittal, but later asserted that, "If this is a quota system, I am against it."<sup>39</sup> The next day he came out in clear opposition to the agreement, following this with a letter to the Chairman of the BHE in which he stated, "We supply substantial amounts of money to the Board and, therefore, we have a real voice in the use of these monies."<sup>40</sup>

On Monday, June 2nd, the Faculty Senate voted to reject the dual admissions plan. In its place it recommend-

ed the admission of a few hundred additional students from "disadvantaged areas" during the next two semesters. These students were not to take the place of any students who would have qualified for admission under the competitive criteria.<sup>41</sup> But the Senate, in transmitting its recommendation to the BHE, also noted that:

A large disadvantaged segment of the City population, for social, economic and educational reasons, has been unable to receive these benefits [of higher education]. The most equitable way to attain this stated goal is by a system of "open enrollment" financially supported by the City, State, and Federal Governments.<sup>42</sup>

In June Bowker and the BHE again took center stage. Their task was to make a final policy decision on the admissions question. During the month the Board held a number of public sessions designed to elicit opinions from student, faculty, and community groups. Various positions were represented. Some favored the maintenance of the traditional admissions criteria, or at least opposed both the dual admissions plan and the Faculty Senate compromise proposal. Among adherents of this position were the CCNY Alumni Association, the School of Engineering at City College, the Jewish Defense League, and the CCNY Student Senate. A second position supported the CCNY Faculty Senate recommendation. CCNY faculty and the CUNY-wide faculty union were adherents, arguing that only this middle ground between the status quo and the dual admissions formula was "socially meaningful and academically responsible."

A third position advocated the dual admissions plan and was supported by the BPRSC, other CCNY faculty, and the National Lawyers Guild. The Guild argued that the dual admissions system was not a quota system, and that institutions have the responsibility to correct situations where inequality and discrimination exist.<sup>43</sup>

These positions were simply reiterations of prior alternatives, each of which already had generated the unalterable opposition of one group or another. But as the month wore on, the eventual resolution of the crisis began to crystallize. Particularly influential in this process was the powerful New York City Central Labor Council and its head, Harry Van Arsdale.

Central Labor Council representatives argued that the only proper plan was one which would offer a guarantee of admissions to all.<sup>44</sup> The other plans suffered from fatal flaws. The dual admissions scheme had the brand, "quota system," indelibly imprinted on it, thus earning it the unshakeable animosity of white groups, especially Jews. The compromise plan of the CCNY Faculty Senate seemed to minorities to be watered down atrociously. The Open Admissions notion offered something for everyone and seemed to lay to rest the specter that increased representation of some groups would come at the expense of other groups. Both within and outside the University, a consensus began to form around the idea of letting everyone in. Support came from organizations such as the United Federation of

College Teachers, the City College Alumni Association, the CUNY University Senate, and the prestigious Public Education Association.<sup>45</sup> By the end of June, Bowker and his staff had decided that an Open Admissions program was the only viable solution to the impasse over the expansion of access to the University and that the long-range goal of 100 percent admissions targeted for 1975 should be moved up to Fall, 1970. This decision was ratified by the BHE in its historic resolution of July 9, 1969. The proposed Open Admissions plan contained the following provisions:

- (a) It shall offer admission to some University program to all high school graduates of the City.
- (b) It shall provide for remedial and other supportive services for all students requiring them.
- (c) It shall maintain and enhance the standards of academic excellence of the College of the University.
- (d) It shall result in the ethnic integration of the Colleges.
- (e) It shall provide for mobility for students between various programs and units of the University.
- (f) It shall assure that all students who would have been admitted to specific community or senior colleges under the admissions criteria which we have used in the past shall still be so admitted. In increasing educational opportunity for all, attention shall also be paid to retaining the opportunities for students now eligible under present Board policies and practices.<sup>46</sup>

In offering places spread throughout the University to all applicants, the Board went far beyond the demands of the dissident minority students who had been demanding an increase in their representation at City College. Thus,

the resolution provided not only a way out of the conflict over admissions, but a mechanism for a huge expansion of the University. Perhaps the outcome was not so surprising. Bowker, after all, had been pushing for broader access to CUNY almost from his first day as Chancellor. In this light, neither he nor the Board had their backs pressed to the wall by the City College crisis. Indeed, that crisis provided just the opportunity which was needed to create what Bowker had favored for a long time.

Open Admissions was thus the only immediately viable solution to the impasse: no major group in the City opposed the policy on principle. In addition, New York's key politicians, facing re-election, could not afford to stand out against a policy which was depicted as an important social priority, benefitting all segments of their constituencies. Thus, Mayor Lindsay, both by inclination and in terms of his need for strong support from the minority community in his campaign, came down on the side of the new program. Even Governor Rockefeller, although initially opposed, tacitly consented to the BHE's actions.<sup>47</sup>

The Board's resolution still left a major item unresolved: the specification of criteria for allocating students to the various CUNY colleges. In the BHE's 1966 Master Plan the allocation scheme for its 100 percent admissions program was a highly stratified one which would have directed the great majority of newly eligible stu-

dents to a community college or an educational skills center. But given the stormy events of the preceding months, it was not likely that this would have been an acceptable allocation model. The Board had earlier established a University Commission on Admissions, which was charged with the task of developing a set of criteria. This effort was to bring about a renewal of conflict.

The Commission consisted of CUNY faculty, students, administrators and outside civic and alumni groups. Broadly speaking, the body represented three social clusters: (1) Minority group members whose first concern was to increase the representation of minority students in the University; (2) Whites who generally supported the objectives of the minority members over other objectives; (3) Other whites who agreed that ethnic representativeness was an important principle, but who were equally, if not more, concerned with protecting the traditional concept of merit in the admissions process.

The Commission was largely in agreement that a new admissions policy should provide not only for an expansion of access to the senior colleges, but also result in their ethnic integration. "Integration" was defined as a proportion of minority students in the senior college Freshman class equal to that in the community college Freshman class--the Commission was concerned that community colleges not become educational ghettos. However, given the diversity of this body, it was unable to achieve consensus on

senior college admissions criteria. Instead, it presented three plans for the Board's consideration.<sup>48</sup> The first would have admitted the major part of the Freshman class on the basis of rank in the student's own high school. As in the Hundred Scholars Program noted earlier, the use of rank as an admissions criterion promised to increase minority representation, because students in ghetto high schools tended to have lower averages than students of equivalent rank in academically strong (and mostly white) high schools. The remainder of the seats would be reserved for students entering under the SEEK program, with the number to be determined in accordance with the principle of ethnic balance. The second proposal was to admit 60% of the Freshmen on the basis of rank in their high school, and about 15% under the SEEK program. The remaining 25% were to be admitted strictly on the basis of student preference with the proviso that if the number of preferences for a given college exceeded the number of seats available, then those places would be assigned by lottery. The intent of this provision was to increase the chances for admission to a senior college of students from the lower ranks of their graduating classes. The third plan was the only one which attempted to preserve high school average as a factor in the admissions process. It would have reserved places to insure that students previously admitted (under the criteria in force in 1968) would still be so admitted. It also provided for enough seats in the SEEK program to achieve

ethnic balance. Finally, it proposed that the major portion of the Freshman class would be admitted on the basis of high school rank, a provision which in practice might have been impossible to attain if all students admitted under the old standards were still to be accepted.

While all three plans used high school rank and the SEEK program as means for increasing the minority presence in the senior colleges, they differed in their emphases. The third plan went furthest toward preserving the traditional admissions criteria (especially the high school average), and attracted support from whites, especially Jews. The support of minority members of the Commission was strongly directed toward the second plan, since they believed its lottery component would have gone the farthest toward increasing minority representation in the four-year schools, thus minimizing "tracking" into the community colleges.<sup>49</sup>

When the Commission's report was presented to the BHE on October 7, it elicited mainly negative public reaction. The objection was that none of the three proposals provided sufficient weight to the concept of academic merit. For example, under any of the three, a student ranking in the 40th percentile of the class at one of the city's academically elite high schools might have a worse chance of admissions to his or her first choice college than a student ranking in the 20th percentile at a ghetto high school, in spite of the probability that the first

student was academically stronger than the second. On such grounds, The New York Times, the major Jewish organizations, and the mayoral candidates, including John Lindsay (who, at this late stage of the campaign, could ill-afford to support a policy which appeared to favor non-whites at the expense of whites) attacked the report.<sup>50</sup> These objections were echoed in the comments of a host of individuals and groups during two large public hearings held by the Board in October and November.<sup>51</sup> Thus, several months after the CCNY confrontation, the ethnic cleavages over the admissions question still remained--the values of merit and equality of opportunity appeared irreconcilable.

This conflict underscored for Bowker and his staff the need to achieve a compromise which simultaneously recognized the twin criteria of high school rank and high school average. They formulated a plan which appeared responsive to the concerns of the conflicting factions. Simply put, the plan entailed the following: students who graduated from high school with at least an 80 average (in academic, college preparatory courses) or who ranked in the top 50 percent of their high school graduating class were guaranteed a place in a senior college, if that was their preference. All others could enroll in a community college.<sup>52</sup> In short, these twin criteria of rank and average generated two pools of students. The primary function of high school rank was to ease entry to the senior college pool. Once these two pools were established, the

admissions plan was designed to work in the following way: If there were more students who picked a certain college than there were places available at that school, the available seats would go to those with the higher averages. This use of average was designed to preserve the key criterion of the old admissions scheme. Those who were not admitted to their first choice college as a result of this competition would then be put in a pool for their second choice school and the competitive process would begin again, if the demand for places exceeded the supply.<sup>53</sup> Thus, the new criteria broadened eligibility for senior colleges, but they did not guarantee admission to the first choice college.

In addition, the Board authorized an expansion of the SEEK program, so as to further increase the minority presence in senior colleges. Both facets, the admissions model and the SEEK expansion, represented an attempt to accommodate the traditionalist and egalitarian constituencies.

The attempt was successful. Support for the plan was widespread, and it was ratified by the Board in November, just after Lindsay's re-election as Mayor. His approval was forthcoming, as was Rockefeller's somewhat later on.<sup>54</sup> A BHE task force appointed earlier worked to coordinate the detailed planning necessary for the implementation of open admissions.<sup>55</sup> Each college submitted a plan outlining its concept of Open Admissions, and such

plans were modified in a complex and difficult period of negotiations with the task force.<sup>56</sup>

The substance of the Open Admissions policy and the manner in which it was enacted highlight two major points. Firstly, access to public higher education was clearly controversial in 1969. Secondly, several issues emerged as being intrinsically related to admissions considerations in Spring 1969.

Three issues were singularly important. First, the question of who should be educated assumed critical dimensions. If colleges should educate the intellectual elite, what criteria were to be used to select the student-of-merit? Second, what was the responsibility of The City University of New York to serve diverse social groupings in its tax-paying constituency? Why was the government and the people of New York City so interested in maintaining and expanding free public higher education? Third, to what extent should society's resources be invested in public higher education? How were funds acquired for necessary increases in both the capital budget and operating expenses of CUNY? And what was the relationship between the availability of facilities and student access to public higher education?

Additional themes were also integrally related to "the five demands conflict" of 1969. These included, generally, the nature and degree of cooperation or conflict of CCNY with governmental agencies, with private interest

groups and with primary and secondary schools in the City. The organizational relationship of CCNY to other CUNY units and to the Board of Higher Education also assumed major importance. In like manner, the nature and degree of control exerted by officials of CCNY, the BHE and New York City and State governments over the regulation of student admissions to the Colleges also proved critical in 1969.

Finally, the Open Admissions program was enacted in 1969, in the specific way and form that it assumed, as a joint result of the social, political and educational climate in New York in 1969 and the convergence of that unique historical moment with the BHE's overall plan to expand access to public higher education in New York City. It may be suggested that Open Admissions, with its particular allocation plan, could not have occurred at any other point in time.

These, then, are the components critical to an understanding of the 1969 changes in student access.

Three basic questions may now be posed:

1. Did the debate over student admissions emerge only in the late-1960s, or was student access an ongoing controversy from the founding of CCNY in 1847?
2. If student access was indeed historically controversial, and if criteria of student selection were subject to alteration, were the issues which emerged during the five demands conflict of 1969 new issues?

Or, had they previously appeared as critical components in prior considerations of student access? What were the mechanisms of student selection which were used previously?

3. If student access was controversial throughout CCNY's prior existence, were there any themes related to student admissions which did not appear in 1969? If so, what were these elements, and how and when were they resolved?

A consideration of these questions will form the substance of this work.

We will hypothesize that the matter of student access was controversial from the time of the inception of The Free Academy. The issues related to student access were, in fact, intrinsic to the existence of CCNY. We will suggest that the methods used to screen students for admission were subject to periodic change. We will further hypothesize that almost all of the issues which surfaced in 1969 during the Open Admissions controversy had appeared on some prior occasion as key aspects in consideration of student access. Ideological arguments articulated in 1969 thus differed primarily in intensity and style, but not so much in substance, from concerns vocalized in earlier periods. We will also postulate that certain issues related to student access emerged and were resolved prior to 1961.

We will hypothesize that the mechanisms of student

selection used at New York City's municipal colleges have always been linked to continuously changing conceptions of the place and purpose of higher education in American society. We will further postulate that changes in admissions criteria, modifications in curriculum and alterations in the ethnic and class composition of CUNY have always reflected changing conceptions of the American class system and governmental public service. Yet with the notable exception of the Open Admissions issue, we will further hypothesize, changes occurred relatively slowly, in an incremental fashion, and generally, with a minimum of ideological confrontation. The Open Admissions issue was unique, we will suggest, not only because it escalated so rapidly in intensity and involved so many interest groups, but because it represented the convergence of every unresolved admissions issue apparent in the history of The City College of New York.

We will also postulate that beyond pedagogic and ideological considerations, access to the municipal college system was significantly influenced by financial, administrative and "technically-neutral" factors. These types of contingencies and processes effected the need and capacity of the College to maintain or modify existent admissions practices and ultimately, to expand access to free public higher education.

All of these issues will be explored in the chapters that follow. Summaries of findings and conclusions

will also be presented.

The method to be used in this study will be that of a social history, as related to the theoretical and analytic perspectives noted here. The period under investigation will commence in 1847, with the founding of The Free Academy (renamed The City College of New York in 1866). Research will continue through 1961, with the legislative federation of the municipal colleges into The City University of New York.

While we will be concerned with student access to all the colleges sponsored by the City of New York, our investigation will focus primarily on student admissions to The City College of New York. Three factors were involved in this decision. First, CCNY is the oldest of the municipal colleges: it is proper to begin at the beginning. Secondly, of the very few Archives existent within CUNY, City College possesses by far the most exhaustive and accessible collection of records and manuscripts. In this connection, this author wishes to thank Professor Barbara Dunlap, Archivist, CCNY, for providing most generous and unlimited access to the College's holdings, as well as permitting virtually unrestricted Xeroxing of these invaluable documents. Finally, CCNY was the site of the Open Admissions controversy: it is appropriate to examine the development of student access concerns at the College where the debate actually took place in 1969.

While this work will not deal with the issue of

student access to CUNY after 1961, the questions raised in connection with the 1847-1961 period may likewise be posed for the post-1961 period. In particular, admission to college became a highly volatile and major political issue at CUNY, one which was exacerbated by the Colleges' adherence to and defense of their free tuition mandate. An investigation of student access concerns until 1976, when the 129-year tradition of free public higher education in New York City was ended, is much needed and will be the subject of a future endeavor.

To the extent that access was problematic, it was the primary concern of a growing and increasingly complex educational bureaucracy. Accordingly, we have examined, on a year-by-year basis, the only continuing organizational record of that institution: the Minutes of the CCNY Board of Trustees and those of the New York Board of Higher Education. This work thus admittedly reflects the perspectives and the biases articulated by and embodied in the work of the governing agency of The City College of New York.

Other types of documents were critical to the documentation of the diverse influences on access to New York City's colleges. Thus, Federal, State and City laws, as well as BHE Bylaws, have been used and incorporated into the body of this text, as applicable. The papers of CCNY's chief executive officers have also been utilized extensively to document the execution and administration

of admissions policies. The CCNY Archives contain manuscript collections for the following Presidents: Frederick B. Robinson, Nelson P. Mead, Harry N. Wright, Buell G. Gallagher, Harry N. Rivlin and Joseph J. Copeland. These documents have been meticulously examined, classified and analyzed and selectively incorporated into this work.

CCNY Bulletins and Directories, records of the Office of the Registrar and Alumnus Magazine articles have also been systematically scrutinized and analyzed.

In addition, Hunter College Minutes of the Board of Trustees and Brooklyn College Bulletins have been examined.

Special reports prepared for and/or issued by the Board of Higher Education have been reviewed in detail and used here, as appropriate. Finally, secondary source material have been utilized when available and when advisable.

<sup>1</sup>David E. Lavin and Florence M. Neumann, "Reaction to Confrontation: Let Everyone In," in David E. Lavin, Richard D. Alba, and Richard D. Silberstein, Right Versus Privilege: The Open Admissions Experiment at The City University of New York (New York: The Free Press, 1981), pp. 1-27.

<sup>2</sup>The creation of the different City University units is documented in Duncan B. Pardue and Suzanne P. Ryder, A Forty-Six Year Summary of the Board of Higher Education of The City of New York (New York: Board of Higher Education, December 1973). See especially Appendix A, "Chronology of CUNY."

<sup>3</sup>The Board of Higher Education of The City of New York, Second Interim Revision of the 1964 Master Plan for the City University of New York (New York: BHE, June 1966), Chapters 6 and 7, pp. 54-67.

<sup>4</sup>Material presented here is essentially extracted from Lavin and Neumann.

<sup>5</sup>BHE, 1966 Master Plan, pp. 54-67.

<sup>6</sup>W. E. B. DuBois Club of City College, "End Racism at CCNY," The Campus (CCNY), 14 November 1968, p. 8.

<sup>7</sup>Buell G. Gallagher, "Reply to Petition," 26 November 1968, City College Archives, Morris R. Cohen Library, The City College of New York, Presidential Files, 5.12, Correspondence 1968-1969. To be designated here as CC Files, drawer number, file name.

<sup>8</sup>"Blacks and Puerto Ricans Demand That BGG End Racism at College," Observation Post (CCNY), 7 February 1969, pp. 1,3.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Jonathan Penzer, "BPR Seize Building After Seeing BGG," Observation Post, 14 February 1969, pp. 1,3.

<sup>11</sup>Jonathan Penzer, "Third World Students Awakening," Observation Post, 7 February 1969, p. 1.

<sup>12</sup>Marc Beallor, "Anti-Racist Slate at CCNY," Daily World, 7 February 1969.

<sup>13</sup>Howard Reis, "Albert Vasquez Defeats Henry Arce," Observation Post, 7 March 1969, p. 1.

<sup>14</sup>The engineering and natural science departments were physically clustered in the north section of the campus, while humanities and social sciences clustered in the south portion. Because balloting took place on both north and south campus, voting results could be separately tabulated.

<sup>15</sup>Sheila C. Gordon, "The Transformation of The City University of New York, 1945-1970." (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1975), p. 215.

<sup>16</sup>Black and Puerto Rican Student Coalition, "Press Release," 6 March 1969, BHE Archives, 1969 Documents Collection.

<sup>17</sup>John Kifner, "13,000 Students Fight City University Cuts," The New York Times, 19 March 1969.

<sup>18</sup>Nelson A. Rockefeller, "A Letter From the Governor to the Students of New York City," 18 March 1969, BHE Archives, 1969 Documents Collection.

<sup>19</sup>Gordon, p. 215.

<sup>20</sup>Buell G. Gallagher to Porter Chandler, Chairman, and members of the Board of Higher Education, 31 March 1969, BHE Archives, 1969 Documents Collection.

<sup>21</sup>Observation Post, 18 April 1969.

<sup>22</sup>The Campus, 22 April 1969.

<sup>23</sup>Tom Ackerman, "The South Campus Seizure," Alumnus Magazine, vol. 65, no. 1, October 1969, p. 16.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., pp. 13-15.

<sup>25</sup>Gallagher's decision not to call in police to open the campus was determined in part by an incident which occurred earlier in the academic year. In November 1968, radical left white groups had provided "sanctuary" for an AWOL soldier protesting the war in Vietnam. After a week, without consulting students or faculty, the President called in the police, resulting in the midnight arrest of 171 students. Many faculty and students were incensed by the incident, and their reactions undoubtedly had a constraining effect when the south campus seizure occurred.

<sup>26</sup>Ackerman, p. 16; Faculty of the School of Engineering, "Resolution and Advisory Deploring The Closing of the Entire College," 29 April 1969, BHE Archives, 1969 Documents Collection.

<sup>27</sup>The faculty voted to support the closing after lengthy debate which revealed a sharp split between tenured and non-tenured faculty. The former wanted the College reopened, while the latter supported the closing. See Ackerman, p. 17 and The New York Times, 28 April 1969.

About six days after the seizure, Bowker won a commitment from Lindsay for additional funding, and he withdrew his threat of "no freshman class." But by this time, the confrontation had acquired its own momentum.

<sup>28</sup>These political alliances are described in Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1963), pp. xxvi-xxviii.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., pp. xxviii-xxix.

<sup>30</sup>Karen Dewitt and William Greaves, "Court Orders CCNY Reopened," New York Post, 2 May 1969.

<sup>31</sup>Gordon, p. 217.

<sup>32</sup>Ackerman, p. 21; The New York Times, 5 May 1969.

<sup>33</sup>The New York Times, 8 May 1969.

<sup>34</sup>Martin Mayer, "Higher Education for All?" Commentary, February 1973, p. 40.

<sup>35</sup>The New York Times, 10 May 1969

<sup>36</sup>The New York Times, 23, 24 May 1969; The Board of Higher Education of The City of New York, Minutes of the Proceedings, 30 June 1969, no. 1, p. 1979, "Attachment F." To be designated here as BHE, Minutes.

<sup>37</sup>Joseph McNamara, "Proc Blasts CCNY Pact, Will Fight It in the Courts," Daily News, 26 May 1969; Sylvan Fox, "Candidates Score Dual Admissions for City College," The New York Times, 26 May 1969.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid; Arthur Greenspan, "CCNY's in the Campaign Now," New York Post, 26 May 1969.

<sup>40</sup>Murray Schumach, "Lindsay Attacks Dual Admissions for City College," The New York Times, 28 May 1969; Stephen Elliot and Joseph McNamara, "Lindsay Raps CCNY Plan, Notes City Pays the Bills," Daily News, 28 May 1969.

<sup>41</sup>Sylvan Fox, "Faculty Rejects CCNY Dual Plan," The New York Times, 30 May 1969; Sylvan Fox, "400 From Slums Urged for CCNY," The New York Times, 2 June 1969.

<sup>42</sup>Faculty Senate of CCNY, "Text of the Negotiated Agreement on Admissions Policy as Revised by the City College Faculty Senate," June 1969, p. 1, BHE Archives, 1969 Documents Collection.

<sup>43</sup>The major positions and their supporters were recorded in "scratch notes" of the BHE sessions by BHE staff members for the sessions of June 10, 16, and 18, 1969, BHE Archives, 1969 Documents Collection.

<sup>44</sup>"Scratch notes" for the BHE Executive Session, 16 June 1969, BHE Archives, 1969 Documents Collection.

<sup>45</sup>"Scratch notes"; Gordon, pp. 223-224.

<sup>46</sup>BHE, Minutes, 9 July 1969, no. 1, pp. 185-189, Statement of Policy, item 4, "Admissions Policy."

<sup>47</sup>Gordon, pp. 227-229.

<sup>48</sup>University Commission on Admissions, Report and Recommendations to the Board of Higher Education, 7 October 1969.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 62. Minority members of the Commission were disturbed about the possible overrepresentation of minority students in community colleges, which they considered inferior.

<sup>50</sup>Gordon, pp. 235-236.

<sup>51</sup>Board of Higher Education, "Summary of Public Hearings Before the Board of Higher Education on the Report of the Commission on Admissions," 22 October 1969 and 5 November 1969, BHE Archives, 1969 Documents Collection.

<sup>52</sup>BHE, Minutes, 12 November 1969, no. 1, pp. 285-289, Statement of Admissions Policy Adopted by the BHE November 10, 1969.

<sup>53</sup>On their applications, students were asked to list six CUNY colleges in order of preference. Some students whose first choice was a senior college nevertheless were allocated to a community college. This would happen if the student's high school average was not high enough to

place him or her in that senior college, and the student had listed a community college as the second choice.

<sup>54</sup>City of New York, Office of the Mayor to the Governor, State of New York, 1 December 1969; Executive Chamber, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, "Statement," 2 December 1969, BHE Archives, 1969 Documents Collection.

<sup>55</sup>This task force was created on September 23, 1969.

<sup>56</sup>The task force issued a progress report within ten weeks after formation. See BHE, Progress Report: September 25-December 5, 1969, December 1969; M. S. Handler, "City U. Open-Enrollment Plan Ready," The New York Times, 28 December 1969.

## CHAPTER II

### THE FIRST FIFTY YEARS: CCNY, 1847-1896

#### A. The Free Academy

The transformation of The City University of New York in the late 1960s to a college pursuing an open access admissions policy occurred rapidly and in the context of local strife. It was, perhaps, the most significant single episode in the history of the College. Yet, admissions standards at the municipal colleges had always been subject to change. Prior changes had emerged, to a large measure, from CCNY's desire to cater to a constituency of those who supported its existence, the residents of the City of New York. As admissions procedures were developed and formalized, the theme of providing educational benefits to this constituency was continuously evoked and advanced. The institutional goal of service to the public was repeatedly articulated and offered as a rationale for the modification of access criteria.

##### 1. Establishment and Governance

The municipal college system began when the citizens of New York voted overwhelmingly to establish a free academy.<sup>1</sup> Under Chapter 206 of the Laws of 1847, funding was to be supplied from the Literature Fund, a state

organ which appropriated sums to academies and other private secondary schools.<sup>2</sup> At formal opening ceremonies in 1849, the Principal of the new tuition-free institution, Dr. Horace Webster, set forth its challenge:

The Free Academy is now to go into operation. The experiment is to be tried, whether the highest education can be given to the masses; whether the children of the whole people can be educated; and whether an institution of learning, of the highest grade, can be successfully controlled by the popular will, not by the privileged few, but by the privileged many.<sup>3</sup>

From the time of its establishment until the turn of the century, the College was governed by the Board of Education of New York City. In May 1866, following the renaming of The Free Academy to The College of the City of New York, the members of the Board of Education became, ex-officio, the Trustees of the College. The actual management of the College's affairs was given to a group known as the Executive Committee for the Care, Government and Management of the College.<sup>4</sup> In May 1900, the New York State Legislature created a separate Board of Trustees which was to be appointed by the Mayor. On April 16, 1926, pursuant to Article 44-A of the Laws of New York, a Board of Higher Education (BHE) was created. The CCNY Board of Trustees continued to function independently until Spring 1929.<sup>5</sup>

## 2. Admissions Policy: Early Provisions

Original admission requirements of The Free Academy set a minimal age limitation of 12 years, attendance

for at least one year in the City's common schools and passage of an entrance examination in seven areas.<sup>6</sup> United States citizenship and residence within New York City were ongoing requisites for admission to the College.<sup>7</sup> Admission was restricted to boys and was offered twice a year; by January 1852, admission was offered only in June.<sup>8</sup> Of the 272 applicants to the first class, 143 passed the exam and were admitted in January 1849 to a five-year course. In July 1849, 59 out of 136 were admitted.<sup>9</sup>

Admissions standards were modified already within the first decade of existence. These minor fluctuations, undoubtedly the result of organizational experimentation, are shown in table 1.

### 3. Key Themes: Student Merit and Space

Several themes which were to exert an ongoing influence on admissions policy surfaced in the ante-bellum period. First, the issue of student merit was paramount from the time of the founding of the school. Thus, within 3-1/2 years, two additional areas of examination were introduced. Second, the space issue was critical from the outset. As early as 1852, a provision was introduced into the Bylaws stipulating that "if the number qualified for admission shall be more than can be admitted, the preference shall be given to those who have attended the Common Schools the greatest period."<sup>11</sup> Hence, even early Free Academy Boards, when confronted with space problems,

TABLE 1

FREE ACADEMY ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS<sup>10</sup>

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Attendance in<br/>Common Schools</u> | <u>No. Areas<br/>in Exam</u> | <u>Minimum<br/>Age</u> |
|-------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1-28-1850   | 12 months                               | 7 areas*                     | 12 years               |
| 1-22-1851   | 12 months                               | 7 areas                      | 12 years               |
| 1-21-1852   | 18 months                               | 8 areas <sup>+</sup>         |                        |
| 7-7-1852    | 18 months                               | 9 areas <sup>#</sup>         | 13 years               |
| 1-12-1853   | 18 months                               | 9 areas                      | 13 years               |
| 7-20-1853   | 18 months                               | 9 areas                      | 13 years               |
| 12-30-1853  | 18 months                               | 9 areas                      | 13 years               |
|             | NOT AVAILABLE                           |                              |                        |
| 7-1856      | 12 months                               | 9 areas                      | 13 years               |
| 7-1857      | 12 months                               | 11 areas <sup>++</sup>       | 14 years               |
| 7-1858      | 12 months                               | 10 areas <sup>##</sup>       | 14 years               |
| 7-1859      | 12 months                               | 10 areas                     | 14 years               |

\*Spelling, Reading, Writing, English Grammar, Georgraphy, Arithmetic, History of the United States.

<sup>+</sup>Algebra, as far as Simple Equations. Added.

<sup>#</sup>Elementary Book-keeping. Added.

<sup>++</sup>Plane Geometry, The Constitution of the United States. Added.

<sup>##</sup>Plane Geometry. Withdrawn.

screened applicants and utilized different types of academic standards in order to curtail enrollments.

A reliance on standardized tests and attendance in the formal educational system was to continue to regulate access to New York's municipal colleges up to the advent of Open Admissions. The process of publicizing and routinizing these criteria was begun immediately. Bibliographies were published covering all areas of study, by textbook title, with the implication that those admitted to the institution would be able to present a "good exam" up to the level of difficulty of Free Academy texts.<sup>12</sup> Additionally, candidates were required to present certificates signed by a Principal of a Common School, indicating their age and the length and dates of their attendance in the school.<sup>13</sup> These procedures, in all probability, were common among similar collegiate institutions attempting to establish and maintain high quality education when faced with space problems.

#### 4. Key Themes: The CCNY "Mission"

The profile of admissions criteria to the City College might have been radically different had merit and space been the only criteria emphasized by the CCNY Board of Trustees. In addition, however, a unique and multi-dimensional sense of purpose, a "mission," articulated from the College's very founding, was recalled throughout the history of the institution. Attempts to perform this

mission were to continuously influence the issue of access to CCNY. The mission was of a dual nature and from the outset, was intrinsically replete with contradictions.

a) High-Quality Education

One aspect of The Free Academy's raison d'être depicted the institution as primarily being available for those who wished "to acquire knowledge," a quality education.<sup>14</sup> Early governing committees, influenced by the Yale Report of 1828, wished the school to supply "an education inferior to none."<sup>15</sup> By the end of 1854, The Free Academy had been granted the authority to award Bachelors degrees.<sup>16</sup> The institutional requirement of offering a high-caliber, fully accredited education was to exert a strong influence on the College's admissions policies throughout its history.<sup>17</sup>

b) Service to the Public

The second part of the College's mission arose out of the school's obligation to New York City. Dependence upon the public and the public treasury resulted in a compound notion of duty to all the City's people. Attending to the public resulted in two distinct, yet interlocked, components: (1) emphasis on a curriculum deemed sound, practical and lucrative; and (2) serving all social classes, particularly the working classes of the City of New York. Both aspects of providing for the public influenced access criteria throughout CCNY's history. Sometimes, however,

they seemed to conflict with the idea of quality education.

(1) A Practical Curriculum

The Free Academy's curricular goals, from the outset, were ambitious and intricate. In addition to providing quality classical and scientific training, the institution was to function as a "Polytechnic School . . . organized to educate the pupils practically, and particularly qualify them to apply their learning to advance and perfect the operations of the various trades and occupations in which they may engage."<sup>18</sup> Students could opt for the "ancient" classical course, the "modern" scientific course, or a "partial" course. Classes were offered which would "have more especial reference to the active duties of the operative life" in order to enable young men "to seek the means of subsistence in productive occupations."<sup>19</sup>

Yet the College's ongoing determination to simultaneously offer high quality classical education while meeting the needs of the tax-paying, primarily working class public generated continuous controversy. In Fall 1866, possibly as an outgrowth of the passage of the Morrill Act, a Committee on Polytechnic Course recommended the formal establishment of a 2-year commercial course; a 3-year course in manufacturing, mechanical arts, engineering and agriculture, a 4-year course in civil and military engineering, art and architecture; and a 5-year course in mining engineering.<sup>20</sup>

The General Faculty of the College, however, adhered to the traditional concept of higher education. The Committee's report was rejected on the grounds that such programs suited the interests of private enterprise, but not those of the general public. Thus, although the College "emanated from the people and was supported through their munificence,"

it [did] not follow, because circumstances [had] changed, that everything which was once considered correct and good should be turned inside out to suit the requirements of the times.

In this respect we must not allow ourselves to be deceived.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, a quandary appeared within the first decade of CCNY's existence not to be "the football of every passing theorist" and yet, to "answer well-considered demands."<sup>22</sup> The struggle to achieve a balance between these goals, despite space and financial considerations, was to continue throughout the history of the institution. In the case cited here, the College's curriculum was not altered or expanded despite deficiencies in practical education in the New York area, and in spite of efforts of the more progressive members of the City College faculty. The 1866 decision, however, did not serve as a precedent for further debates related to curricular modifications. Each controversy was to appear and to be resolved on an ad hoc basis, dependent upon the pedagogic, economic, social and historic conditions of the moment.

## (2) Service to All Classes

The second consequence of the public nature of CCNY was its determination to serve all social classes of the City. Enmeshed within these early debates over curriculum was the Academy's resolution "to meet the needs of all classes," especially the needs of those with "slender resources who contribute their full share in supporting the burden of organized society."<sup>23</sup> The theme of "serving the public" was met structurally and normatively.

(a) Structural Components. Accommodations to New York's lower and middle classes were evidenced in the inclusion of some commercial subjects in the Introductory and Freshman years. Though a much-debated feature of CCNY's curriculum, rudimentary vocational training endured and was utilized advantageously by many students. An estimated 60% of those who left during the Academy's first decades after one or two years of study entered "some trade or business."<sup>24</sup>

Working class students were also drawn to the Academy by its emphasis on the Introductory, Sub-Freshman class. This pre-college class, which constituted nearly 50% of the school's enrollment, "afforded opportunity to youth otherwise turned into the streets."<sup>25</sup> In attempting to "benefit the whole community, with no regard to wealth, social rank or religious persuasion," administrators did not regard in a negative light the overwhelming proportion of drop-outs from the Introductory class.<sup>26</sup> In a retro-

spective of the College's first 50 years, Richard Bowker stated,

The decrease in numbers is an essential feature of the relations of the college to the community, and suggests how many boys come to it for such collegiate education as they can get, and drop out necessarily to take their places in the work-a-day world.<sup>27</sup>

Thus, financial economy and efficiency were evaluated in the 19th century not in terms of the number who graduated from CCNY, but rather in terms of the number of students who had passed through her doors.<sup>28</sup>

(b) Normative Themes. The College "served the public" normatively as an agency fostering the attainment of "manhood and citizenship."<sup>29</sup> This was evidenced in several ways. Unlike many other colleges which stressed Greek and Latin, "English was the language most emphasized in The Free Academy."<sup>30</sup> Given the minimal formal education of most 19th century CCNY students, a major function assumed by the College was the teaching of the "language of the land" to the children of immigrants. In addition, CCNY's first two Presidents were military men: "The College adopted West Point traditions of strict discipline."<sup>31</sup> Obedience to authority and respect for government institutions were inculcated into the students through their incorporation into mandatory courses in military instruction. Finally, courses in American History and Government, the Constitution and Moral Philosophy, present in the curriculum at the Introductory level, were further designed to acculturate those who would leave the school to enter "the

department of business." The net effect of this "service" to the public was the implementation of the ideals of "liberal democracy," which, as noted by Sherry Gorelick, advanced formal equalities while not substantially undermining substantive inequalities.<sup>32</sup>

Throughout its first three decades, CCNY, adhering to the procedures noted here, sought to better the conditions of all of its students, though strictly within the boundaries of their own social and economic class. We may suggest that students enrolled in the ancient curriculum were drawn, in the main, from the upper and upper middle classes. Many of these students later pursued professional careers in law, medicine and the clergy. In like manner, we may hypothesize that the modern course was elected primarily by students from the working classes. The smallness of CCNY in its early years served to foster that close contact between these groups which did not exist "beyond the ivory tower." The College thus served to harmonize differences between these social classes. The key advantage of CCNY

. . . in placing the rich man's son by the side of the poor man's son [was] letting each learn, by actual contact, that they are both to be respected, either for brains or assiduity, or for honesty of heart.<sup>33</sup>

Intellectual and economic advancement were thus clear goals; but crossing social class lines was definitely not.

In summation, access to free public higher education in New York City was conditioned by considerations of the academic merit of the students and the availability of

space. A complex, dual "mission," the seeds of which were planted during the College's first 25 years, began to emerge and would exert an ongoing influence on CCNY's admission standards. Two principles which were emphasized simultaneously were quality, traditional studies and service to the masses of the people of the City of New York. Service to the people was evidenced in the curriculum offered at CCNY and by attending to the needs of the working classes.

## B. Higher Education and Elementary Education in New York

### 1. Introduction

As noted above, CCNY, from its inception, was managed by the New York City Board of Education. This fact was singularly influential in determining the College's position vis à vis other educational institutions within the City. The connection between the public schools and The Free Academy was manifested in several ways. The College saw itself in a position of providing academic leadership for the school system. Free Academy faculty, for instance, viewed the College's courses as providing the common standard for the curriculum of city elementary schools.<sup>34</sup> CCNY faculty assisted in the 1866 restructuring of evening schools and President Webb was instrumental in the 1873 reorganization of New York's common schools.<sup>35</sup>

The College also viewed the entire public educational system of New York as a continuum, one system,

with the Introductory class of CCNY assuming great significance. The Sub-Freshman class was regarded as the critical link in bridging primary and grammar school education to the program offered by the College. This one year of study, which was later extended to a two and then to a three year program, became the structural link between the ward schools and the four collegiate years.

## 2. The Normal College for Women

### a) Establishment

One of the most important tasks assumed by New York City's Board of Education was that of preparing young people to teach in the City's elementary schools. This goal gave rise to the creation of The Normal College for Women in 1869. Renamed Hunter College in 1914, the institution was to supply until the 20th century the bulk of New York City's school teachers. Hunter College was to provide separate but equal higher education for the young women of New York, with admissions requirements and course instruction equal in difficulty and quality to that offered by The City College of New York.<sup>36</sup>

### b) Admissions Requirements: The Merit and Space Issues

In July 1851, merely four years after the creation of The Free Academy had been approved by the State government, the Board of Education was authorized "to organize a similar institution for females."<sup>37</sup> In 1864, the Manual

of the Board of Education, as approved by the New York State Legislature, contained a similar provision.<sup>38</sup> The Normal College admitted in February 1870 its first class of "pupil-teachers" based on "the results of a competitive written exam." The Trustees rejected a proposal to admit students on the basis of "written statements of their [grammar] school teachers."

Such a course might degenerate into pro rata admissions [as in Philadelphia) which must inevitably lower the standard of scholarship. Ere long there would be general discontent and charges of partiality. All things considered, it was best that rich and poor, high and low, should be placed upon a common platform and subjected to the same conditions and regulations. In a competitive written exam alone can uniform justice be secured for every individual candidate.<sup>39</sup>

Admissions regulations to the Normal College almost duplicated those enforced at The City College. Requirements included a minimum age of 14 years, legal residence within New York City, attendance in the City's public schools for at least one year and at least a 70% average in eight entrance exams.<sup>40</sup> Thus, from its inception, student merit was stressed as a pre-requisite for admission to Hunter College.

The College also experienced space problems within the first decade of its existence. With the annexation by New York City of the three Westchester townships west of the Bronx River in January 1874, concern was voiced by Board members that the College will "in a few years, be too far downtown."<sup>41</sup> In 1877, in a specific action to reduce "the evil of overcrowding," the Normal College

"raised the standard of admission from 70 to 80 per centum." An examination in Drawing was also added to other requirements for admission.<sup>42</sup>

The space problem was thus multi-faceted. Not only was the availability of sufficient facilities a key concern, but also, the geographic centrality of the College, and its accessibility to its prospective student constituency was, and would remain, a critical issue throughout the existence of the municipal college system.

c) The Hunter College "Mission"

The establishment of Hunter College buttressed and even amplified the *raison d'être*, the "mission," of CCNY. Both the Board of Education and President Thomas Hunter viewed the Normal College as supplying the same indispensable services for women as CCNY did for men. Traditional education for women would create a "similarity of intellectual culture" which would foster between the sexes "harmony of feeling, mutual respect and lasting happiness." A general practical training "will soon enable women to compete with men in almost every arena."<sup>43</sup> Thus, CCNY's conception of and rationale for its diverse curricular offerings was likewise articulated by Hunter College leaders.

It was the education of women, however, which was regarded as a particular obligation of the City to the taxpayers.

I have regarded as essential the proper education, disciplining and cultivation of the female mind. Women's influence on civilized society, who can too highly appreciate it? Woman, the natural teacher, how could we carry on our work of public instruction without her?<sup>44</sup>

Thus, as noted by the President of the Board of Education, more than 90% of the teachers in New York's public schools in the post-Civil War era were women.<sup>45</sup> If anything, a college for women provided a greater service to the citizens of the City than did even CCNY.

Normal instruction is a matter of prime necessity; and the higher education of women is the unquestionable right of the people. Parents who pay taxes to establish schools for children have the undoubted right to demand that these children shall be taught by trained and competent teachers.<sup>46</sup>

The rights of parents to expect their children to be taught by competent teachers would only be met by the training of women teachers.

The advantages to the public which education secures can not be too highly appreciated. If a republican government is, as we believe, the best, let us not forget that it can be neither beneficial nor lasting unless it rests upon a basis of educated electors.<sup>47</sup>

Thus, while even educated women would not be granted the right to vote until 1920, they could and did render an invaluable service to the City by teaching the future electorate.

The connection between New York's elementary and higher educational units, all under the aegis of the Board of Education, was thus evidenced in several ways. The Colleges provided a standard of instruction for the common schools, supplied the structural link (in the Sub-Freshman

courses) between grammar and collegiate classes, and trained teachers for the public school system.<sup>48</sup>

### 3. The Attendance Pre-requisite

Control of all public instruction by the Board of Education resulted in the CCNY stipulation that attendance for one year in the City's common schools be a condition for entry. This pre-requisite was an indication that the College was regarded as an integral part of the entire municipal school system.<sup>49</sup> Some 30 years after The Free Academy opened its doors, this requirement for admission became the focus of an extensive debate. The ensuing dissolution of this pre-condition represented the earliest substantive alteration in admissions procedures to The City College of New York.

#### C. The "Open College" Measure

##### 1. Introduction

In his Inaugural Address to the Board of Trustees in 1878, Chairman William Wood advised dropping the one year pre-requisite of common school attendance. This would help diminish the College's drop-out rate by permitting upper class boys, who now were excluded from CCNY because they had not attended public schools, to attend the College.<sup>50</sup> Within a few weeks, the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees was enmeshed in a debate over the State Assembly bill "to open the College to all male per-

sons who shall pass preliminary examinations for admission therein." The controversy came to a head on March 15, 1878, after prolonged discussion, when the Executive Committee voted 5 to 4 to recommend to the Board of Trustees adoption of the contested motion.<sup>51</sup>

## 2. The Executive Committee Debate

The points articulated by the Board of Trustees' Executive Committee were manifold. In general, however, two basic themes emerged as being of paramount concern. These were the nature of the relationship between CCNY and the City's common schools and the relationship between private interests and public services.

In 1857, in a statement supporting the continued existence of The Free Academy, the President of the Board of Education had urged that the school be opened to all residents of proper qualification, regardless of where they may have been previously educated. Opening the Academy would lead the institution into "a new and more vigorous existence." The public college would be open to all competent students until the school was so overcrowded "as to require regulations of exclusions, by reason of lack of accommodation."<sup>52</sup> In fact, almost all quantitative, incremental modifications in admissions requirements at CCNY would be the direct result of a lack of sufficient facilities.

Proponents of the "Open College" measure argued

that the attendance requirement had been initially imposed in order to popularize the common schools. Now that this objective had been attained, the stipulation should be removed. Opponents argued that the College was "an integral part of the common school system," and its "existence and maintenance [was] defended by many on that sole ground." A new "Open College" would "render the connection between the College and other parts of the system less intimate."

Supporters maintained that even if boys do attend private school, that does not mean that they "surrender their rights to the benefits of the institutions for the support of which they [and their parents] are taxed." Moreover, parents may have sent their boys to private schools because they were in an affluent position, or because of the "delicate health of the children." They should not be denied the resource of public education should they "meet with reverses of fortune [or if] the children be restored to health and vigor."<sup>53</sup>

Those opposing an "Open College" asserted that the issue had not manifested itself as a popular demand, but rather, to serve the interests of a few. There was no reason why the Board of Trustees should change the admissions requirements for the benefit of private institutions.

Additionally, the history of many collegiate institutions had shown "that while originally designed for all and for free instruction, they have been appropriated

almost exclusively by the rich." The City of New York should fight the "tendency to appropriate what is common and meant for all, to the use and benefit of the few."

Other points were made by each side of the debate in order to buttress their arguments. Thus, protagonists urged admission to the College solely on the basis of competence, noting that a "closed" College was "greatly at variance with the general spirit of liberality that pervades public education." A better quality and expanded student body would ultimately result in a "larger number of students in the graduating class."

Opponents of the measure cited prior Board efforts to prevent such legislation from passage.<sup>54</sup> A move to open the College, they argued, would establish a precedent for the Legislature to abolish or materially modify the College "without a sanction less solemn and less binding than that which created the institution, namely, the direct vote of the people." The Free Academy may even have not been sponsored in 1847 by New York's residents "if such a proposition had been submitted to them."

A final point was made by opponents of the measure. At the present time, the College was "free from sectarian influences." Opening the College would make CCNY students vulnerable to a "spirit of rivalry, especially religious rivalry," and would foster "tendencies to establish caste" within the student body. "Invidious comparisons and distinctions would be made" which "might lower the morale"

of the entire school.

### 3. Chapter 143, Laws of 1882

Shortly after the major debate in the Executive Committee, the Board of Trustees, on March 19, 1878, voted 10 to 9 in favor of recommending to the Legislature the change of admissions requirements to that of the passing of an entrance exam, without requiring the one-year's attendance.<sup>55</sup> A bill to provide for the requested modification was then rapidly introduced into the State Legislature and adopted on May 1, 1878 without a dissenting vote. The Legislature, however, adjourned prior to Senate action on the matter. Despite renewed agitation in Albany to abolish the College, the bill "to open the College of the City of New York to all male persons who shall pass the preliminary examinations for admissions therein" was re-introduced, quickly passed and signed into law as Chapter 143 on May 11, 1882.<sup>56</sup>

The Board of Trustees moved quickly to amend CCNY's Bylaws "so as to make them conformable" to the "Open College" law.<sup>57</sup> In expectation of an increase in the number admitted to the College, a resolution was also passed "to furnish additional accommodations as may be required" for the new students. Simultaneously, new admissions were to be restricted to available space until these new quarters became usable.<sup>58</sup>

By the Fall of 1882, CCNY required for admission

to its Sub-Freshman class a minimum age of 14 years and a "good exam" in eight areas. Candidates were notified by public advertisement and invitation of the examination, which was given in June. The eight-week probation period, designed to foster "the early elimination of undesirable material," remained in effect.<sup>59</sup> In addition, applicants would be received "into any of the four higher classes upon passing the same examination as that passed by those students of the College composing the class to which the applicants seek admission."<sup>60</sup> Statistics available for both CCNY and Hunter College admissions in the 1880s indicate that less than 3% of those accepted came from private schools. Hunter College officials thus observed that "the private school candidates were poorly prepared."<sup>61</sup>

#### D. CCNY Adjustment: The 1880s and the 1890s

##### 1. Introduction

Admission to CCNY continued to be determined by student merit and the availability of facilities. Additionally, normative considerations and historic circumstance effected the expansion and re-formulation of the institution's mission. This continuously evolving composite of institutional goals would increasingly influence access to the College.

##### 2. The Merit Issue

The 1880s saw the imposition of more stringent

tests for admission to the College's Sub-Freshman class. In the 1870s, qualifications for acceptance to CCNY were less than those required at the Normal College. Coordination between the two public institutions of higher education ensued when, as a result of public complaints, the severity of CCNY tests was increased.<sup>62</sup> Additionally, proficiency in English and Mathematics continued to be required regardless of standing in other areas, and 68% became the passing grade on admissions tests.<sup>63</sup> Those receiving grades between 65% and 68% were permitted to take a second exam. By Fall 1882, the passing grade had been raised to 75%.<sup>64</sup>

It also appears that in the mid-1880s, students were still required to present evidence of attendance in the common schools in order to qualify for the admissions examination.<sup>65</sup> Thus, CCNY admissions requirements drew simultaneously on the two dominant college admissions orientations prevalent in the United States in the late 19th century: graduation from accredited schools and standardized admissions examinations. Accreditation and certification of schools had been instituted in Michigan in 1870 and was well established throughout the Mid-Western states.<sup>66</sup> The second criterion, the testing of individual students, was favored and promoted in the Mid-Atlantic region.<sup>67</sup>

The 1880s also saw the re-emergence, in Board of Trustee Reports to the State Board of Regents, of incredi-

bly detailed textbook listings, for each topic area which was required for admission to the College. Prespective students were held responsible for material covered in these bibliographies.<sup>68</sup> These listings were probably prepared to enable the College to receive full accreditation in the newly-formed Middle State Association of Colleges. They also served, however, to equalize the educational backgrounds of incoming students and to standardize curriculum in the emerging city high schools.

Finally, the 1880s and 1890s saw systematic reviews of scores attained on admissions tests. In 1882, for instance, the marks of some 30 applicants to CCNY were upgraded from 70% to 75%, enabling them to be admitted to the Sub-Freshman class.<sup>69</sup> In 1892, however, a review of test results revealed that over 30% of the 1891 applicants received scores under 50% in English grammar, and 20% received less than 50% in Arithmetic.<sup>70</sup> The Sub-Committee on Exams was thus able to assert that "no candidate who was qualified was intentionally rejected." "Correct English [could] hardly be expected from pupils of foreign birth and unfavorable surroundings."<sup>71</sup>

Thus, in the face of the Eastern European mass immigrations and increased demand for access to public higher education, CCNY adhered to its policy of admitting only the academically qualified.<sup>72</sup>

### 3. The Space Issue

In the late-1800s, despite the construction of new accommodations in the 1870s, the lack of accommodations exerted an increasingly powerful influence on the size of the incoming classes of the municipal colleges.<sup>73</sup> By 1882, Hunter College was compelled to raise the required score on entrance exams from 75% to 85% in order to alleviate vast overcrowding.<sup>74</sup> Admissions scores at Hunter College continued to rise: by 1886, acceptance was restricted to a maximum of 600 new students.<sup>75</sup>

At City College, a detailed accounting was conducted in March 1884 to determine "the maximum number of students that can be admitted." The Faculty considered eight criteria, including the number and size of available classrooms, the size of the teaching staff, the number of sections required for each course, the number of students at CCNY and student attrition rates. It was concluded, as a result of these intricate calculations, that it would be "safe to admit 792 young men next June."<sup>76</sup> Scarcely a Board meeting was held in the late 1800s which did not call for the purchase of ground for the construction of more spacious quarters for the College. Finally, in 1895, with the signing into law of Chapter 168, College authorities were allocated up to \$600,000 to acquire a new site.<sup>77</sup>

#### 4. The Dual Mission

##### a) A Quality Curriculum

The College's complex mission continued to influence admissions policy and procedures during the 1880s and 1890s. Classical and scientific courses were offered; curricular additions were considered. The space issue, however, was the critical determinant in curtailing expansion of the College's programs. Increases in the scope of elective studies were postponed until facilities would become available. This affected, in particular, the proposed course in Pedagogy, all post-graduate courses and the division of Philosophy into two Chairs in order to create a new department of Moral Philosophy.<sup>78</sup> Once the new buildings would be completed, not only would more students be accommodated, but new curricular options could be explored.<sup>79</sup>

##### b) Service to the Public

###### (1) Curricular and Technical Elements

Service to the public was also maintained during this period. The College's "first duty [was] to regard the practical aims of life, without overlooking the needs of higher culture."<sup>80</sup> Despite a critical space shortage, commercial and mechanical courses began to be offered by CCNY.<sup>81</sup>

CCNY also "served the public" by extending the

Sub-Freshman course to two years, in Spring 1884, making the entire CCNY program a six-year course.<sup>82</sup> Finally, CCNY made its Library available to principals of public schools and later, opened both its Library and Museum to the public. Classrooms were also opened for meetings of common school teachers.<sup>83</sup>

## (2) Normative Goals

The City College of New York continued to "seek the benefit of the community by diffusing general education as widely as possible among the people."<sup>84</sup> During the latter decades of the 19th century, the College's mission was vastly expanded. "Benefits" to the community to be rendered by CCNY now included upgrading the general welfare of the public, Americanizing the immigrant population and abolishing class distinctions.

In the beginning of the 1880s, the faculty of the College announced their intention of "combatting the ignorance of the working classes" which was "threatening to the peace of society." It would do this by "combining the work-shop with the school-room."<sup>85</sup> Earlier, Free Academy officials had controlled their rowdy students through the imposition of military training and discipline. Now, education was viewed as a "preventive of crime and poverty" and a "fact of insurance." Both the faculty and the Board of Trustees supported the notion that "the greater the number of inhabitants intellectually cultivated, the

greater the safety to the State."<sup>86</sup>

The College also attempted to acculturate its young men to American society. We have already noted the ongoing efforts of the College to teach the English language, and to offer courses in government and civics. Now this theme was emphasized by increasing the size of the professorial staff in English and History. All instructors were exhorted to mark English compositions: "It is of little use to have compositions written unless they are revised, returned to students and corrected by them."<sup>87</sup>

The Faculty of CCNY was "called upon to educate children to become citizens." It would assume the "responsibility of Americanizing this heterogenous mass of nationalities."<sup>88</sup> "Command of [the] mother tongue" became a primary obligation of the College.<sup>89</sup> While the common schools had been founded initially to "prepare the child for future citizenship," this limited education was no longer sufficient as an "insurance against danger to the commonwealth."<sup>90</sup>

The most pernicious doctrines [are] set forth in the most attractive language. Will anyone seriously maintain that elementary training alone will fit the youthful citizen to thread his way through the mazes of this labyrinth?<sup>91</sup>

Thus, free public higher education was of particular significance in a period of social unrest.

The final component of the "mission" of The City College was first articulated in 1884. This element, the abolition of class distinctions, ultimately became the most

important aspect of admission to and attendance at CCNY. It would ultimately provide the major incentive for greater demands for admission to the municipal college system in the 20th century.

The Free Academy, and later, the College, had always been depicted as serving the diverse needs of distinct groupings of people. Thus, the ancient course benefited the affluent; the modern course was geared to educate the working classes and to give them some rudimentary vocational training. Exposure of the rich to the poor, and vice versa, would promote mutual respect, but would not eliminate class differences.<sup>92</sup> The admissions demands of the late 1870s, primarily vocalized by the well-to-do, and by Catholics, were not aimed at eliminating class differences. Furthermore, the repeal of the one-year common school attendance requirement in May 1882 did not substantially alter the existent class composition of CCNY. It remained a school for predominantly middle to upper class students. Through all the controversy, the underlying assumption remained that the classes would never be coalesced into a relatively homogenous grouping.

In early 1884, however, two addresses were delivered at CCNY which proposed a dramatic departure from this point of view. In his Inaugural Address, Chairman of the Board Stephen A. Walker asserted that it was the duty of government to support education, particularly higher education.<sup>93</sup> Among the reasons offered for the

maintenance of free public higher education was that of eliminating class privilege.

Another reason why legislation has established the colleges in our system is doubtless found in certain fundamental theories of our republican government that the State should aid in the abolition of distinctions of caste or class privilege, that so far as education is a means of advancement in social or political condition, the opportunity for it should be at least offered to every one without money and without price.<sup>94</sup>

Thus, institutions of public higher education were seen by the head of New York City's educational complex as agents of class mobility. The promulgation of social class mobility was to become one of the explicit facets of the mission of the municipal colleges in New York.<sup>95</sup>

Shortly after Walker's address, in a statement supporting the expansion of the commercial course at CCNY, Alfred Compton, a leading faculty member, expressed a similar position explicitly for the College.

Consider with us briefly, the history and aims--the past and the future of the College. The notion that higher education was to be the property of the privileged few, of the wealthy or the well-born, was obsolete. The theory of our people was rather that the children of parents in the humblest walks of life should have the same opportunity of educating themselves as those of the most favored and of raising themselves by virtue of such education, from the class in which they were born to any other, thus making permanent class distinctions nearly impossible.<sup>96</sup>

It is not possible to determine whether or not the abolition of permanent class cleavages was accepted by a majority of CCNY's administration and faculty. Yet the fact that such a position was espoused by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees and a reknown faculty member is

of major importance. The administration of CCNY would increasingly portray social mobility as an integral part of the College's mission. Having accepted the abolition of class differences as a key responsibility, the municipal college system would have to become responsive to claims for admission made on the basis of social class mobility which would be issued in later years.

#### E. Summary

The criteria determining access to The City College of New York from its very inception were subject to periodic alteration. Each change in criteria was the product of both structural changes in the school system and underlying philosophical concepts concerning the purposes of public education. Specific events and circumstances external to the College also affected access to public higher education in New York City. Two types of change are apparent: substantive transformations of the mode of access and incremental modifications within a specific format of admissions requirements.

From 1847 until the turn of the century, two modes of access to CCNY existed. From 1847 until 1882, attendance in the public school system and passage of competitive exams were required for admission to the College. From the mid-1880s until 1900, applicants had to be certified by the principals of their schools. They were then required to pass a series of competitive exams. The admissions

tests were constructed and conducted by the College's Board of Trustees; they were administered only to young men who were American citizens and bona fide residents of the City of New York.

Regardless of the mode of selection utilized, student merit was always a determining principle. The lack of space for additional students was a chronic problem for the College. These two key themes persistently influenced admissions requirements, with the merit issue being the dominant factor in effecting changes in the mode of access. The lack of facilities tended to effect incremental modifications within each mode of access. The space issue thus tended to reinforce the merit principle, resulting in the admission of students of the highest caliber. The physical expansion of the City of New York generated yet an additional facet to the space issue. Not only was the availability of facilities critical, but the centrality of the College and its geographic accessibility to its prospective student constituency began to emerge as a key concern. This issue would persist and would dominate CCNY extension efforts in the post-Consolidation era.

Curricular guidelines at CCNY "straddled both sides of the fence," emphasizing simultaneously traditional, "high quality" bodies of knowledge and modern, practical education. Changes in the balance between these pedagogic approaches did not only influence demand for higher

education. Rather, student admissions standards, the availability of facilities and curricular reform were inter-dependent factors, all intrinsically related to the concept of access to public higher education. Additionally, access considerations were affected by historic and macroscopic changes in New York City in the 19th century. These included, for instance, industrialization, patterns of immigration and political transformations within the City and State.

By the end of the first fifty years of existence, CCNY's multi-faceted "mission" had been fully articulated by the administrators of the College. This complex of institutional goals encompassed a wide range of curricular guidelines, which were always depicted as beneficial to the City's population. The principle element of CCNY's mission, however, was service to the people. While this principle was evidenced in several technical and structural innovations, the central themes of this rationale for free public higher education emphasized the idea of instilling "manhood and citizenship" in students, the acculturation of immigrants and, finally, the abolition of class distinctions. The mission of the municipal colleges, as defined in the 19th century, was to endure--without deletions or additions--until the demise of the free tuition policy of the municipal colleges of New York in 1976.

The impetus for changes in access arose from diverse sources: from among the College's administration,

City and State officials and agencies and organized groups not connected to the College or to local government. As a rule, alterations in admissions policy occurred slowly, products of extended decision-making procedures. This two-stage process included the long-term development of a commitment to a general principle, followed by a more rapid establishment of the details of implementation of that policy. On occasion, however, curricular modifications and changes in admissions requirements were implemented without prior deliberation. While this phenomenon was, and would become, more prevalent in the 20th century, some alterations in access policy were largely unanticipated, virtually unplanned for and spontaneously determined.

Finally, three additional themes exerted a secondary influence on access considerations. These were the relationship of the city colleges to the remainder of the public school system, to private interest groups and to governmental authorities. These sources of tension impacted on the College's mission as well as on admissions requirements.

<sup>1</sup>Mario E. Cosenza, The Establishment of The College of The City of New York as the Free Academy in 1847 (New York: The City College, 1925), pp. 89-129.

<sup>2</sup>S. Willis Rudy, The College of the City of New York: A History--1847-1947 (New York: City College Press, 1949), pp. 10-21. Chapter 206 was signed into law on May 7, 1847.

<sup>3</sup>Rudy, p. 29.

<sup>4</sup>For a detailed analysis of Board of Education politics see Diane Ravitch, The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805-1973. A History of the Public Schools as Battlefield of Social Change (New York: Basic Books, 1974), pp. 79-104 and 161-167.

<sup>5</sup>Donald A. Roberts, editor, Alumni Register: The College of the City of New York, 1853-1945 (New York: The Associate Alumni of The College of the City of New York, 1946), "Appendix A," pp. 874-878.

Between 1926 and 1961, the municipal college system was officially known as The College of the City of New York. This term will not be used in this work in order to avoid confusion with The City College of New York, the institution founded in 1847 as The Free Academy.

<sup>6</sup>Office of the President, Annual Report on The Free Academy by the Board of Education to the Common Council, 28 January 1850, pp. 157-161. To be designated here as CC Trustees, Minutes.

<sup>7</sup>These requirements endured with but few exceptions until the post-World War II era.

<sup>8</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 January 1852, pp. 1-5.

<sup>9</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 28 January 1850, pp. 157-161.

<sup>10</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 28 January 1850, pp. 157-161; 22 January 1851, pp. 1-5; 21 January 1852, pp. 1-5; 7 July 1852, pp. 14-15; 12 January 1853, pp. 5-7; 20 July 1853, pp. 6-7; 30 December 1853, p. 8; July 1856, pp. 36-39; July 1857, pp. 36-39; July 1858, pp. 38-41; July 1859, pp. 38-41.

- <sup>11</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 7 July 1852, p. 14.
- <sup>12</sup>See, for example, CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 January 1852 and later dates.
- <sup>13</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 20 July 1853, pp. 6-7.
- <sup>14</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 1 September 1851, pp. 2-7.
- <sup>15</sup>Sherry Gorelick, "Social Control, Social Mobility, and the Eastern European Jews: An Analysis of Public Education in New York City, 1880-1924" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1975), pp. 55, 60; CC Trustees, Minutes, 1 September 1851, pp. 2-7 and 12 January 1853, pp. 5-7.
- <sup>16</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 12 January 1853, pp. 5-7; 30 December 1853, p. 69; 1 January 1855, pp. 22-25; 30 June 1889, pp. 10-13. These were also conferred retroactively on prior graduates.
- <sup>17</sup>Class names were also changed from A, B, C, D and E to Senior, Junior, Sophomore, Freshman and Introductory (Sub-Freshman), "more in conformity with the character of the Institution." See CC Trustees, Minutes, 1 January 1855, pp. 22-25.
- <sup>18</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 7 July 1852, p. 3; 12 January 1853, pp. 5-7.
- <sup>19</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 7 July 1852, p. 3; Rudy, p. 13, citing the "Report regarding The Literature Fund," (1847); Townsend Harris, J. S. Bosworth, and John L. Mason, Memorial (New York: George F. Nesbitt, Stationer and Printer, 1847), pp. 6-7.
- <sup>20</sup>The Executive Committee of The City College of New York, Minutes, 19 November 1866, p. 11. To be designated here as CC Trustees, Minutes.
- <sup>21</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 November 1866, pp. 1-3.
- <sup>22</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 20 November 1874, pp. 1-8.
- <sup>23</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 1 September 1851, pp. 2-7; 7 July 1852, p. 3.
- <sup>24</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 1 September 1851, pp. 2-7; Rudy, p. 164. The Polytechnic Division was formalized in 1871. Occupational statistics for the graduates of CCNY differed. Rarely more than 27% of graduates entered various business fields, with the averages being about 18%. See Rudy, p. 199.

- <sup>25</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 15 July 1862, pp. 32-37.
- <sup>26</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, September 1866, pp. 18-20.
- <sup>27</sup>Richard Rogers Bowker, The College of the City of New York, 1847-1895 (New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1895), p. 25. Richard Rogers Bowker, Class of 1868, was editor of the first CCNY student newspaper, The City College Collegian. This paper sponsored the first experiment with student self-government at a U.S. college. Bowker achieved distinction as a writer, editor, publisher and political reformer. See Rudy, pp. 100-103; Roberts, for 1868.
- <sup>28</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 19 February 1873, pp. 12-14.
- <sup>29</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 7 July 1852, p. 3.
- <sup>30</sup>Rudy, p. 60.
- <sup>31</sup>Bowker, p. 4. Horace Webster served from 1848-1869; Alexander S. Webb from 1869-1902. See Roberts, p. 879.
- <sup>32</sup>Gorelick, p. 59.
- <sup>33</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 10 February 1873, pp. 12-14.
- <sup>34</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 15 July 1862, pp. 32-37.
- <sup>35</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 19 September 1866, p. 217; 21 March 1873, pp. 1-7.
- <sup>36</sup>The creation of the Normal College was one of the first economy measures instituted by the Tweed-Ring-controlled Board of Education appointed in May 1869. The founding of the normal school eliminated "supplementary" public school classes where young women had received some preparation for teaching. Additionally, women teachers were paid less than half of that which men teachers received for performing the same duties. See Ravitch, pp. 92-104.
- <sup>37</sup>President of the Normal College, Report Submitted to the Committee on Normal, Evening and Colored Schools of the Board of Education, 31 May 1871, p. 3. To be designated here as HC Trustees, Minutes.
- <sup>38</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, 29 December 1871, pp. 5-6.
- <sup>39</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, 18 May 1870, pp. 4-5.
- <sup>40</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, 31 May 1871, p. 4; 31 December 1874, p. 19; 31 December 1875, p. 24.

<sup>41</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, p. 18. For a description of the 1874 annexations see I. N. Phelps Stokes, New York Past and Present: Its History and Landmarks, 1524-1939 (New York: Plantin Press, 1939), p. 84. Also, Albert E. Henschel, Municipal Consolidation: An Historical Sketch of Greater New York (New York: n.p., 1895), p. 6.

<sup>42</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, 31 December 1877, p. 21; 31 December 1878, p. 78; 31 December 1879, p. 39. Also, United States, Bureau of Education, Annual Report of the Commissioner, 1878-1879, p. 172.

<sup>43</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, 29 December 1871, p. 9.

<sup>44</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, 29 October 1873, p. 7.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., pp. 7, 13.

<sup>46</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, 29 December 1871, p. 8.

<sup>47</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, 29 October 1873, p. 15, citing a statement by Mayor William F. Havemeyer.

<sup>48</sup>The City College of New York also served as a "normal school for men," sending many of its graduates into the teaching profession and New York City schools. See Bowker, p. 11.

<sup>49</sup>Attendance of Free Academy Sub-Freshmen in the City's common schools averaged slightly more than three years of schooling. See CC Trustees, Minutes, 31 December 1855, p. 39; July 1856, pp. 56-57.

<sup>50</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 15 January 1878, pp. 10-12. Wood is identified by Diane Ravitch as the Tammany Commissioner of Education who cut nearly \$1 million from the City's school budget and doubled class size. The Normal College was also founded as an economy measure (see above). Yet, by 1878, Wood came to see education as the means for effecting a more democratic society and the instrument which would "bring back to the city that great middle class which has been absolutely squeezed out of it." See Ravitch, pp. 95-104.

<sup>51</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 15 March 1878, pp. 16-33.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

<sup>53</sup>Conditions within classrooms were poor and even dangerous. See Ravitch, pp. 57, 100-103, 138-139.

<sup>54</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 17 March 1874, pp. 8-9; Rudy, p. 124.

- <sup>55</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 19 March 1878, pp. 34-37.
- <sup>56</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 January 1879, pp. 6-7; Rudy, pp. 125-126. Supporters of the "Open College" measure included Chairman Wood, President Webb and Thomas Grady, an Assemblyman who had sponsored several bills to abolish CCNY. The City's Board of Aldermen and the Catholic Church also supported the measure which would abolish the "unjust exclusion of a large and influential class of citizens." Very little is known about the social and economic background of those who opposed the measure. See Rudy, pp. 124-126. Controversy over the measure persisted. See CC Trustees, Minutes, 17 January 1882, pp. 6-8; 21 March 1882, pp. 26-29.
- <sup>57</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 7 June 1882, pp. 50-56.
- <sup>58</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 16 May 1882, pp. 33-37.
- <sup>59</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 17 January 1882, p. 14; 7 June 1882, pp. 50-56.
- <sup>60</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 7 June 1882, pp. 50-56.
- <sup>61</sup>See, for instance, HC Trustees, Minutes, 31 December 1882, p. 24; Rudy, p. 126.
- <sup>62</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 20 June 1879, pp. 40-42; 20 January 1880, pp. 6-7; 31 March 1880, pp. 18-21; 10 June 1880, p. 35; 23 December 1880, pp. 80-82; 30 March 1881, pp. 14-15; HC Trustees, Minutes, 31 December 1881, pp. 22-23.
- <sup>63</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 27 November 1872, pp. 2-5; 10 June 1880, p. 35; 18 June 1880, pp. 37-39.
- <sup>64</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 27 October 1882, p. 53; HC Trustees, Minutes, 31 December 1882, p. 16.
- <sup>65</sup>The precise date when this pre-requisite for taking the admissions test was passed is undetermined here. See CC Trustees, Minutes, 30 June 1889, pp. 10-13. In this manner, although indirectly, attendance in the common school system remained a condition of admission to CCNY.
- <sup>66</sup>Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), pp. 282-286; David B. Tyack, editor, Turning Points in American Educational History (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967), pp. 352-362; Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 100-124.

<sup>67</sup>Michael S. Schudson, "Organizing the 'Meritocracy': A History of the College Entrance Examination Board," Harvard Educational Review, vol. 42, no. 1, February 1972, pp. 34-69.

<sup>68</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 25 June 1885, pp. 8-9.

<sup>69</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 27 October 1882, p. 53; 12 May 1892, pp. 45-46.

<sup>70</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 12 May 1892, pp. 45-48; 15 December 1892, p. 161. This study was precipitated by newspaper allegations that adequately prepared students were being rejected by CCNY.

<sup>71</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 12 May 1892, pp. 47-48.

<sup>72</sup>The precise "formula" which regulated acceptance or rejection is unknown. Did a score in excess of 75% in English and Arithmetic automatically insure acceptance? Was an overall average of 75% required? Was one able to enter the College with "deficiencies" in one or two of the required seven areas? These remain unanswered questions.

<sup>73</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 3 May 1871, pp. 12-13; 18 January 1877, pp. 4-13; 12 May 1892, p. 44. In the 1880s and 1890s, even primary schools could often not accommodate all children who wished to attend the public schools. See Ravitch, pp. 111-113.

<sup>74</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, 31 December 1883, pp. 18, 27.

<sup>75</sup>HC Trustees, Minutes, 31 December 1886, p. 36.

<sup>76</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 14 March 1884, pp. 54-57.

<sup>77</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 10 April 1895, pp. 24-31. Chapter 168 was signed into law on March 27, 1895.

<sup>78</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 9 December 1886, pp. 108-111; 21 March 1893, pp. 20-25; 12 November 1896, pp. 75-77.

<sup>79</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 17 November 1896, pp. 76-79; 20 March 1900, pp. 16-20.

<sup>80</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 17 January 1882, pp. 15-16.

<sup>81</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 25 May 1883, pp. 66-72; 26 April 1884, pp. 89-97; 18 June 1885, pp. 77-78.

<sup>82</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 26 April 1884, pp. 89-97.

<sup>83</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 30 March 1881, pp. 14-15;  
10 April 1895, pp. 29-30.

<sup>84</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 March 1893, pp. 20-25.

<sup>85</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 25 May 1883, p. 69.

<sup>86</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 15 January 1884, p. 10.

<sup>87</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 25 February 1896, pp. 12-13.

<sup>88</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 15 January 1895, p. 11.

<sup>89</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 25 May 1883, pp. 70-71.

<sup>90</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 June 1888, pp. 14-15.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid.

<sup>92</sup>As discussed above. See also Gorelick, pp. 26-39.

<sup>93</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 15 January 1884, pp. 5-14.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid.

<sup>95</sup>A similar sentiment had been expressed by President Hunter of the Normal College in December 1882. "The common school receives the different nationalities, the rich, the poor, the high, the low, as into a great mill, and grinds them all out good American citizens. . . . The common school system, in its integrity, is the great democratic leveler; but it always levels upward to a higher plane." See HC Trustees, Minutes, 31 December 1882, p. 19.

<sup>96</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 26 April 1884, p. 90.

## CHAPTER III

## CCNY IN AN EXPANDED METROPOLIS

A. Introduction

From 1896 until 1926, when CCNY's Board of Trustees was replaced by a Board of Higher Education (BHE), "the People's College" remained "the crown of [New York City's] great educational system."<sup>1</sup> That "great educational system" was undergoing a mammoth transformation: in 1896, the New York City school system was centralized and in 1897, a State Teacher Certification Law was passed.<sup>2</sup> Continuing mass immigration and the consolidation of "Greater New York" in 1898 resulted in the doubling of the City's population between 1890 and 1900.<sup>3</sup> Elementary school enrollment doubled between 1896 and 1903; high school registration soared by more than 1000% during the same period.<sup>4</sup>

In the early 20th century, traditional education was being replaced by "the new education," later to be known as "progressive education." This movement, which has been described as "a many-sided effort to use the schools to improve the lives of individuals," charged public schools with new responsibilities.<sup>5</sup> Sherry Gorelick has characterized Progressive education as emphasizing social con-

trol, Americanization and manual training.<sup>6</sup> These goals, which were substantially consistent with The City College mission, would dramatically influence access considerations at the College.

Prior to 1926, several major innovations were adopted and implemented at CCNY. These alterations and additions were the products of considerations of student merit and the space issue. CCNY's mission of "service to the people," however, was the critical factor in expanding the scope of the collegiate course and in extending public higher education to ever-increasing numbers of New York City residents.

## B. The Regulation of Access

### 1. Introduction

Until the 1890s, applicants to CCNY took a test for entrance into the school's Sub-Freshman class. It was possible, however, to enter a higher grade by passing the final general examination given to the College's registered students.<sup>7</sup> Yet few, if any, students were admitted to CCNY's collegiate classes. The reason for this was that until 1897, CCNY was almost the only institution offering secondary education within New York City.<sup>8</sup>

New options became available, however, as the public high school movement grew in New York City.<sup>9</sup> It was now actually possible to complete secondary schooling and then enter CCNY's collegiate course. The emergence of

institutions which were essentially in friendly competition with CCNY's Sub-Freshman course generated a series of new admissions procedures.

## 2. Admission to the Sub-Freshman Course

In March 1896, the Executive Committee suggested that CCNY require Principals of elementary schools to certify that students from their schools were prepared to pass the College's admissions tests.<sup>10</sup> The recommendation was rejected by the Board of Trustees. Instead, a proposal was adopted that the College "make use of examinations conducted by the Principals of the grammar schools."<sup>11</sup> The administration of CCNY thus resolved that screening applicants for admission to the College could not be conducted internally. This task would have to be and was shortly thereafter absorbed by another organization: the elementary school.

By Spring 1900, the Executive Committee had concluded that "it is now impossible and undesirable that the grammar schools prepare the boys specially for the examination for entrance into the City College of New York." The Executive Committee thus recommended

that students from the grammar schools may be admitted to the Sub-Freshman Course on the presentation of certificates from the principals of said schools, stating their age, residence, time of attendance at school, their choice of course and their rating in their studies, the said rating to be, in no case, under seventy-five per cent.<sup>12</sup>

This recommendation was adopted by the Board of Trustees

on May 23, 1900 and enacted that Fall.<sup>13</sup>

The Fall of 1900 also saw the expansion of CCNY's pre-collegiate course to a three-year program. In Spring 1899, acting on the recommendation of its Executive Committee, the Board of Trustees had approved this extension.<sup>14</sup> The argument had been made that since professional schools, in particular, those of the legal profession, now required as pre-requisites the completion of a seven-year elementary education and of a high school and college course, the Introductory course at CCNY should be lengthened "if the less wealthy classes are not to be excluded from the learned professions."<sup>15</sup> By 1900, following further debate, this curricular revision had been implemented.<sup>16</sup>

### 3. Admission to the College Course

In June 1899, the Executive Committee proposed that graduates of the high schools of any of the boroughs of the City shall be admitted to the Freshman Class on presentation of principals' certificates showing that they have passed the final examinations of their schools.<sup>17</sup>

It was not until the following December, however, that this recommendation was accepted by the entire Board.<sup>18</sup>

On March 18, 1901, on the recommendation of its Committee on Curriculum and Bylaws, the Board adopted the following provision:

Certificates issued by or under the authority of any such College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) shall, for admission to the College, be accepted in lieu of the successful passage of an examination at the College regularly held as prescribed in these bylaws.<sup>19</sup>

Admissions requirements at CCNY thus entered a third phase. The mode of access initiated at the turn of the 20th century allowed for a choice. Students could enter CCNY by passing the CEEB tests, by scoring at least 60% on the CCNY-constructed entrance exams or by presenting a certificate of graduation from an accredited high school.<sup>20</sup> This latter option was to remain effective until 1924, when a total reliance on competitive exams and high school average was to supersede the accreditation mode of entry to CCNY.<sup>21</sup>

The 1900 to 1924 period is lauded by some as being a precursor of Open Admissions.<sup>22</sup> The institution in 1924 of specific qualitative restrictions on admissions therefore "violated the spirit in which [CCNY] had been founded."<sup>23</sup> These well-publicized statements, however, reveal a gross unfamiliarity with the state of secondary education in New York in the early 20th century. The 1900 to 1924 period cannot reasonably be likened to the post-Open Admissions era of the 1970s.

In the early 1900s, only 8% of New York's graduates of elementary schools graduated from high schools, and only an estimated 2% of this group ever reached the Freshman year of college.<sup>24</sup> This situation may be contrasted with that of 1970, when 75% of 17 year olds graduated high school and at least 30% of the 18 to 24 year old cohort attended some institution of higher education.<sup>25</sup>

The type of diploma awarded to high school gra-

duates also made the later period quite different from the early 1900s. Until 1938, all non-commercial and non-technical New York State diplomas were, in fact, academic diplomas. These were awarded only to those who passed a battery of tests constructed and certified by the State's Board of Regents. Following 1938, the increasingly-popular "general" diploma, which did not require this comprehensive testing, was also granted.<sup>26</sup> The 1900 to 1924 option which permitted entry to CCNY after high school graduation was, in fact, an admissions mode which relied heavily on the testing of applicants. Those who did graduate high school in the early 20th century were "the cream of the crop."

On December 5, 1923 a meeting was held between representatives of the two municipal colleges and the City's high schools. As related in 1944 by CCNY's Dean Morton Gottschall, the purpose of the conference was to "get the views of the high school principals on the question of whether it was desirable to have quality requirements for admission."<sup>27</sup>

The representatives of the high schools were quite emphatic in saying that not every graduate of the high schools was of college caliber. None of them knew very much about the process of selection [which developed in the 1930s and 1940s]. Shortly thereafter, we embarked upon the selection process. We started with the thought that by and large, the high school record is the best indication of what the student can do. An analysis of the high school record, supplemented by exams, does give the best method of selection.

Although the city colleges as a whole should take the position that they will accept every student who has the ability to do the work, nevertheless, it is a physical impossibility. We therefore have the problem of trying to select those who are best qualified. The high school record should be taken into account as paramount, and exams only as supplementary to it.<sup>28</sup>

In 1924, the City College of New York set graduation from high school with an average of 72% as the primary criterion for admission. By 1926, the matriculation average had risen to 75%.<sup>29</sup> Students whose high school average fell below the specified grade were permitted to attempt to qualify for entry to the College by passing entrance examinations. The new procedure signified the start of a new mode of access to the College. The simultaneous reliance on a high school record and testing to screen applicants for admission would remain the dominant pattern of access until the implementation of the Open Admissions policy in September 1970.

### C. The Space Issue

As noted above, Chapter 168 of the Laws of 1895 allocated \$600,000 for the purchase of a new site for CCNY.<sup>30</sup> It was not until 1903, however, that ground was broken on St. Nicholas Heights. Until completion of the new buildings, in view of the shortage of facilities, "applicants [were] preferred in the order of their rating upon the [entrance] examination."<sup>31</sup>

Funds for new buildings were first allocated in January 1903; the first cornerstone was laid in March

1905.<sup>32</sup> In the interim, additional rooms were leased near the main building on 23rd Street.<sup>33</sup> The Board of Trustees announced that it would not be satisfied "until [CCNY] shall throw open to the youth of our metropolis the noble structure for which you have toiled and struggled so long and faithfully."<sup>34</sup> In 1907, the buildings were occupied: they constitute today the College's North Campus.

The opening of the new quarters initiated a golden era at CCNY. The College underwent great expansion in both admissions and curriculum development. Thus, until the Depression era, the severity of the chronic shortage of facilities was mitigated.

A second dimension of the space issue, the geographic accessibility of the College to the City's students, was also a key theme in the pre-BHE era. The solution of this problem would result in the creation of City and Hunter College extension units in the boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens.

#### D. The Extension Movement

##### 1. Introduction

The United States Extension Movement began in 1891 at The University of Wisconsin: the "Wisconsin Idea" stressed the concept that universities were obligated to serve the community-at-large and depicted academia as an arena where practical problems could be tackled. While extension services initially dealt with agricultural areas,

they also served the Progressive notion of "taming the masses."<sup>35</sup>

New York City's population in 1890 was largely either foreign-born or of foreign parentage. Education became the primary instrument of a reform movement which would "conquer, subdue and transform the worst of that was in America." Diane Ravitch has characterized the activities of the reformers as follows:

For some, the motive was fear, fear of the spread of anarchism and discontent, fear for their own comfortable way of life. For many others, the motive of reform was compassion, the compassion born of a deep commitment to religious principles and ideals of social justice.<sup>36</sup>

This trend resulted in a complete overhaul of education in New York City, with the public schools becoming a ladder "from the gutter to the university."<sup>37</sup>

## 2. CCNY Extension Programs

In this historical milieu, expanding on its prior commitment of service to the people, CCNY initiated educational outreach programs. The College had already allowed public school teachers to use its classrooms for lectures in Pedagogy, Language and Science.<sup>38</sup> By Winter 1898, in order to assist teachers to meet requirements of the new State Certification Law, CCNY faculty began offering free lectures, open to all teachers.<sup>39</sup> No collegiate credit was offered to the teachers registered in these courses. The Extension classes were deemed "too vague and general for proper inclusion in any of the College courses pro-

per."<sup>40</sup>

Students petitioned for the granting of credit for work completed in Extension classes. On April 26, 1916, a compromise was reached. Certificates would continue to be issued for Extension courses which were of a vocational nature. Courses which were "of equal standing in content and difficulty" with the Liberal Arts curriculum would be credited toward a degree.<sup>41</sup>

In Spring 1917, the Division of Extension Courses was officially created.<sup>42</sup> Specializing in classes for teachers, librarians and social workers, the Division coordinated offerings with the Board of Education's Bureau of Public Lectures.<sup>43</sup> In June 1920, the Extension Division was reorganized, with courses being classified according to sponsorship and content.<sup>44</sup>

Group A classes were subsidized by public or private agencies and cost \$1.50 per course.

Group B included all liberal arts courses and those in general education theory. A registration fee of \$2.50 was collected but no tuition was charged.<sup>45</sup>

Group C incorporated classes of a technical nature or those which related to "preparation for higher positions in the school or library system." A registration fee of \$2.50 was charged and tuition was levied at the rate of \$5.00 per 30 hours.<sup>46</sup>

By the 1920s, extension courses were an accepted feature of the College's curriculum. Yet the underlying concept behind extension, service to the people, had been articulated for more than half-a-century as part of the

College's mission. With the formalization of the Extension Division, CCNY was able to open its doors even wider, admitting still a greater number and variety of students to the College.

### 3. Extension in Brooklyn

Public higher education in Brooklyn was initiated in Fall 1910 when a request from the Brooklyn Teachers Association for Extension classes was approved by the Board of Trustees.<sup>47</sup> These increasingly popular late afternoon courses, held in rented quarters or local community rooms, were, however, unable to meet demands for higher education in Brooklyn.<sup>48</sup> By the mid-1920s, nearly 4,500 Brooklyn students were enrolled in CCNY programs either in Manhattan or in Brooklyn.<sup>49</sup> Increasingly, government officials and civic associations, notably including the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, called upon the CCNY Board of Trustees to establish a branch in Brooklyn.<sup>50</sup> Investigatory committees were formed, cooperation between prominent Brooklynites increased and by September 1926, a Brooklyn Center opened.<sup>51</sup>

### 4. Extension in Queens

Higher education was also in demand in the borough of Queens. On the recommendation of President Mezes, CCNY Extension courses were first offered in Queens in 1924.<sup>52</sup> By the following winter, the Riverview Heights Community Council petitioned for the establishment of an independent branch of CCNY in that borough.<sup>53</sup> The replacement of the

Board of Trustees by the Board of Higher Education in 1926 delayed further consideration of plans to create a separate collegiate center in Queens.<sup>54</sup>

#### E. Expanded Schedules

##### 1. The Evening Session

In June 1907, a faculty Sub-Committee headed by Alfred Compton presented preliminary recommendations "on the question of the establishment of evening sessions."<sup>55</sup> These classes, to be held between 7:30 and 9:30 p.m., with a minimum of 15 students per class, would be open to those "who have satisfied the requirements of the College Entrance Examination Board or passed the examination set by the College." Students would be limited to 9 hours of work, would have to pay for their own books and would be permitted to enter the College's Freshman Class.

A Board of Trustees Committee on Evening Courses was subsequently established to correspond with "other colleges of the first rank which maintain evening sessions."<sup>56</sup> A report released in December 1907 urged the Board to "commit the College to the policy of Evening Classes." Consideration of the report was laid over twice; when the issue was brought up in Fall 1908, "the whole matter [was] referred to a special committee of three to report details."<sup>57</sup> In Spring 1909, the Committee of Three on Night Courses issued its report.<sup>58</sup> Evening courses were to operate each with a minimum of 20 students qualified for

admission to the Day Session. Students would be restricted to nine hours of work, but they would be supplied with free books and apparatus. The April 1909 recommendations were adopted and implemented; 250 students were accepted in September 1909.<sup>59</sup>

For the next several years, Evening Courses were approved on a term-to-term basis.<sup>60</sup> The Evening Session was certified in Spring 1916 when a Board resolution allowed the Faculty to "transfer student in good standing in the day or evening session from one session to another."<sup>61</sup>

By December 1925, President Mezes reported that the enrollment in the Evening Session "has increased tremendously. Last term, we thought we had reached the limit . . . but this term, there are 9,480 students."<sup>62</sup> These students benefited from "modern education's [adjustment] to the industrial situation."<sup>63</sup>

Urban institutions, especially those that are publicly supported, are pledged to the policy of giving the same opportunities to workers as to the more fortunate youths who can devote their days to study.<sup>64</sup>

An additional segment of New York City's population, the working classes, was served. The Evening Session was, and would remain, the most significant single structural innovation of the College's history. It would increasingly become the critical mechanism for the fulfillment of CCNY's mission and the expansion of access to public higher education.

## 2. The Summer Session

The CCNY Summer Session was started in 1917 as a result of a number of facilitating factors. Firstly, between 1,000 and 1,500 students, including teachers in the Extension Division, had expressed a desire to attend a summer session. At the same time, a key official of the Council of National Defense had urged that science courses be offered in the national defense interest. Finally, The College itself had long desired to offer a summer session, but financing had been extremely difficult. Now, Lee Kohns of the Board of Trustees, a former alumnus of the College, had donated \$6,000 for this purpose. As a result, Liberal Arts and Vocational Subjects were offered in Summer 1917. The session was open to all students registered at the College and "to any other person who may, under existing rules, be eligible for admission to the College."<sup>65</sup>

In March 1920, as part of the general reorganization of fee-bearing courses, a permanent Summer Session was created. Matriculated students with an A or B average would be given the "additional facilities of the Summer Session free." Students with a C or D average would be required to pay the rate per course charged to non-matriculantes.<sup>66</sup>

While the Summer Session may not have extended higher education to new and different students, it did enable those already registered at CCNY to receive a more continuous and rapid education. In all probability, the

Summer Session provided the greatest benefit to working students, enrolled in partial programs in CCNY's Evening Session.

## F. New Academic Divisions

### 1. Introduction

Official academic recognition of vocational and professional subjects also took place at CCNY. Three quasi-independent "schools" were established under the College's aegis during the first quarter of the 20th century.

The creation of these schools did not directly increase enrollment at the College. Indirectly, however, by promoting recognition of and specialization in these disciplines, CCNY drew through its doors many additional students. Thus, formal acceptance by the school's administration of these subjects and their permanent inclusion in CCNY's curriculum was yet another way the College served the public.

### 2. Engineering and Technology

In 1919, a School of Technology was established as one of CCNY's fee-bearing divisions.<sup>67</sup> The monies collected were to be deposited with the City Comptroller and would go into a special fund to be administered by the Board of Trustees.<sup>68</sup> The School was given some discretionary power regarding admissions criteria. For instance,

students admitted without a solid background in American history were required to take two terms of three-credit history.<sup>69</sup> Thus, technology, a long-standing but long-contested feature of the CCNY curriculum, was finally recognized and certified academically.

### 3. Business and Public Administration

Commerce and civics were first organized, jointly with technology, into a separate division of CCNY in 1916. Courses in these areas had already been offered by CCNY; the creation of this division did not result in the appearance of new electives.<sup>70</sup> In March 1919, the Board established a School of Business and Civic Administration as one of CCNY's fee-bearing divisions.<sup>71</sup> By 1926, the Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.) awarded by CCNY was recognized by the New York State Board of Regents.

### 4. Education

The emergence of Pedagogy as a distinct academic field at CCNY began with the extensive December 1886 debate on the merits of the subject as a collegiate discipline.<sup>72</sup> By 1887, the area had been incorporated into the CCNY curriculum; in November 1889, however, the Faculty resolved to terminate the course.<sup>73</sup> With the passage of the 1897 State Certification law, stipulating that all instructors in the State's common schools have formal teacher training, CCNY's Faculty reconsidered its earlier

position. Since City College would be unable to have its graduates licensed as teachers, "it was imperative that action be taken without delay."<sup>74</sup> By May 1897, students in the Junior and Senior years were first permitted to elect Pedagogies. A "rush to the course" soon ensued; Pedagogy became the object of "universal demand."<sup>75</sup>

By the 1920s, there had been a tremendous surge in teacher training courses, both in the Extension Division and at the main campus.<sup>76</sup> Soon 90% of all men engaged in elementary education in New York were trained at CCNY. President Mezes called upon the Board to approve immediately a School of Education. The resolution was passed and took effect in the Spring of 1921.<sup>77</sup>

The CCNY course in Pedagogy arose in answer to the 1897 Certification Law; the School of Education was created in the climate of Progressivism. Gorelick has commented that the "Department of Education was as much a child of its time as the Free Academy had been a child of the 1850s."<sup>78</sup> This statement implies that the program was a response to historic events and social conditions occurring outside the College: the ethnically-heterogenous mass immigration to the City, the teachers' certification stipulation and the Progressive ethos favoring acculturation. While these external conditions did precipitate the formation of the School of Education, the aim of the Americanization of students had been stressed by CCNY since its founding. Progressivism served to extend the goal of teaching

citizenship to CCNY students, from that of providing for their own personal improvement, to instructing students who would, in turn, diffuse the general education they received throughout the City. As expressed by Magnus Gross, CCNY Class of 1878 and President of the New York City Teachers Association, the Pedagogy course was "[best] fitted to accomplish the highest purpose of our local school system--the welding of the population of this most cosmopolitan city into a common American citizenship."<sup>79</sup>

The establishment of the Education program was also an opportune way for the College to reassert its association with the rest of the City's school system. Stephen Duggan, Chairman of the new department, indicated the continuing importance of CCNY's connection to the Board of Education.

The majority, not only of the male teachers, but of the male principals of the elementary schools, are graduates of our institution. An increasing number of our graduates annually enter as teachers into the city high schools. A considerable number are found among the superintendents. It was felt that this strong bond between the schools and the City College should not only be maintained, but strengthened, and that one of the best ways for the College to make a return to the City was to increase the efficiency of those who left its portals to go into the schools as teachers and administrators.<sup>80</sup>

The link between the municipal colleges and the public school system had been originally exemplified in The Free Academy's admissions requirement of attendance in the common schools. The establishment of The Normal College for Women strengthened this connection. Now the

bond was buttressed by the development of the program in Education at the College.

## G. New Student Categories

### 1. Introduction

In the early 20th century, CCNY began admitting a wider variety of students to her expanded programs. Provision was made, for instance, to enable graduates of the College to continue their education.<sup>81</sup> Most important, however, was the initiation of a new category for a special type of student enrolled in the CCNY Extension Division.

### 2. The Municipal Student

In November 1913, President Finley requested that the Board institute provisions which would enable city employees to be admitted to the Night College. These persons "heretofore have been permitted to take special evening courses intended to improve the efficiency of their work, but without proving their competency by submitting to an entrance examination."<sup>82</sup> Acting on the recommendations of a sub-committee, the Board resolved in December 1913 that "no student be admitted without first proving his qualifications by passing [an] exam."<sup>83</sup>

By the following June, this student category was officially designated as "municipal students." These city employees, probably including teachers enrolled in the Extension Division, were obliged to present credentials

showing their status in the City Service and to pass an entrance exam. No college credit would be granted for this work, and students would be on probation for a four-week period.<sup>84</sup>

In the Fall of 1915, in conjunction with a Mayor-appointed supervisory committee, courses for municipal students were incorporated into the Division of Vocational Subjects and Civic Administration of the Evening Session.<sup>85</sup> A fee of \$10.00 was charged for each 30 credits taken; no additional expense to the College was to be incurred.

The creation of new student classifications, allowing for the circumvention of some element of the formal entrance requirements, enabled more persons to attend CCNY. Not only was enrollment increased in size, but different types of students who otherwise would have been unable to attend the College were afforded the opportunity of public higher education. The formation of diverse student categories, an activity which would continue throughout the 20th century, was yet another method by which CCNY served the people of the City of New York.<sup>86</sup>

#### H. Summary

By 1926, CCNY had been transformed into a "municipal university attuned to the educational needs of the modern age."<sup>87</sup> CCNY's physical expansion in the post-Consolidation era was dramatic: a new main campus and two major Extension units had been established. Admissions

procedures had been altered, curricular offerings expanded, and access extended to a wider range of students.

Between 1896 and 1926, the College modified, on two occasions, its access regulations. Until 1900, candidates were required to be certified by the principals of their elementary schools prior to being allowed to take CCNY's competitive entrance examinations. From 1900 until 1924, students could enter CCNY by passing either the CCNY-administered tests, by passing the College Entrance Examination Board tests, or by presenting a certificate of graduation from an accredited high school.<sup>88</sup> Beginning in 1924, the College imposed a uniform qualitative requirement on this latter group of applicants: a 72% average was required of high school graduates in order to be accepted for admission. By 1926, this "matriculation average" had been raised to 75%. The mode of access which relied on secondary school performance and ratings on entrance tests was to endure until 1970, when the Open Admissions policy was implemented.

The opening of CCNY's new "uptown" campus enabled the College to offer electives and new programs which had been postponed for several decades because of the lack of facilities. The wider variety of course offerings served to train persons to meet the needs of diverse industries and professions in the New York area. The "uptown" location of the new campus served students not only from Manhattan, but also from The Bronx; the CCNY centers in Brook-

lyn and Queens made feasible access to public higher education to most of the City's population.<sup>89</sup>

The development of the Evening and Summer Sessions enabled working students to avail themselves of a higher education. The creation of the "municipal student" category legitimized the status of both those enrolled in post-secondary courses as well as the very existence of CCNY's Extension Division.<sup>90</sup>

Most changes at the College occurred as had those of the previous decades: the result of extended decision-making. This process entailed a commitment to a general principle, followed by the speedy implementation of the policy. This is particularly apparent in the case of the establishment of the Evening Session. Night Classes were proposed in 1907, then debated, "laid-over," and finally instituted two years later in a manner which did not differ substantially from the plan initially proposed.

It was possible, however, for alterations to be implemented in an atypical, and startlingly rapid manner. Thus, the initiation of the course in Pedagogy was a response to the 1897 Certification Law and the Summer Session was made possible by the sudden availability of funding.

Finally, the College's mission, reinforced by the climate of Progressivism, continued to influence access to public higher education in New York. Implementation of this mission, in the several ways discussed here, resulted

in the vast institutional growth of the College.

The notion of service to the people, however, promoted the development of a city-wide student body with an egalitarian structure. Only because of the continuing influence of CCNY's mission was the Evening Session created with full transfer privileges to the Day Session. Only because of the public nature of the College and the College's ethos of service to the people of the City were students of the Brooklyn and Queens branches allowed to transfer automatically to CCNY's main centers.

The non-hierarchical nature of the status of the College's assorted student bodies would, however, be a temporary phenomenon. The advent of the two major crises of the 20th century, the Great Depression and World War II, would force the implementation of emergency measures. These would result in the emergence of a multi-tiered student body within the municipal colleges and a varied and differentiated system of access to public higher education within New York City.

<sup>1</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 17 November 1896, pp. 76-79.

<sup>2</sup>David Conrad Hammack, "Participation in Major Decisions in New York City, 1890-1900: The Creation of Greater New York and the Centralization of the Public School System" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1973), Chapter VI, pp. 313-406; Ravitch, pp. 181-188; Rudy, p. 229.

<sup>3</sup>Census estimates of New York's population for 1890 hover between 1,513,501 and 1,710,715. By 1900, the population of Greater New York was 3,437,202. See Daniel Van Pelt, Leslie's History of Greater New York (New York: Arkell Publishing Company, 1899), Volume I, pp. 503, 509; I. N. Phelps Stokes, The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909 (New York: Arno Press, 1926), Volume V, p. 85.

<sup>4</sup>Gorelick, p. 167. Also Andrew S. Draper, "The New York Secondary School System," in United States, Bureau of Education, Annual Report of the Commissioner, 1905, pp. 143-149.

<sup>5</sup>Ravitch, pp. 167-168, citing Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), p. viii.

<sup>6</sup>Gorelick, pp. 165-181.

<sup>7</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 1 January 1855, pp. 22-25; 7 June 1882, pp. 50-56; 30 June 1889, pp. 10-13.

<sup>8</sup>Ravitch, p. 163. Three public high schools were established in 1897.

<sup>9</sup>By 1911, eleven public high schools were in operation. Although in the early 1900s only 8% of the elementary school graduates completed high school, 60% of New York's youngsters received some secondary education. See Gorelick, pp. 98-103.

<sup>10</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 26 March 1896, pp. 22-23. This measure would have expanded upon the previous specification that applicants to CCNY had to present a certificate attesting to their attendance in the public schools. See above. An equivalent certificate would be required of applicants who had attended primary schools outside the City. This additional provision presumably referred to

students from the East Bronx townships which were annexed to New York City on June 6, 1895.

<sup>11</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 1 April 1896, pp. 18-21. Final examinations were administered not only in elementary schools, but also at the high school level. In 1878, the New York Board of Regents had established an exam for secondary school graduation and for admission to some colleges in the State. These tests were the precursors of the New York State Regents Examinations and the College Entrance Examination. See Schudson, p. 41.

<sup>12</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 May 1900, pp. 37-38. City high schools were in the practice of accepting students upon the presentation of certificates from their grammar school principals.

<sup>13</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 19 November 1900, pp. 54-55.

<sup>14</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 April 1899, pp. 36-39; 9 May 1899, pp. 43-45; 16 May 1899, pp. 24-26.

<sup>15</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 April 1899, pp. 36-39.

<sup>16</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 June 1899, pp. 62-63; 10 January 1900, pp. 8-9; 21 May 1900, pp. 37-39; 23 May 1900, pp. 28-33.

<sup>17</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 June 1899, p. 62.

<sup>18</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 24 October 1899, pp. 84-85; 13 December 1899, p. 56. In 1907, the Board of Trustees voted to admit to the College's Sub-Freshman class those high school students who had completed three years of study, which was deemed the equivalent of CCNY's Sub-Freshman course. See CC Trustees, Minutes, 17 June 1907, p. 198.

<sup>19</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 18 March 1901, p. 126.

<sup>20</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 31 January 1901, p. 97.

<sup>21</sup>Robert L. Taylor, Secretary, Admissions Committee, "Summary of High School and College Conference on College Admissions held on Saturday, March 11, 1944," 18 May 1944, p. 5, CC Files, 3.35, Registrar. Taylor's summary of this historic meeting including Dean Morton Gottschall's resume of a similar meeting which took place in December 1923.

<sup>22</sup>Women's City Club of New York Inc., The Privileged Many: A Study of The City University's Open Admissions Policy, 1970-1975 (New York: n.p., 1975), pp. 14-15.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid. This publication contains other platitudes, or rather, falsehoods. It notes, for instance, that from 1849 until 1924, "the only requirements for entrance were New York City residence and a high school diploma." Additionally, it claims that "the start of the 1924 fall semester was the first time that the number of applicants exceeded the available space."

<sup>24</sup>Gorelick, pp. 98-103, 219-220.

<sup>25</sup>United States, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1976), Series H599, H701.

<sup>26</sup>Francis Trow Spaulding, High School and Life: The Report of the Regents' Inquiry (New York and London: The McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., second printing, 1938), pp. 187-208. Cited in Joint High School-College Articulation Committee, "Report of the Subcommittee on Tests and Measurements," June 1947, sec. 2.2, pp. 4-5, CC Files, 3.52, High School-College Committee.

<sup>27</sup>Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," 18 May 1944, p. 5.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>Ad Hoc Committee on Admissions at the College, "Changing Admissions Standards," Alumnus, vol. 64, no. 6, April 1969, p. 23.

<sup>30</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 10 April 1895, pp. 24-30.

<sup>31</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 7 December 1898, pp. 38-42; 31 January 1901, p. 97.

<sup>32</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 19 January 1903, pp. 99-100; 20 March 1905, pp. 112-115.

<sup>33</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 31 January 1901, p. 92; 18 March 1901, p. 132.

<sup>34</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 19 January 1903, pp. 98-101.

<sup>35</sup>Rudolph, pp. 361-365; Veysey, pp. 108-109.

<sup>36</sup>Ravitch, pp. 107-111.

<sup>37</sup>Ravitch, pp. 161-173.

<sup>38</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 15 January 1895, p. 15.

<sup>39</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 15 November 1898, pp. 30-31; 7 December 1898, pp. 38-42.

<sup>40</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 June 1910, pp. 140-143.

<sup>41</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 26 April 1916, pp. 69-70.

<sup>42</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 3 April 1917, pp. 34-39.

<sup>43</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 23 September 1919, pp. 176-179.

<sup>44</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 16 March 1920, pp. 42-48; 22 June 1920, pp. 116-119, 135. The creation and organization of the Extension Division was conducted under the sponsorship of President Sidney Mezes.

<sup>45</sup>CCNY's Evening Session and Extension Division were not maintained by the College as independent entities. The administrative and financial records of the two units were intertwined.

<sup>46</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 22 June 1920, pp. 116-117.

<sup>47</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 22 September 1910, pp. 200-201.

<sup>48</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 23 September 1919, pp. 176-179; 24 January 1924, pp. 12-21; 16 June 1925, pp. 172-173, 196-199.

<sup>49</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 24 January 1924, pp. 19-20.

<sup>50</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 4 June 1925, pp. 136-139; 15 October 1925, pp. 240-241; 14 January 1926, pp. 26-27; 23 April 1926, pp. 98-105; 25 May 1926, pp. 118-122.

<sup>51</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 23 April 1926, pp. 98-105; 20 September 1926, p. 195. The CCNY and Hunter College annexes in Brooklyn officially became Brooklyn College on April 22, 1930.

<sup>52</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 8 July 1924, pp. 162-163; Frederick Bertrand Robinson, "The Board of Higher Education of the City of New York," Alumnus, vol. 22, no. 7, September 1926, pp. 295-300.

<sup>53</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 26 February 1925, pp. 46-51.

<sup>54</sup>Queens College was created on April 6, 1937.

<sup>55</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 17 June 1907, pp. 196-199. The Board of Trustees, already in 1884, had recommended

the establishment of evening classes. See CC Trustees, Minutes, 15 April 1884, p. 79. The matter lay dormant until 1907.

<sup>56</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 20 December 1907, pp. 315-316.

<sup>57</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 20 April 1908, pp. 58-61; 26 October 1908, pp. 136-137.

<sup>58</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 19 April 1909, pp. 66-69.

<sup>59</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 19 April 1909, pp. 66-69; 29 April 1909, pp. 71-73. The term "Evening Session" has been used here to denote Liberal Arts courses offered in the evening hours which did not require payment of any tuition fee. Evening classes began at Hunter College in 1910.

<sup>60</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 June 1910, pp. 140-143; 10 January 1911, p. 24; 12 July 1911, pp. 97-101.

<sup>61</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 26 April 1916, p. 74.

<sup>62</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 4 December 1925, pp. 256-257.

<sup>63</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 24 January 1924, p. 14.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid.

<sup>65</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 22 May 1917, pp. 72-77.

<sup>66</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 16 March 1920, pp. 48-49.

<sup>67</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 18 March 1919, pp. 78-81; 16 March 1920, pp. 42-49.

<sup>68</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 16 March 1920, pp. 42-49.

<sup>69</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 10 May 1921, pp. 74-75.

<sup>70</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 27 May 1914, pp. 74-79; 16 June 1914, pp. 94-99; 26 April 1916, pp. 78-79.

<sup>71</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 21 January 1919, pp. 30-35; 18 March 1919, pp. 78-81; 16 March 1920, pp. 42-49.

<sup>72</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 9 December 1886, pp. 108-111.

<sup>73</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 31 December 1886, p. 119; Rudy, p. 229.

<sup>74</sup>Rudy, p. 229.

<sup>75</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 19 January 1903, pp. 88-91; Rudy, p. 299.

<sup>76</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 13 December 1915, p. 223; 23 September 1919, pp. 176-179. The College also increasingly aided the New York City Bureau of Attendance and Child Welfare. By January 1921, the Extension Division had trained 4,600 teachers and 110 students in the Liberal Arts course were "majoring" in Education. See CC Trustees, Minutes, 18 January 1921, pp. 15-16.

<sup>77</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 18 March 1919, pp. 78-81; 18 January 1921, pp. 10-17.

<sup>78</sup>Gorelick, p. 214.

<sup>79</sup>Gorelick, p. 213. "Service to the City," a CCNY tradition, was recognized by Stephen Duggan, the head of the new Department, as a "special reason" for the founding of the Education Department.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid.

<sup>81</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 16 January 1912, pp. 6-7; 16 September 1913, pp. 108-111.

<sup>82</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 3 November 1913, pp. 132-133; 23 December 1913, pp. 162-164.

<sup>83</sup>It is unclear whether students in Extension courses were required to take the same admissions tests as was required of applicants to baccalaureate programs, or a separate test.

<sup>84</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 16 June 1914, pp. 94-99.

<sup>85</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 27 September 1915, pp. 170-175.

<sup>86</sup>The College Discovery and SEEK programs of the 1960s are additional examples of this technique.

<sup>87</sup>Rudy, p. 240.

<sup>88</sup>Available statistics suggest that the route used by most students to enter the College continued to be that of testing; either entrance examinations administered by CCNY itself, or, increasingly, that conducted by the College Entrance Examination Board. See Gorelick, pp. 219-220.

<sup>89</sup>Hunter College established a center in The Bronx in 1931. The first municipal college in Staten Island was established in 1955.

<sup>90</sup>These post-secondary, but not-quite collegiate courses were also being sponsored by the Board of Education. The technical jurisdiction of Extension courses was thus not clarified; both the city high schools and colleges assumed the responsibility for the provision of this service. This situation was to recur in the post-World War II era. See below.

## CHAPTER IV

## THE EARLY BHE YEARS: CCNY, 1926-1941

A. Introduction

## 1. The Board of Higher Education

In 1926, a Board of Higher Education (BHE) was established in the City of New York. This board replaced the Board of Education as Trustee of New York's municipal colleges. The new board, consisting of twenty-one members appointed by the Mayor, was to "govern and administer that part of the public school system which is of collegiate grade and which leads to academic, technical and professional degrees."<sup>1</sup> The BHE was to "prescribe conditions of student admission, attendance and discharge" and was empowered to furnish "the benefits of collegiate education gratuitously to citizens who are actual residents of the city and who are qualified for admission to any regular undergraduate course of study." Additionally, technical, professional or other courses of study could be offered "gratuitously or otherwise" to actual residents or employees of the City, and to non-matriculated students. Students could be required, at the Board's discretion, to pay library, laboratory, locker and breakage fees, and meet the cost of books

and consumable supplies.<sup>2</sup>

The Board was given "the same powers to acquire sites, buildings, apparatus and equipment for its institutions as the board of education has for school purposes." Already in 1926, a mandate was given to the BHE to select "as soon as possible a site for an educational unit or center under its control and administration in the borough of the city which has the largest high school registration." This unit, which was to emerge out of the City and Hunter College Extension centers in Kings County, became Brooklyn College in 1930.<sup>3</sup>

A three-year transitional period was specified for the transfer of power from the individual municipal college Boards of Trustees to the Board of Higher Education.<sup>4</sup>

## 2. Admission Requirements, CCNY, 1926

At the time of the formation of the BHE, admission to the Freshman class of The City College of New York required a candidate to satisfy both quantitative and qualitative requirements. Meeting the former, substantive prerequisites entailed the presentation of 15 units of secondary school work. Most were required academic units including English, mathematics, foreign languages and history. A student presenting only 14 or 14-1/2 units could be admitted with conditions, with deficiencies being removed within one year of admission.<sup>5</sup>

Evidence of quantitative preparation could be given

by presenting a certificate from an accredited high school or from the College Entrance Examination Board, issued for specific subject areas. Evidence of completion of the required 11 units of high school work could also be supplied by passing CCNY entrance examinations in six areas or the graduation examinations of the Townsend Harris High School. The candidate would be required to supply additional information regarding the completion of the remaining units.<sup>6</sup>

Students who were certified to have met these quantitative entrance requirements and "whose general average in all their high school studies [was] not less than 75%" would be admitted to a full program in the Day Session. All others would be assigned to partial programs, to be taken in the Evening Session.

It is provided, however, that so far as the capacity of the Day Session permits, students [assigned to the Evening Session] may be transferred in the order of their excellence in the entrance examination.<sup>7</sup>

The BHE continued the policy established in 1912 of allowing men of at least twenty-one years of age who were residents of the City to be admitted to particular courses with the approval of department heads. Those meeting requirements for admission to the Freshman class could enroll as matriculants; all others could, by paying tuition fees, register as non-matriculants.<sup>8</sup>

The 1913 resolution admitting New York City government employees who did not qualify as matriculated students

was extended. These "municipal students" were admitted to courses upon payment of tuition fees at a rate of 50% of that charged to regular non-matriculated students.<sup>9</sup>

Women who qualified for matriculation, under a special arrangement with Hunter College, were allowed to attend the City College Evening and Summer Sessions, provided that they could demonstrate that they would be clearly inconvenienced by attending courses at Hunter College.<sup>10</sup>

### 3. Admissions and Access, 1926-1961

Admissions criteria to CCNY following the general formula outlined here: specific and incremental changes were, on occasion, instituted. (See below, table 2) Yet even until 1970, the College would require presentation of specific secondary school course units, and would rely simultaneously on performance in high school and on the testing of candidates as the primary methods of screening applicants for admission. The relative emphasis placed on high school average and on examination scores would fluctuate; the type of tests administered would also be changed periodically. Nonetheless, this mode of access regulation would persist beyond the federation of CUNY in 1961, until the institution of the Open Admissions policy.

Between 1926 and 1961, total enrollment at the municipal college system mushroomed from 43,000 to 92,000. During the same time period, the population of the City grew from 6,276,000 to 7,782,000.<sup>12</sup> The rate of growth

TABLE 2

CHANGES IN ADMISSIONS CRITERIA: CCNY, 1926-1961<sup>11</sup>

| Year | Total<br>No. HS<br>Units | No. Re-<br>quired<br>Units | <u>Required High School Units</u> |      |           |         |         | Lan-<br>guages<br>Allowed | Required<br>High School<br>Average |
|------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
|      |                          |                            | English                           | Math | Languages | History | Science |                           |                                    |
| 1926 | 15                       | 11½                        | 3                                 | 2½   | 5         | 1       | 0       | 6*                        | 75%                                |
| 1932 |                          |                            |                                   |      |           |         |         | ↓                         | 78%                                |
| 1933 |                          |                            |                                   |      |           |         |         | 6-7**                     | ↓                                  |
| 1936 |                          | ↓                          |                                   |      |           |         | ↓       | ↓                         | 80%                                |
| 1939 |                          | 12½                        |                                   |      | ↓         |         | 1       | 7                         |                                    |
| 1943 |                          | 10½                        |                                   |      | 3         |         |         | (+Hebrew)                 |                                    |
| 1946 |                          | ↓                          | ↓                                 |      |           |         |         | 8                         |                                    |
| 1950 | 16                       | 11½                        | 4                                 |      |           |         |         | (+Portuguese)             | ↓                                  |
| 1955 |                          |                            |                                   |      |           |         |         |                           | 82%                                |
| 1958 |                          |                            |                                   |      |           |         |         | ↓                         | 84%                                |
| 1959 | ↓                        | ↓                          | ↓                                 | ↓    | ↓         | ↓       | ↓       | 9                         | 85%                                |
| 1961 | 16                       | 11½                        | 4                                 | 2½   | 3         | 1       | 1       | (+Russian)                | 85%                                |

\*French, German, Greek, Italian, Latin, Spanish

\*\*Hebrew allowed as a second language

of enrollment at the college thus exceeded New York City's growth rate by nearly 500%.

The growth of the student body was determined as much by the issues of student merit and the availability of facilities as by the continuously evolving "mission" of the College. Yet, as the 20th century progressed, access to public higher education in New York City was to be increasingly effected by major external events: the Great Depression, World War II, the "cold war" and suburban sprawl of the 1950s, and, finally, the "coming of age" of the post-World War II "baby boom" in the 1960s. The economic, social and political conditions created by these happenings were to effect not only the desire and need for a college education, but also the very structure of access to the municipal colleges.

A number of other themes were present in discussions and decisions related to access to the municipal colleges. The first, evident from the inception of The Free Academy, pertained to the relationship of the College to New York City's elementary and secondary schools. The second element, created by the addition of sec. 1143-b to the New York State Education Law in 1938, allowed the waiver of the requirement of United States citizenship, in certain specified cases, as an additional avenue for admission to the municipal colleges. The third component, effected by the addition of sec. 1143-d of the Education Law in 1940, allowed the BHE to waive the requirement of residence in New

York City as a criterion for admission. Another dimension arose out of the organizational development of the municipal colleges' different divisions and sessions which together might form a unified and stratified system of higher education in New York City. This process of integration, to a large extent, was related to the emergence of systematic evaluations, and planning for the future of the entire system. The final access theme which arose during the 1926-1961 period was the idea that higher education was not a municipal function, but ultimately, a state responsibility. This concept was increasingly articulated as it became more difficult for the City to provide tuition-free higher education to an ever-increasing pool of students. A resentment of the City's statutory obligation to supply this service began to emerge: by 1961, CCNY's mission and free tuition policy would be seriously challenged.

#### 4. Chapter 226, Laws of 1929

One of the BHE's first accomplishments was the receipt of State money "for the elementary and high schools under the control of the board of higher education." Funding was allocated "on the same basis as (New York City) receives apportionments of public school moneys for the schools conducted by the board of education."<sup>13</sup> Chapter 226, which became sec. 1145 of the Education Law, was important for two reasons. Firstly, the City of New York and the BHE would receive an additional \$400,000 per year

for the education of the children enrolled in Hunter College's Model and High Schools and CCNY's Townsend Harris High School. This assistance would free other monies for collegiate purposes. Additionally, sec. 1145 acted to separate the BHE's jurisdiction over higher educational functions from that of the Board of Education's claim to control all the public elementary and secondary schools within the City. Thus, the relationship of the City's colleges to the remainder of New York's schools, a constant and problematic theme, shifted toward the separation of the administrative, financial and functional domains of the two organizations.

#### 5. The Creation of Brooklyn College

In its early years, the BHE was absorbed with the creation of Brooklyn College. Numerous meetings were held in conjunction with an advisory committee of leading Brooklyn citizens to establish a center for higher education in Kings County.<sup>14</sup> Yet the move to create the new facility rejuvenated a long-standing local cause: the creation of a self-governing University of Brooklyn. The drive to transform the City and Hunter College centers in Brooklyn to an independent unit also generated a debate regarding the administrative parity with or subordination of the proposed new unit to the existing municipal colleges. Thus, the emergence of a centralized system of higher education in New York City, encompassing numerous collegiate

institutions, operating with equal powers of policy-making and implementation, was not at all assured from the outset.

The idea of "The University of Brooklyn" originated in 1861 when a State legislative act empowered a local council to establish colleges "promoting literature, science and the arts."<sup>15</sup> With the outbreak of the Civil War, the idea became dormant. When the City of New York was consolidated in 1898, City College and Hunter College began to accept qualified applicants from all boroughs. The opening of New York's subway system in 1904 facilitated transportation to the Uptown campus. Yet even this facility would soon prove insufficient.

Starting again in 1905, several proposals re-emerged proposing the establishment of Brooklyn's own university. The need for post-secondary education in Kings County, New York City's most populous borough, was obviously acute: City and Hunter College's Extension Divisions, established in the early 1900s, were proving to be inadequate to meet the demand.<sup>16</sup>

The 1923-1926 New York State legislative sessions witnessed the introduction of two types of bills drafted to meet Brooklyn's educational needs. One set of plans re-introduced the notion of a separate University of Brooklyn, with its own trustees and sources of funding. Similar measures were forwarded calling for independent universities in The Bronx and Queens. Faced with the prospect of each of five boroughs operating two colleges (one for

men, one for women), resulting in ten Boards of Trustees, ten charters, ten groups applying to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment for funds and ten ways of conducting work, a more manageable alternative was required.<sup>17</sup>

City College's President Mezes advocated the creation of a collegiate unit in Brooklyn supervised by City College's Board of Trustees. Yet, it was a draft by Frederick Robinson, then Director of the Evening Session, which introduced the idea of a Board of Higher Education which would supervise three municipal colleges, each operating as equals. The new measure floundered in Albany until a committee of more than one hundred prominent citizens, coordinated by Ralph Jonas, president of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, was able to negotiate a compromise bill to the satisfaction of all interested parties. Thus, Chapter 407 was signed into law on April 16, 1926.<sup>18</sup>

Although Chapter 407 had been specifically enacted to provide the machinery for the creation of a new college in Kings County, the establishment of Brooklyn College was to remain controversial even among the membership of the BHE.<sup>19</sup> Chairman M. J. Stroock claimed that under sec. 1143 of the Education Law, the Board "could not now segregate portions of the existing institutions and erect them into a separate and distinct college."<sup>20</sup> Additionally, a 1930 petition from seventeen faculty members of "the Brooklyn Center of City College" urged the formation of only a Center, under the continued auspices of The City College, in

order to assure the maintenance of the College's "tradition and high standards of conduct and scholarship." Both of these points were overruled. On April 22, 1930, the BHE voted decisively to establish a separate unit of the system, Brooklyn College.<sup>21</sup>

Despite its independence and physical separateness, Brooklyn College was to emulate its parent institutions. This was particularly the case regarding admissions criteria: Brooklyn College reports on 1930s activities indicate the establishment of an access formula paralleling that of The City College.<sup>22</sup>

The equity of new units under the jurisdiction of the BHE with pre-existent ones was ultimately to foster both the opportunity for innovation and a difficulty in the control and administration of the various colleges in the system. Not only was the Board of Higher Education, under Chapter 407 of the Laws of 1926 to establish four-year colleges in the City of New York, but beginning in 1955, a string of two-year community colleges would be initiated under this same provision. All colleges, based to a large measure on the precedent established in 1930, would have an equal voice in the affairs of the BHE. These considerations would, in later years, have a direct bearing on the expansion of access to public higher education in the City of New York.

## B. The Great Depression and CCNY

### 1. Introduction

As the Great Depression intruded upon the nation, numerous educational activities were diminished.<sup>23</sup> President Robinson of City College was outspoken in his defense of public education.

Education promotes honest, free, fearless and capable intelligence. It is the antidote to ignorance which can be controlled by ballyhoo slogans and insidious propaganda which plays upon prejudices and passions rather than reason. The continuance of education is the best insurance against the recurrence of those very social and economic maladjustments from which we now suffer.<sup>24</sup>

In New York City, decreased tax revenues jeopardized the municipal colleges. Robinson's protest, therefore, was aimed at those "fiscal authorities [who] are taking the determination of educational policy out of the hands of educators."<sup>25</sup>

In March 1932, the Depression hit City College full-force. Acting Mayor Joseph V. McKee urged the closing of the municipal colleges, suggesting instead that the City pay students to attend private colleges. City monies, he claimed, were better spent on child welfare and relief for World War I veterans.<sup>26</sup> By mid-April, City officials called for a reduction in enrollment at City and Hunter Colleges; Brooklyn College would not be restricted to the same degree as the older colleges as the Board of Aldermen "did not wish to stunt [its] growth to a normal size."<sup>27</sup>

The Alumni Association was CCNY's staunchest supporter. In a scathing denunciation of "the ill-informed who [since the inception of The Free Academy] had sought to destroy the living fabric of Townsend Harris's dream," the group issued the following rebuttal to those who would shut down the College:

Now when the government of the City is profoundly disturbed by municipal problems of the gravest nature, all the tribe of detractors, whining over the shrinkage of their bloated money bags, jealous of a life and purpose they can not understand, and dissembling under the cloak of civic welfare their hatred of races and creeds not their own, rise up in ignorance and hypocrisy to call the College a luxury, and by their blatancy in troubled times, to disturb the calm minds of those who desire to do well.<sup>28</sup>

The disproportionate curtailment of secondary and higher educational services was attacked by President Robinson. "In the higher schools and colleges are the most promising future citizens. These students, if not helped at their tasks, will swell the ranks of those now idle and, in the future, they will be unable to render the services of which they are potentially capable."<sup>29</sup> Thus, the rhetoric utilized in the defense of education, in general, and of free public higher education in New York City, in particular, capitalized upon the diverse elements of CCNY's "mission" which had developed over the preceding 85 years. The engendering of a widespread and stable citizenship and the cultivation of a resilient and self-supporting population remained a critical goal of the municipal college.

## 2. Austerity Measures: The "Limited-Matriculated Student"

Robinson was not only City College's articulate public defender: he was also its expedient administrator. In the Spring of 1932, when the crisis impinged upon BHE deliberations, Robinson urged the Board to limit the admission of students so that total enrollment would remain at a constant level. The ablest students would be selected for the Day Session, with others taking a partial program in the Evening Session.<sup>30</sup>

The Colleges were greatly restricted by law regarding sources of additional revenues. After certifying the measures' legality, the Board required students to buy their own textbooks and to pay assorted non-instructional fees.<sup>31</sup> Yet, it was not within the discretionary power of the BHE "to impose instructional fees for courses construed to be essential to a regular undergraduate course of study."<sup>32</sup> Thus, the Depression may have been the first of several critical points in time when the administration of the municipal colleges was tantalized by the abandonment of a free tuition policy.<sup>33</sup>

At three hastily-scheduled special meetings, the BHE and the Presidents of the three colleges debated limiting student enrollment.<sup>34</sup> After much deliberation, the following measure was adopted:<sup>35</sup>

RESOLVED, That in the Day Session of each College the total number of admissions of regularly matriculated students to undergraduate courses for the semester beginning September 1932 shall not exceed

such admissions for the semester beginning September 1931.<sup>36</sup>

Additional students could be admitted to the Evening Session as "Limited-Matriculated Students," a new student category, upon payment of \$2.50 per credit. The basis for transfer to the Fully-Matriculated status would be "scholastic merit." Standards for matriculation in the Evening and Summer Sessions were to be set at the same level as those of the Day Session. Transfers from the Evening to Day Session would continue, as in the past, depending on classroom capacity.<sup>37</sup>

In voting for all crisis resolutions, the Board reiterated that "all the foregoing resolutions were adopted as emergency measures [for 1932-1933] and are not to be regarded as permanent changes at this time in the policies of the Board."<sup>38</sup> Actions were to be made public by the Chairman of the Board.<sup>39</sup>

The proposal to impose tuition fees brought about student actions. City and Hunter College students protested placing entrance "on a monetary rather than intellectual standard." Some groups claimed that 75% of the Evening Session would have to quit school. Petitions were circulated and rallies were held in opposition to a policy which would make higher education "the exclusive property of the privileged wealthy."<sup>40</sup>

The Depression measures were enacted, though reluctantly and with an air of resentment. Thus, it was re-

cognized by the BHE and College administrators that the crisis resolutions represented a construction of the Colleges' mission, effecting "the diminution of educational services to the citizens of the City."<sup>41</sup> In addition to charging for Extension courses, including even those deemed to be of a collegiate character, a variety of non-instructional charges would now be levied. The initiation of the category of the Limited-Matriculated students was seen as the only way to curtail Day Session enrollment, thus cutting costs, while simultaneously continuing to admit students able to profit from a college education. The imposition of a moderate tuition rate was yet another means of increasing funds. Above all, these measures were intended to be temporary expedients, and were to be discontinued as soon as national fiscal stability was attained.

The Depression measures were, however, to become permanent features. Non-instructional charges, currently called the "Consolidated Fee," are now uncontested collegiate expenses. The separation of the student body into two groups, the superior, or Fully-Matriculated students, from the competent, or Limited-Matriculated students was, similarly, to become an integral feature of access to public higher education in New York City. Yet the creation of this second tier of students represented a new dimension in student admission policies. The evolving relationship between this group of students and the fully matriculated, Baccalaureate degree students was to present ongoing and

increasingly complex problems to the Colleges' administration. Controversy regarding the quality of students attending the municipal colleges, transfer policies, curricular reform and budgetary allocations would be generated and exacerbated by this second tier of students.

The Limited-Matriculated students were defined as those whose high school averages fell between approximately 75% and the "quality" requirement established each term for admission to the Day Session. In 1932, this meant students whose averages were between 75% and 78%; by 1961, second-tier students had expanded to include students with averages between 75% and 85%. These students were later to be registered primarily as Associate degree candidates, often enrolled in two-year colleges. In addition, the tuition rate charged the Limited-Matriculated students in 1932 was 50% of the rate charged the Non-Matriculated students; by 1961, fees had been raised to about 75% of those charged to Non-Matriculants.<sup>42</sup>

### C. The Space Problem

#### 1. Introduction

The creation of the category of Limited-Matriculated students provided a means for CCNY to deal with the ever-present space shortage. Thus, the shifting of a segment of the College's enrollment to the Evening Session and part-time registration alleviated the pressure on Day Session classes.

Other methods were also utilized to cope with the chronic problem. Buildings and rooms were leased, as necessary, for instructional purposes. By 1912, the new City College quarters were inadequate for the ever-increasing number of students. Hunter College also was unable to accommodate all the girls who applied for admission. By 1917, the situation had deteriorated to the point where "[College] authorities were forced to use all ingenuity in arranging schedules which would keep every bit of space in use from early in the morning until late at night."<sup>43</sup> The establishment of Evening Sessions in Brooklyn in 1917 and in Queens in 1924 were insufficient to keep pace with the growing demand. Even Summer Session enrollment was limited to those working for degrees, rather than those taking pre-professional courses. New quarters were in urgent demand.<sup>44</sup>

In 1929, the space shortage was acknowledged by President Robinson to be directly responsible for the exclusion from the College of deserving students.

The pressure from those wishing to enter the College has become tremendous. The policy of the President and the faculty has been steadily to raise the entrance requirements in order to admit to the limited facilities only the very ablest boys in the City. In the meantime, additional efforts have been made to increase the facilities of the College in order that the intellectually competent of the City may not be deprived of the educational benefits which would make them more capable members of our civic, industrial and political community.<sup>45</sup>

The year 1930 saw the opening of Brooklyn College,

housed in temporary quarters in the Boro Hall district. Enrollment in September 1930 exceeded 5,000 students in the Day and Evening. Classes for men and women, while being conducted in the same building, were segregated by sex; the system of "co-ordinated education" was to persist until the World War II years. Yet, in order to conserve physical and financial resources, elective, upper-level classes were conducted jointly for men and women students.<sup>46</sup>

In 1930, a new building with an estimated capacity of 2,000 students was erected at the 23rd Street location of City College. Since Day Session enrollment at the business center was much less than the uptown registration, the boys and faculty of the Townsend Harris High School were transferred downtown. This effort to relieve congestion was to be shortlived: enrollment at the School of Business was to mushroom during the Depression years, requiring yet additional shifts of students.<sup>47</sup>

The space shortage remained acute throughout the 1930s. During the Depression, rental of facilities, once again, became necessary.<sup>48</sup> Thousands of students were crowded into quarters "prepared for one-fifth the number." "The problem of inadequate physical accommodations" was described by Robinson "as the most important issue at City College."<sup>49</sup> Even storage space under the Lewisohn Stadium was salvaged.<sup>50</sup> President Robinson urged the Board to "give serious attention to the problem of acquiring more extensive property for College use."<sup>51</sup>

## 2. The Creation of Queens College

In 1935, a committee was appointed to investigate and report on the educational need and desirability, and the financial feasibility, of a "collegiate center in the Borough of Queens."<sup>52</sup> The impetus to establishing a new, independent college out of existent Extension units arose after Mayor LaGuardia and various civic associations had gone on record as favoring such an institution. On April 6, 1937, pursuant to Article 44A of the Education Law, and in order not to deprive Queens residents of the benefit of free collegiate education, Queens College was created. The New York City Comptroller was authorized to issue bonds for the amount of \$424,000 to subsidize the new institution. Provisions were made to transfer Queens residents in attendance at the other city colleges to the new center. It was anticipated that Queens College would alleviate enrollment pressures at the existent municipal colleges, where admissions were "strictly limited by a high passing mark: a high school average of 79% or better."<sup>53</sup>

## 3. Higher Education in Staten Island

In 1938, a deputation of Staten Island citizens petitioned the Board to consider the possibility of establishing a collegiate unit in the Borough of Richmond. The group noted the great difficulty of Staten Island students in attending the free colleges (which entailed a three to six hour trip each day) and the constant growth

of the island's high school population. If facilities would not be provided, few students would be able to continue their education.

They feel that they have been encouraged to travel along an avenue of mental development which at present turns out to be a blind alley at the very stage in life when they are most interested and eager. The only remedy for this "dead end" is the establishment of free college facilities accessible to these ambitious young people.<sup>54</sup>

A special Board committee, as a response to this request and mindful of the fiscal limitations of the City, recommended that in lieu of a new college, the BHE establish a center in Richmond in rented quarters, under the jurisdiction of Queens College. A tentative budget was developed and estimates of student enrollment were compiled.<sup>55</sup>

All available information suggests, however, that the center never attained fruition. It was not until the inception of the Staten Island Community College in 1955 that public higher education was brought to Richmond County.<sup>56</sup>

The creation of an independent college in Queens, and earlier, in Brooklyn, did not actually extend free public higher education to additional groups of New Yorkers. Geographic access to post-secondary public education had been granted already to residents of these areas earlier, with the establishment of City and Hunter College Extension units. The new colleges did answer, however, requests

for a "community college." Elements of local pride resulted in each borough, ultimately, possessing its "own," unique and independent college.

#### 4. Coping Measures

The space issue superseded the need for an increased capital budget. Increasingly, the day-to-day operations of the College were and would be affected by the College's lack of facilities.

During the Depression, as a direct result of the shortage of classrooms, CCNY instituted larger-sized sections. Emergency centers were established in Garden City and in White Plains for students meeting all entrance requirements.<sup>57</sup> In Spring 1933, the School of Business and Civic Administration even resolved to discontinue admitting women to the Day Session because of overcrowding.<sup>58</sup>

In 1937, Queens College opened; Brooklyn College began classes at its new Flatbush campus.<sup>59</sup> Yet the space problem persisted. Admissions requirements were raised again in an effort to limit enrollments. All available footage was allocated to student instruction: the College's administrative and faculty areas were reduced, lunchroom and library facilities were minimal and space for extracurricular activities was eliminated.<sup>60</sup> Even registration in the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) was held down because of limited facilities.<sup>61</sup>

The unprecedented growth of the School of Business

aggravated the acute space problem. Only a few years after the opening of the new building, classrooms were overcrowded. With 43 out of the 87 classrooms being allocated to the Townsend Harris High School, approximately 15,000 people were crammed into the remaining space every day. Beginning in February 1939, City College embarked on what was acknowledged to be "merely a temporary expedient": business Freshmen were enrolled uptown. Serious attention was given to the possibility of transferring the Preparatory High School to new quarters.<sup>62</sup>

The situation was also severe in the Evening Session. Required courses closed before the end of registration, with no space available to open new sections. After a period of investigation and experimentation, the first period of night classes was moved back, from 6:25 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., to enable "a larger number of [working] students to enroll for the first hour of classes."<sup>63</sup>

In Fall 1941, a new building was erected at the uptown campus in the open space between the Chemistry and the Mechanical Arts buildings. Designed as a measure for the "temporary relief of the excessive overcrowding of the Engineering school," the building at 140th Street was to become but one of the "architectural monstrosities" of the early 1940s. Later creations included the "wings" of Harris Hall and the vaults on the front of the Chemistry building.<sup>64</sup>

In a state of near desperation, the College began negotiations to obtain the Hebrew Orphan Asylum, a property covering two large city blocks, situated between 136th and 138th Streets, between Amsterdam Avenue and Broadway.<sup>65</sup>

### 5. The Space Problem and Access

The space shortage at the municipal colleges produced diverse tactics for coping with the dilemma. The lack of facilities affected primarily those students already registered at the College. But space considerations did have a direct bearing on the number of students who could be admitted each term. The relationship was a simple ratio: the greater the number of "entrenched" students at the College, the fewer the number who could be admitted. Thus, entering Freshmen were considered at the bottom of "the totem pole" of student groups.

The following calculations determined admissions to the Day Session in the Spring of 1936:

TABLE 3

#### ENROLLMENT AND ADMISSIONS, SPRING 1936<sup>66</sup>

|                              |       |
|------------------------------|-------|
| Old Students Continuing      | 7,071 |
| Evening Session Transfers    | 150   |
| Former Students Re-entering  | 225   |
| Entering from T.H.H.S        | 140   |
| Entering from Other Colleges | 22    |
|                              | <hr/> |
|                              | 7,608 |
| Remaining available Spaces   | 768   |
| TOTAL DAY SESSION:           | 8,376 |

This type of formula had already been employed in the 1880s to ascertain the size of the incoming Freshman class. In later years, in-transfers from community colleges would further reduce the potential size of the entering class of students.

The space issue was thus an ever-present theme influencing access to the municipal colleges. Throughout CCNY's history, restricted facilities reduced admissions to the College. The space shortage actually limited registration levels even beyond that which had been determined previously by College authorities based on considerations of merit and the institution's mission.

The space problem manifested itself in three areas. Firstly, overcrowding was a major rationale for the establishment of new colleges. Overcongestion also led to the leasing and construction of additional facilities at existent institutions. These types of activities were greatly dependent on the BHE's capital budget: financial matters thus weighed heavily in the control of access to the municipal colleges. But the space problem exerted an even more pervasive influence in the area of collegiate administrative procedures.

Tactics for coping with the chronic dilemma emerged on an ad hoc basis in an effort to maintain "service to the city." Expedients were instituted randomly, presumably for limited periods of time. Yet often they were to become permanent features. Occasionally, a coping device

generated additional, more serious and complicated problems. Increasingly, these inconveniences were integrated into CCNY's routine operations, ultimately affecting the quality of its academic life.

The pragmatic changes were effected as a matter of necessity, sometimes with an air of desperation about them, but never as a subject of vocal intra-collegiate or public debate. Criticism of ongoing expedients aimed at preventing the restriction of enrollment at the College was unheard of until the 1960s. At that point, the manner in which City College's grounds and buildings were utilized would emerge as a full-blown, volatile political debate, both within the College's community and among the people of New York City.

D. Expansion of Access: Non-United States Citizens and Non-New York City Residents

Prior to the entry of the United States into World War II, the municipal colleges would extend access to two groups heretofore excluded from public higher education in New York City: the BHE would be allowed to waive the admissions requirements of United States citizenship and residence in New York City.

The passage of Chapter 385 of the Laws of 1938 added an additional paragraph to Article 44-A of the State Education Law. The newly-created sec. 1143-b provided that the BHE "shall have the right to waive the requirement

of citizenship."<sup>67</sup> Shortly thereafter, Chapter 636 of the Laws of 1940, which was to become sec. 1143-d of the Education Law, allowed the BHE to "waive the residence requirement for admission to the colleges under its jurisdiction."<sup>68</sup> Both sec. 1143-b and sec. 1143-d directed the Board to "adopt appropriate Bylaws setting forth the conditions or circumstances under which such requirements may be waived."<sup>69</sup>

Between 1938 and 1941, several amendments to the Bylaws allowed the waiver of citizenship and residence as pre-requisites for admission.<sup>70</sup> All additions were introduced to the Board and finalized in less than one year; furthermore, students actually utilized their new opportunities immediately.<sup>71</sup>

There were, however, six ad hoc resolutions passed in 1941-1942 which permitted non-New York City residents and non-United States citizens to attend the Colleges. These measures were never added to or even considered for inclusion in the Bylaws. Most actions were directly related to the war emergency; one measure allowed a student of the College who moved outside the City after completion of more than 50% of his credit requirements for the Bachelor's degree, to continue his education at CCNY upon payment of \$5 per credit.<sup>72</sup>

The war resolutions are unique in that they existed only as legislative provisions. At least a decade was to pass before non-New York City, New York State residents

would be officially permitted, through the enactment of additional Bylaws, to attend the municipal colleges. This would occur primarily as a result of the inception of State financial support for BHE-administered teacher training, Associate degree and graduate programs.

In the 1950s, foreign students would again be allowed admittance to the municipal colleges. The admission of these students was facilitated primarily by the passage of State Laws and BHE Bylaws waiving the citizenship, and, on occasion, the residence requirements.<sup>73</sup> Additionally, however, several special emergency resolutions sanctioned the admission of refugees from Hungary, Cuba and Southeast Asia.<sup>74</sup>

Over a 25-year period, foreign students, often without established residence within New York City, were admitted to the municipal colleges. These students were accepted as members of exchange programs, as immigrants, or simply, as aliens studying at the Colleges. Usually, foreign students were admitted under BHE Bylaws. Often, however, access for non-citizens and non-residents was expanded by legislative resolution, exerting a de facto result undifferentiated from that of official Bylaw provision. In all cases, it was stipulated that students be qualified for a collegiate education and that facilities be available for these additional students. Available statistics suggest that the diverse quotas for foreign students were almost always completely filled. In almost all instances,

changes were made on an ad hoc basis, often in response to political repression in a foreign country. Thus, in general, the Board facilitated the passage of provisions related to foreign student access to New York City's colleges in a rapid, uncontested and relatively unplanned manner.<sup>75</sup>

## E. The Regulation of Access

### 1. Introduction

The admission of foreign students to the municipal colleges was facilitated by the adoption and implementation of "legislative provisions." These statutes, which originated in the State Legislature and in the Board of Higher Education, may be identified as Law, Bylaw and Resolution.

Two additional types of regulations, emanating from the Office of the College President, also determined access to the Colleges. The "Administrative Directive" and the "Administrative Proviso" served as executive orders. While not having a statutory or legal basis, these types of regulations were increasingly responsible for the control of access to The City College of New York.

### 2. Legislative Provisions

The primary category within this group of regulations is that of New York State Law. After the creation of the BHE in 1926, Article 44-A of the State Education Law encompassed all statutes pertaining to the municipal colleges. On July 1, 1947, the Education Law was reor-

ganized: Article 44-A became Article 125.

The second level of statutory provisions is that of Bylaw. In general, admission to the Colleges were regulated as follows:

#### TABLE 4

#### BHE BYLAW REVISIONS, 1926 TO 1971<sup>76</sup>

- 1926-1932: Operation under Chapter 407, Laws of 1926. Article 44-A, "Board of Higher Education." Also operating under previous legislation and CCNY
- 1932-1939: Bylaws of the BHE. Article VII, par. 1, "Faculties . . . shall determine standards of admission."
- 1939-1956: Bylaws of the BHE. Article XV, sec. 151, "Admission."<sup>77</sup>
- 1956-1959: Bylaws of the BHE. Article XV, sec. 210, "Admission."
- 1959-1971: Bylaws of the BHE. Article XVII, sec. 17.1, "Admission"; sec. 17.2, "Additional Admissions"; sec. 17.3, "Admission Upon Payment of Fees."

The third type of provisions controlling access is that of the BHE Resolution. This category refers to measures adopted by the BHE, but not included, or even considered for inclusion in the Bylaws. Examples of such provisions include the "war resolutions" of the early-1940s and the "political refugee" resolutions of the late-1950s.<sup>78</sup>

### 3. Executive Directives

The "Administrative Directive" is determined by the College's President, in consultation with Deans, the Regis-

strar and faculty. This official information is available to a finite number of concerned parties and may be characterized as being quasi-public knowledge.

The "Administrative Proviso" is also determined by the College's President, but usually in private consultation with a Dean or the Registrar. It is, as opposed to the Directive, a restricted communication. Provisos are unofficial directives which are made known, in a discreet manner, only to a very limited number of parties.

After 1926, the latter two levels of regulations encompassed the entire range of particulars related to the mode of student access, the method of applying for admission and the specific admissions requirements. In addition, such provisions dealt with the assigning of student status, standards of student retention and rules of transfer between the Colleges' different branches and sessions.

In earlier decades, these types of operating procedures were frequently discussed and adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Free Academy or CCNY. In later years, however, only a few of the operating specifics were adopted by the Board of Higher Education as a Bylaw or as a Resolution. Increasingly, the concrete aspects of student admissions and allocation would be determined at the level of the Office of the President and his executive staff. Executive directives would exert a uniquely powerful impact on access considerations during the crisis years of the 1940s.<sup>79</sup>

## F. Student Status Allocation

### 1. Introduction

As noted earlier, the mode of access initiated in 1924 allowed students to be admitted either on the basis of results of entrance exams or on graduation from high school with the average required for matriculation. Until the Spring of 1932, most students were accepted on the basis of test ratings. In the aftermath of the "Depression resolutions," however, the Day Session Freshman class was increasingly filled through the certification mode of entry. CCNY did permit applicants with high school averages falling between 75% and the matriculation average to attempt to qualify for enrollment in the Day Session by passing entrance tests.<sup>80</sup>

In February 1936, by which time the matriculation average had risen to 80%, a total of 768 students were admitted to the College. The breakdown of procedures utilized is as follows:

TABLE 5  
METHODS OF ADMISSION, SPRING 1936.<sup>81</sup>

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Available Spaces*  | 768 |
| Admitted on credentials (80% average)                          | 668 |
| Admitted on examination  | 100 |
| Applicants with averages below 75%--<br>Rejected               | 218 |
| Applicants with averages between 75% and<br>80%                | 695 |
| Applicants with averages between 75% and<br>80% who took exams | 335 |
| Applicants admitted on the basis of<br>entrance exams          | 100 |

\*See table 3, above.

By mid-1940, the Board of Higher Education went on record as favoring direct admission to both the Day and Evening Sessions "based on high school certification and entrance examinations."<sup>82</sup> By this time, the matriculation average had risen to 85%: students with averages between 75% and 82% would be admitted to the tests. But the Board questioned the prognostic value of the high school average, noting that "grades do not always provide a satisfactory means of selection."<sup>83</sup> This lack of total confidence in methods utilized to screen students was echoed by President Mead of City College. Mead noted the compulsory reduction of the number of Freshmen to be admitted to City College, from 1200 to 1000, precisely when the matriculation average was raised. Thus the City College President challenged the function of the entrance exams.

There can be little doubt that many of the applicants who are not admitted are qualified.

Ideally, the purpose of these [admissions] exams would be to determine in doubtful cases the qualification of the applicants to undertake regular college work and not primarily to limit the enrollment.<sup>84</sup>

Thus, testing was acknowledged to be another method of curtailing registration. As an additional measure to achieve this goal, the Evening Session, effective September 1940, ceased to admit students lacking required high school units. This practice had resulted in "providing classes for several hundred students in courses which belong distinctly to the high school." The elimination of remedial courses for students admitted with deficiencies "will release some of the pressure of our schedule problems."<sup>85</sup>

## 2. Brooklyn College Innovations, September 1941

In September 1941, two actions at Brooklyn College brought about parallel, but not identical decisions regarding admissions at City College. At Brooklyn College, a BHE resolution went into effect which fixed the ratio of Freshmen as follows: 75% of the entering class would be admitted using the certification method (i.e., high school average), with the remaining 25% being admitted on the basis of the admissions test.<sup>86</sup> In practice, this meant that "the required rating for admission from a New York City high school without examination [was] usually over 85%."<sup>87</sup> The remaining students could qualify for admission

on the basis of their high school records (of at least 75%) and their ratings in achievement tests in the following: mechanics of expression, effectiveness of expression, reading comprehension, social studies, natural sciences and general mathematics.<sup>88</sup>

The second action which Brooklyn College undertook in the Fall of 1941 was the initiation of an Associate degree program in liberal arts subjects. Thus, Brooklyn College became the first of the municipal colleges to offer a two-year course for those students "who are unable or unwilling to pursue a four-year curriculum." General, vocational and semi-professional classes were also available.<sup>89</sup>

With the development of the Associate degree programs in the Evening Session, Brooklyn College immediately abolished the status of "Limited-Matriculation." Thus, the designation for second-tier students was transferred to Associate degree candidates.<sup>90</sup>

### 3. City College Imitations, September 1941

City College imitated Brooklyn College's innovations. Beginning in September 1941, City College also began restricting the proportion of those admitted on the basis of high school record to 75% of all admissions. While an acknowledged "lack of complete satisfaction with the use of grades alone" had given rise to the use of testing as a supplementary method for screening applicants, College administrators noted that

At present, the high school grades are the most dependable single factor for the predicting of the student's success in college. As a matter of fact, these grades themselves are to a considerable degree indices of character traits and should be regarded as such.<sup>91</sup>

The remaining 25% of the entering Freshmen would be admitted on the basis of a procedure which utilized

tests. Here the College embarked on a new policy which differed in several ways from the one employed for the previous nine years. Heretofore, the testing program operated by City College's Student Personnel Bureau was reserved for admissions to the Day Session; now, the Bureau assumed responsibility for testing for both Day and Evening Sessions. Of those applying to the Evening Session in September 1941 using the tests, 30% passed.<sup>92</sup>

Prior to September 1941, entrance tests were a battery of exams developed by City College's individual departments in the fields of English, mathematics, languages, and history. In addition, "the Psychological Aptitude Test devised by Bingham" was administered to applicants.<sup>93</sup> After September 1941, "in order to conform more closely to Brooklyn College's admission requirements," City College abandoned the departmental tests and began using the Minimum Test Program of the Cooperative Test Service.<sup>94</sup> The Psychological Exam of the Scholastic Aptitude Test was also used.<sup>95</sup>

Additional Fall 1941 changes altered the mode of admissions to City College for second-tier students. Prior to Fall 1941, these students would be admitted as Matriculated or Limited-Matriculated students depending entirely upon their ratings in the admissions tests. Specifically, all such students were considered for admission on an equal basis, "without regard to high school record," regardless of whether their average was 75.1% or 79.9%.<sup>96</sup> This "clean

slate" approach to the administration and evaluation of the entrance exams was abolished in 1941. Instead, a "composite score" was developed.

#### 4. The "Composite Score"

The composite score introduced in September 1941 was used until September 1945. It relied on three indicators for determining success in college, and thereby controlling admissions. The weight given to each item is as follows:

TABLE 6

COMPOSITE SCORE, SEPT. 1941 TO SEPT. 1945<sup>97</sup>

|                          |      |
|--------------------------|------|
| High School Average      | 57%  |
| Cooperative Test Score   | 29%  |
| Psychological Exam Score | 14%  |
|                          | 100% |

The Cooperative Tests were probably those known as the "Iowa Tests of Educational Development" constructed primarily by Kenneth W. Vaughn for The Science Research Associates. The Psychological Exam was that of the Scholastic Aptitude Test Service.

The composite or combined score, as it was also called, was alternatively described as embodying a 4:2:1 ratio, or a 6:3:1½ ratio: the relative weights remained the same. The range of scores ran from 0 through 70. When first instituted, the required score for matriculation was

60; as World War II effected enrollment at the all-male college, the composite score was slowly reduced to 56.<sup>98</sup>

Revisions effected in Fall 1941 thus called for the admission of 75% of the entering class relying solely on high school record, with the remaining 25% being admitted using a composite score. This procedure, now open also to students applying directly to the Evening Session, used tests which were standardized and used by numerous colleges throughout the country.

Information regarding CCNY's adherence to the new admissions policy during the war years is scanty. It does appear, however, that prior to September 1941, only about 7% of Freshmen were admitted on the basis of qualifying exams; after this date, between 20% to 22% were admitted on the basis of the composite score.<sup>99</sup> Records concerning the proportion of applicants who passed admissions tests and who were accepted on the basis of the composite score are contradictory and can not be used.<sup>100</sup>

##### 5. The "Special Student"

A second series of changes pertaining to applicants with the lower high school grades involved a change of name for the student category and modifications of transfer regulations and crediting of course work. In Spring 1941, the category of "Limited-Matriculated student" was changed to "Special student." By Fall of that year, an additional method for attaining the matriculated status was offered.

In addition to the option of transferring on the basis of a B average in a minimum of 15 credits completed over two consecutive terms, Special students were now allowed to transfer to the Day Session (space permitting) upon presentation of a C average for 60 credits.<sup>101</sup>

These City College regulations were a conscious attempt to approximate Brooklyn College's new policy of permitting the transfer of Associate degree holders to a Baccalaureate program.

The Fall 1941 innovations at both Brooklyn and City Colleges were aimed at the competent, but not superior high school graduates. These measures were the schools' first manifest steps in the establishment of a structured, student allocation system within the municipal colleges. Yet, as we have seen, the dual-strata college materialized as much a result of conscious planning for a more general curriculum and vocational training as an outcome of pragmatic considerations which emerged during and after the Great Depression.

There are indications that CCNY administrators, prior to the total involvement of the College and the country in the War, did attempt, on several other occasions, to deal in an organized manner with the question of second-tier students.<sup>102</sup> These efforts, initiated in the aftermath of The Regents' Inquiry in 1938 and in a milieu of the growth of junior colleges in the United States, were concerned with issues of student merit, standards of scholar-

ship in the Day and Evening Sessions, transfer regulations and the development of alternate liberal arts and vocational training curricula. With the exception of the Fall 1941 innovations, most of these endeavors were sidetracked by the War. Long-range planning was pre-empted by the urgency of day-to-day administration during the crisis years of World War II.

#### G. Summary

During the fifteen years after the creation of the Board of Higher Education, student merit, the availability of space and the CCNY mission continued to play critical roles in determining who and how many people would attend the municipal colleges. In addition, the relationships of CCNY to New York City's primary and secondary schools, to private interest groups and to governmental agencies and authorities also influenced admissions considerations.

The mode of access initiated in 1924, one which relied simultaneously on ratings on entrance examinations and performance in high school, was continued. In 1941, CCNY began utilizing a "composite score" to more accurately assess the merit of applicants. While the specific components and weighting formula of this combined index would be subject to periodic change, the composite score would ultimately become the key determinant of admissions to the Colleges.

Admission was thus determined by issues which had

been influential since the inception of The Free Academy. Increasingly, however, considerations of access were effected by two often opponent forces. The first theme was the ongoing and accelerating desire, need and action of the BHE and even of the College Presidents to unify, centralize and co-ordinate the administration of the various municipal colleges. This centripetal tendency would ultimately grant to the BHE the de facto powers alluded to in Chapter 407 of the Laws of 1926. The drive to develop one complex system of post-secondary education in New York City would effect, particularly in the post-World War II era, a series of systemic evaluations and long-range plans for the municipal college system.

The second force which continually influenced access considerations was that of historic circumstances. Increasingly, events external to the Colleges themselves precipitated changes in the nature, content and quality of access to free public higher education. History was, and is, unpredictable: a particular incident could buttress and even accelerate ongoing efforts to create a coherent and organized municipal college system. Alternatively, a sudden crisis could disrupt and nullify an entire series of carefully-planned, and meticulously-enacted activities. City College was not an "ivory tower": and access to the College was particularly susceptible to the influence of historical events.

In 1932, in direct response to the economic condi-

tions created by the Depression, a second tier of students was carved out of a previously-homogenous enrollment. The Limited-Matriculated student status would designate those degree-seeking students who were considered competent and worthy of a post-secondary education, although not superior in academic preparation for college. Later, these students would be termed Specials, Associate degree candidates and Community College students.

Initially, the creation of a "second-class" of students represented a dramatic constriction of the mission of the Colleges. In particular, Limited-Matriculated students were working students of meager means: the charging of tuition, even at a moderate rate, compounded the negative effects of this crisis measure.

Yet precisely this second tier of access would provide in the coming decades the most widespread and convenient mode of entry into the municipal college system for thousands of New Yorkers. It would be the Associate degree programs which would supply the main avenue for the broad expansion of access to post-secondary education. Higher education would thus be extended to many who would not have been admitted to four-year Baccalaureate programs under prevailing conditions of a lack of facilities and the continued considerations of student merit. The emergence of a fluid transfer system in the 1950s and later, in the 1960s, would further serve to confirm the extension of CCNY's mission even to the system's second-tier of students.

<sup>1</sup>Education Law (New York State), Article 44-A, sec. 1142. Regarding Chapter 407 of the Laws of the State of New York, passed on April 16, 1926.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., sec. 1143.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., sec. 1144. These developments are discussed below.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., sec. 1143.

<sup>5</sup>CCNY, Bulletin (1925-1926), "Admission," pp. 51-55.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 16 January 1912, pp. 6-7; 16 September 1913, pp. 108-111.

<sup>9</sup>See, for example, CCNY, Bulletin (1926-1927), p. 101; CC Trustees, Minutes, 3 November 1913, pp. 132-133; 23 December 1913, pp. 162-164; 16 June 1914, pp. 94-99.

<sup>10</sup>CC Trustees, Minutes, 18 December 1917, pp. 183-187.

<sup>11</sup>Sources for the information presented here include CCNY Bulletins (1925-1926 through 1961-1962) and Fall term enrollment reports presented in BHE Minutes.

<sup>12</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 January 1930, pp. 18-21; 21 November 1960, no. 11, pp. 562-563; The News, World Almanac and Book of Facts (New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, 1973), p. 136; Wallace S. Sayre and Herbert Kaufman, Governing New York City: Politics in the Metropolis (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1960), p. 22.

<sup>13</sup>BHE, Minutes, 15 January 1929, pp. 8-9; 19 September 1938, no. 7, pp. 910-911; 17 October 1938, no. 3, pp. 982-983.

<sup>14</sup>See BHE, Minutes, c. 1926-1930.

<sup>15</sup>Murray M. Horowitz, Brooklyn College: The First Half-Century (New York: Brooklyn College Press, distributed by Columbia University Press, 1981), pp. 1-2.

<sup>16</sup>These developments have been discussed in Chapter III.

<sup>17</sup>The State proposal in the late 1940s to create numerous self-administered Institutes of Applied Arts and Sciences within New York City was to raise, again, the spectre of competing institutions of higher education.

<sup>18</sup>Horowitz, pp. 2-5; Robinson, "The BHE," pp. 295-300.

<sup>19</sup>"Intra Muros--Higher Education," Alumnus, vol. 22, no. 4, April 1926, p. 180.

<sup>20</sup>BHE, Minutes, 22 April 1930, p. 217.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., pp. 216-218.

<sup>22</sup>BHE, Minutes, 20 January 1931, pp. 76-83.

<sup>23</sup>Samuel Eliot Morison, The Oxford History of The American People (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 940-947; Frederick B. Robinson, "Address Delivered Before the Kiwanis Club at the Hotel McAlpin," 16 May 1934, pp. 1, 3 (Broadcast over Station WEAJ), CC Files, 3.64.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., Robinson, p. 2.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>26</sup>The New York Times, 19 March 1932, p. 10.

<sup>27</sup>The New York Times, 17 April 1932, p. 24; 19 April 1932, p. 14; 24 June 1932, p. 9. Other less restrained attacks on the Colleges were also made.

<sup>28</sup>Alumnus, vol. 28, no. 3, April 1932, p. 53. City College's student body was predominantly Jewish at this time. Could the drive to close the College have included anti-Semitic elements?

<sup>29</sup>Robinson, "To the Kiwanis Club," p. 5.

<sup>30</sup>BHE, Minutes, 15 March 1932, pp. 136-141.

<sup>31</sup>BHE, Minutes, 28 April 1932, pp. 316-317; 5 May 1932, pp. 336-339; 17 May 1932, pp. 450-451.

<sup>32</sup>BHE, Minutes, 15 March 1932, pp. 136-141; 20 April 1932, p. 306.

<sup>33</sup>The imposition of instructional fees was to remain prohibited by law until 1961.

<sup>34</sup>BHE, Minutes, 20 April 1932, p. 307; 28 April 1932, pp. 312-327; 5 May 1932, pp. 328-339.

<sup>35</sup>BHE, Minutes, 28 April 1932, pp. 314-315.

<sup>36</sup>BHE, Minutes, 5 May 1932, pp. 336-337.

<sup>37</sup>BHE, Minutes, 28 April 1932, p. 315; 5 May 1932, pp. 337-338; 17 May 1932, pp. 450-451.

<sup>38</sup>BHE, Minutes, 5 May 1932, p. 339; The New York Times, 18 May 1932, p. 3.

<sup>39</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 May 1932, p. 450.

<sup>40</sup>The New York Times, 14 May 1932, p. 17; 24 May 1932, p. 21; 25 May 1932, p. 12; 26 May 1932, p. 16.

<sup>41</sup>BHE, Minutes, 28 April 1932, pp. 312-317, 320-325.

<sup>42</sup>See CCNY, Bulletins, 1932 through 1961.

<sup>43</sup>See above, Chapters II and III. Also, Robinson, "The BHE," pp. 295-300.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid. By 1926, City College's Extension Program for teachers had expanded to nearly thirty afternoon centers. At least 21,000 students were enrolled at CCNY in 1926. See BHE, Minutes, 23 April 1926, pp. 103-104.

<sup>45</sup>Frederick B. Robinson, "Interview with J. Michael O'Connor," 17 September 1929, p. 1, CC Files, 3.64.

<sup>46</sup>Horowitz, pp. 8-10.

<sup>47</sup>Nelson P. Mead, "The Annual Report of The Acting President of The City College," September 1940, p. 6, CC Files, 3.64.

<sup>48</sup>BHE, Minutes, 24 February 1933, pp. 90-91; 19 July 1933, pp. 350-351.

<sup>49</sup>"Dr. Robinson Sees Change in Education; Says Expansion Period Is Nearing Its End," The New York Times, 15 October 1933, CC Files, 3.64.

<sup>50</sup>Frederick B. Robinson to the Investigating Committee of the Associate Alumni, 19 May 1935, p. 1, CC Files, 3.64.

<sup>51</sup>BHE, Minutes, 27 December 1935, p. 588.

- <sup>52</sup>BHE, Minutes, 25 September 1935, pp. 470-471.
- <sup>53</sup>BHE, Minutes, 31 March 1936, pp. 194-197; 14 April 1936, pp. 198-203; 6 April 1937, pp. 432-437.
- <sup>54</sup>BHE, Minutes, 19 July 1938, pp. 668-671.
- <sup>55</sup>BHE, Minutes, 19 July 1938, pp. 668-671; 19 September 1938, no. 7, pp. 910-911; 17 October 1938, no. 3, p. 983.
- <sup>56</sup>The absence of any public higher education in Richmond until 1955 has been substantially confirmed in correspondence with Albert V. Maniscalco, CUNY Board of Trustees. Maniscalco is a past-Borough President of Richmond. In addition, the Queens College Offices of Public Relations and Alumni Relations, as well as the Library, do not have any record of any Queens College-sponsored Extension unit on Staten Island.
- <sup>57</sup>BHE, Minutes, 19 September 1933, pp. 374-375.
- <sup>58</sup>BHE, Minutes, 16 May 1933, pp. 180-181.
- <sup>59</sup>Horowitz, p. 48.
- <sup>60</sup>Robinson to Alumni Committee, p. 1; Nelson P. Mead, "Report of the Acting President Nelson P. Mead, CCNY, for 1938-1939," c. Spring 1939, pp. 36-37, CC Files, 3.64.
- <sup>61</sup>Irving Rosenthal, Publicity Office, CCNY, "Press Release regarding the Construction of \$100,000 Armory for ROTC," 12 March 1941. Featured in an exhibit compiled and presented by Professor Barbara Dunlap, Archivist, CCNY, on March 10, 1982.
- <sup>62</sup>Mead, "The Annual Report," September 1940, pp. 6-8; Publicity Office, CCNY, "Press Release regarding the Second Annual Report of Dr. Mead, Acting President," 19 September 1940, CC Files, 3.64.
- <sup>63</sup>Mead, "The Annual Report," September 1940, p. 53; "Report of the Evening Session," 24 June 1941, CC Files, 3.12, Evening Session; "Report of the Evening Session Committee to the BHE regarding The City College," 19 September 1941, p. 2, CC Files, 3.12, Evening Session Committee; BHE, Minutes, 25 September 1941, no. 4, pp. 676-683.
- <sup>64</sup>"Intra Muros--New Building," Alumnus, vol. 37, no. 7, October 1941, pp. 61, 63; "South Hall," Alumnus, vol. 42, no. 7, October 1946, pp. 115, 119.

<sup>65</sup>Mead, "Report for 1938-1939," p. 2; "Intra Muros--New Building," Alumnus, vol. 37, no. 7, October 1941, pp. 61, 63.

<sup>66</sup>Frederick B. Robinson, "Statement in Connection with the Opening of the Spring Term at the City College," 11 February 1936, p. 2, CC Files, 3.64.

<sup>67</sup>The passage of this act represented a victory for City College officials who had, for nearly a decade, urged and petitioned governmental agencies for permission to admit qualified foreign students. See, for example, BHE, Minutes, 23 October 1929, pp. 382-383; 19 February 1936, pp. 136-139; 17 January 1938, pp. 42-45, 50-51; 24 February 1938, pp. 158-159; 2 May 1938, pp. 396-397.

<sup>68</sup>Education Law, Article 44-A. Available evidence suggests that sec. 1143-d was also a BHE-initiated amendment to the State Education Law. See BHE, Minutes, 6 June 1938, pp. 450-451; 18 December 1939, no. 69, pp. 1000-1001.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid.

<sup>70</sup>BHE, Minutes, 22 January 1940, no. 82, pp. 92-93; 24 June 1940, nos. 8, 9, pp. 516-517; 23 September 1940, no. 93, pp. 642-645; 21 October 1940, no. 68, pp. 712-713; 16 December 1940, no. 23, pp. 804-805; 17 February 1941, no. 67, pp. 134-135; 17 February 1941, no. 101, pp. 188-189; 17 March 1941, nos. 12, 13, pp. 204-205.

<sup>71</sup>For reports on foreign students admitted, see, for example, BHE, Minutes, 19 June 1938, pp. 598-601; 19 July 1938, pp. 658-659; 21 April 1941, no. 80, pp. 324-327; 19 May 1941, no. 52, pp. 392-393; 15 June 1942, no. 139, pp. 370-371; 12 May 1945, no. 36, pp. 152-153.

<sup>72</sup>BHE, Minutes, 24 February 1939, no. 3, pp. 320-323; 17 March 1941, no. 13, pp. 204-205; 25 September 1941, no. 11, pp. 686-689; 19 January 1942, no. 101, pp. 46-51; 16 February 1942, nos. 107, 111, pp. 106-111; 16 March 1942, no. 106, pp. 156-157; 15 June 1942, no. 29, p. 308; 28 September 1942, no. 105, pp. 440-441; 16 November 1942, no. 104, pp. 556-557; 25 September 1944, no. 103, pp. 380-383; 20 November 1944, nos. 9, 10, pp. 432-437; 18 June 1945, no. 8, pp. 176-179.

<sup>73</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 December 1951, no. 81, pp. 748-749; 17 March 1952, no. 5, pp. 104-105; 21 April 1952, no. 6, pp. 177-178; 19 May 1952, no. 7, pp. 242-243; 16 June 1952, no. 6, pp. 296-297; 17 May 1954, no. 6, pp. 256-261; 15 June 1954, no. 6, pp. 328-329; 20 December 1954, no. 10, pp. 750-751; 17 January 1955, no. 3, pp. 2-3; 21 November 1960, no. 3, pp. 558-563; 23 January 1961, no. 4, pp. 2-5.

<sup>74</sup>BHE, Minutes, 19 November 1956, no. A, p. 603; 17 December 1956, no. 15, pp. 688-689; 20 May 1957, no. 50, pp. 224-225; 17 June 1957, no. 19, pp. 328-329; 18 November 1957, no. 87, pp. 578-579; 16 June 1958, no. 57, pp. 312-313; 17 November 1958, no. 83, pp. 584-585; 15 June 1959, no. 59, pp. 290-291; 26 October 1959, no. 41, pp. 504-505; 16 November 1959, no. 76, pp. 608-611; 25 April 1960, no. 38, pp. 162-163; 20 March 1961, no. 89, pp. 148-149; 17 April 1961, no. 5, pp. 160-161.

<sup>75</sup>Only one specific proposal to admit foreign students to the municipal colleges was denied. Between 1941 and 1942, the Board repeatedly entertained an application to allow the admission of foreign students on special visas as matriculated students. This motion, which might have facilitated the emigration of a limited number of refugees from Hitler's Europe, was denied in February 1942. See BHE, Minutes, 17 February 1941, no. 115; 7 April 1941, no. 3, pp. 258-259; 28 April 1941, no. 11, pp. 352-353; 30 June 1941, no. 43, pp. 596-599; 25 August 1941, no. 2, pp. 630-631; 25 September 1941, no. 83, pp. 730-731; 17 November 1941, no. 93, pp. 862-863; 15 December 1941, no. 101, pp. 916-917; 19 January 1942, no. 9, pp. 12-13; 16 February 1942, no. 6, pp. 62-63.

<sup>76</sup>The 1947 and 1964 issues of the BHE Bylaws did not modify or renumber any Bylaws or amendments to the Bylaws which had been added to the specific codification.

<sup>77</sup>Article X, which covered the "Admission of Students," was only adopted by the BHE on June 29, 1939, and almost immediately renumbered to Article XV in the 1939 revision of the BHE Bylaws.

<sup>78</sup>The most famous of these is the Open Admissions resolution of July 9, 1969. This major decision, discussed in Chapter I, was not included in the Board of Higher Education's Bylaws. Also included in this general category are Board resolutions which were operative in the interim period between the time of adoption and the time of inclusion in the Bylaws.

<sup>79</sup>The situation of a public college is such that private arrangements facilitating the admission of a person or group of persons are few-and-far-between. Locating documentation about such events is even rarer. Yet this researcher was fortunate enough to find a few examples of such private communications effecting the admissions process.

<sup>80</sup>Robinson, "Statement Regarding Opening of Spring Term," p. 2. Limited-Matriculated students could become fully matriculated if they maintained a "B" average for 15 units of college work distributed over two successive terms.

- <sup>81</sup>Ibid., pp. 1-2.
- <sup>82</sup>BHE, Minutes, 11 June 1940, no. 2, pp. 356-357.
- <sup>83</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 June 1940, no. 23, pp. 414-419.
- <sup>84</sup>Mead, "The Annual Report," September 1940, pp. 2, 4.
- <sup>85</sup>Ibid., p. 53. The necessities of war would nullify this decision: by 1943, the majority of students admitted to the Technology program were admitted with deficiencies in high school mathematics.
- <sup>86</sup>BHE, Minutes, 18 November 1940, no. 61, pp. 768-769.
- <sup>87</sup>Brooklyn College, Bulletin--Day Session (1941-1942), p. 40.
- <sup>88</sup>Ibid., p. 41.
- <sup>89</sup>Brooklyn College, Bulletin--Evening Session (1941-1942), p. 26.
- <sup>90</sup>Brooklyn College, Bulletins--Evening Session (1940-1941), pp. 26-29; (1941-1942), pp. 26-31.
- <sup>91</sup>"For Newspapers," 31 October 1941, CC Files, 3.21, Admissions Requirements.
- <sup>92</sup>Walter A. Knittle, "City College Evening and Extension Division: Annual Report for the Academic Year, September 1946 to June 1947," June 1947, p. 2, CC Files, 3.52, Evening Session.
- <sup>93</sup>The Special Committee on Trends, "Report on Student Personnel Services," September 1942, pp. 1-2, CC Files, 3.31, Report Material.
- <sup>94</sup>Ibid. Also, Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," p. 6.
- <sup>95</sup>The Cooperative Tests were probably those known as the "Iowa Tests of Educational Development" constructed primarily by Kenneth W. Vaughn for The Science Research Associates. See Oscar Kristen Buros, editor, The Third Mental Measurements Yearbook (Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1949), sections 12 and 218. The components, range and weighting formula of this composite score are discussed below.
- <sup>96</sup>Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," p. 3.

<sup>97</sup>The Special Committee on Trends, "Report on Student Personnel Services," pp. 1-2; Robert L. Taylor to Harry N. Wright, 22 October 1943, CC Files, 3.32, Enrollment Figures.

<sup>98</sup>Ibid. Also, "The City College--Day Session Admissions," February 1944, CC Files, 3.41, Enrollment; Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," p. 6; Robert L. Taylor, Registrar, "Advance Report to Harry N. Wright, President, regarding Fall 1944," 22 September 1944, CC Files, 3.41, Enrollment.

<sup>99</sup>"Day Session Admissions: September 1940 through February 1943," February 1943, CC Files, 3.32, Enrollment Figures; "CC--Day Session Admissions," February 1944. These statistics have been calculated for September and February admissions combined for the academic year: the new procedure was not followed on a term-by-term basis.

<sup>100</sup>The Special Committee on Trends, "Report on Student Personnel Services," pp. 1-2; "Day Session Admissions," February 1943; Taylor to Wright, 22 October 1943.

<sup>101</sup>BHE, Minutes, 19 May 1941, no. 76, pp. 410-411; 25 September 1941, no. 4, pp. 676-683. Also, "Preliminary Report on the Evening Session Reorganization and Resulting Change in Admission Requirements," 21 April 1941, CC Files, 3.22, Evening Session; "Summary of New Admission and Evening Session Regulations," 19 May 1941, CC Files, 3.21, Admission Requirements; "Report of the Evening Session," 24 June 1941.

<sup>102</sup>BHE, Minutes, 2 June 1937, pp. 418-419. Also, Mead, "Report for 1938-1939," p. 16; Nelson P. Mead to Harry T. Carman, 5 April 1939, CC Files, 3.12, Evening Session Committee; Mead, "The Annual Report," September 1940, p. 52; "Distribution of High School Graduates With Reference to Secondary School Course of Study, 1940-1941 and Number of High School Graduates Entering Higher Institutions, 1941-1942 Only," June 1942, CC Files, 3.41, Enrollment; Morton Gottschall to The Members of the Special Committee on Trends, 11 June 1942, CC Files, 3.31, Report Material.

## CHAPTER V

## THE WAR YEARS: 1941-1945

A. Introduction

## 1. The United States and World War II

The American mobilization for war activities, relative to events in Europe and the Far East, occurred at a very late stage. By the time Pearl Harbor was attacked, nearly every nation in continental Europe had already fallen to the invasions of the Third Reich: England herself had barely survived the Battle of Britain of Fall 1940. Japan's expansion was continuing, reaching its territorial height in late Spring 1942.<sup>1</sup>

Despite "Lend-Lease" agreements and massive defense appropriations in 1940-1941, U.S. war production did not substantially increase until approximately a year after her entry into the War. And, as has been aptly noted, mighty as America's effort was to become, "it did not add up to total war, as the term was understood in the British Commonwealth, Germany or Japan."<sup>2</sup> Despite rationing, despite sizable tax increases, despite a national debt of \$250 billion, the country was never invaded: it was spared the actual devastation and horror being endured by much of the

world.

## 2. Selective Service Laws, 1940-1947

In September 1940, the United States established its first peacetime conscription. All men between the ages of 21 and 35 were required to register and were eligible for one year of service. In August 1941, the service requirement was extended to eighteen months.

With the attack on Pearl Harbor, a new Selective Service Act was passed. All men between the ages of 18 and 45 were liable for military service, while all those under the age of 65 were required to register. The terminal point of service became six months after the cessation of hostilities.

The wartime Selective Service Act was to remain in effect, with extensions, through March 1947. At the point of expiration, over ten million men had been inducted into the armed services.<sup>3</sup>

## 3. Student Deferments, 1940-1945

As the need for men in the armed services grew, deferments were curtailed. These deferments were generally awarded for employment in essential services and for reasons of family dependency. Many students in colleges were also eligible for and received draft deferments.

In October 1940, the Armed Forces Counseling Service was established at CCNY to handle requests for student deferments. Most deferments were awarded to young

men studying the sciences, accounting or engineering. Many City College students, however, volunteered for the Service.<sup>4</sup>

In August 1942, the Army Enlisted Reserve Corps was established. By January 1943, about 1600 College men had been accepted into a reserve corps. Simultaneously, a minimum of 100 students were drafted every month. In Spring 1943, mobilization of the Enlisted Reserve Corps began. The last of the Corps students was called for service in August 1944.<sup>5</sup>

Yet even as late as April 1943, the reduction in registration was less than had been expected by CCNY administrators. The comparative youth of the College's students protected many from military service: 2/3 of the Freshman class was under 18 years of age. Furthermore, one-third of the student body was enrolled in the draft-exempt technology fields: 39% of these students were deferred.<sup>6</sup>

At the end of 1943, student deferments were reduced. City College was allowed the largest quota of any U.S. college: 330 men could be deferred after July 1, 1944.<sup>7</sup>

Deferments for Engineering, Technology and Science students were withdrawn in Spring 1944.<sup>8</sup> The mobilization of these students was the single critical element which caused City College's student population to drop to 75%

of its pre-War level. The loss of registration during the late War years would exert a major impact on CCNY's access policies.

#### 4. The Closing of Townsend Harris High School

Within New York, the War took its toll by straining State resources to the utmost.<sup>9</sup> The fiscal strain was also felt at CCNY: a major casualty was the Townsend Harris High School. As space at the 23rd Street Center was increasingly needed for collegiate classes, proposals were issued to dissolve the high school.<sup>10</sup> The budget cuts of 1941-1942 made the elimination of the unit an economic necessity. By March 1942, the BHE was forced to order the discontinuance of all of the high school's activities.<sup>11</sup>

With the closing of Townsend Harris High School, CCNY's last tangible link to secondary education in New York City was eliminated. Yet the College would still be concerned with and would become increasingly involved with the preparation of applicants for admission. These activities would dramatically accelerate in the post-War era.

#### 5. Effects on Admissions, Enrollment and Access

American involvement in World War II had an impact on access to the municipal colleges in a variety of ways. While conditions and factors effecting CCNY were far from static, certain generalizations about the War years can be made.

First, the War brought about a lessening of the stringency of the substantive admissions requirements of the College. Thus, for example, instead of presenting five high school units covering two foreign languages, applicants for admission were required to present only three years of study in one language.

Second, during the course of the War, despite an easing of the admissions requirements, CCNY experienced a drop in overall enrollment. This was due, in a large part, to voluntary enlistment and conscription among its all-male student body. While laws regarding deferments actually seemed to "protect" CCNY's students in the early years of the War, by 1945, the College had lost a major part of its registration.

The loss of students, particularly in the later War years, had ramifications in a number of areas. New regulations eliminated restrictions on the attendance of women in CCNY's three professional schools: Business, Education and Technology. Women were still excluded from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences until 1951.

The loss of registration affected the qualitative requirements for admission. The matriculation average fell after Fall 1943 to 78%. Applicants with lower high school records were allowed to qualify for admission on the basis of the composite score. Yet, in the late War years, the College was admitting high school graduates with averages as low as 75% or even 74%. The existence of these lowered

cut-off points was not publicized and generally unknown beyond the level of President Wright and his executive staff.

A final outcome of CCNY's loss of students was especially noticeable in the Evening Sessions. Here, decreases in enrollment were particularly severe among the Limited-Matriculated/Special Student category. The shift in the size and composition of the Evening Session effected innovations which would redefine the College's notions of student merit and service to the City.

It might appear that during the War years, given a reduced enrollment, CCNY's space shortage would have been less severe. This, however, was not the case. To the contrary, War conditions exacerbated the College's lack of facilities. CCNY, an all-male, publicly-supported institution, became the site of numerous military training programs. CCNY facilities and personnel were largely commandeered to serve the War effort.

#### B. Quantitative Admissions Requirements

Reductions in the stringency of the substantive, or quantitative admissions requirements during World War II were implemented in several ways. First, certain requisites were simply eliminated. Thus, as noted, the municipal colleges, almost without exception, suspended "for the duration" the second language requirement for admission. At City College, applicants to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences were required to present only three units of

high school instruction in a foreign language. This resulted in a reduction of the prescribed units for admission from 12-1/2 to 10-1/2. The three professional schools adopted similar procedures, with the School of Technology changing the requirements to two years of a modern language.<sup>12</sup>

The College also expanded the pool of courses from which candidates were permitted to offer elective entrance credit. The School of Business and Civic Administration allowed credit for a maximum of five units in commercial subjects; the School of Education accepted up to three elective units of commercial work. Other branches of the College followed suit by allowing elective credit for diverse engineering and mechanics courses. In addition, pre-induction, community civics and war emergency courses could be offered for elective, but not prescribed, admission credit.<sup>13</sup>

Finally, CCNY again began admitting students with deficiencies in substantive requirements.<sup>14</sup> Students were accepted with only 14 units; "superior" students presenting an 82% average, but only 13 curricular units were likewise admitted. The School of Technology actually admitted between 50% to 60% of its Freshman class with entrance deficiencies.<sup>15</sup>

Thus, substantive admissions requirements were eased during World War II by eliminating some required subjects; by expanding the pool of courses useable for ad-

missions credit; and by accepting students with deficiencies in secondary school preparation.

### C. Reduced Enrollment

A major effect of the War on City College was a drop in the size of the student body. The best estimates of enrollment before and during the World War II years are shown below.

TABLE 7

ENROLLMENT - CCNY - BOTH CENTERS, ALL SCHOOLS, FALL TERM

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Day Session</u> <sup>16</sup> | <u>Evening Session*</u> <sup>17</sup> |          |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|
| 1937        | 7,714                            | 12,964                                |          |
| 1938        | 8,257                            | 13,112                                |          |
| 1939        | 8,217                            | 12,889                                |          |
| 1940        | 8,340                            | 12,571                                |          |
| 1941        | 7,911                            | 10,901                                |          |
| 1942        | 7,558                            | 7,616                                 |          |
| 1943        | 5,014                            | 6,848                                 |          |
| 1944        | 4,734                            | 8,171                                 | 8,727**  |
| 1945        | 4,880                            |                                       | 10,532** |
| 1946        | 10,434                           |                                       | 16,456** |

\*Excluding Graduate Students.

\*\*Including off-campus, non-credit (Adult Education) courses for non-matriculants.

As shown here, the major loss of students from the Day Session occurred in Spring 1943. The dynamics of the shifts in CCNY's enrollment, largely related to the

mobilization of its students, affected admissions and allocation policies in a dramatic manner.

#### 1. The Admission of Women

The loss of enrollment put CCNY in a unique and startling position: the College was in a position to accept virtually as many incoming students as it desired. Yet despite some additional space, the loss of students was not entirely viewed as a beneficial occurrence. College administrators feared that the drop in enrollment "threatened to destroy the completeness of our [course] offerings."<sup>18</sup>

The number of elective courses had already been reduced drastically. By September 1943, elective courses offered in the Arts, Languages and Social Sciences had dropped to 22% of their September 1941 level; electives in the Sciences had fallen to 58% of their pre-War number.<sup>19</sup>

In a conscious effort to stabilize enrollment, CCNY began admitting women during the Spring, Summer and Fall terms of 1943, on an equal basis with men students, to its three professional schools.<sup>20</sup> Women were now admitted to the entrance exams and eligible for admission to the Day Sessions. Prior to 1943, the Schools of Business, Technology and Education had imposed numerical and scheduling restrictions on their women students. These were now abolished.<sup>21</sup>

The effect of the enrollment of women at City

College's professional schools was enormous. By the Fall of 1944, women constituted 25% of CCNY's Day Session and more than 50% of the Evening Session.<sup>22</sup> The number of women in the School of Business surpassed that of Hunter College's regular economics course. Registration of women in the School of Education was "large enough to maintain the School."<sup>23</sup> By 1944, women represented 24% of the Freshman class of The City College.<sup>24</sup>

The admission of women to the College's professional schools was the direct outcome of a reduced registration during the War years: it had little or no relation to any ideology of "sexual equality." Rather, administrative exigencies opened the doors of educational opportunity to women at City College's professional schools.

## 2. Qualitative Admissions Requirements

As a result of reduced enrollments, the official matriculation average at CCNY did not rise, but remained stabilized at 80% throughout the early 1940s.<sup>25</sup> High school graduates with averages between 75% and 80% could be admitted to the Evening Session as Special students on the combined basis of high school averages and scores on entrance examinations.

The effect of low registration on access to public higher education was, however, even greater than official reports. An examination of recently-discovered correspondence between Robert Taylor, the College's Registrar, and

President Wright reveals that during the late World War II years, CCNY accepted virtually all applicants with a 75% or even 74% high school average.<sup>26</sup>

Until mid-1943, the matriculation average was officially still 80%. In the Spring of 1943, most non-Engineering students lost their deferments. Enrollment plummeted, with the Evening Session reaching its all-time low.<sup>27</sup>

In Fall 1943, efforts were made to stabilize enrollment: the admission of women to CCNY's professional schools was a major tactic. By June 1944, however, with the loss of the Engineering and Science students, the College began admitting all students with a 78% average on the basis of high school records alone. The 78% cut-off remained in effect until the end of the War.<sup>28</sup>

Reduced enrollment effected the composite score. In September 1943, the score dropped from 60 to 59; by February 1944, it was 58, and by June 1944, it was 56.<sup>29</sup> In Fall 1944, Registrar Robert L. Taylor warned President Wright that "we have come dangerously close to a 75% high school average for admission."<sup>30</sup>

Since we accepted the larger part of the group taking the entrance exams, it means that we are virtually accepting all students with a high school average of 75% or higher.<sup>31</sup>

In addition, CCNY allowed students with a 74% average to be admitted to the entrance exams. Taylor instructed his staff to "continue admitting to the qualify-

ing exams those students whose high school average is 74% or higher, even though officially 75% will still remain on the books as the minimum requirement for admission to the exams."<sup>32</sup>

World War II thus exerted a strong effect on the College's qualitative admissions requirements. Access was extended in the latter War years to virtually all high school graduates with minimal qualifications for admission. These procedures succeeded in maintaining a relatively stable Day Session at the College. Yet, in the Evening Session, the problem of a declining student enrollment was not solved by the lowering of admission requirements. The measures which had been instituted to alleviate the loss of registration in the Day Session failed to relieve the situation in the Evening Session. To the contrary, the new procedures actually generated a host of new problems in the Evening Session.

### 3. A De-stabilized Evening Session

As noted, the War mobilization effected a dramatic decline in City College's student population. Yet it was the College's own admissions policy which exacerbated conditions in the Evening Session. As the effective high school average required for admission was lowered, fewer students with averages between 74% and 80% were allocated part-time programs in the Evening Session. Rather, these second-tier students entered CCNY as matriculants, usually

attending the Day Session. Between February 1940 and September 1942, the City College Evening Session lost 40% of its enrollment.<sup>33</sup>

Even more devastating than the loss of its Evening Session's student body was the fact that CCNY was losing precisely those students who generated the College's income. Students who heretofore had been accepted to CCNY only as fee-paying Special students were now entering as matriculated students who enjoyed the benefits of the College's free tuition policy.

Between 1937 and 1940, Evening Session registration at City College was composed of approximately equal proportions of Matriculated and Limited-Matriculated (Special) students: about 42% in each category. Graduate students and non-matriculants made up the remainder of the Evening Session's student body.<sup>34</sup> By Fall 1941, Specials constituted only 37% of the Evening Session; by Fall 1943, they represented only 19% of the student body, dropping to 13% by Spring 1945.<sup>35</sup>

Efforts to stabilize Day Session enrollment thus resulted in a critical de-stabilization of the Evening Session. Not only was overall enrollment minimal, but the College was losing income and was unable to sustain its variety of course offerings.<sup>36</sup>

In Fall 1943, efforts were begun to remedy the crisis in the Evening Session.

#### D. Expansion of Access: The Non-Matriculated Student

##### 1. Commerce Center Innovations

The students of the Commerce center were not deferred from military service: between 1939 and 1943, the Evening Session's registration dropped from 6,700 to 2,400.<sup>37</sup> Robert A. Love, the Evening Session's Director at 23rd Street, described this loss of students as "the most outstanding development during the war period." In a Fall 1943 report, Love noted:

Because this drop in enrollment threatened to destroy the completeness of our offerings to such an extent that the School would become unattractive, we recognized the importance of non-matriculated students for the necessary enrollment to maintain professional courses.<sup>38</sup>

The School therefore embarked on a series of actions aimed at "making a bid for the non-matriculated students." Specifically, the following was undertaken:

- a) School offerings were adjusted to meet business needs
- b) Teaching methods were changed
- c) Courses were re-grouped to make them attractive to adults with professional objectives
- d) A publicity program was established
- e) A committee of educational advisors was set up to aid in the formulation of programs of study.<sup>39</sup>

As a result of these efforts, the School showed "a sizeable increase in non-matriculated students at a time when practically every other college in the country was experiencing a marked decline." The increased enroll-

ment "made possible the richest offerings of professional courses in the history of the school and made a considerable contribution in the form of fees."<sup>40</sup>

The steps taken at the School of Business remedied the two problems which war conditions had generated. With the increase and stabilization of the Evening Session's enrollment, the Division was able to offer a wider variety of courses, thus making great progress toward becoming "what a professional business college should be in this business community." The infusion of additional fee funds from non-matriculated students was indispensable in maintaining the economic viability of the institution. Significantly, the new revenues were to support the traditional programs of matriculated students.

## 2. Expansion of CCNY's Mission

Precisely at the moment when pragmatic considerations necessitated the widespread enrollment of a new type of student, the Director of the Evening Session issued a call for a "broader function of the School":

It is highly desirable that the administrators of the College, of the BHE and of the City recognize a new and broader concept of the function of the School of Business and Civic Administration in the city. The school should be assigned the task and provided the staff and facilities for rendering a service to the business community.

We urge that careful thought be given to the role of business training by the School of Business and particularly by the Evening Session in any government plans for training or rehabilitation in the post-war period.<sup>41</sup>

Practical and economic considerations had brought about the inclusion in Fall 1943 of the non-matriculated student in City College's enrollment. Unique and specific conditions which arose during World War II had elevated the status of non-matriculants to that of a valuable and viable segment of the College's student body. But the administrative necessities of the War and of national recovery from the War effected a more far-reaching consequence: the expansion of service to the people of the City of New York.

The mission of service to the people had been articulated and nurtured from the inception of The Free Academy. Periodic curricular and administrative innovations were undertaken under the banner of providing benefits to the taxpayers of the City. Retrenchments and economy measures were instituted with conscious acknowledgments of a curtailment of service to the community. Yet, it was only a crisis, the emergencies of World War II, which allowed and brought about the convergence of pragmatic budgetary necessities with the College's more humanistic philosophy. The economically-based innovation of catering to the non-degree seeking student interlocked and merged with a substantial and significant expansion and re-definition of the College's mission.

### 3. Main Center Programs

In Spring 1944, with the removal of deferments

for Science and Engineering students, the Uptown Evening Session was also experiencing a crisis in lost enrollment. The Main Center also embarked on assorted efforts to increase registration, attempting to enroll non-matriculants. Technical, construction and language courses, partially subsidized by Federal monies to aid wartime work, were maintained and amplified. These efforts resulted in a steady rise in the registration of fee-paying students. The increase in the fee fund was described by Walter Knittle, Director of the Evening Session at the Main Center, as "most welcome to the general College."<sup>42</sup>

#### 4. The Adult Education Program

In October 1944, City College initiated a novel, diversified series of courses specifically designed for those interested in job training skills, the non-matriculated students. Supervised by the Evening Sessions of both the Downtown and Uptown Centers, the Adult Education Program soon became an object of emulation. The courses were conducted in local libraries, public schools, even in museums. These "neighborhood colleges" were justified by "the theory that education should travel to the people, and, in effect, should be presented at their doorsteps."<sup>43</sup>

The Program was designed to be entirely self-supporting: theoretically, non-matriculated students seeking courses in occupational and recreational fields would have no connection with the degree-seeking Liberal Arts

students of the College. This notion would be dramatically revised within a short time period. Shortly after the inception of the Adult Education Program, CCNY administrators recognized the inter-connectedness of all of the College's divisions. Non-matriculants, particularly in the off-campus programs, became valuable economic assets.

The findings from a June 1947 report by Walter Knittle are particularly noteworthy:

- a) The City is no longer covering the cost of the degree-candidate students' education in the Evening Session, since the Tax Levy appropriation for 1946-47 was c. \$260,000 less than the approximate costs for the Matriculated students and Special (Limited-Matriculated) students.
- b) This deficit is paid for from the fees collected from the full-fee paying students.
- c) The Evening Session serves a wide variety of adult needs for special courses of one kind or another. These are courses taken by non-matriculated students paying \$7.00 per credit hour. The Adult Education Program in the public libraries is simply an extension of this Evening Session service to non-degree students.
- d) The Evening Session has gathered large fee funds in the past years which have been utilized largely to provide for Day Session needs not covered by the Day Session budget.<sup>44</sup>

Students of the Adult Education Program, and non-matriculants of the College's Evening Sessions thus subsidized the education of Baccalaureate matriculants. To the degree that enrollment in fee-bearing non-degree courses was composed of lower and working class persons, the poorer classes of the City supported the middle and upper class students enrolled in the tuition-free degree

programs of City College.

#### 5. Economics and Idealism, CCNY in 1944

The extension work of the College, both on-campus and off-campus, served a two-fold purpose. Generated initially as a device to offset the wartime decline in enrollment, extension courses catering to non-degree students solved both a tangible and intangible objective. Non-matriculants generated a fee fund: increasingly, this reservoir of money was used to subsidize matriculated students enjoying tuition-free higher education in New York City. The infusion of non-matriculants also allowed the College to seek and enjoy a reputation of serving the public good by extending education to the people. CCNY's "neighborhood colleges" were imitated throughout the United States. In fact, "the United States State Department broadcast a description of the program in twenty foreign languages around the world as an example of American educational development."<sup>45</sup>

By expanding non-degree programs, City College had developed, promoted and defended two themes. CCNY administrators asserted that non-degree students were worthy of post-secondary education. The College then proposed to take the responsibility to provide that education. In acting on these principles, critical organizational needs were met. CCNY innovations resulted in the convergence of administrative pragmatism with the broadening of the mission of the College. Economic and humanistic goals were simul-

taneously served by the extension of higher educational services to a third-tier of students: the non-matriculants.

#### E. The Space Shortage

It would seem reasonable to assume that the dramatic decline in enrollment at The City College during World War II served to lessen the severity of the chronic space shortage. This, however, was not the case. Increasingly, CCNY facilities were diverted for non-civilian activities; these actions, in fact, created a space shortage far worse than any experienced by the College in the pre-War years.

The pre-War space situation had already been quite severe. In February 1941, only 984 freshmen were admitted, as opposed to the usual 1300: "it had become necessary to make an overall decrease in the student body."<sup>46</sup> During the War years, however, several military and civilian defense programs were based at the Uptown campus. A substantial portion of the College's facilities and resources were therefore unavailable to the school's students.<sup>47</sup>

The defense-related programs caused a space problem of overwhelming proportion. By the Fall of 1943, CCNY's educational activities were restricted to 79 out of 150 classrooms.<sup>48</sup>

By the time World War II drew to a close, the "inadequacies of space and facilities [affected] adversely every phase of college life." The need for additional facilities was described as "immediate" and "critical," even

at the point in time when enrollment was 50% of its pre-war peak.<sup>49</sup> Additional reasons for the College's state of unpreparedness in dealing with the space problem in the 1950s were suggested:<sup>50</sup>

1. "A broadening of the traditional concept of education so that it is regarded as the proper business of the College to do more than transmit intellectual techniques and bookish subject matter." Thus, the new activities would effect "the development of the whole man, and to produce well-rounded personalities and good citizens."
2. An unforeseen expansion in the laboratory sciences and technology, requiring more space per student.
3. An unforeseen expansion in the total number of persons attending institutions of higher education.
4. An unawareness of and a consequent lack of provision for the expansion of administrative activities.

Thus, all student activities had been virtually dissolved during the war years; the library was virtually non-existent; laboratory space was grossly inadequate, to the point where the Chemical Engineering department had failed to achieve accreditation; and faculty and administrative offices were minimal.<sup>51</sup>

Once again, the College was forced to take drastic measures in order to cope with the overcrowding and meet continuously increasing demands.

The College has been able, by means of make-shift accommodations and undesirable adaptations, to admit a vastly larger number of students than the buildings were originally planned for. These make-shifts have been of every conceivable sort and have ranged all the way from converting passageways to locker rooms, to changing lavatories to staff offices.

These ad hoc adaptations were known to be accompanied by a series of deficiencies and were recognized as being justified only as "lesser evils."<sup>52</sup>

Despite these stop-gap measures, some students were forced to carry less than full-time schedules. "We have seen too that the College has reached the end of its ability to furnish make-shift provision for all those who wished and are equipped to enter, and has found it necessary to step up admission standards which debar able students." College administrators regretted the necessity of having to ask students and staff "to make the best of a plant and facilities which are patently outgrown and inadequate." A post-War massive building program was urgently needed.<sup>53</sup>

New buildings were urgently needed if only to keep pace with ongoing demands for admission. Yet it would be the crush of returning veterans which would deepen the shortage of facilities and create an unprecedented crisis.

#### F. Summary

Between 1941 and 1945, all College activities were effected by escalating U.S. involvement in the War. Budgetary restrictions, civil defense obligations and military inductions created new and continuously changing problems. Access to CCNY was particularly vulnerable to these vicissitudes.

The College attempted to aid the War effort by reducing substantive admissions requirements. Young men were thus able to receive maximum training prior to induc-

tion. Yet the critical element during the War years was a declining enrollment. Sudden drops in registration occurred at different points in time at the various Schools of CCNY.

Precisely these drastic reductions in enrollment served as catalysts for a dramatic expansion of access to CCNY. Women were admitted to CCNY's professional schools, thus sustaining curricular offerings. Students with high school averages as low as 74% were also accepted to the College. The status of second-tier students was upgraded to that of Baccalaureate matriculants. The re-classification of these students, implemented often in a secretive manner, alleviated the drain on enrollment in the Day Session. This ad hoc coping measure, however, generated a major crisis: the loss of the College's income.

The elimination of the fee-generating Special student was the critical causal element precipitating a novel and unique program. In 1944, CCNY threw open its doors to a third tier of students, the non-matriculant. These students provided urgently needed income, funds which were used to maintain the College's Evening Session--and the Day Session. Almost instantly, non-degree seeking students were recognized as a valuable segment of the College's enrollment. These fee-paying students financed the tuition-free education of Day Session matriculants.

Pragmatic and administrative necessities first effected the extension of service to the community. Si-

multaneously, however, the rhetoric of philosophic and humanistic considerations articulated by CCNY's administration began to embody and promote the College's expanded mission.

<sup>1</sup>See, for example, R. R. Palmer, editor, Atlas of World History (New York: Rand McNally and Company, 1957), pp. 180-183.

<sup>2</sup>Morison, p. 1010.

<sup>3</sup>Columbia Encyclopedia, 1950 ed., s.v. "Selective Service"; Collier's Encyclopedia, 1962 ed., s.v. "Military Service."

<sup>4</sup>Harry N. Wright, "Report of the President of The City College, 1940-1944," November 1945, pp. 59-61, CC Files, 3.64.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>6</sup>Harry N. Wright, President, City College to the Executive Committee of the BHE, 1 April 1943, CC Files, 3.31, Admissions.

<sup>7</sup>Wright, "Report for 1940-1944," p. 63. This was in addition to 250 students who were scheduled to be graduated in June 1944, plus 150 special cases.

<sup>8</sup>Taylor, "Advance Report regarding Fall 1944."

<sup>9</sup>Columbia Encyclopedia, 1950 ed., s.v. "New York State."

<sup>10</sup>Mead, "Report for 1938-1939," p. 35; Mead, "The Annual Report," September 1940, pp. 7-8; "Intra Muros-- The Townsend Harris Matter," Alumnus, vol. 37, no. 7, pp. 61-63; BHE, Minutes, 15 April 1941, no. 1, pp. 263-265; 16 June 1941, no. 42, pp. 488-491; 30 June 1941, no. 81, pp. 614-615.

<sup>11</sup>BHE, Minutes, 16 March 1942, no. 116, pp. 164-171; 31 March 1942, no. 1, p. 177.

<sup>12</sup>BHE, Minutes, 16 November 1942, no. 63, pp. 546-551; 21 December 1942, nos. 97, 101, pp. 592-595; Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Applicants for Admission, 22 March 1943, CC Files, 3.31, Admissions; "Instructions regarding Admissions, CCNY, Day Session of The City College," May 1943, CC Files, 3.41, Admissions; Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," pp. 2-3.

This would become a permanently eliminated entrance requirement at the municipal colleges. See CCNY Bulletins, BHE Minutes.

<sup>13</sup>BHE, Minutes, 16 November 1942, no. 78, pp. 546-551; 21 December 1942, nos. 97, 101, pp. 592-595; Taylor to Applicants for Admission; Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," pp. 9-10.

<sup>14</sup>This practice nullified a September 1940 decision to cease accepting students on probation, allowing them to take remedial secondary school courses while already in attendance at the College. The provision had been instituted to release classroom space to truly collegiate courses. See Mead, "The Annual Report," September 1940, p. 53.

<sup>15</sup>This was caused by a recent change in the mathematics requirement, which called for presentation of both Advanced Algebra and Trigonometry for admission into an engineering course. See BHE, Minutes, 26 April 1943, no. 114, pp. 208-209; Taylor to Wright, 22 October 1943; Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," p. 2.

<sup>16</sup>"Day Session Admissions," February 1943; Wright to the BHE Executive Committee, 1 April 1943; "Day Session: Matriculated Undergraduate Enrollment, Admissions, February 1940 through February 1945," February 1945, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; Wright, "Report for 1940-1944," p. 6; "Day Session: Matriculated Undergraduate Enrollment, Admissions, February 1941 through February 1947," February 1947, CC Files, 3.52, Enrollment.

<sup>17</sup>A. T. Condon, "Evening Session Statistics: Fall 1937 through Spring 1942," 10 November 1942, CC Files, 3.34, Statistics; Wright, "Report for 1940-1944," p. 9; Knittle, "Report for September 1946 to June 1947," p. 2.

<sup>18</sup>Robert A. Love, "Progress and Problems in the Evening Session, School of Business and Civic Administration, The City College, 1942-1943," September 1943, pp. i-v, CC Files, 3.31, Report Material.

<sup>19</sup>Wright, "Report for 1940-1944," p. 3. There was a slight increase by September 1944.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>21</sup>Mead, "Report for 1938-1939," p. 6; Mead, "The Annual Report," September 1940, p. 6; "Instructions regarding Admissions," May 1943; Robert L. Taylor to Dr. Harry N. Wright, 15 September 1943, p. 2, CC Files, 3.34,

Reports; Taylor to Wright, 22 October 1943; Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," p. 3; "Notes regarding Telephone Conversation between E. M. Turner, Acting Dean of the School of Education and Robert L. Taylor, Registrar," 28 June 1945, CC Files, 3.41, Enrollment; William I. Pearman and Charles F. Reid, "An Analysis of Factors Affecting Trends in Enrollment in The City College of New York," February 1947, p. 15, CC Files, 4.22, Reports; Flora Spetalnick, "Sturdy Daughters. . .," Alumnus, vol. 44, no. 7, March 1949, pp. 8, 9, 22. Only six women were enrolled in the Engineering fields in September 1940. Information regarding the quota of 75 admissions per term for women in the School of Education is vague.

<sup>22</sup>Love, "Progress and Problems, 1942-1943," pp. i-v; Taylor, "Advance Report regarding Fall 1944."

<sup>23</sup>George H. Shuster, President, Hunter College, "Memo to The Honorable Ordway Tead, Chairman, BHE regarding the Distribution of Enrollment in the Manhattan-Bronx Area," 18 October 1945, pt. II, CC Files, 3.41, Enrollment; Pearman and Reid, "Factors Affecting Trends," p. 15. The Day Session of the School of Education was "almost non-existent" before the Fall of 1943.

<sup>24</sup>Taylor to Wright, 22 October 1943; "CC Day Session Admissions," February 1944; Robert L. Taylor to Harry N. Wright, 11 October 1944, CC Files, 3.41, Enrollment.

<sup>25</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 June 1940, no. 23, pp. 414-419; 25 January 1943, no. 104, pp. 52-53; 26 April 1943, no. 3, pp. 164-167; 17 May 1943, no. 2, pp. 215-217; 17 April 1944, no. 3, pp. 147-153; 15 May 1944, no. A, pp. 178-181; 25 September 1944, no. C, pp. 337-339.

<sup>26</sup>"Instructions regarding Admissions," May 1943; Taylor to Wright, 22 October 1943; Robert L. Taylor to [Group of Seven] Dr. Knittle, Dr. Love, Miss Mulligan, Miss Condon, Mr. Feldman, Dr. Wright, Dr. Brophy, 28 April 1944, CC Files, 3.35, Registrar; Taylor to Wright, 11 October 1944; Robert L. Taylor to Harry N. Wright, 26 October 1945, CC Files, 3.43, Admissions. Students accepted solely on the basis of their high school averages were permitted an early enrollment in the lengthened Summer Session, with a course load of up to 12 credits. The expanded Summer Session was begun in June 1943 in an effort to accelerate educational training during the War emergency.

<sup>27</sup>Walter A. Knittle, Director, Evening Session, Main Center to Dr. Harry N. Wright, President, The City College, 6 March 1944, CC Files, 3.35, Evening Session.

<sup>28</sup>Taylor to Wright, 22 October 1943; Taylor to [Group of Seven], 28 April 1944; Taylor, "Advance Report regarding Fall 1944"; Taylor to Wright, 11 October 1944; Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to [Group of Six] Dr. Walter A. Knittle, Dr. Robert A. Love, Miss Agnes C. Mulligan, Miss Agnes T. Condon, Mr. David D. Feldman, Dr. Wright, 4 December 1944, CC Files, 3.41, Admissions; Taylor to Wright, 26 October 1945.

<sup>29</sup>Taylor to Wright, 22 October 1943; Taylor, "Advance Report regarding Fall 1944."

<sup>30</sup>Taylor to Wright, 11 October 1944.

<sup>31</sup>Taylor, "Advance Report regarding Fall 1944."

<sup>32</sup>Taylor to [Group of Seven], 28 April 1944; Taylor to Wright, 11 October 1944; Taylor to [Group of Six], 4 December 1944.

<sup>33</sup>Walter A. Knittle, Director, Evening Session, Main Center to Dr. Harry N. Wright, President, City College, 23 October 1942, CC Files, 3.32, Enrollment Figures.

<sup>34</sup>Non-matriculantes and graduate students paid \$5.00 per credit; Specials paid \$2.50. Many Specials, however, enrolled for several courses to facilitate transfer to the matriculated status.

<sup>35</sup>A. T. Condon, "Evening Session Statistics"; "Preliminary Report for Fall 1940, Fall 1942, Fall 1943," Fall 1943, CC Files, 3.32, Enrollment Figures; Taylor to Wright, 15 September 1943; Wright, "Report for 1940-1944," p. 9; "Preliminary Report on Enrollment in all Divisions, Number of Admissions and Qualitative Requirements for Admission, The City College, for Fall 1943, Fall 1945, Fall 1946," September 1946, CC Files, 3.53, Registrar. Also, Registrar's Statistics, Main and Commerce Centers, 1942-1947, The City College, Administration Building, Office of the Registrar.

In Fall 1943, the Evening Session of the Business Center experienced a 13% increase over the previous year's registration, a direct result of the enrollment of women.

If Adult Education enrollment is included in these calculations, Special students represented only 10% of the total Evening Session registration in Spring 1945.

<sup>36</sup>Enrollment of graduate and non-matriculated students did remain stable during the War. These students, however, tended to be enrolled for only one or two courses on a sporadic basis.

- <sup>37</sup>Taylor to Wright, 15 September 1943.
- <sup>38</sup>Love, "Progress and Problems, 1942-1943," p. i.  
Also, pp. 1-3.
- <sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 1. Also, pp. 3-5.
- <sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. ii. Also, p. 6.
- <sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. ii-iii. Also, pp. 11-12.
- <sup>42</sup>Knittle to Wright, 6 March 1944.
- <sup>43</sup>"Expanding Educational Fronts," Alumnus, vol. 42, no. 1, January 1946, pp. 5-6.
- <sup>44</sup>Knittle, "Report for September 1946 to June 1947," pp. 13-17.
- <sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 15.
- <sup>46</sup>Wright to the BHE Executive Committee, 1 April 1943.
- <sup>47</sup>These included the Institute of Film Techniques; the Engineering, Science, Management and War Training Program; the Specialized Training and Reassignment (STAR) Program; the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP); and the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC). See "Expansion," Alumnus, January 1945, vol. 41, no. 1, p. 13; Harry N. Wright, President, "Facts About City College: The CCNY Educational Highlights," April 1951, pp. 4-6, CC Files, 4.15, President's Office; Harry N. Wright, President, prepared by Maude Stewart, "A College Leads, A College Learns, New York 1941-1952: Fruitful Years at City College," 14 April 1952, pp. 49-60, CC Files, 3.64.
- <sup>48</sup>Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Dr. Harry N. Wright, President, 26 July 1943; Albert P. d'Andrea, Chairman, "Report of the General Faculty Committee on Post-War Building Plans," November 1943, p. 10, CC Files, 3.33, Committee on Post-War Building Plans; Robert L. Taylor to Dr. Harry N. Wright, 20 July 1944, CC Files, 3.42, Registrar. By Fall 1944, the College was able to use 90 classrooms.
- <sup>49</sup>"Intra Muros-Student Life," Alumnus, vol. 41, no. 2, February 1945, pp. 29-30; Albert P. d'Andrea, probable author, "Space Needs of City College," Spring 1945, pp. 2-3, CC Files, 3.41, Reports.
- <sup>50</sup>d'Andrea, "Space Needs of City College," pp. 2-3.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., pp. 4-6; Alumnus, February 1945, pp. 29-30.

<sup>52</sup>d'Andrea, "Space Needs of City College," p. 14.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., p. 14. The situation was also severe at the Commerce Center. See "Space and Registration Statistics," Fall 1945, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE WORLD WAR II VETERANS

#### A. The Issue of Merit

##### 1. The National Context

The termination of World War II generated in the United States an unprecedented demand for higher education. Colleges were asked to admit both students who graduated from high school between 1944 and 1947, and an entire tidal wave of returning soldiers whose education had been interrupted by the War. Top officials of the municipal college system had already foreseen the coming of the WWII veterans during the War years. The solution of the problem of providing for the veterans would require facing the key issues of student merit, the availability of facilities and CCNY's mission to serve the needs of the City's taxpayers.

In Fall 1943, the Board of Higher Education and the Presidents of the four municipal colleges began addressing the issue of providing guidance for demobilized soldiers. After some deliberation, both BHE Chairman Ordway Tead and the College Presidents determined that the development of post-War higher educational resources for veterans would be

contingent upon a Federal agenda and subsidy for such programs.<sup>1</sup>

In March 1944, the American Council on Education sponsored a Conference on Legislation for Servicemen's Education. At the termination of the meeting, the Council had adopted key principles to be incorporated into any legislation affecting returning soldiers. The key elements are summarized here:

- a) That veterans' education should be administered through authorized governmental educational agencies
- b) That responsibility for certification of eligibility of the individual should rest with the Veterans' Administration
- c) That in each state there shall be an educational agency which shall
  - (1) furnish lists of approved educational or training institutions within the State
  - (2) advise and assist the approved institutions
  - (3) determine, subject to national policies, the amount of payments to institutions furnishing training under this Act
  - (4) provide educational and vocational guidance
- d) That the educational or training institution should determine the qualifications of the individual for study in such institution and for continuance in the courses
- e) That the individual should be free to select the institution in which he wishes to study, and after counseling, to select the program of study which he desires to pursue<sup>2</sup>

By June 22, 1944, Congress had passed the "GI Bill of Rights," Public Law 346. Under this law, veterans who

were eligible would receive Federal educational benefits for training programs begun which within seven years after the passage of the Act. By the close of 1952, half of the nation's WWII veterans (some 7,500,000) had availed themselves of the educational opportunities of the GI Bill. Public Law 16, furnishing training to veterans with service-connected disabilities, had already been passed on March 24, 1943.<sup>3</sup>

## 2. The Local Situation

Two salient issues pertaining to the ex-service-men confronted the municipal colleges between 1944 and 1947: student merit and space. With respect to merit, controversy emerged regarding standards of admission and criteria for student status allocation. The lack of facilities, a theme discussed in a later section of this chapter, posed a complicating and severe problem.<sup>4</sup>

In Spring 1944, at a conference of New York City high school principals, City College administrators committed themselves to two general principles regarding the admission of veterans. Firstly, any post-War applicant who had been accepted for admission during the War years, and was then drafted before actually enrolling at the College, would be automatically accepted. In like manner, veterans who had been already enrolled at the College, who were then drafted, would be allowed to automatically resume their studies.

Secondly, the College pledged to accept "war diplomas": diplomas given to students who had completed seven of the eight high school terms.<sup>5</sup> In this matter, "the College would go as far as the State Education Department in making concessions." Yet the quality requirement would still exist, and would be based on high school record and additional examinations.<sup>6</sup>

The Board of Higher Education was also concerned with the merit of returning servicemen. Thus, a resolution was passed "in opposition to the allowance of indiscriminate blanket credit for military experience."<sup>7</sup> The actual implementation of this resolution was left to the discretion of the individual colleges.

At CCNY, a Committee on Post-War Problems was convened. In reporting to President Wright, the Committee noted the incomplete or irregular high school sequences being presented for admission by returning ex-servicemen. Three suggestions were presented for dealing with the problem. The College could waive a liberal amount of specific requirements; it could administer a test of general competence; or CCNY could offer make-up and remedial courses.<sup>8</sup>

City College chose basically to institute practices which tapped all three options outlined by the Committee. War diplomas were accepted; some credit was given for specific military training programs; proficiency testing was conducted by the Veterans Advisement Unit and the Student Personnel Bureau; and remedial courses were offered. In-

structors were instructed to be on the lookout for students who should "be advised to enroll without credit for refresher purposes in a preparatory course in your department."<sup>9</sup> The procedures regarding veterans were to be maintained throughout the year, including admissions and enrollment in the Summer Session.<sup>10</sup>

By Spring 1945, the BHE had formally adopted guidelines for the admission of veterans. The highlights of the Board resolution are presented here:

- a) The City College [system] should accept every veteran who applies and qualifies for admission.
- b) Holders of war diplomas [are] eligible for admission on the same basis as holders of regular diplomas, except that they will be required to take in college [with or without credit, as the case may be] courses that are pre-requisite to required college courses.
- c) Veterans whose secondary school preparation has been inadequate, either in terms of scholarship or entrance units, or both, should be considered for admission as non-matriculated students, and should be matriculated subsequently, if the record of achievement in the college justifies such action.

In addition, a maximum of ten college credits would be granted for a veteran who was in the service for at least six months.<sup>11</sup>

The challenge to the admission standards of the Colleges was met. As a public institution, CCNY faced the political necessity of admitting large numbers of returning World War II veterans: the BHE acceded to pressure to admit all who applied. Yet, cognizant of the inadequacy of the preparation of many who would be entering, the BHE

and the Presidents of the Colleges resolved to deal with the issue of standards and student status internally.

### 3. CCNY Accommodations: Administrative Directives

While it remained the official policy of the municipal colleges to admit all veterans, and then stratify them within the individual college based on merit, two types of accommodations were instituted which enabled the veteran to maintain his GI benefits. Administrative directives refer to provisions which were openly discussed among the President and his Deans and subsequently made known to concerned parties. Administrative provisos were privately discussed: implementation of these procedures remained a secret known only to a very limited number of college officials.

The following listing is illustrative of the more publicized directives affecting student status.

a) All disabled veterans, regardless of their academic preparation, were awarded full-time programs in the Day Session in order to maintain their benefits under Public Law 16.

b) Veterans who were categorized as Special or Non-Matriculating Students were permitted to carry a full-time, 12-credit program. This was accomplished in three ways:

(1) Specials who were veterans were assigned to the Day Session "for patriotic reasons."

(2) Specials and Non-Matriculants who were veterans had their programs split between Day and Evening Session classes. Thus, a program might consist of 9 credits in the Evening Session, with the remaining 3 credits being taken in Day Session classes.

(3) Later afternoon classes (between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m.) were considered both a part of the Day and Evening Sessions' schedule, providing the College with additional time and courses for the programs of the less-competent veteran. "Thus, the problem of the veteran would be met without encroaching on the prior rights of the matriculated students."<sup>12</sup>

These procedures, operative at CCNY in the late 1940s, were the result of oral and written discussions between Robert L. Taylor, City College's Registrar and President Harry N. Wright. The enactment of these special scheduling modifications was subsequently made known to Special and Non-Matriculant veterans through the Office of the Registrar.<sup>13</sup>

#### 4. CCNY Accommodations: Administrative Provisos

The next group of provisions contain clearly highly restricted information. The items presented here were again the result of oral and written discussions between Taylor and Wright. This time, however, Taylor stressed the following:

No general publicity should be given to these arrangements since the non-veteran might raise embarrassing questions.<sup>14</sup>

Additionally, these exceptional accommodations, effected with the tacit consent of Morton Gottschall, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Deans Walter Knittle and Robert Love of the Evening Session (Uptown and Downtown Centers), were in operation for not more than one year, probably beginning in September 1945 and ending by September 1946.<sup>15</sup>

Three administrative provisos affecting the student status of veterans at City College can be identified. They are presented here.

a) Applicants who graduated high school prior to January 1946 could be admitted at Matriculated students "on the strength of the high school record alone" if they presented at least a 78% average. This stipulation may be contrasted with the official matriculation requirement for students who were just graduating high school in January 1946, which was presentation of an 80% average.

This exception was allowed "on the ground that most of them are veterans who would have been eligible to enter the College while our 78% average was in effect, if they had been free to do so."<sup>16</sup>

b) In like manner, applicants graduating prior to January 1946 could qualify for admission on the combined strength of entrance exams and secondary school records if they presented a high school average of 74%. This may be contrasted with the "minimum certification average" in effect for all other applicants, which was

75%.<sup>17</sup>

c) With reference to the veteran who was enrolled in the College's Evening Session as a Special student before induction, but whose record was higher than the one now required for admission as a Matriculated student, or required during the War years, Taylor suggested the following:

A student's status would be changed from Special to Matriculated only if his "residence at the College was directly interrupted by military service" and if his high school average was at least 78% and his college record was at least a "C."

This change would be effective February 1946. Wright's response to Taylor's suggestions was brief and direct: "I approve."<sup>18</sup>

Again, these three stipulations were essentially kept as secrets, known only at the level of the CCNY Presidency and his top executive staff. They were applied discreetly, presumably on a case-by-case basis. By April 1946, Taylor and Wright had decided to abandon these exceptional procedures, as well as the scheduling accommodation which enabled Special and Non-Matriculant veterans to take programs in the Day Session, or to split their course load between the Day and Evening Sessions. Only such disabled veterans receiving benefits under Public Law 16 would still be allotted Day Session classes.<sup>19</sup>

By late Spring 1946, Taylor and Wright had agreed on a priority order for awarding the Matriculated status to incoming students. The priorities were, first, veterans

with an 80% or higher average; then new students from high schools with an 80% or higher average; and finally, veterans with averages below 80%.<sup>20</sup>

#### 5. CCNY Admissions in the 1940s

Efforts were thus made to deal in an equitable manner with both veterans and high school graduates. Yet, the students of City College and the other municipal colleges would suffer during the "1946-1947 crunch." Largely as a direct result of the almost unbearable space shortage, the matriculation average and composite score required for admission rose dramatically in Fall 1946 and remained high throughout the immediate post-World War II period.<sup>21</sup> The fluctuations in required admissions scores during the 1940s are shown in the following table:

TABLE 8.

QUALITATIVE ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS--CCNY, 1940-1950<sup>22</sup>

|                | <u>High School Average</u> | <u>Composite Score</u> |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| September 1940 | 82                         | Not used               |
| September 1941 | 80                         | 60                     |
| September 1942 | 80                         | 60                     |
| September 1943 | 80                         | 59                     |
| September 1944 | 78                         | 56                     |
| September 1945 | 78                         | 430                    |
| September 1946 | 83*                        | 476                    |
| September 1947 | 83*                        | 476                    |
| September 1948 | 79                         | 465                    |
| September 1949 | 79                         | 465                    |
| -February 1950 | 81                         | 154                    |
| September 1950 | 80                         | 156                    |

\*85 for women.

As previously noted, the composite score utilized by CCNY from September 1941 through September 1945 had a range of 0 through 70. It contained three components, weighted as follows: high school average: 4 (57%); Cooperative Test Service Score ("Iowa Tests"): 2 (29%); and Psychological Exam (SAT) Score: 1 (14%).

A concerted effort has been made by this researcher to determine the range, components and weighting scheme applicable to the composite score utilized between September 1945 and September 1949. While the score appears to

have been based at 0, the upper limit varied on a term-to-term basis. For instance, in February 1948, the highest attainable (or attained) score for non-engineers appears to have been 608; in September 1949, it was 646.<sup>23</sup> It is known that the score was composed of the following: high school average; quantitative (Q) and verbal (L) scores of the ACE Psychological Exam (curved to a final normalized score); and several achievement tests, apparently selected from among the "Iowa Tests," also used as normalized scores. What is not known--and highly unlikely to be determined--is the mathematical formula used to curve and normalize these components, and the weighting scheme assigned to these final scores.<sup>24</sup>

The composite score initiated in February 1950 had a range of 0 to 200 and used two components. High school average was given a weight equal to the ACE Psychological Exam.

## B. The Space Crisis: 1946-1947

### 1. Introduction

The critical element effecting access to the municipal colleges in the late-1940s was the availability of facilities. With thousands of veterans enrolled at the municipal colleges, CCNY was actually operating under crisis conditions from 1945 through 1948.<sup>25</sup> In Spring 1946, with the composite score reaching a high of 483, acceptance notifications were sent out to only 98 out of the

651 taking tests.<sup>26</sup> In April 1946, the Registrar's Office began prognostications regarding the anticipated Fall 1946 enrollment. Calculations included estimates of the number of matriculated students still in attendance in the Fall term, the number of re-entering servicemen and the number of transfers from the Evening Session. Consideration was also given to the effect on enrollment of the possible discontinuance of the draft.<sup>27</sup>

As a result of these estimates, the size of the incoming class was shrunk by approximately 50%. The drop in the size of the Freshman class meant that "many high school graduates whose average is 83% or better will be excluded from a college education."<sup>28</sup> A letter sent out to applicants for September 1946 described the chance of admission for those with a high school average between 75% and 85% as being in a "more doubtful class."<sup>29</sup> Despite the raised admissions requirements and the cut in the number of entering students, an additional crisis measure was employed: notification of acceptance to CCNY for September 1946 was held off until mid-Summer 1946.<sup>30</sup> The same delay in notifying applicants of their admissions status would again become necessary the following year.<sup>31</sup>

## 2. Coping Tactics

The influx of veterans placed an undue pressure on CCNY, especially at the Commerce Center. In Spring 1946, Agnes Clare Mulligan, Assistant Registrar, informed Dr.

Thomas L. Norton, Dean of the School of Business, that, "It is, of course, equally obvious that it will be impossible for us to take an entering class downtown. We are assigning our entering class to the Main Center."<sup>32</sup> In Fall 1947, the Freshman class accepted by the 23rd Street Center would again be assigned to the Uptown campus.<sup>33</sup>

Irregular programs were also assigned to many students. The Day Session ran from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.<sup>34</sup> The Evening Session's official hours were extended, some classes starting as early as 3 p.m. in the afternoon.<sup>35</sup> These special arrangements soon became known as the "Twilight College Program."<sup>36</sup> In addition, classes were scheduled for Saturday mornings.<sup>37</sup> More than 3,000 students during the Fall term of 1946 carried full-time programs in these oddly-scheduled classes.<sup>38</sup>

Even additional coping measures were necessary. Qualified students were restricted to part-time schedules.<sup>39</sup> The size of class sections was increased.<sup>40</sup> Space became the most precious commodity at the College.

Classes are having to be assigned to places not suited for them, such as public speaking classes in physics laboratories and other classes in the Faculty Room.<sup>41</sup>

The College's administration began speaking of space in terms of square feet per student. A report to President Wright from the Director of Planning and Design described CCNY's educational facilities as "inadequate, crowded and deteriorating."<sup>42</sup> In 1907, the new campus had

supplied 100 square feet per student; by 1936, the College was forced to operate under conditions of 26 square feet per student. Conditions in the post-World War II period were substantially below even the 1936 mark. Thus, the Report proposed increasing available footage to at least 73 square feet per student.<sup>43</sup>

The present combined lack of space, facilities, equipment and personnel is such that there is a grave question how long it can continue without a serious detrimental effect to faculty and student morale and to educational standards.<sup>44</sup>

### 3. Retention and Admission

Yet City College maintained its high educational standards. It also displayed a "superior holding power": dropout rates at CCNY, compared to many other colleges, were much lower than expected. This phenomenon gave rise to an additional complication regarding the admissions process:

It seems ironic that the schools in which the highest scholarship is maintained [read--retention] have been the least responsive to public demand for expansion!

The more that the College encourages students to come to the College and stay in college, the fewer students it is able to accommodate.<sup>45</sup>

Thus, the College experienced a repeat of the situation which had presented itself in the mid-1930s. At that time, CCNY had been forced to raise admissions requirements due, in a large measure, to the fact that students who would have dropped out of school during "normal times" to gain employment remained in school. Now, again, in the

late 1940s, students exhibited a disproportionate desire to complete their education. Both occurrences, in the mid-1930s and the mid-1940s, were largely unplanned for and were basically accountable to external events and forces.<sup>46</sup>

During the earlier 1940s, the War had siphoned off to the military many students who, in peacetime conditions, would have remained at the College. Thus, the College underwent two sudden "shocks" in the 1940s: a rapid and dramatic drop in enrollment in 1943-1945 after the severe overcrowding of the late 1930s, followed by an immediate and rapid surge in enrollment, far beyond anticipated levels, in 1945-1947.

#### 4. Budgetary Considerations and Enrollment

In addition to the enrollment "crunch" and space crisis of 1946-1947, CCNY was experiencing budgetary problems in the post-War period. In Spring 1946, Mayor O'Dwyer proposed an operating budget equal to the one allotted prior to the outbreak of the War. While in 1946 enrollments in the Day Session approximated their pre-War levels, "things [which were] done prior to the War can not be done now."<sup>47</sup> In the main, small classes and laboratory sections had been substituted for the lecture-hall system. As noted by Assistant Registrar Mulligan, "All of these needs have been deemed educationally sound by our faculties and I would regret to see any educational gains lost purely because of budget considerations."<sup>48</sup>

Additionally, the availability of the College's operating funds was impeded by the manner in which GI Bill benefits were awarded. Reimbursement could be made only after a veteran had applied for his benefits. CCNY found itself in a difficult position when more than 50% of the veterans enrolled in its units failed to register for their benefits.<sup>49</sup> In addition, considerable delays in payment from the Federal government to the College became commonplace.<sup>50</sup> Finally, following peak veteran enrollment in September 1947, reductions in the number of veterans in the municipal colleges resulted in gaps in the anticipated versus the actual operating budgets.<sup>51</sup>

College executives recognized the severity of the space and financial crisis. "The number of students that can be accommodated in a building having a certain capacity or that can be instructed by a staff of a given number is hardly defensible as a measure of need of the community for higher education."<sup>52</sup> It was therefore evident that the College would not be able to continue "to meet its obligations unless prompt relief is provided in the form of substantial additional space, facilities, equipment and personnel."<sup>53</sup>

##### 5. The Post-WWII Mission and Space Needs

The College's mission to the people of the City of New York was offered as a bona fide rationale for additional funding. "Until more adequate provision is made

for the College in the City budget, and a building program is carried into effect, the College can not meet the full obligation it visualizes for itself to the City and the student body."<sup>54</sup> An integral part of that obligation was defined by the Presidents of the four municipal colleges as "meeting the increasing demand for post-high school education." In March 1947, President Gideonse of Brooklyn College, acting on behalf of Presidents Wright of City College, Shuster of Hunter College and Klapper of Queens College, drafted a paper entitled "The Scope of Higher Education in New York City."<sup>55</sup> Four factors were identified as reasons why "an increasing number of qualified young people will ask for post-high school education":

- a) increased preparation needed for industry and commerce
- b) increased need for technological workers
- c) increased enrollment in all types of general and vocational secondary schools and
- d) the upward reach for "an ampler social and spiritual life"<sup>56</sup>

Thus, a ten-year, four-stage building program was outlined for the four municipal colleges. Plans were also made for the establishment of four junior college units, beginning with such a unit in Staten Island.<sup>57</sup>

The March 1947 Presidential paper compiled by Gideonse was thorough and accurate in its analysis of population trends in New York City. The proposals for the ten-year expansion of the Colleges' facilities were both

daring and farsighted. Yet the contemporary problem, the post-War space crisis, would not be met by this plan: City College could not afford to wait five or ten years for the solution of its immediate dilemma.

In recent years, a growing student body with no concomitant increase of facilities had given the impression that the walls of the College were made of rubber.<sup>58</sup>

With the College being referred to as a "classroom factory," new facilities were instantly and desperately needed.<sup>59</sup>

#### 6. Capital Improvements

The space emergency was met at City College in a number of ways. Firstly, Army Hall was reconverted to civilian useage.<sup>60</sup> Classrooms in the High School of Music and Art were rented from 4 p.m. until 10:30 p.m.<sup>61</sup> Additional small buildings were also used for instructional purposes.<sup>62</sup>

Secondly, the Episcopal Orphanage was purchased and quickly remodelled for collegiate purposes.<sup>63</sup> Upon occupancy on July 1, 1946, the building was named South Hall. On December 8, 1955, it was renamed Klapper Hall, as the City College School of Education assumed permanent residence in the structure.<sup>64</sup>

Thirdly, the College began serious negotiations for additional properties. Discussions were held to purchase one-half of the land on which Army Hall stood; the other half would be converted to a public school. Then

City College offered to exchange its option on the Army Hall space for Jasper Oval, a City-owned property on Convent Avenue.<sup>65</sup> Finally, the College set out to acquire the 18-1/2 acre Manhattanville property of The College of the Sacred Heart, located adjacent to CCNY's campus. "It now remains for the City of New York to do the obvious: acquire for its great free college the absolutely essential space."<sup>66</sup>

### C. The Adult Education Program

#### 1. Introduction

We have noted earlier the establishment of a BHE-sponsored Adult Education Program in October 1944. These non-credit courses were conducted primarily in conjunction with the New York Public Library system, although several other governmental and private agencies also aided in the operation of these programs.<sup>67</sup>

Three separate historical factors contributed to the unique milieu which allowed the Program to develop.

The War had proven to be the threshold of a new era: of a new technology, of prosperity, of a return to normalcy. The late-1940s provided a hospitable climate for innovation: the Adult Education Program flourished. Secondly, in 1944, two major reports appeared in New York State which gave a "vote of confidence in our colleges and our Board."<sup>68</sup> The first was the report on the city colleges conducted by Dr. George D. Strayer for the State

Legislature. The second was the Regents' Report on technical institutes and scholarship in higher education in New York State. These reports supplied an official sanction for the development of short, non-degree, vocational, technical and recreational courses.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Adult Education Program emerged as a result of economic and normative organizational needs which arose during the latter World War II years. As previously discussed, beginning in 1943, it was to CCNY's benefit to attract and integrate into her enrollment large numbers of tuition-paying, non-matriculating students, first to the College itself, and later, to its extension, off-campus divisions. The factors which created the need for this new group of students occurred prior to and independently of the two 1944 New York State Reports. They also pre-dated the actual termination of hostilities and the resurgence of a period of tranquility and 'normalcy.'

Several extension courses were operated under the jurisdiction of CCNY's Main Center. The Adult Education Program, usually conducted in the New York Public Libraries, was the largest and most famous of these programs. Other extension activities encompassed in-service and pre-service courses for municipal employees, homemaking classes and community service forums and programs. Foreign language, technical and engineering courses initiated during the War years continued to be offered.<sup>69</sup>

## 2. State Law and Adult Education

The Adult Education Program was to become a problematic addition to CCNY's course offerings. Within a year after the inception of the "neighborhood college" program in the public libraries, the State Education Department and the New York City Board of Education challenged the BHE's and CCNY's right to conduct courses not leading to the B.A. degree. A claim was made that the Program exceeded the Board of Higher Education's legal jurisdiction and encroached on the Board of Education's prior rights to operate precisely this type of program.<sup>70</sup>

The municipal colleges defended their extension programs, noting the following clause in the State Education Law:

[The Board of Higher Education] may furnish gratuitously or otherwise for non-matriculated students additional technical, professional and special courses of study and other educational advantages.<sup>71</sup>

Dr. Walter Knittle, Director of the Adult Education Program associated with CCNY's Main Center, presented the College's case at a special conference in Albany.<sup>72</sup>

By March 1947, a special Committee on Adult Education, sponsored by the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education, recommended a compromise:

- a) The Board of Education is to make space available freely to college programs of adult education.
- b) "Where duplications or other problems arise, they should be dealt with ad hoc, and not according to a set of rigid rules."

- c) All colleges undertaking extension programs may exploit publicity within their own borough, but will follow a common format.
- d) The heads of the various adult education and extension work programs are to meet as a council.
- e) No rigid division of subject fields will be imposed on the two Boards.
- f) New Board of Education programs will be "centered [on] an attempt to work with communities as such" whereas college programs will be primarily concerned with interest in specific subject matters.<sup>73</sup>

While information is very scanty and ambiguous, it appears that cooperation between the New York Public Library (NYPL) and CCNY continued throughout the 1950s. In 1961, the Office of Adult Services of the NYPL re-evaluated its position with regard to the CCNY Adult Education Program. At that point, the decision was made "to give space for a decreasing number of classes." Future City College catalogues would drop the phrase "in collaboration with The New York Public Library," although the Library would "continue our friendly association and cooperation."<sup>74</sup>

### 3. The Intensive Business Training Program

The Veterans Intensive Business Training Program started operation in September 1946 after a suitable building was acquired.<sup>75</sup> Courses were offered in the six areas of business where surveys had indicated the availability of job opportunities and a need among ex-servicemen for specific training. These were: advertising, foreign trade, retail credit practice, retail store management, salesmanship and small business management.<sup>76</sup> Based on

the premise that business skills can be taught and not acquired only through practical experience, the IBT Program flourished. In later years, the prefix "Veterans" was dropped. Some industrial organizations even began conducting in-plant courses for their employees.<sup>77</sup> Drop-outs from the Program were negligible, and by Fall 1952, over 50,000 adults had been served. The Evening and Extension Divisions of the School of Business soon encompassed 40% of CCNY's enrollment.<sup>78</sup>

Beginning in Winter 1952-53, the Midtown Center began to experience difficulties. The initial problem emerged as one of limited facilities, with the Board of Education receiving title to the IBTP building.<sup>79</sup>

More serious than the space problem, however, was the crisis of dwindling revenues. From its inception, IBT had been operating with a sizeable surplus. In 1953, however, the situation changed. Financial statements for the IBTP indicate a \$704,000 surplus in 1952; in 1953, it was only \$265,000, representing 38% of its 1952 level. Salaries and expenses also dropped between 1952 and 1953, but not as substantially as did income levels, resulting in a \$52,000 deficit, the first yearly loss ever recorded by the Program.<sup>80</sup> Robert Love, Dean of the School of Business, wrote, "The operation can not be further expected to absorb the general overhead for programs which do not contribute to its revenues."<sup>81</sup> The IBTP deficit for 1953-54 was esti-

mated at \$73,000.<sup>82</sup>

By Summer of 1955, the IBT Program was deemed completely unviable, and plans were made for a small "closing-out" operation in 1955-1956. The IBT Program was officially terminated on June 30, 1956.<sup>83</sup>

The dissolution of the Intensive Business Training Program appears perplexing. It occurred in an era when vocational training programs were being supported by government and business interests.<sup>84</sup> The mission of CCNY was being fully realized and extended by the IBTP. Why, then, was it terminated?

At the crux of an answer is the fact that the Intensive Business Training Program was primarily a Veterans program. An examination of financial records indicates that while IBTP may have been vicariously supported by numerous New York City business enterprises, its operation was actually subsidized by World War II veterans' educational benefits. Thus, while the rhetoric of public relations emphasized service to the community-at-large and the extension of "the American way of life," IBTP maintained its existence primarily through the receipt of Federal funds. The Program's termination was the direct result of the cessation of these monies.

Public Law 346, which provided WWII educational benefits, required that courses be begun between June 22, 1944 and July 25, 1951. All programs had to be completed by July 25, 1956. Public Law 550, which applied to Korean

War veterans, contained similar provisions. Yet, the limited American military involvement in Korea as compared with that of World War II, and the availability of student deferments during the Korean War did not materially affect enrollment at the Midtown Center.<sup>85</sup>

The stipulations of Public Law 346 therefore had a direct and singular bearing upon registration at the IBT Program. Between 1946 and 1952, tuition from veterans accounted for in excess of 90% of the Program's income. In 1953, veterans' tuition represented only 64% of total receipts, with total income itself having dropped to a fraction of its 1952 level.<sup>86</sup> The trend was clear: in March 1953, Robert Love stated that the veterans were now "out of the picture."<sup>87</sup> A statement by President Gallagher confirmed the Center's dependence upon revenues from the WWII veterans:

We felt under obligation to continue the program through the time in which veterans' entitlements from WWII were valid.

During the bulge of the veterans' enrollments, this program showed a considerable balance on the profit side. It is not catastrophic for it to show a deficit in its closing period if at the same time we are enabled to fulfill a moral commitment to those who have started their studies with veterans' entitlements and ought to be permitted to conclude them even at some cost to us.<sup>88</sup>

Thus was ended one of the most remarkable of CCNY's undertakings. Begun in 1943 to offset losses in student enrollment and revenues of the Evening Session during the War, courses for non-matriculated students promoted as a

"new way in American life" as "neighborhood colleges" were operated throughout the City. The establishment of IBTP, "The School That Means Business," was likewise applauded. College administrators depicted these ventures as an extension of CCNY's mission to serve the people of the City of New York. The courses were lauded as the antidote to the threats of fascism and communism, as precisely that element which would promote individual self-sufficiency, personal advancement and, ultimately, a sound democracy.

Yet with the curtailment of revenues from the veterans' benefits, the programs floundered. At that point, descriptions of the Program became notably pragmatic. No longer was IBTP depicted in terms illuminating the long-range, intangible, idealistic normative goals which it sought to serve. Instead, the primary considerations became the legality, fiscal independence and solvency of the endeavor. Heretofore, the Intensive Business Training Program had generated a surplus revenue, which was used to subsidize classes attended by non-tuition paying, matriculated students. Now, however, the Program became dependent upon other CCNY units.

With the demise of the Program in 1956, the mission of the Colleges constricted, now being defined in a more narrow and traditional manner.

#### D. Summary

The presence of the World War II veterans at The

City College intensified the problems related to the long-standing issues of student merit, the availability of facilities and the mission of the College. As had occurred during the War years, the College's administration continued to rely upon and to utilize a wide range of provisions to control student access. Thus, admission in the post-War period was regulated by Federal and State Law, BHE Bylaws and Resolutions and Administrative Directives and Provisos.

The College accepted, under the pressure of the historical moment, all veterans who applied for admission. These students were subsequently stratified internally, according to their academic preparation. Exceptions to the publicized allocation scheme were discreetly permitted in order to cater to the ex-serviceman's unique situation.

The flood of veterans exacerbated the chronic space shortage. While plans for capital improvement were formalized, the immediate space crisis was dealt with on an ad hoc basis. Temporary expedients were implemented as the College's expanded post-War mission further strained facilities.

The particular educational needs of the veterans were met by a vast expansion of CCNY's curricular offerings. A specific innovative post-secondary program was designed to assist in the re-integration of the World War II veteran. These courses, which also served the City-at-large, received substantial publicity and praise as an extension

of CCNY's mission. The unique program and the concomitant expansion of the concept of service to the community would endure, however, only as long as the program remained solvent. It was dissolved at precisely the point where veterans' benefits no longer subsidized its continuance. Subsequently, City College's mission was defined in a narrower, more constricted fashion.

<sup>1</sup>Ordway Tead, Chairman, BHE to Harry N. Wright, President, City College (and to George N. Shuster [HC], Harry D. Gideonse [BC] and Paul Klapper [QC]), 22 October 1943, CC Files, 3.33, Presidential Conferences; Paul Klapper to Harry N. Wright, George N. Shuster and Harry D. Gideonse, 28 October 1943, CC Files, 3.33, Presidential Conferences; "Memo regarding Screening Veterans," 20 January 1944, CC Files, 3.35, Veterans.

<sup>2</sup>George F. Zook, President, American Council on Education to Colleagues, 17 March 1944, CC Files, 3.35, Veterans Legislation.

<sup>3</sup>Collier's Encyclopedia, 1962 ed., s.v. "Veterans' Benefits." The BHE and CCNY had lobbied in Albany for passage of an act which would permit the municipal colleges to offer admission to non-New York City resident veterans receiving GI benefits. Thus, Chapter 190 was signed into law on 17 March 1945. Section 151-e of the Bylaws, adopted in October 1945, provided for the admission of non-resident veterans "as candidates for the baccalaureate degree or otherwise." See BHE, Minutes, 20 November 1944, no. 10, pp. 432-437; 19 February 1945, no. 2, pp. 46-47; 24 September 1945, no. 6, pp. 280-283; 22 October 1945, no. 1, p. 319.

<sup>4</sup>CCNY accommodations for WWII veterans emanated from the five levels of decision-making identified in Chapter IV. In terms of the practical implementation of policies pertaining to veterans at the College, no distinction whatsoever was made by collegiate authorities with reference to the actual statutory basis of any specific procedure.

<sup>5</sup>"War diplomas" were awarded to students who had completed seven out of eight secondary school terms. In like manner, the Colleges, in an attempt to facilitate their graduation prior to induction, had conferred the B.A. on those who entered the military lacking up to 12 credits for graduation. See BHE, Minutes, 16 February 1942, no. 120, pp. 106-111; 23 April 1942, no. 63, pp. 208-209; 26 April 1943, no. 3, pp. 164-167; 19 June 1944, nos. 6 and 7, pp. 214-221.

<sup>6</sup>Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," 18 May 1944, pp. 9-10.

<sup>7</sup>BHE, Minutes, 19 June 1944, no. 7, pp. 214-221; 19 March 1945, no. 4, pp. 74-77.

<sup>8</sup>Jacob S. Orleans, Research Secretary, Committee on Post-War Problems of Higher Education, "Memo to President Harry N. Wright regarding Proposed Principles and Policies Basic to Planning Post-War Education Programs for the City College," 9 November 1944, part IV, CC Files, 3.42, Committee on Post-War Problems.

<sup>9</sup>Robert L. Taylor, Registrar and Agnes C. Mulligan, Assistant Registrar, School of Business, "Notice to All Day Session Instructors," 18 March 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar.

<sup>10</sup>Harry N. Wright, President to Robert L. Taylor, Registrar, 16 May 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar.

<sup>11</sup>BHE, Minutes, 16 April 1945, no. 4, pp. 107-115. The College awarded a high school diploma to students completing refresher courses who maintained a satisfactory collegiate record. See Harry N. Wright, President, City College to Robert L. Taylor, Registrar and Agnes C. Mulligan, Assistant Registrar, 13 November 1945, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar.

<sup>12</sup>Taylor to Wright, 26 October 1945; Robert L. Taylor, Registrar, "Special Notice to Veterans Who Are Classified as Non-Matriculated or Special," December 1945, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Harry N. Wright, President, 5 December 1945, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; BHE, Minutes, 24 October 1949, no. C, pp. 473-477.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Dr. Harry N. Wright, President, City College, 26 December 1945, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; Harry N. Wright to Robert L. Taylor, 9 January 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar.

<sup>15</sup>Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Harry N. Wright, President, 3 December 1945, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; Taylor to Wright, 26 December 1945; Wright to Taylor, 9 January 1946; Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Harry N. Wright, President, 23 April 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; Harry N. Wright, President to Robert L. Taylor, Registrar, 5 June 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar.

<sup>16</sup>Taylor to Wright, 3 December 1945.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Taylor to Wright, 26 December 1945; Wright to Taylor, 9 January 1946.

<sup>19</sup>Taylor to Wright, 23 April 1946.

<sup>20</sup>Ordway Tead, Chairman, BHE and Pearl Bernstein, Administrator to Thomas J. Patterson, Director of the Budget of The City of New York, 14 May 1946, CC Files, 3.12, BHE-III; Wright to Taylor, 16 May 1946; Wright to Taylor, 5 June 1946.

<sup>21</sup>Brooklyn College resolved in 1949 to admit 75% of its incoming class based on high school average and 25% based on the combined score of average and exams. CCNY followed suit. See BHE, Minutes, 23 June 1949, no. 13, pp. 266-267.

<sup>22</sup>Taylor to Wright, 22 October 1943; Knittle to Wright, 6 March 1944; Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," 18 May 1944, pp. 6-7; Taylor, "Advance Report regarding Fall 1944," 22 September 1944; "Preliminary Report on Enrollments," September 1946; Buell G. Gallagher, "Historical Data on Admissions," 9 January 1964, CC Files, 5.13, Admissions-I; Office of the President, "Minimum Composite and High School Average for Admission to the Four Senior City Colleges," February 1964, CC Files, 5.13, Admissions-I.

<sup>23</sup>These appear to be the extreme high and low scores for the upper limit of the composite score.

<sup>24</sup>This author wishes to thank Dr. Donna Morgan, Director of Institutional Research, CCNY, for generously making time in her busy schedule to discuss this problem with me. I thank her for her concern, suggestions, phone calls and references on my behalf. I also wish to thank Dr. Morgan's assistant, Renée Blumstein, for discovering the 1959 Long Memo.

See Louis Long, Director, Division of Testing and Counseling, "Memo Regarding Recommendations Related to Admissions Procedures," 19 January 1959, pp. 22-23, Table 1A-1, Appendix Tables, "Department of Student Life-Academic Profiles." Also, see Buros, section 12 and section 218.

Between February 1938 and September 1940, and again, from February 1943 through September 1945, CCNY dealt with variations among high school grading policies and procedures by using correction coefficients for individual high school averages. As noted by Long, however, "an Entrance Composite has the effect of ironing out the variation in grading. Handling the problem this way has several distinct advantages: (a) an up-to-date correction

factor for each high school is not necessary; (b) a correction can be applied to all high school averages without regard to the number of students entering the College from a particular high school; and (c) the College does not have to justify its correction procedures to the high schools or to the public." Apparently, CCNY policies had evoked complaints from some high school administrators. See page 6.

<sup>25</sup>With veteran discharges reaching their peak in Fall 1946, by 1947, enrollment of veterans at City and Brooklyn Colleges constituted in excess of 50% of the Day Sessions. By Fall 1947, enrollment of veterans in the municipal colleges had peaked at about 18,000. See BHE, Minutes, 21 April 1947, no. 2, pp. 152-153; 20 October 1947, no. B, pp. 420-433; 20 March 1950, no. 99, pp. 186-188; "Statement of Financial Needs of the City College to be Presented to the Municipal Administration," September 1945, CC Files, 3.53, Statistics.

<sup>26</sup>Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Harry N. Wright, President, 25 January 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar.

<sup>27</sup>Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Harry N. Wright, President, 4 April 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; Agnes Clare Mulligan, Assistant Registrar to Dr. Thomas L. Norton, Dean, School of Business, 5 April 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; Thomas L. Norton, Dean, School of Business to Harry N. Wright, President, City College, 9 April 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Harry N. Wright, President, 28 June 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; "Prospective Student Enrollment, September 1946," 2 July 1946, CC Files, 3.52, Enrollment. Such "mathematics" had been part of the admissions process since the inception of The Free Academy.

<sup>28</sup>Mulligan to Norton, 5 April 1946. The admissions requirement for women was raised to an 85% average. CCNY administrators feared criticism of any procedure by which "our returning servicemen are hampered." See Robert L. Taylor, "Annual Report of the Registrar to Harry N. Wright," 27 August 1945, p. 6, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Harry N. Wright, President, 16 July 1946, CC Files, 3.53, Registrar; Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Harry N. Wright, President, 23 October 1946, CC Files, 3.53, Registrar.

<sup>29</sup>Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Harry N. Wright, President, 9 April 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; Robert L. Taylor, "Draft of Letter to be dated May 1946 to Applicants to the Day Session, September 1946," 9 April 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar.

<sup>30</sup>Mulligan to Norton, 5 April 1946; Taylor to Wright, 9 April 1946; Taylor, "To Applicants, September 1946"; Taylor to Wright, 28 June 1946. The delay was also caused by an uncertain budgetary situation.

<sup>31</sup>Robert L. Taylor, Registrar, "Memo to High School Principals--Instructions Regarding Admission to The City College, Fall 1947," 24 February 1947, CC Files, 3.53, Registrar.

<sup>32</sup>Mulligan to Norton, 5 April 1946.

<sup>33</sup>Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Dean John J. Theobald, 17 June 1947, CC Files, 3.52, Enrollment. The Business Center had attempted already in Fall 1945 to assign its Freshmen to the Main Center. However, "anticipating an increase in registration, Uptown [could not] absorb our freshman class." See "Space and Registration Statistics," Fall 1945.

<sup>34</sup>Mulligan to Norton, 5 April 1946.

<sup>35</sup>"Registration," Alumnus, October 1946, pp. 115, 119.

<sup>36</sup>Knittle, "Report for September 1946 to June 1947," June 1947, p. 5.

<sup>37</sup>Pearman and Reid, "Factors Affecting Trends," February 1947, p. 11.

<sup>38</sup>Harry N. Wright, "The Promise of The Future," Alumnus, vol. 42, no. 8, November 1946, pp. 130-131.

<sup>39</sup>BHE, Minutes, 24 June 1946, no. 12, pp. 204-206.

<sup>40</sup>Taylor to Theobald, 17 June 1947. In Fall 1946, Robert Love, Director of the Evening Session at the 23rd Street Center, assured Dr. John J. Theobald, City College's Dean of Administration, that "the load (on the 7th and 12th floors) does not exceed the amount allowed in the Certificate of Occupancy. First, because there is an unusually large dropout at the beginning of the semester and secondly, because there are absences each evening." See Robert A. Love, Director, Evening Session, School of Business and Civic Administration to Dr. John J. Theobald, Dean of Administration, City Collge, 15 October 1946, CC Files, 3.52, Evening Session.

<sup>41</sup>Harry N. Wright, "Address at The Annual Alumni Luncheon," Alumnus, vol. 42, no. 2, February 1946, pp. 21-23. Library space was also at a premium. Nearly 80,000 volumes were oddly stored, and out of circulation. More

than 10,000 books were stored "in highly unsuitable places: in cartons, in a wooden shack under the Convent Avenue sidewalk or in unventilated places under the Stadium." Ibid.

<sup>42</sup>Harry N. Wright, "A Report to the BHE on the Physical Plant Facilities at the Uptown Center and Proposed Campus Development and Building Program," 2 January 1947, p. 1, CC Files, 3.64.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>44</sup>"Memorandum of the Activities of the City College during the year 1946," December 1946, p. 3, CC Files, 3.53, Reports.

<sup>45</sup>Pearman and Reid, "Factors Affecting Trends," February 1947, pp. 16-17, 33.

<sup>46</sup>The CCNY Committee on Post-War Problems urged planning "for an unlimited enrollment." See Orleans, "Memo on Post-War Education," 9 November 1944, point II.

<sup>47</sup>Mulligan to Norton, 5 April 1946.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.

<sup>49</sup>BHE, Minutes, 18 February 1946, no. 7, pp. 44-49.

<sup>50</sup>Harry N. Wright, President, The City College, "Memo to Members of the BHE," 14 February 1946, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT.

<sup>51</sup>BHE, Minutes, 12 January 1948, nos. 2, 3, pp. 6-11; 19 April 1948, no. 4, pp. 150-151; 8 April 1949, no. 3, pp. 152-157; 16 May 1949, no. 2, pp. 196-203; 24 October 1949, no. C, pp. 473-477; 20 March 1950, no. 99, pp. 186-188.

<sup>52</sup>Pearman and Reid, "Factors Affecting Trends," February 1947, p. 16.

<sup>53</sup>"CC Activities, 1946," December 1946, p. 4. Additional funding from New York City had been sought by the BHE for 1946-1947. See BHE, Minutes, 21 January 1946, no. 2, pp. 1-9.

<sup>54</sup>Wright, "Address at Alumni Luncheon," Alumnus, February 1946, pp. 21-23.

<sup>55</sup>Harry D. Gideonse, President, Brooklyn College, "Memo and Draft for Discussion on 'The Scope of Higher Education in New York City' for 21 March 1947," 17 March 1947, CC Files, 3.52, Presidential Conferences.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., pp. 5, 12-13.

<sup>58</sup>"Army Hall--A New Center of College Activities," Alumnus, vol. 42, no. 4, April 1946, p. 49; "South Hall, Registration," Alumnus, October 1946, pp. 115, 119.

<sup>59</sup>Harry N. Wright, "No Other Place To Go: A City College Plea for the Purchase of the Manhattanville Property," c. 1950, distributed by the Public Relations Department, Lester M. Nichols, Director. Featured in an exhibit compiled and presented by Professor Barbara Dunlap, Archivist, CCNY, on March 10, 1982.

<sup>60</sup>City College's lease on the property ran through June 1947. See "Statement of Financial Needs," September 1945; Walter A. Knittle, Director, Main Buildings, Evening Session to Dr. Harry N. Wright, President, 28 March 1946, CC Files, 3.44, Evening Session; "South Hall, Registration," Alumnus, October 1946, pp. 115, 119; Knittle, "Report for September 1946 to June 1947," June 1947, p. 5.

<sup>61</sup>Knittle to Wright, 28 March 1946; Knittle, "Report for September 1946 to June 1947," June 1947, p. 5.

<sup>62</sup>"Army Hall," Alumnus, April 1946, p. 49.

<sup>63</sup>"Statement of Financial Needs," September 1945; "South Hall, Registration," Alumnus, October 1946, pp. 115, 119.

<sup>64</sup>See The City College, Year of Dedication: 1955-1956, pp. 12-14. Klapper Hall was razed in March 1983.

<sup>65</sup>"Army Hall," Alumnus, April 1946, p. 49; "South Hall, Registration," Alumnus, October 1946, pp. 115, 119.

<sup>66</sup>Wright, "No Other Place To Go," p. 6; "The New South Campus," Alumnus, vol. 49, no. 2, November 1953, pp. 2-7.

<sup>67</sup>See, for instance, BHE, Minutes, 23 October 1944, nos. 10, 11, pp. 396-397; 20 November 1944, nos. 4, 5, pp. 432-437; "Expanding Educational Fronts," Alumnus, January 1946, pp. 5-6; Agnes T. Condon, Registrar, Evening Session, "Comparative Registration in the Evening Session for the Spring Term 1945 and the Spring Term 1946," 13 March 1946, CC Files, 3.45, Registrar; "City College Activities, 1946," December 1946.

<sup>68</sup>BHE, Minutes, 15 May 1944, no. A, pp. 178-181.

<sup>69</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 November 1938, no. 2, pp. 1062-1965; 15 May 1939, no. 91, pp. 558-561; 23 October 1944, nos. 10, 11, pp. 396-397; 20 November 1944, nos. 4, 5, pp. 432-437; 18 December 1944, no. 9, pp. 475-479; 22 January 1945, no. 22, pp. 14-15; 18 June 1945, no. 118, pp. 270-271; 24 September 1945, no. 48, pp. 290-291; 17 December 1945, no. 18, pp. 398-399; 19 December 1945, no. 29, pp. 402-405; 23 September 1946, no. 51, p. 336. Also, Mead, "The Annual Report," September 1940, pp. 2, 51; The Special Committee on Trends, "Report on the Division of Public Service for 1940-1941," September 1942, CC Files, 3.31, Report Material; Knittle to Wright, 23 October 1942; "Adult Education," Alumnus, vol. 41, no. 2, February 1945, p. 22; Walter A. Knittle, Director, Evening Session, Main Center to Dr. Harry N. Wright, President, The City College, 29 November 1945, CC Files, 3.44, Evening Session; "Expanding Educational Fronts," Alumnus, January 1946, pp. 5-6; Condon, "Comparative Registration," 13 March 1946; Walter A. Knittle, Director, Evening Session, Main Buildings to Dr. Harry N. Wright, President, City College, 4 September 1946, CC Files, 3.52, Evening Session; "City College Activities, 1946," December 1946; Knittle, "Report for September 1946 to June 1947," June 1947, pp. 2-3, 12-18; Dr. Bernard Levy, "New Roads to a People's Education," Alumnus, vol. 43, no. 3, November 1947, pp. 5-7, 16-17; Dr. Robert A. Love, "New Friends for City College," Alumnus, vol. 43, no. 4, December 1947, pp. 8-9, 18; "Lifelong Learning," Alumnus, vol. 46, no. 1, October 1950, pp. 12-13; Wright, "Facts About City College," April 1951, pp. 3-4; Wright, "A College Leads, A College Learns," 14 April 1952, pp. 5, 60.

<sup>70</sup>BHE, Minutes, 22 October 1945, no. 84, pp. 354-355; 21 October 1946, no. 8, pp. 372-375; 17 February 1947, no. 6A, pp. 52-53. Also, Knittle to Wright, 29 November 1945; Walter A. Knittle, Director, Adult Education, Main Buildings, "Report on Conference at Albany concerning the Legality of Adult Education Programs in New York City's Municipal Colleges," 10 December 1946, CC Files, 3.53, Reports.

<sup>71</sup>Education Law, Article 44-A, section 1143, paragraph 2. Also, Knittle to Wright, 29 November 1945.

<sup>72</sup>Knittle, "Report of Conference at Albany," 10 December 1946.

<sup>73</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 March 1947, no. 4B, p. 95; "Report of the Committee on Adult Education," 17 March 1947, CC Files, 3.45, Adult Education.

<sup>74</sup>Katherine L. O'Brien, "Annual Report on the Office of Adult Services, New York Public Library, for 1960-1961," section I, p. 4. Special thanks to Richard Tiorata, of the NYPL, OAS, for locating this information.

<sup>75</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 December 1945, no. 20, pp. 402-405. Also, Wright, "Memo to Members of the BHE," 14 February 1946; Harry N. Wright, President, The City College to Members of the BHE, 14 February 1946, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT; "South Hall, Registration," Alumnus, October 1946, pp. 115, 119; "Report of the Committee on Adult Education," 17 March 1947; Love, "New Friends for City College"; Ed Walzer, "Midtown Center Means Business," Alumnus, vol. 44, no. 8, April 1949, pp. 10-11, 20-21.

<sup>76</sup>"City College Activities, 1946," December 1946; Love, "New Friends for City College"; Walzer, "Midtown Center Means Business."

<sup>77</sup>Walzer, "Midtown Center Means Business"; Robert A. Love, Director, The City College Evening and Extension Division, "Notes on Developments and Plans in the Evening and Extension Division," 3 May 1954, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT; Bernard Levy, Director, Uptown Center, School of General Studies, Evening Division, "Report to Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, President, for the Academic Year, September 1953 to June 1954," 31 July 1954, pp. 21-22, 30-35, CC Files, 4.23, School of General Studies-Uptown; "On the Campus--New Textile Center," Alumnus, vol. 50, no. 2, November 1954, pp. 10-11; Dr. John W. Wingate, Assistant Director, Evening Session, Downtown, "Memo regarding Industry Programs," 1 March 1956, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT; Bernard Levy, Director, School of General Studies, "Report to Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, President, for the Academic Year, September 1955 to June 1956," 1 October 1956, CC Files, 4.23, School of General Studies-Uptown.

<sup>78</sup>"City College Activities, 1946," December 1946; Love, "New Friends for City College"; "On the Campus--Enrollment Record at Midtown Center," Alumnus, vol. 47, no. 2, December 1951, pp. 6-7; "On the Campus--Midtown Center Report," Alumnus, vol. 48, no. 1, October 1952, pp. 6-7; "On the Campus--Adult Classes Hit New High," Alumnus, vol. 48, no. 2, December 1952, pp. 10-11.

<sup>79</sup>"Present Status and Future Building Needs of the Intensive Business Training Program," 11 December 1952, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT; Ordway Tead, Chairman, BHE to Abraham D. Beame, Director, Bureau of the Budget, New York City and to William M. Ellard, Director, Bureau of Real Estate, New York City,

15 December 1952, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT; Robert A. Love, Director, IBTP to Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, President, The City College, 17 December 1952, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT; Leslie W. Engler, Dean of Administration, "Preliminary Report to Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, President, The City College, on the Midtown Center," 2 February 1953, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT; Aaron Zweifach, Assistant Business Manager to William M. Ellard, Director of Real Estate, New York City, 5 June 1953, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT.

<sup>80</sup>"VIBT, Condensed Comparative Statement of Income and Expense, Years ended 30 June 1953 back through 1947," 20 January 1954, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT.

<sup>81</sup>Robert A. Love, "Notes on the Financing of Promotional and Developmental Activities for the Evening and Extension Division of the School of Business," 25 March 1953, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT.

<sup>82</sup>J. D. Burton to Leslie W. Engler, Dean of Administration, 23 February 1954, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT.

<sup>83</sup>Buell G. Gallagher, President, The City College to John Adikes, 24 August 1955, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT; Aaron Zweifach, Business Manager, Uptown to Dr. Robert A. Love, Director, Evening and Extension Division, Downtown Center, 2 August 1956, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT.

<sup>84</sup>Wingate, "Memo regarding Industry Programs," 1 March 1956. Also, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, Report of the Evaluation of The City College, New York, New York, 4-7 December 1955, pp. 77-78.

<sup>85</sup>Collier's Encyclopedia, 1962 ed., s.v. "Veterans' Benefits." Also, David S. Surrey, Choice of Conscience: Vietnam Era Military and Draft Resisters in Canada (New York: Praeger Special Studies, J. F. Bergin Publishers, 1982), pp. 27-28. Until the mid-1950s, enrollment of Korean War veterans more than replaced losses in registration among World War II veterans. See Levy, "Report for the Year September 1955 to June 1956," 1 October 1956, pp. 14-15.

<sup>86</sup>"VIBT, Condensed Comparative Statement," 20 January 1954.

<sup>87</sup>Love, "Financing Promotional and Developmental Activities."

<sup>88</sup>Gallagher to Adikes, 24 August 1955.

## CHAPTER VII

## THE STRAYER REPORT

A. Introduction

The World War II years represented for the municipal college system the threshold of a new era. From the creation of the Board of Higher Education in 1926 until the mid-1940s, the Colleges acted almost as distant relatives might at a family gathering: somehow vaguely interested in each other, yet uncertain of the nature, quality and intensity of the relationship. But beginning in 1943-1944, the collegiate institutions of New York City were thrust into a new era. A series of comprehensive evaluations and detailed plans for future development were initiated. These were conducted for twenty years primarily by outside concerns and agencies; with the legislative creation of The City University of New York in 1961, these functions were almost totally incorporated into the administrative activities of the University.

A study of the operation of the Board of Higher Education and of the Colleges was initiated in 1943. The New York Joint Legislative Committee on the State Education System appointed Dr. George D. Strayer to lead the investigation.<sup>1</sup> Areas of concern would include:

1. Opportunities now available for higher education
2. The possible provision of other opportunities
3. The possible need for a two-year post-high school course
4. The jurisdiction and administration of such a course
5. The financial organization and administration of the Colleges, and
6. The part, if any, which New York State should play in financing higher education in New York City.<sup>2</sup>

The Report of a Survey of the Colleges Under the Control of the Board of Higher Education of The City of New York, George D. Strayer, Director, was released on January 7, 1944. The "Strayer Report," the first comprehensive evaluation and "master plan" of the municipal colleges, laid out a blueprint for the development of a unified system of higher education in New York City. The Report was to exert an immediate and dramatic effect on the activities of the BHE and the Colleges. It would require, however, several decades of negotiation and continual organizational adjustment before many key recommendations of the Strayer Survey Committee would be integrated into the policy-making and administrative activities of The City University of New York.

The Strayer Report, which may be the single most important document concerned with the municipal colleges, devoted substantial sections to a delineation of the legislative tasks of the Board of Higher Education and the executive tasks of the College Presidents and their staffs.

The Report also recommended major policy-making and administrative innovations regarding student access to and allocation within the Colleges.

B. The BHE and the Mission of the Colleges

The Board of Higher Education, established in 1926, was organized to coordinate control of the two colleges which The City of New York was then supporting, "and to preclude the necessity of establishing independent boards of control for such additional collegiate institutions as the City might afterwards create."<sup>3</sup> At the same time, the city-supported units were included in what is now known as The College of the City of New York.<sup>4</sup>

The clear intent of the state law and the underlying-- though not always explicitly expressed--purpose of the people of the City in establishing the College of the City of New York was to create a coordinated system of higher institutions.<sup>5</sup>

Although the BHE took important steps in the direction of an integrated program and in the coordination of the institutions under its control, "the Board has not yet prepared the fundamental basis for a comprehensively planned system of higher education for the City."<sup>6</sup>

The first recommendation of the survey staff, therefore, is that the Board of Higher Education, acting under the leadership of the four Presidents, should establish the broad purposes and general characteristics of an integrated system of higher education for the City of New York.<sup>7</sup>

The objectives of the Colleges, as identified by the leadership of the system's units, expanded upon Townsend Harris's vision of a program of higher education in

the City. Harris, in the mid-nineteenth century, had conceived of an institution which would enable every child--the poor as well as the rich--"to become a productive and socially intelligent member of society."<sup>8</sup> While the Board, as a unit, had not explicitly stated its goals, contemporary spokesmen for the Colleges viewed the Colleges' responsibility for the education of youth in broad terms: intellectual growth, as well as social development was to be emphasized. The following statement by BHE Chairman Ordway Tead was exemplary:

Stress is now being laid not merely on the development of intellectual power, but on capacities for citizenship, for social life, for effective use of leisure, on ability to work with others and on developing emotional maturity.<sup>9</sup>

The "development of intellectual power" and "capacities for citizenship" have been identified as integral components of the College's "mission" from the time of the founding of The Free Academy.

The Survey Staff "strongly endorsed this conception of the purposes of the Colleges."<sup>10</sup> The Committee was impressed with the fact that there had been "steady growth toward the goal of creating in fact The College of the City of New York which the statutes and the general will of the people have projected."<sup>11</sup>

### C. The BHE and Policy-Making

The Board of Higher Education was thus charged with the definition of goals and the formulation of basic

policies. The functions of the BHE therefore included the following:

1. Determination of the general purposes and objectives of The College of the City of New York and of its constituent institutions.
2. Selection of the Presidents of the Colleges.
3. Delegation of full authority and responsibility to the Presidents for the administration of the Colleges and for carrying out the Board's policies and actions.
4. Collection of information concerning the activities, problems and plans of the Colleges.
5. Holding the Presidents accountable for the execution of its policies.
6. Interpretation of the work of the institutions to the public as evidence of its stewardship and as a means of securing strong support for its program.<sup>12</sup>

To further achieve these ends, the Strayer Survey Committee urged the re-organization of the policy-making tasks of the municipal colleges. Five major recommendations, tapping both procedural and organizational facets of decision-making within the BHE, were issued. Nearly two decades would pass, however, before all of these suggestions would be adopted and fully integrated into the methods of operation of The City University of New York. A summary of these recommendations follows.

#### 1. Procedural Recommendations

a) The Board should drastically reduce the time now given to detailed matters by delegating these matters more fully to its responsible [faculties] committees,

agents and executives, and devote its time to the consideration of basic policies.<sup>13</sup>

b) The BHE should be reconstituted to be composed of nine members selected at large [rather than specifically as representatives of the several boroughs] and appointed one each year for a term of nine years.<sup>14</sup>

c) The central office should be strengthened by broadening its functions and increasing its personnel, and by making [it] directly responsible to the [newly-created] Administrative Council.<sup>15</sup>

## 2. Organizational Recommendations

a) If the Board is to develop consciously and successfully a system of higher education, it must have a unified leadership and unified administration. To that end, it should now establish an Administrative Council of the BHE, consisting of the Presidents of the four Colleges, with the chairmanship rotating at two-year intervals.

If the Administrative Council should be unable to meet the needs of the Board for unified planning and executive action, the Board should then appoint a Chancellor and make him administratively responsible for the institutions under its control.<sup>16</sup>

Explanation: The Survey Staff had considered the problem of securing an integrated program of higher education. One method for attaining the required unified leadership and administration would have been the appoint-

ment of a Chancellor. Included in the advantages of having one executive were the following:

- Centralization of the responsibility for recommending policy
- Centralization of the authority for effecting integration among the institutions
- Clear interpretation of educational policy to the Board and to the people of the City
- Harmonization and mediation of divergent points of view as to the appropriate roles of the constituent schools.

There were, however, corresponding disadvantages in placing all the institutions under the administrative direction of a Chancellor. These included:

- Loss of leadership and prestige by the Presidents of the individual colleges
- Lack of a Chancellor's close contact with institutional activities and personnel
- Lack of confidence among students and faculty in the administration of a college.

The Survey Staff therefore opted for the only available alternative: the cooperative leadership of the Colleges' Presidents to develop an integrated program for the municipal college system. The Administrative Council was therefore preferred as a coordinator. Yet the following was additionally stressed:

The survey staff is strongly of the conviction that the Board should fully discharge its responsibility for the development of a coordinated system and therefore it recommends further that if the Administrative Council should not succeed in providing the necessary leadership and executive efficiency, the Board should appoint a Chancellor and make him administratively responsible for the institutions under its control.<sup>17</sup>

b) The Board of Higher Education should organize its work around a small number of functional committees and should abolish the local administrative committees as the natural next steps in the coordination of the Colleges as constituent institutions of The College of the City of New York.<sup>18</sup>

Explanation: The Bylaws of the BHE provided for four Local Administrative Committees (one for each college) as well as the following standing committees:

- The Executive Committee
- The Committee on Finance
- The Committee on Fees
- The Committee on Trusts and Gifts
- The Auditing Committee
- The Committee on Curriculum and Faculty Relations
- The Committee on Legislation and Bylaws.

The Strayer Survey Staff proposed a complete overhauling of the Board's committees. Instead, it recommended the creation of three comprehensive functional committees:

- The Committee on Finance
- The Committee on Plant Development
- The Committee on Faculty and Educational Policy

The latter committee would "assume the responsibility for continuous consideration of policies fundamental to the development of an integrated system of public higher education for The City of New York and the role of each

college in the coordinated program." The functions of the Committee on Legislation and Bylaws would be assumed by the BHE as a whole; the Executive Committee would be unnecessary under the proposed reorganization. In addition, small, functional, inter-institutional committees could be appointed "only when exceptional problems [were] to be considered." These would be discharged "as soon as their specific task was accomplished."<sup>19</sup>

To summarize the above, therefore, the BHE was charged with the determination of the Colleges' policies. College Presidents were delegated administrative responsibilities. Finally, college faculties were urged to operationalize BHE-articulated goals so as "to devise an educational program instrumental to these outcomes."<sup>20</sup>

The recommendations of the Strayer Report which have been presented thus far dealt with a delineation of responsibility for policy-making and administrative tasks. The Survey Staff also urged greater coordination between the municipal colleges: the initiation of ongoing presidential conferences was suggested under the aegis of the proposed Administrative Council. The reorganization of the power of the BHE and the powers of the College Presidents would exert an influence on the statutory basis of provisions effecting access to public higher education in New York City.

#### D. Student Access

##### 1. A Plan for Expansion

A second group of recommendations dealt with the number and type of students who would be admitted to the Colleges. In discussing this question, the Survey Staff alluded to precisely those three themes which have been previously identified in this work as the dominant influences on access since the establishment of The Free Academy. Specifically, the Strayer Survey Committee considered the issue of student merit (and the measurement of "merit"), the availability of space for the Colleges' students and the responsibility of the Colleges to the public. Recommendations were outlined based on assessments of these considerations in the context of the post-World War II era.

The Survey Staff considered the status and future of the Colleges' Day Sessions and Evening Sessions separately: students enrolled in the four evening sessions "differ[ed] markedly in abilities, background and purposes from day session students."<sup>21</sup> Nonetheless, the BHE was charged "with the task of developing a system of higher education for New York City" which would "lay out a consciously designed, comprehensive program."<sup>22</sup> The Committee therefore stressed the following:

It [is] advocated that the evening session be more consistently viewed as an integral part of the system of higher education of the City of New York, so that

all its offerings may be developed not only in relation to those given in the day sessions of the four colleges, but also in relation to the broad educational purposes established for the system as a whole.<sup>23</sup>

The broad purposes for the system of higher education in New York City envisioned by the Strayer Committee were both far-sighted and far-reaching. In issuing recommendations about "Other Types of Young People Who Might be Served by these Colleges," the Survey Staff proposed the conscious implementation of a liberal and sweeping program of expansion of post-secondary education in the City. Such a dramatic articulation of the broadening of the College's mission would not be surpassed for more than twenty years.

The Strayer Committee advocated that the municipal college system, in essence, offer a four-year Baccalaureate degree education to 50% of the graduates of New York City's academic high schools. Two types of programs would be operated: the traditional, four-year curriculum and a new, more generalized, four-year course. Secondly, the Committee urged the establishment of a string of technical and vocational institutes in New York City, such as were being founded in Upstate areas. The Survey staff viewed these programs, however, as being an "upward extension of secondary schools," and the proper jurisdiction of New York City's Board of Education, rather than that of an independent, newly-created board, or that of the Board of Higher Education.<sup>24</sup> Finally, the Survey Staff applauded

the early efforts of the municipal colleges in supplying adult education courses. In this regard, the Committee recommended that the Colleges expand on leads made "in providing special (non-credit) courses suited to the interests and backgrounds of New York City adults."<sup>25</sup>

## 2. Admissions Considerations

The Strayer Report reviewed and appraised different methods used by the municipal colleges for assessing student merit. Suggestions were made to effect greater coordination among the four colleges and improve on the prediction of success in college. Yet the great expansion in the secondary school population in the preceding twenty years had forced the Colleges to become increasingly selective in their admissions. The Report noted that only a small proportion could be admitted "because of the limited facilities available." As President Gideonson of Brooklyn College trenchantly observed:

Our standards of admission are higher than those of any public institution in the country, and the numbers we turn down are so large that the implementation of our American ideal of equality of opportunity seems to be seriously hampered in view of the increasing demand of professional and business life for college graduation as a minimum requirement for newcomers.<sup>26</sup>

The Survey Committee's appraisal of the admissions situation amplified concerns of the Colleges' Presidents. In 1940-41, the Freshman who barely qualified for entrance was superior to three-fourths of the students in his high school graduating class. He probably surpassed 90% of the

pupils in his elementary school classes, "since many scholastically less able students had withdrawn before high school graduation or had transferred to vocational curricula."

While the city has made a college education available to many financially handicapped young people, these opportunities have been definitely limited to date to students of outstanding ability. The boy or girl who has made a creditable but not distinguished high school record is likely to find the door barred to him for further educational opportunities on a full-time basis at these colleges.<sup>27</sup>

Thus, students in the four municipal colleges were drawn largely from the highest quarter of their high school graduating classes.

This selectivity gave the four institutions one of the most intellectually able student bodies in the entire country. These students possess the exceptionally high level of mental ability necessary for professional and scholarly careers, and for positions of high leadership. It is extremely important to society that educational institutions should lead these mentally gifted young people to make the most of their talents.

But a democracy needs more than an intellectual elite. It needs a large number of people who have a deep understanding and appreciation of fundamental values. It needs many persons who possess social intelligence and who exercise social leadership. It needs as many individuals as possible who live the good life. Such a larger group of liberally educated persons is not a luxury, but a necessity in a democracy.<sup>28</sup>

The Colleges should therefore serve another large group of students who deserved four years of liberal education. The Committee thus urged the municipal colleges to make provisions for "the second highest quarter of high school graduates." The needs of these people, however,

would not be met by the traditional college course. A new type of program, organized with less departmentalization and not requiring specialization, was envisioned. "The four year program should be terminal in the sense that it combines general education with vocational training."<sup>29</sup>

### 3. New Programs

This new program would not only serve large numbers of high school graduates currently not eligible for education in the municipal colleges, but would also better meet the needs and goals of many students who were enrolled in the Colleges' Evening Sessions. The precedent set by Brooklyn College in offering two-year programs leading to the Associate in Arts degree was applauded as being the first step in the system-wide development of "a basic program of general education for evening session students."<sup>30</sup> Yet additional curricular and coordinating efforts were essential. The student body of the Evening Sessions was regarded as too heterogenous to insure the success of the division. Not more than 8% of Evening Session students ever received a B.A. degree, as opposed to a 60% graduation rate in the Day Sessions.<sup>31</sup> The Strayer Committee therefore issued the following additional recommendations:

The liberal arts program offered in the evening session be limited to students qualified from the point of view of aptitude, preparation and purpose.

Appropriate sequences of courses of a semi-professional or vocational type be developed. All such curricula [should] be developed cooperatively by the College

evening sessions in order to avoid undue overlapping of effort.

The Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education [should] launch a joint appraisal of existing educational opportunities for this type of adult education and cooperatively determine what further courses or curricula should be provided and what responsibilities each college should assume for meeting these needs.<sup>32</sup>

The Survey Committee also considered the application of plans being developed by the New York State Department of Education and the Regents of the State of New York. These called for the establishment of a system of regional business and technical institutes to provide terminal education at the junior college level under State auspices and support. The Strayer Committee opposed placing these institutes under the jurisdiction of either the BHE or an independent authority, urging instead that such training be offered under the aegis of the Board of Education of The City of New York.<sup>33</sup>

Finally, the Survey staff recommended "that the Colleges should establish general priorities for the development of their services for the youth of New York City in the following order:

- a) The improvement of their program for students of the level of scholastic aptitude now admitted, including the offering of a coordinated program of graduate work for teacher education.
- b) The admission of a larger number of students into four-year curricula by reducing somewhat the ability threshold now required for admission.
- c) The establishment of certain technical or semi-professional courses under the general conditions outlined above.

In conclusion, the Survey Staff took the position "that the State of New York has an obligation for the support of [both] two-year terminal education and a broad program of education at the four-year level in the four New York City colleges." This obligation was discussed by the Strayer Committee at some length in a separate section of the Report.<sup>34</sup>

#### E. State Responsibility for Higher Education

New York City had provided free higher education for its young men and women for nearly a century.

There is no other city in the United States that makes as generous provision in higher education for its citizens. The people of New York City are justified in taking great pride in this extension of the common school system.<sup>35</sup>

The City of New York's support for the Colleges was not supplemented by any funds provided by the State. "If the State were to contribute for the support of institutions of higher education an amount comparable to that provided by many other states of the Union, it would be reasonable to expect that a considerable contribution would be made by the State in support of the four city colleges." Furthermore, "much of the additional support required to develop the program of higher education in New York City should and must come from the State."<sup>36</sup> The Committee thus urged New York, which possessed the highest per capita income of the 48 states, to take strident steps to substantially increase its support for higher education

throughout the State.<sup>37</sup>

The Report also noted the disparity in government support for Upstate and Downstate education. In particular, the Committee rebuked the State government for subsidizing eleven teachers colleges, while not contributing at all for the training of teachers provided in the four city colleges.

This seems to the survey staff to constitute a discrimination by the State against New York City. There are employed in the City of New York approximately two-fifths of all the teachers employed in the State. Fair treatment by the State would indicate an increase in appropriations for teacher training to provide New York City an amount of support for the education of teachers in direct proportion to the number of teachers employed in this area.<sup>38</sup>

In addition, the Survey Staff argued that the unique business and technical programs offered in the municipal colleges "should as certainly receive State support as do the special schools connected with the Universities in other parts of the State."<sup>39</sup>

Simple equity demands that the State equalize its contribution in support of the Colleges of the City of New York as compared with [other State colleges].<sup>40</sup>

Fairness in the distribution of the revenues of the State of New York dictates that, over the years, increasing sums be contributed by the State to the support of higher education in the City of New York.<sup>41</sup>

Thus, the Survey Staff recommended to the State Legislature the appropriation of funds for the teacher training programs administered by the municipal colleges.<sup>42</sup>

The Strayer Report thus set the stage for a new era in the history of the municipal colleges. In 1948,

Chapter 695 would provide State funds for the support of the fifth year of the teacher training programs operated by the municipal colleges.<sup>43</sup> By 1953, the State-sponsored Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences, established in 1946, would be incorporated into the municipal college system. The advent of State monies for college programs under the aegis of the City's Board of Higher Education was to generate a new dimension in the determination of CUNY policies. In particular, the extent of State control over student access to the City-administered colleges would become a pressing and volatile issue in the 1960s and 1970s.

#### F. The Measurement of Merit

The Strayer Report also considered the pedagogical and administrative issue of the methods employed by the four municipal colleges to screen applicants for admission. A review of these practices for the 1926-1941 period was undertaken. It is therefore understandable that the Committee noted that:

Until recently, [quality standards] were defined exclusively in terms of high school or Regents' marks, but the Colleges have now begun to experiment with tests of aptitude and achievement as supplementary evidences of ability to do college work.<sup>44</sup>

It should be recalled, however, that prior to 1924-1926, three different modes of access were used by CCNY to screen applicants. From 1847 to 1882, the College required a year's attendance in the common schools and a

good performance in a battery of admissions tests. From approximately 1882 until 1900, CCNY required certification of graduation from a secondary school, in addition to passage of the entrance tests. From 1900 until 1924, graduation from an accredited high school was sufficient for acceptance to the College. As noted earlier, academic diplomas were awarded only to those students who passed the New York State Regents Examinations. In 1924, at the recommendation of the City's high school principals, CCNY imposed a quality requirement on the graduates of high schools: a 72% average was designated as a pre-requisite for admission. By 1926, the score was set at 75%. Thus, between 1926 and 1941, most Freshmen were admitted entirely on the basis of their high school performance, with a small proportion being accepted on the basis of scores received in a battery of admissions tests. In 1941, the municipal colleges began experimenting with the use of a composite score for the latter group of incoming Freshmen.

The Strayer Survey Committee agreed with the heavy dependence on most of the municipal colleges on the high school average as the primary method for screening applicants. High school performance had been shown, in several studies, to be the leading single indicator in predicting college achievement.<sup>45</sup> Yet, "the identification of promising students has been by no means perfect." Notwithstanding the fact that only half of the applicants were admitted to the Colleges and that these students were pre-

sumably the most able to succeed in their studies, approximately 30% of incoming Freshmen never enter "the upper division of the College" (the junior year).<sup>46</sup> The graduation rate from the Day Session was estimated to be 60% of the entering Freshman class. The Evening Session graduation rate did not exceed 10%, with not more than an additional 5% of the Evening Session students transferring to the Day Session. Thus, further study of the problem of student survival was urged by the Survey Staff, with particular reference to the Evening Sessions of the municipal colleges.<sup>47</sup>

Finally, the Strayer Committee recommended that the Colleges carefully study their admissions procedures "and effect such adjustments as will make certain that the young people admitted are those most likely to profit from the educational program."<sup>48</sup> Specific steps to identify promising students were suggested. They are, as follows:

1. Liberalizing of specific unit requirements.
2. Determination of the relative values of the high school average, the Regents' average (used only by Hunter College) and the high school percentile rank as means of predicting scholastic success in college. The latter measure, which has been found valuable in many other institutions, would counteract any tendency on the part of the high schools to liberalize their grading standards as a means of getting more of their graduates into college.
3. Further experimentation with supplementary measures, such as aptitude and achievement tests, in the admission of all students rather than only in the case of those who fall below the threshold for entrance.

4. Development of a combined index based up weighted values that will yield the best prediction of college success, rather than dependence on a single averaging of ranks, as is true at present.
5. Consideration of additional information, such as health records, social adjustment and the like, in relation to success in college.
6. Exploration of the possibilities of developing a uniform standard of admission for the four colleges, thus precluding the filing by some students of dual or triple applications for admission.<sup>49</sup>

#### G. Summary

The major findings of the Strayer Report, as summarized here, served several purposes. First, a systematic evaluation of the status of the municipal college system had been provided. Many sporadic assessments of the Colleges' problems, as depicted by BHE and college administrators, were reiterated by the Strayer Survey Committee. Possibly, the independence and objectivity of the Survey Committee may actually have lent credence to recommendations which were presented to the BHE.

The Survey Committee also acted as an "efficiency expert," offering practical suggestions to streamline BHE operations. Procedural and organizational options were offered to expedite administrative and decision-making tasks.

The Report of the Strayer Committee reaffirmed and even proposed a vast extension of the Colleges' mission. Post-secondary education was essential not only to train society's leaders, but to insure the existence of a know-

ledgible electorate. A four-year college education was to be provided by the BHE for at least 50% of the City's high school graduates. In addition, the Board of Education was urged to establish a variety of two-year vocational and technical programs. Adult education classes were to be increased and expanded.

The State-appointed committee called upon the State government to begin assuming its responsibility for funding post-secondary education within New York. The existent favoritism exhibited toward Upstate colleges was severely criticized. State-financing of BHE-sponsored teacher education programs was strongly urged.

Finally, the Strayer Committee proposed a consideration of additional measures for screening college applicants. In particular, the use of a composite score was urged.

Within the next few years, BHE and college officials would review, evaluate and implement these major findings. The appraisals and actions of the late-1940s lent further credence to the Report and provided the mechanisms to insure the implementation of Strayer's recommendations.

<sup>1</sup>George D. Strayer, Director, Report of a Survey of the Colleges Under the Control of the Board of Higher Education of The City of New York (Albany: Legislative Documents, 167th Session, 1944, vol. 8, no. 60, 7 January 1944), Appendix II, pp. 386-711. The term "Strayer Report" used in this work refers solely to Appendix II. Appendix I was concerned with the public education system under control of The New York City Board of Education.

<sup>2</sup>BHE, Minutes, 27 September 1943, no. B, p. 397.

<sup>3</sup>Strayer Report, p. 395.

<sup>4</sup>This term has not been used in this work to avoid confusion with The City College of New York, the institution founded in 1847. Rather, this author has referred to what was to become CUNY in 1961 as "the municipal college system."

<sup>5</sup>Strayer Report, p. 690.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 395.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 396.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 397.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 398. Citing Ordway Tead, "Concerning 50,000 Young People," Report of the Chairman of the BHE, June 1940-June 1941, p. 9.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 398.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 700.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., pp. 692-693.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 694, 701.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 694, 702.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., pp. 699-700, 702.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., pp. 701-702.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., pp. 697-699.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 702.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., pp. 696-697.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 399.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 499.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., pp. 526-527. Underlining in original text.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 499.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 425.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 496.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 404.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 406.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 422.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 423.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 496.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 494.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., pp. 495-497.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 424-425.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 426-427.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 703.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 703.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., pp. 706-708. New York State ranked 45th and would have had even a lower position were it not for New York City's investment in higher education. State appropriations per capita of the total population placed New York next to last among the 48 states.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 708.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 708. This referred to special colleges of agriculture, forestry, home economics, veterinary medicine, etc.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 709.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 711.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 711. See also Strayer Report, Chapter IV.

<sup>43</sup>This recommendation was also included in Owen D. Young, Chairman, Report of the Temporary Commission on the Need for a State University (Albany: Legislative Documents, 16 February 1948), pp. 14-15, 24-25.

<sup>44</sup>Strayer Report, p. 404. Regents' marks were consistently used by Hunter College to select its students. See p. 405.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 405.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 418-419.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., pp. 419, 494-495, 499.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 410.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 410-411.

## CHAPTER VIII

## REACTION TO THE STRAYER REPORT

A. The Rogers Committee

The Strayer Report was completed and published in Albany. Upon receipt of the Report, the BHE appointed its own committee, headed by Harry S. Rogers, to:

1. Review and analyze the Report
2. Appraise recommendations and decisions based upon those recommendations, in cooperation with the Presidents of the Colleges
3. Summarize conclusions and prepare additional recommendations to the Board.<sup>1</sup>

The reports of the Rogers Committee, issued in conjunction with reports of the four college Presidents and their faculties, over a three year period, are possibly equal in significance to the original Strayer Report. The Rogers Committee reports, and the reports and actions of the Joint High School-College Articulation Committee and other analyses, represented BHE and college efforts to evaluate and assimilate recommendations of the State Legislative body. It was through the apparatus of these internal committees and reports that Strayer's suggestions were proposed and implemented at the Colleges. Without such mechanisms, the Strayer Report's findings could not

and would not have attained their full impact.

The Rogers Committee reports focussed on those Strayer Report recommendations which pertained to the administrative reorganization of the Board. Two proposals were adopted by BHE resolution in December 1944.

1. The dissolution of individual college Administrative Committees and their replacement with three functional committees:
  - Faculty and Educational Policy
  - Finance
  - Plant Development
2. The creation of an Administrative Council composed of the four Presidents. Duties encompassed the coordination of the educational administration of the city colleges.<sup>2</sup>

Shortly thereafter, an addition to the Bylaws created the Administrative Council. The Council was to be composed of all municipal college Presidents, for all college units to be established under BHE jurisdiction, and was charged "to formulate a coordinated and reasonably complete system of higher education for the City of New York."<sup>3</sup>

#### B. The Administrative Council

Within a year, the Administrative Council presented "a summary of the educational and administrative changes which have been undertaken or which have been quickened as a result of recommendations made by the Strayer Survey Committee." While the bulk of changes pertained to the business management of the Colleges, changes in the areas

of curricula, student counseling and techniques of teaching were also considered.<sup>4</sup>

Included in the material prepared by the Administrative Council was the already noted position paper "The Scope of Higher Education in New York City."<sup>5</sup> The assumption by the State of responsibility for general and professional higher education, as evidenced by the imminent creation of The State University of New York, was viewed as a positive step: the Council was certain equivalent financing of New York City's colleges would be forthcoming.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the College Presidents outlined a ten-year plan for the plant development and curricular expansion of "a system of higher education."

The plan for the expansion of facilities, to the year 1947, was presented in four priority groups. Most emphasis was given to the existent senior colleges: City College would receive a new Technology Building, a library, additional space for business programs and a student center over the ten-year period. Additionally, the Council issued plans for the establishment of four two-year colleges, with a facility in Staten Island being of top priority.<sup>7</sup>

The new two-year units would offer programs "for students eager to continue general education but who do not seem fully qualified to pursue a four-year course; or who are not prepared to invest more than two years in post-high school general education, but who are not yet ready to make a vocational choice at graduation from high

school." Such programs had been initiated in the Evening Sessions of Brooklyn and City Colleges "under extreme budgetary and administrative handicaps and might provide a model for future endeavors."<sup>8</sup>

Yet even before the first such college was opened, a pedagogical conflict existed over the actual purpose of such a unit. On the one hand, the junior college course "should not be merely the first half of a four-year course: it should have an identity of its own." This approach would lead to the development of vocational and sub-professional training programs, as well as general education courses. These programs would be terminal in nature. On the other hand, the Administrative Council envisioned the junior colleges to offer provision for transfer, for "students of proved competence," to regular four-year courses, as well as provision for transfer to the junior colleges of students in the four-year course "who seem to lack ability to complete a four-year liberal arts course, but who can profit by a modified two-year general course."<sup>9</sup> This approach would suggest a more fluid system of transfer between the senior and junior collegiate units of the municipal college system.

Thus, a divergent approach to junior college programs was articulated by the Administrative Council. The conflict would not be readily resolved: indeed, it would persist and become an increasingly problematic issue for the Board of Higher Education.

The Administrative Council also prepared a detailed statement outlining issues pertaining to admission which were still to be examined.

1. A comparison of admission procedures in the Colleges.
2. A conference with representatives of secondary schools on the subject of admission to the Colleges. A study of recommendations by high school officials and by college officials.
3. Trends in admission procedures throughout the country.
4. An experimental program in the matter of admission:
  - A liberalization of admission units, especially those prescribed
  - "Development of a combined index based upon weighted values that will yield the best prediction of college success, rather than dependence on a simple averaging of ranks, as is true at present."<sup>10</sup>
5. The admission of students who are graduated from special vocational high schools and give evidence of intellectual competence to pursue college studies, but who do not meet the present pattern of admission requirements.
6. Recommendations for the revision of admission procedures.<sup>11</sup>

In order to give proper attention to these issues, a special city-wide committee was convened.

### C. The Joint High School-College Articulation Committee

#### 1. Introduction

In Spring 1946, the Administrative Council, in conjunction with the Board of Education, sponsored a Joint High School-College Articulation Committee.<sup>12</sup> This

Committee, which met regularly for the next one and a half years, amplified and extended efforts initiated during World War II by the CCNY Committee on Admissions and the High School and College Conference on College Admission.<sup>13</sup> The Articulation Committee served as a parallel organ to the Rogers Committee: while the BHE-appointed Rogers Committee facilitated the implementation of functional recommendations issued by the Strayer Report, the Articulation Committee operationalized specific suggestions in the area of student admissions.

Four areas of inquiry were delineated by the Committee:

- a) Admission requirements
- b) Admission procedures
- c) Admission policies
- d) Articulation of subject fields.<sup>14</sup>

By the end of 1946, the Committee had appointed seven Sub-Committees composed of faculty representatives of the municipal colleges and high schools. Six groups were charged with the delineation of the appropriate secondary and collegiate curricula for the following subjects: English-speech, mathematics, social studies, science, foreign languages and commercial subjects. The "Sub-Committee on Tests and Measurements" was charged with an assessment of examinations utilized for screening applicants, placement and achievement.

## 2. Admission Requirements

On February 18, 1947, a report on admission requirements to the four municipal colleges was presented. The report, which examined five areas, indicated notable differences between the four colleges in all the following areas:

- a) Dates of matriculation and application
- b) Components of a formal application
- c) Admissions criteria for Baccalaureate matriculation
- d) Additional admissions (only at Brooklyn and City Colleges)
- e) Admission with conditions.<sup>15</sup>

In the area of admissions criteria, all four units indicated that the number admitted was based on "space facilities and budget allotments." Some colleges, however, screened applicants after seven and not eight high school terms. Some calculated ratings on the basis of "creditable subjects"; some on the basis of "the entire high school course." Sometimes high school average was the key indicator for screening applicants, though cut-offs differed from college to college. Sometimes a battery of exams, also varying from college to college in scope and content, was used. Hunter College pursued a completely independent approach, relying heavily on scores attained on the State's Regents' examinations.<sup>16</sup>

Brooklyn and City Colleges, as has been discussed earlier, also admitted students who did not meet entrance

requirements for matriculation. At Brooklyn College, students could be admitted to the Evening Session as candidates for the A.A. degree or for specific semi-professional diplomas. CCNY admitted students to the Evening Session as Special students. Both colleges offered courses for non-matriculated students.<sup>17</sup>

### 3. Admission Procedures

Admission procedures were also discussed by the Committee. Topics included the reporting of high school failures; the inclusion of failing marks in class standing and overall average; disparities in passing grades and between Regents' marks and high school grades. Other subjects included the optimal predictive value of high school records, rank in class, entrance examinations, Regents' examinations and/or a combination of these factors in predicting success in college. Also discussed was the advisability of controlling admissions to the municipal colleges through a central agency.<sup>18</sup> These issues were resolved primarily by committees established and operated by the Board of Education.

### 4. Admission Policies

The Articulation Committee observed that "interest and aptitude would seem to be more important than courses studied."<sup>19</sup> The following tentative recommendations were therefore issued:

Except for general ability and interest, specific subject matter requirements for college entrance be limited to English, social studies and general science, which are basic requirements for all high school students, keeping in mind the following criteria:

- a) Evidence of scholastic accomplishment of a reasonable degree
- b) Evidence of interest and aptitude in that field in which the candidate wishes to concentrate in college
- c) Evidence of social adjustment commensurate with the age and background of a high school youngster
- d) Evidence of basic knowledge and skills necessary for advanced study.<sup>20</sup>

Thus, in Spring 1947, the leaders of New York City's educational system were suggesting the elimination of all but minimal requirements for admission to some form of post-secondary education. Additional, more individualized requisites would be necessary for education in specialized, technical fields.

#### 5. The Measurement of Merit

In June 1947, the Sub-Committee on Tests and Measurements submitted its report to the High School-College Articulation Committee. The group had surveyed and issued recommendations in four areas:

- a) Pre-Admission Tests and Measures in the High School
- b) College Admission Tests and Measures
- c) College Placement Tests
- d) College Achievement Tests and Measures.<sup>21</sup>

The major conclusions of the report of the Sub-Committee, as relating to student access to the municipal colleges,

are presented below.

a) Pre-Admission Tests and Measures

Examinations served multiple purposes. "Historically, the administration of tests [was] very intimately bound up with the democratic principle of making professional educators responsible to the community they served and whose money they received."<sup>22</sup> In addition, exams informed the teachers which of their pupils had achieved the standards of their grade level, and they gave the school board and the citizens a report on the achievement of their schools. This would have to be done in simple and straightforward language.

To the modern educator, all this seems very quaint and narrow. The modern concept of education is much broader and much more humane. It is now thought that the education of the child should bear a rather close relationship to his abilities, needs and interests.

But so long as America remains democratic, so long will its citizens demand that their public servants render an account of their stewardship: and this account must be in terms which the average citizen can understand.<sup>23</sup>

Tests and measurements administered in the context of a "modern education [which] stresses the development of a healthy, wholesome, well-adjusted personality" must therefore be carefully scrutinized.<sup>24</sup>

The Sub-Committee surveyed achievement measures utilized by New York City's public high schools: all were found to be lacking. End-term marks "varied considerably from teacher to teacher, even within the same department

of the same school."<sup>25</sup> Regents' Examinations were characterized as being "subjectively made, subjectively weighted and subjectively scored."<sup>26</sup> In like manner, character ratings, intelligence tests and tests in special fields were found to be lacking in validity, reliability and standardization.<sup>27</sup>

The Committee recommended that secondary schools apply three general types of measure to those who wished to go to college:

- (1) A measure of general academic aptitude or intelligence test. These should be given in the senior year of high school.
- (2) Achievement tests in the major subject fields. These should be standardized and uniform for the City (thus precluding, in their present form, the Regents' Examinations).
- (3) Some measure of personality, of individual and social adjustment.

These three measures, while not supplying the Colleges with all the information they could use profitably, would represent "a great improvement over the information now available."<sup>28</sup>

#### b) College Admission Tests and Measures

New York's colleges received more applications than they could possibly honor. This situation imposed on the Colleges an obligation to select from among the applicants those who would be most likely to succeed in college.

The results of many studies indicate that selecting students on the basis of both test results and high school grades (or regents marks) is a more effective

procedure than selecting students on the basis of either one or the other of these two tests alone.<sup>29</sup>

In surveying practices employed through the United States, the Sub-Committee noted the use of two main groups of examinations. The College Entrance Examination Board tests included Scholastic Aptitude Tests in verbal, mathematical and spatial aptitudes.<sup>30</sup> Subject matter tests, also administered under the CEEB's aegis, were viewed "not only as a measure of past achievement, but also as a predictor of future performance with similar material in college courses."<sup>31</sup> The University of Chicago Entrance Tests included the American Council on Education Psychological Test, a special reading test, and a judgment test of the effectiveness of expression.<sup>32</sup>

The four municipal colleges, however, while administering objective psychological and achievement tests, did not utilize any nationally-recognized format. "There is considerable variation as to the type of test administered, number of tests given, use of test results, etc."<sup>33</sup>

The Committee thus recommended that a common core of tests be used by the four city colleges. Each college would be permitted to decide for itself whether the common core of tests would replace, or be added to the examinations used at present. It also suggested that initially, the common core of tests include the ACE Psychological Exam, plus three separate tests designed to measure the ability to read and comprehend material in the areas of

social science, natural science and mathematics. The Committee further urged that the Colleges be encouraged to experiment with the idea of differential testing at the time of admission, with the understanding that such specialized tests be considered extra tests and not as replacing those constituting the common core. The BHE should also recruit a test organization to construct the exams to be used by the city colleges and a review committee should evaluate the effectiveness of the testing program. In addition, consideration should be given to setting the date of the Admission Tests as early as possible in the student's last term of high school and to determining the weights to be assigned to the high school average and to the individual tests included in the common core.<sup>34</sup>

c) College Placement Examinations

The Sub-Committee reviewed reasons why placement tests were administered to students already accepted by a college. Included in these objectives were the following:

- (1) A more accurate measurement of each student's knowledge of basic concepts in fields to be studied in college.
- (2) A more careful assignment of students to courses in college. (This reflected an increasing awareness of the fact that the number of units completed in a given subject was an inadequate basis for placing the student in college.)
- (3) Decreasing the rate of student failures. Thus, Freshman failures would be curtailed; attitudes of frustration and hostility on the part of failing students would be diminished.<sup>35</sup>

As was noted in the case of college admission tests, the individual municipal colleges were each experimenting with different placement exams. None of these were, however, used by any other university in the country.<sup>36</sup> The Sub-Committee therefore recommended that placement examinations eventually be developed for foreign languages, science, English and social science. A placement exam in mathematics should be developed immediately.

While standardization of such tests with those utilized nationally was not viewed as essential, the Committee urged close cooperation between secondary school and collegiate faculty in the preparation and administration of these examinations.<sup>37</sup>

#### D. The Pearman and Reid Report

The Strayer Report thus generated in New York City evaluations of its findings at several administrative levels. The Rogers Committee, an organ of the BHE, dealt with functional and organizational aspects of the Report. The Joint Articulation Committee, convened under the auspices of the Administrative Council and New York City's collegiate and high school faculties, analyzed and issued recommendations regarding admissions criteria and the measurement of merit.

There were, however, additional evaluations and projections undertaken at the municipal colleges in the aftermath of the Strayer Report. One of these was prepared

especially for President Wright and his executive staff by William I. Pearman and Charles F. Reid. Released in February 1947, this report was the first major effort to reconcile the College's post-World War II mission, as suggested by the Strayer Report, with the pragmatic, administrative necessities entailed in operating the College.<sup>38</sup>

The report approached the question of access comprehensively. The researchers noted the overall expansion of higher educational institutions in the United States, the post-War surge in demand for post-secondary education, demographic trends in New York City and patterns of enrollment at The City College. In this context, CCNY's mission was presented. "In the minds of more and more people, a college education is necessary for intelligent living in a democratic society."<sup>39</sup> But as had been noted earlier, higher education was not merely a pre-requisite for individual advancement: it was also a requirement of the State. "A large group of liberally educated persons is not a luxury, but a necessity in a democracy."<sup>40</sup>

On the other hand, the College hardly was able to begin to effect any expansion of access without additional facilities. "Unless substantial increases [in the number of instructional personnel and space provisions available to the College] are made, the rate of growth of The City College will continue to remain below the rate for colleges of the country as a whole."<sup>41</sup>

Pearman and Reid noted that the Strayer Survey

staff had suggested that persons in the upper-half of their high school graduating class deserve the advantages of four years of college education. Translated into realistic terms, the city colleges would be offering admission to those with an average of 77% or higher. Even a slight lowering of the matriculation average would substantially increase college registers.

It is a responsibility which the community can not escape if the Colleges are to be the democratic institutions that they profess to be.<sup>42</sup>

Pearman and Reid, working on the assumption that the holding power of secondary schools would not increase substantially, foresaw a decline in high school graduates during the 1950s. Thus, the pressure on the municipal colleges would be somewhat reduced. Nonetheless, additional facilities were still urgently required. Facilities were needed for returning veterans and for the expansion of access to an additional tier of students.

The number of students that can be accommodated in a building is hardly defensible as a measure of the need of the community for higher education.<sup>43</sup>

The report concluded by issuing predictions for the future. "The 40-year trend indicates that by 1960 at least 20% of persons between 18 and 21 years of age will be enrolled in college, compared with 15.4% in 1940."<sup>44</sup> Yet a minor comment by Pearman and Reid would prove to be more potent and prophetic than all statistical projections.

Just how far the College should go in opening its doors to a less-highly-selected group is for the community to decide.<sup>45</sup>

Precisely this point, the involvement of the community in the determination of CCNY's mission and the expansion of access, would become the primary characteristic of admissions considerations in the 1960s.

#### E. Summary

The impact of the work of the committees created after the publication of the 1944 Strayer Report can not be overstated. The findings and recommendations issued in 1945-1947 would exert an ongoing influence on New York City's educational policies throughout the next two decades, even into the 1970s.

The Rogers Committee was the critical agent which streamlined the BHE's committee structure, created the Administrative Council, and ultimately served to grant to the BHE the de facto control over the individual municipal colleges originally intended in Chapter 407 of the Laws of 1926. The Administrative Council, the conference of municipal college Presidents, in the late-1940s, outlined the first plans for the long-range expansion of the City's colleges. A unit in Staten Island would be constructed, bringing finally free public higher education to that borough more than half-a-century after the consolidation of New York City. The initiation of a string of two-year colleges was also proposed. These units would serve multiple, often ambiguous and even contradictory functions within the City's educational system.

The work of the Joint High School-College Articulation Committee is singularly noteworthy. As a result of the activities of this ad hoc group, New York's high schools and colleges developed and utilized valid, reliable and standardized tests. Consistency of procedures emerged among the municipal college system. Yet, the ensuing coordination still allowed the individual units additional options. The liaison between the City's two mammoth educational bureaucracies, the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education, was also reaffirmed.

Finally, the major findings of the Pearman and Reid Report served to reiterate Strayer's conception of the expanded mission of the municipal colleges in the post-World War II era. Numerous demographic and economic projections were utilized in conjunction with school enrollment profiles to issue forecasts of a continuously expanding need for additional college facilities in the New York area.

The accomplishments of the ad hoc, temporary groups of the late 1940s were the predecessors of legislative and other official reports issued in the post-War period of normalcy. The actions undertaken by the post-Strayer Committees provided models for the continued growth and centralization of the municipal college system.

<sup>1</sup>BHE, Minutes, 15 May 1944, no. A, pp. 179-181; 19 June 1944, no. D, p. 214.

<sup>2</sup>BHE, Minutes, 11 December 1944, no. B, pp. 470-473.

<sup>3</sup>BHE, Minutes, 19 March 1945, no. 3, pp. 74-77, regarding Article II-A, section 25.

<sup>4</sup>BHE, Minutes, 19 November 1945, no. 4, pp. 358-361.

<sup>5</sup>Harry D. Gideonse, "The Scope of Higher Education in New York City," 17 March 1947, CC Files, 3.52, Presidential Conferences.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 1-2.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., pp. 4-5, 12-13.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 4-5.

<sup>10</sup>Strayer Report, p. 410.

<sup>11</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 January 1946, no. 2, pp. 6-9.

<sup>12</sup>CC Files, Drawer 3.52, High School-College Committee. This author estimates that approximately 70% of the material generated by this Committee has been preserved.

<sup>13</sup>Taylor to Applicants for Admission, 22 March 1943; Taylor, "Summary of High School and College Conference," 18 May 1944.

<sup>14</sup>Benjamin F. Davis, Secretary, "Minutes," 22 October 1946, nos. 1, 8, CC Files, 3.52, High School-College Committee; David H. Moskowitz, Assistant Superintendent, High School Division, "Work To Date," 22 October 1946, Attachment no. 1, CC Files, 3.52, High School-College Committee.

<sup>15</sup>Benjamin F. Davis, Secretary, "Minutes," 18 February 1947, no. 2, CC Files, 3.52, High School-College Committee; Dean Margaret Keily, Queens College, "Chart of Admissions Requirements and Procedures for the Four City Colleges," 18 February 1947, Attachment no. 2, CC Files, 3.52, High School-College Committee.

- <sup>16</sup>Keily, "Chart," 18 February 1947, sec. III.
- <sup>17</sup>Ibid., sec. IV.
- <sup>18</sup>Benjamin F. Davis, Secretary, "Minutes," 22 October 1946, nos. 1, 12; 17 December 1946, nos. 10, 11; 21 January 1947, nos. 1, 10; 18 February 1947, nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; 18 March 1947, nos. 1, 2, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16; 15 April 1947, nos. 5, 6, 7, CC Files, 3.52, High School-College Committee.
- <sup>19</sup>"Admission Problems Unresolved," 17 December 1946, Attachment no. 8, CC Files, 3.52, High School-College Committee.
- <sup>20</sup>"Report on Admission Policies," 17 December 1946, Attachment no. 13, CC Files, 3.52, High School-College Committee.
- <sup>21</sup>The latter category, which includes Pre-Sophomore tests and Graduate Record Examinations, will not be reviewed here.
- <sup>22</sup>Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone, Chairman, "Report of the Subcommittee on Tests and Measurements," June 1947, sec. 2.1, p. 2, CC Files, 3.52, High School-College Committee.
- <sup>23</sup>Ibid., sec. 2.1, pp. 1-2.
- <sup>24</sup>Ibid., sec. 2.1, pp. 2-3.
- <sup>25</sup>Ibid., sec. 2.2, p. 3.
- <sup>26</sup>Ibid., sec. 2.2, pp. 4-5, citing Spaulding, Chapter X, pp. 187-208.
- <sup>27</sup>Ibid., sec. 2.2, pp. 5-7.
- <sup>28</sup>Ibid., sec. 2.3, pp. 6-7.
- <sup>29</sup>Ibid., sec. 3.1, p. 7.
- <sup>30</sup>The latter test was administered to applicants for engineering courses.
- <sup>31</sup>Ibid., sec. 3.3, pp. 8-9A.
- <sup>32</sup>Ibid., sec. 3.3, p. 9A.
- <sup>33</sup>Ibid., sec. 3.3, p. 9B.
- <sup>34</sup>Ibid., sec. 3.4, pp. 9B-10.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., secs. 4.1, 4.2, pp. 10-11.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., secs. 4.3, 4.4, pp. 11-12.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., secs. 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, p. 12.

<sup>38</sup>William I. Pearman and Charles F. Reid, "An Analysis of Factors Affecting Trends in Enrollments in The City College of New York," February 1947, CC Files, 4.22, Reports.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 1.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 20, citing the Strayer Report, p. 417.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., pp. 21-22.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 16. The College's high retention rate compounded space problems. "It seems ironic that the schools in which the highest scholarship is maintained have been the least responsive to public demand for expansion!" See pp. 16-17, 33.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

## CHAPTER IX

## CONSOLIDATION AND PLANNING

A. Student Admissions

The publication of the Strayer Report has been depicted here as a landmark event, presenting an outline for the vast expansion of the municipal college system. Combined, however, with the activities and the findings of the committees and reports which followed its issuance, the impact of the Strayer Report on student access to the Colleges is staggering. Beginning in the late 1940s, the BHE and the individual colleges initiated changes which were to facilitate the actual development of the coherent system of higher education in New York City which Strayer had envisioned.

## 1. General Procedures

Perhaps the most far-reaching, yet simplest of actions which was effected on the aftermath of the Strayer Report was the reporting by each college to the BHE, in an ongoing and consistent manner, registration statistics. In Spring 1943, the Board had urged all college Presidents to report enrollment and admission figures on a term-by-term basis, as "it would be valuable to have similar in-

formation" for all units.<sup>1</sup> Yet, while such information may have been collected and retained by individual colleges, it was not until 1946 that all four colleges began to report to a central office, the BHE, enrollment statistics.<sup>2</sup> Reports of the number admitted and the criteria used began sporadically in 1947.<sup>3</sup> The BHE report of November 1949 was the first covering all colleges, all sessions, presented in an easy-to-read tabular format.<sup>4</sup>

A second element related to access instrumental in the organizational development of the municipal colleges was the Board resolution to "approve, as a matter of policy, uniformity, as far as possible, in admission requirements to the four colleges."<sup>5</sup> Thus, in Fall 1948, the required average for all four schools was 80%; in Spring 1949, the average was either 78% or 79%.<sup>6</sup>

The third improvement which emerged as a result of the post-Strayer Report activities was the decision to centralize the application procedure. Heretofore, entrance applications had been submitted by a student to each of the four, individual city colleges. In May 1949, following Administrative Council discussions, the Board resolved to circulate among the four colleges a "new uniform [admissions] blank."<sup>7</sup> The form, containing an applicant's high school transcript, would be presented initially to the student's first-choice. Transcripts would then be referred to the remaining colleges, in order of a student's choice, and students would be admitted "where their qualifications

and the budget permit." The new policy would go into effect as of February 1950 admissions.<sup>8</sup>

## 2. Admission Requirements

In Spring 1950, the Board passed an additional, two-part resolution. The first component established for all four colleges "uniform quantitative (i.e., substantive) requirements for admission." Thus, at least 16 admission units were required, 11-1/2 of which were required academic subjects. The additional 4-1/2 units allowed some flexibility, but also included academic subjects. The average used in determining eligibility was based only on academic subjects, encompassing English, social studies, mathematics, science and foreign languages.<sup>9</sup>

The second portion of the resolution stipulated:

That approximately three-fourths of the entering class shall be admitted on the basis of the average in high school class ratings. The exact average requirement [is] to be set by the Registrar and Admissions officers in accordance with available facilities.

That students who meet all of the other entrance requirements but are not included in the group admitted on the basis of the high school record alone be required to take uniform tests. The test score and the high school record average shall be combined in a ratio to form a composite score which shall be the basis for ranking the candidates. Students shall be admitted in rank order until the quota of the colleges has been filled or until a score is reached which indicates the student is not good college material.

That this uniform procedure shall apply to all applicants for matriculation as candidates for a degree in a liberal arts college, in either day or evening session, who are current graduates of high schools, public or private within the United States.<sup>10</sup>

The Spring 1950 resolution was the determining factor in regulating admissions to the municipal colleges for the next twenty years. The 16-unit requirement remained in force until the advent of Open Admissions in 1970. In like manner, performance in secondary schools was deemed the best predictor of success in college. The construction of a composite score, giving equal weight to both high school average and performance on the tests, served as an objective measure to insure the "selection of students with ascertained promise of success in college studies."<sup>11</sup> Thus, following initial questioning as to whether these factors were indeed good predictors of college success, the Board concluded that the "system [is] accomplishing successfully all the aims for which it was initiated."<sup>12</sup>

Initially, the BHE entered into a contract with the Psychological Corporation and the Educational Records Bureau for the construction, administration and scoring of the tests. Utilized for eight years, these contracts were renewed on a yearly basis.<sup>13</sup> In Spring 1957, based on recommendations of college deans, the Board resolved to utilize the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) of the College Entrance Examination Board. This exam was preferred as its use would facilitate comparison with colleges outside the municipal system.<sup>14</sup> In addition, examinations would be administered in the seventh, and not the eighth term of high school, allowing notifications of acceptance to be issued in April, and not in June, as previously. These

changes were instituted effective September of 1958.<sup>15</sup>

The June 1950 resolution also designated the emerging class of high school graduates as the primary focus of college admissions policies. After the turbulent World War II and post-War era, the BHE thus attempted to provide a smooth transition in the educational ladder, from secondary to higher education. Thus, while technically opening its doors to all U.S. high school graduates, the BHE looked to New York City secondary schools for most of its incoming students. The strengthening of this liaison presumably allowed for more accurate prediction of the demand for higher education at the municipal colleges. This, attempts were made to forecast the Colleges' operating and capital budget needs.<sup>16</sup>

Table 9 presents admission requirements to CCNY from 1950 until 1961. The listed high school average was required for all units of the municipal college system. (Until 1952, women applicants to the Colleges had to present a higher grade point average than did men.) The composite score required for admission at Brooklyn, Hunter, Queens and City-Uptown and Downtown varied, depending on the availability of facilities.

TABLE 9  
ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS 1950-1961  
CCNY-UPTOWN CAMPUS<sup>17</sup>

|                 | <u>High School Average</u> | <u>Composite Score</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| February 1950   | 81                         | 154                    |
| September 1950  | 80                         | 156                    |
| September 1951  | 80                         | 154                    |
| September 1952  | 80                         | 160                    |
| September 1953  | 80                         | 154                    |
| September 1954  | 80                         | 154                    |
| September 1955  | 82                         | 162                    |
| September 1956  | 82                         | 162                    |
| September 1957  | 82                         | 168                    |
| September 1958* | 84                         | 167                    |
| September 1959  | 85                         | 167                    |
| September 1960  | 85                         | 167                    |
| September 1961  | 85                         | 169                    |

\*Beginning of SAT Period.

B. The BHE and State Funding: Teacher Training, 1948

1. Introduction

The Strayer Report had generated discussion and activity in many areas. One section of the Report had urged the BHE to offer a fifth year of teacher training, as required for secondary school teachers, on a tuition-free basis.<sup>18</sup> This was viewed by the Survey Staff as an essential component in a plan to develop a more integrated

network between the BHE and the Board of Education.<sup>19</sup>

The Strayer Committee did not envision the training of teachers for the public school system as an additional burden on the City of New York. The State of New York was called upon to meet its obligation to fund teacher training, to the same extent as it was funding several Upstate collegiate institutions.<sup>20</sup>

Beginning in 1945, BHE-sponsored action was begun to acquire State funding for these programs. Several bills were introduced into the State Legislature: these efforts proved unsuccessful for a few years.<sup>21</sup> In 1948, concomitant with the establishment of The State University of New York, Chapter 695 was signed into law.<sup>22</sup> This legislation provided State support for graduate teacher training programs, with the provision that the municipal colleges accept, also on a tuition-free basis, non-New York City, New York State residents who wished to pursue their studies at the BHE-sponsored programs.<sup>23</sup> In admitting non-New York City students, beginning on July 1, 1948, the Board exercised its option to waive section 6204, the former section 1143-d, of the State Education Law.<sup>24</sup> The number of M.A. candidates in teacher education programs was to be controlled "by the needs of elementary and secondary schools for teachers."<sup>25</sup> A priority order was established for the accommodation of both New York City and New York State college graduates of 1943-1948 into the fifth-year program.<sup>26</sup>

Additionally, "pending the formulation of a perma-

ment policy," a small number of New York State residents could be admitted as undergraduate matriculants, without tuition charges, to the four colleges. Such students were required to sign affidavits declaring their intention to prepare for teaching. The Board closely monitored the enrollment of such students, so as not to overtax the Colleges' limited facilities.<sup>27</sup> For the next five years, resolutions were passed by the BHE which permitted the admission, on a year-to-year basis, of a limited number of New York State residents majoring in education.<sup>28</sup>

In September 1955, the Bylaws of the BHE were revised. At that point, section 210 (b)(7) served to formalize the continuing resolutions of 1948-1953, which had extended the privilege of a free education at the municipal colleges to non-resident teacher education majors.<sup>29</sup>

With the passage in 1960 of Chapter 418, New York State began funding undergraduate teacher training programs operated by the City of New York to the same measure as those Upstate: 100% of operating costs.<sup>30</sup> Fifth-year teacher education students were exempted from tuition increases.<sup>31</sup> Heretofore, State support for teacher training programs in New York City had never exceeded 75% of the cost.<sup>32</sup> In 1960-1961, the status of New York State education majors was certified and they continued to be admitted to the municipal colleges on a tuition-free basis. Total State support for the programs ensued.

The advent of State monies in 1948, and the con-

tinuance of State funding for New York City-operated teacher training programs during the 1950s, culminating in the passage of Chapter 418 of 1960, drew upon three themes. Two of these had been critical issues of access at the municipal colleges for some period of time; only one emerged in the post-World War II era. The convergence of these three contributing forces made State teacher training funds that much more significant, and would initiate a chain of events resulting in greater State funding, on an incremental basis, for the programs of the municipal college system.

## 2. The Board of Education Connection

The provision by the State government of monies for teacher training programs reconfirmed the Colleges' long-standing relationship with New York City's Board of Education, existent from the inception of The Free Academy in 1847. The passage of Chapter 695 of the Laws of 1948 served to officially designate the BHE's colleges as the prime agencies for preparing New York City's public school teachers. Closer liaison between the two educational systems ensued.

Cooperative efforts of the BHE and the Board of Education increased. In anticipation of the arrival of "baby-boom" children at the elementary schools in the early 1950s, the BHE initiated an Emergency Teacher Education Program.<sup>33</sup> Emergency teachers' licenses were granted to students completing between 32-36 credits in classroom and

field work. Students were exempted from tuition charges. The unique program was particularly geared to college graduates who might now be willing to consider employment in the City's school system.

Teacher education censuses in the late 1950s indicated phenomenal growth in the proportion of municipal college students preparing for careers in pedagogy: an approximate 25%-33% of the municipal colleges' undergraduates were enrolled as education majors.<sup>34</sup>

### 3. Non-New York City Residents

The second theme involved in the appropriation of Albany monies for teacher training programs in New York City reinvoked the question of the admission of non-New York City residents to the municipal colleges. This issue first emerged in 1940 as a statutory option granted to the BHE by an amendment to the State Education Law.<sup>35</sup> The provision of funds for the Colleges which were not supplied solely by New York City's taxpayers influenced the BHE's inclination and further advanced its proclivity to extend the benefits of free higher education to New York State residents.<sup>36</sup> Accordingly, several additional amendments and resolutions were enacted during the 1950s which permitted the admission of non-New York City residents to the Colleges.<sup>37</sup>

With the creation of Staten Island Community College in 1956, the BHE established a tiered-schedule for in-

structional (tuition) fees. New York City residents were charged \$125 per term. Non-New York State residents (including foreign students, with the exception of those granted "scholarships" under the provisions of the Bylaws) were charged \$375. Students who were residents of New York State, but not of New York City, in accordance with section 6305, paragraph 3 of the State Education Law, were charged \$125 per term. An additional \$125 per term was charged back to their county of residence.<sup>38</sup>

In Fall 1957, the Bylaws were amended. Non-residents would be admitted to any Associate degree program operated under the auspices of the BHE upon payment of tuition "at the rate prescribed for non-matriculated students." Thus, the legality of the registration of New York State students in New York City's community colleges, as well as in the Schools of General Studies, was re-affirmed.<sup>39</sup> At the same time, the Board acted to specifically exempt non-resident graduate teacher education students from payment of tuition fees.<sup>40</sup>

#### 4. State Responsibility for Higher Education

The third theme involved in the advent of State monies to New York City in 1948 began only in the post-World War II era. At that point, the State government began assuming responsibility for higher educational services. Chapter 451 of 1945 and Chapter 433 of 1946 provided funding for schools of technical training: one such institute

was established within the City boundaries of New York.<sup>41</sup> The Young Report of 1948 and the ensuing creation of The State University of New York channelled State monies into teacher training schools, colleges of agriculture and forestry, and into other special programs.<sup>42</sup>

The passage of these acts had a dramatic effect on BHE deliberations. The mission of the Colleges began to be defined in terms of priorities established by Albany: a movement began not only to attain fiscal equity with other State public colleges, but to determine educational priorities based on Upstate activities. The Strayer Report (1944), the Cottrell Report (1950) and Strayer-Yavner Report (1951) called upon the Albany government to assume in New York City a greater share of the role now defined as a State responsibility: the provision of higher education for the youth of New York State.

Throughout the 1950s, the State of New York would provide limited funding for New York City's teacher education programs. The BHE would, in a reciprocal manner, waive residence requirements for undergraduate and graduate education students. Efforts were increased by the City and other groups lobbying on behalf of the municipal colleges (in particular, the Alumni Association) to obtain increased funding for the Colleges under the BHE's jurisdiction, at least on par with funding awarded to other New York State public colleges. Such endeavors were accelerated upon the establishment of junior colleges in the City:

by 1961, a series of bills would have been passed by the Albany legislature awarding to the City sizeable State grants for both the capital and operating costs of the Colleges.

The growth in the proportion of support for New York City's colleges supplied by the State would exert a powerful influence on the administrative and fiscal autonomy of the BHE. The mission of the Colleges would be subject to severe modification. Even more importantly, New York City's long-standing mandate to provide tuition-free higher education would be dramatically challenged, and ultimately voided.

### C. The Cottrell Report

#### 1. Introduction

In January 1950, Donald P. Cottrell and his associates released the first Master Plan for the "minimum capital plant needs of New York City for public higher education." Conducted at the request of the BHE, Public Higher Education in the City of New York presented plans for the physical growth of the municipal college system through 1970.<sup>43</sup>

In issuing recommendations for the expansion of facilities, the team examined population trends, vocational prospects and the educational policy of the BHE. The study was therefore conducted for four reasons:

- a) an awareness of the greatly over-crowded conditions and increasing obsolescence of certain of the facilities of the Colleges
- b) the ever-increasing number of students interested in higher education
- c) the shifting concentration of population within the five boroughs, raising the question of the equitable distribution of accessible facilities,
- d) notable alterations in the pattern of occupations in New York City.<sup>44</sup>

## 2. Post-High School Education: "A Must"<sup>45</sup>

The Cottrell Report based its recommendations for future capital development on assessments of the need for higher education in New York City articulated by George Strayer, the Administrative Council and Pearman and Reid, among others. The municipal college system would thus be called upon to train basically all workers to be employed within New York City: numerous documents forecasting national trends foresaw a need for more training at the sub-professional, technical, graduate and professional levels.<sup>46</sup> No implication was made "that the expense will be entirely met from the tax funds of the City of New York."<sup>47</sup> "The City has to face the problem of the extent to which it will accept and financially support its legal mandate to provide higher education for an appreciable fraction of its eager young people."<sup>48</sup>

Higher education was particularly relevant to the unique "vocational, physical and psychological factors that exist in New York City."<sup>49</sup>

In New York City, the problem of assimilation and Americanization is unique. Though their parents and grandparents came from the four corners of the earth, the children must become Americans in loyalty, language and outlook. Credit for success obtained is in very large part due to our schools and colleges.<sup>50</sup>

Thus, for the city inhabited by persons of divergent racial, religious and national origins, "in combatting prejudice, knowledge is indeed power."<sup>51</sup>

Education was also viewed as an important means for equalizing opportunity, not only in the economic realm, but also in the political arena.

Leadership for the economically poor neighborhood must come from within that neighborhood. Here higher education has a critical role to play.<sup>52</sup>

Thus, a higher education would supply men and women with more than just the ability "to earn a living." "They must carry their share of the responsibility for our democratic leadership at home and abroad."<sup>53</sup>

### 3. Capital Expansion

The Cottrell Study staff, based on this appraisal of the mission of the Colleges in the 1950s and 1960s, reiterated Strayer's recommendations for the expansion of the scope of higher education in New York City. Thus, the development of several two-year community colleges and the extension of adult education programs was urged. In particular, Cottrell stressed the need for a two-year college in Staten Island.<sup>54</sup> Major capital improvements at the existent senior colleges were also outlined, grouped according to degree of urgency.<sup>55</sup>

Administration of these programs would not necessarily be an exclusive or even a major function of the BHE.<sup>56</sup> Thus, the study staff and even the BHE recognized the impact of the creation of the new State University of New York in 1948. The creation of this agency was viewed as a major step toward the establishment of "continuous coordination and liaison with various educational agencies." In particular, the merger of diverse higher educational facilities into one organization was regarded as a mechanism which "would naturally strengthen the Board's position when making capital and other requests."

I repeat that the year 1948 is destined to mark a turning point in the career of our city colleges. And the basic reason for this is that in varying ways, the city colleges of the future will have to become in this locality the core of a splendidly conceived and generously developed New York State University system.<sup>57</sup>

Yet the nature of the liaison between SUNY and the municipal colleges was not discussed by Cottrell: this would become one of the topics investigated by a report issued the following year: the Strayer-Yavner Report.

#### D. The Strayer-Yavner Report

##### 1. Introduction

In October 1951, the Mayor's Committee on Management Survey issued a two-volume survey of the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education. Entitled Administrative Management of The School System of New York City, the report was submitted by George D. Strayer and

Louis E. Yavner, Directors of the study. The latter chapters dealt with the administration of the municipal colleges.<sup>58</sup>

The report, while focussing on pragmatic aspects of managing the college system, also alluded to the issues influencing access to higher education in New York City which have been developed in this thesis. Two recommendations were issued to streamline the BHE's central office. Firstly, the survey staff urged that the size of the Board be reduced to fifteen, but preferably, nine members.<sup>59</sup> Secondly, the report urged the creation of the position of Chancellor. As the full-time Chairman of the Administrative Council, the Chancellor would be "recognized as the authoritative spokesman of the municipal college system."<sup>60</sup> Strayer and Yavner acknowledged the "element of unity" which had been introduced by the Administrative Council in effecting the four colleges. Yet, it was "doubtful whether any of the Presidents can do justice to his institution and, in addition, assume the burden of Chairman of the Administrative Council."<sup>61</sup> Thus, the Office of Chancellor would serve as the "executive arm" of the Board of Higher Education.<sup>62</sup>

## 2. Higher Education for Whom?

The Strayer-Yavner Report reiterated the finding of the 1944 Strayer Report that "The selectivity of the municipal colleges limits opportunities for post-secondary

education to students of good ability."<sup>63</sup> The New York municipal colleges had been operating at capacity for several years, and were able to accommodate only a fraction of the qualified applicants who were annually graduated from the City's high schools. Most of those who were denied admission were "excluded for failure to comply with entrance requirements which, according to professional judgment, were inordinately high."<sup>64</sup>

Statistics gathered by the Strayer Survey Committee in the early 1940s were viewed as still relevant.

For reasons related in large measure to the inadequacy of existing facilities or the absence of facilities, at least 50% of (1940 high school graduates) did not continue in any form of post-secondary schooling.<sup>65</sup>

If facilities were provided, particularly for two years of post-secondary schooling, "considerable numbers of youth who are forced to register in part-time evening courses would be able to receive the training they need and want."<sup>66</sup>

In addition, many high school graduates whose academic average is below the mark set for college entrance are discouraged by guidance counselors from applying to the Colleges. "The training of these youth would prove not only personally, but socially desirable."

The recommendation of the 1944 Strayer Report was repeated in 1951:

It may be positively suggested, therefore, that persons in the upper half of the high school graduating class deserve the advantage of post-secondary schooling. This emphasis does not preclude consideration

of the needs of other youth of lower academic status or of other adults who would benefit from technical and general education.<sup>67</sup>

The challenge of providing "two years of terminal and general education" had been recognized by the President's Commission on Higher Education.<sup>68</sup> Community colleges would be locally controlled and serve the needs of the community, particularly "deserving, if not academically superior members of society."<sup>69</sup> The State of New York had likewise recognized the need for such institutions.<sup>70</sup>

The community college seeks to provide a general cultural education for social living and democratic citizenship, while at the same time, providing practical training in occupational skills.<sup>71</sup>

Technical institutes for vocational training to meet accelerated needs of industry were also envisioned.<sup>72</sup>

Such two-year programs were notably lacking in New York State: only one technical institute existed within New York City. It had been informally suggested that the BHE assume control of this Institute and operate it under a community college formula.<sup>73</sup>

### 3. Higher Education in Richmond

The Strayer-Yavner Report also repeated earlier recommendations urging the immediate establishment of a community college in Richmond.<sup>74</sup> The college was needed to better serve high school graduates of Richmond County. At present, the 153 Staten Island residents enrolled in the municipal colleges "must not only evidence exceptional mental ability to meet entrance requirements, but must

be physically able to tolerate fatiguing travel to and from college, as well as be financially able to absorb multiple transportation charges and forego part-time employment."<sup>75</sup>

The proposed community college would offer both general education and vocational training, which "would be in line with the tradition of higher education sponsored by the City of New York."<sup>76</sup> Following the opening of the Richmond County community college, additional junior colleges and institutes should be established within the City. "The survey staff is fully convinced that the public collegiate program in the City of New York will never be adequate until the system of two-year institutions is expanded."<sup>77</sup>

The community college in Richmond would be established under the State University Act, with the State assuming the cost of one-third of the operating costs, and the local community being responsible for at least another one-third of the operating costs.

In view of the traditional policy of operating tuition-free colleges, with the benefits of this policy extending to residents of Manhattan, Queens, Brooklyn and the Bronx, the Survey staff recommends that the City of New York should assume responsibility for two-thirds of the operating costs of the proposed community college for Staten Island, thereby relieving students of tuition charges.<sup>78</sup>

Thus, the Strayer-Yavner Report appeared to urge the maintenance and extension of the free tuition mandate to all post-secondary education operated within New York City.

#### 4. Inadequate Financing

Revenues would not be raised by the imposition of tuition at the Richmond community college. Thus, government monies would be required for the support of the BHE's colleges. But City support of the Colleges, as a percent of the total tax levy budget, had declined in recent years.<sup>79</sup> "Unless additional public support is forthcoming, the municipal colleges will be unable to meet present demands upon them, much less consider expanding educational offerings."<sup>80</sup>

The municipal colleges were "prohibited from levying tuition charges" upon matriculated students. The Colleges had no endowment for current needs, nor did they receive substantial income from philanthropic sources.<sup>81</sup>

The municipal colleges were singled out as receiving less State support per full-time student than any other higher educational facility in the State.<sup>82</sup> The ramifications of an inadequate system of financial support resulted in the limitation of access to public higher education in the City. Thus, "the benefits of higher education can not be offered to all capable of profiting from it."<sup>83</sup> Additional consequences were also noted:

- The professional staff is not large enough to care for the present enrollment
- Salaries are low and fail to retain competent personnel in the Colleges
- Clerical force is understaffed and poorly paid

- Necessary building repairs are not made
- Capital budgets are not met.<sup>84</sup>

##### 5. State Monies: Assistance or Control?

The recommendation stressing that "the next logical step toward broader opportunities for higher education" would be the incorporation of the Colleges in the newly-created State University of New York was issued in the final chapter of the Strayer-Yavner Report.

The State University of New York should absorb the New York City municipal college system, and thereafter exercise full control over and take full responsibility for its management and support.<sup>85</sup>

Higher education had been recently recognized, both in the State's Legislature and court system, as a major State responsibility. Thus, "[the Colleges] provide a service that the State of New York now classifies as a function of the State government."<sup>86</sup> The emphasis had now shifted to an "equalization of higher educational opportunity," to provide programs and low-cost facilities for all capable of taking advantage of these services. Thus, the Board of Higher Education had been defined as an entity separate from the City, actually a "State agency" charged with implementing the general educational policy of both New York City and New York State.<sup>87</sup>

But, as has already been noted, the BHE's de jure status differed notably from its de facto status. The municipal college system in 1951 was receiving no State support for its programs, with the exception of funding

for its graduate, fifth-year teacher training programs. The incorporation of the Colleges into SUNY would "eliminate the problems resulting from existing City fiscal control" and "result in developing a sounder and more equitable basis of financial support."<sup>88</sup>

Additional benefits would accrue to the Colleges upon transferral to the SUNY system. "A potential benefit to the faculties may also result, with broader professional, prestige and financial opportunities." The transfer to SUNY would be necessarily remove the statutory provision restricting enrollment in the city colleges to residents of New York City, so that more young people of varied backgrounds would have an opportunity to understand and respect each other."<sup>89</sup> Thus, "the logic of events" pointed to the acquisition of the municipal college system by the State of New York.<sup>90</sup>

But what would be the nature of State responsibility for the Colleges? Here, Strayer and Yavner appeared to display a certain uncertainty. In Chapter 31, the survey staff urges "the full assumption of responsibility and control by the State."<sup>91</sup> Yet, earlier in the report, the following proviso was presented:

If the State of New York provides a larger degree of financial support than at present, but not all of the support [for the educational programs of the municipal college system], it will be necessary to consider the problem of the degree of State representation on the board of control.<sup>92</sup>

Thus, "State-subsidy as contemplated in this report, would

place the municipal colleges in the classification of a 'State-aided' [versus a 'State-operated'] institution."<sup>93</sup>

An inconsistency in recommendations is apparent. It appears reasonable therefore to propose that the final chapter of the report may have been presented as a long-range plan, an ideal situation. Thus, Chapter 31 may be viewed as a type of "manifesto," a position-paper, arguing for total State support of the Colleges, with concomitant total State control of the Board of Higher Education. Earlier statements regarding the actual degree of partial State subsidy--and control--of college services present more realistic considerations.

A second policy area remained unresolved in the mammoth Strayer-Yavner Report.

An alternative to increased public support for the municipal colleges of New York City is through the levying of modest tuition and increased fees for day students. With rapidly expanding needs of financial support apparent, emphasis has been given to the belief that the individual receives from his education such value, aside from that accruing to the state as a whole, as to justify the shift to him of part of the cost of his education.

Against this belief must be weighed the hardships which even a limited tuition policy would impose upon many New York students.<sup>94</sup>

A concrete recommendation regarding the imposition of additional fees and/or even a limited tuition for matriculated Day Session students was not resolved in the Strayer-Yavner Report. No consideration was given to the pragmatic aspects of the problem, either within the context of the absorption of the municipal college system

into SUNY, where tuition was charged, or the maintenance of an adequate system of higher education within the City of New York.

The problem would persist for the next 25 years. It would become critical at the point of the legislative creation of The City University of New York in 1961. It would abate in severity in 1964 when tuition fees were abolished for matriculated Associate degree students. Yet, it would violently resurface in the 1970s, in the aftermath of the imposition of the Open Admissions policy, and in the context of a city-wide fiscal crisis. The free tuition policy of the municipal colleges would finally disappear in 1975-1976, thereby dramatically altering the nature of all considerations of access to public higher education in New York City.

#### E. Summary

The post-War period witnessed a centralization and standardization of admissions procedures to the municipal colleges. The format of admissions requirements, one which would persist until 1970, was established. A composite score which gave equal weight to high school performance and to test scores would be utilized until the implementation of Open Admissions. The first State monies were awarded to the municipal college system for its teacher training programs. Simultaneously, non-New York City, New York State residents were permitted to pursue studies in

these State-funded programs.

Two major reports which appeared in the early-1950s served to reiterate and extend the Colleges' multi-faceted mission. The Cottrell and Strayer-Yavner Reports also supported efforts to expand--with State funding--the scope of post-secondary education in New York City and to establish a collegiate unit in Richmond County. Additionally, the latter report reaffirmed the College's century-old tuition-free mandate.

Developments of the late 1940s and the 1950s were, therefore, to a significant degree, a direct outgrowth of the findings of the 1944 Strayer Report and the activities of the committees which attempted to assimilate and operationalize Strayer's recommendations. Other improvements, related to competent but not superior students, were also largely outcomes of Strayer's discussions. The admission to the municipal colleges of these second-tier students and their allocation within New York City's system of higher education would become a critical issue of the 1950s.

- <sup>1</sup>BHE, Minutes, 26 April 1943, no. 115, pp. 208-209.
- <sup>2</sup>BHE, Minutes, 22 April 1946, no. 2, pp. 111-119; 21 April 1947, no. 2, pp. 152-153; 20 October 1947, no. B, pp. 421-422.
- <sup>3</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 April 1947, no. 2, pp. 152-153; 20 October 1947, no. B, pp. 421-422; 18 October 1948, no. A, pp. 459-461.
- <sup>4</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 November 1949, no. 9, pp. 536-537.
- <sup>5</sup>BHE, Minutes, 12 January 1948, nos. 2, 3, pp. 6-11.
- <sup>6</sup>BHE, Minutes, 18 October 1948, no. A, pp. 459-461; 8 April 1949, no. 3, pp. 152-157; 18 April 1949, no. 13, pp. 160-165.
- <sup>7</sup>BHE, Minutes, 22 September 1947, no. A, pp. 368-371; 16 May 1949, no. 2, pp. 196-203; 23 May 1949, no. 24A, pp. 224-225.
- <sup>8</sup>BHE, Minutes, 23 May 1949, no. 24A, pp. 224-225.
- <sup>9</sup>BHE, Minutes, 20 March 1950, no. 11, pp. 132-133; 20 June 1950, no. 21, pp. 314-317.
- <sup>10</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 April 1950, no. 26, pp. 206-209; 20 June 1950, no. 21, pp. 314-317.
- <sup>11</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 May 1951, no. 15, pp. 246-249.
- <sup>12</sup>BHE, Minutes, 20 October 1952, no. 91, pp. 588-591; 30 September 1954, no. 23, pp. 530-531.
- <sup>13</sup>See, for example, BHE, Minutes, 25 September 1950, no. 99, pp. 500-503; 21 April 1952, no. 20, pp. 188-191; 30 September 1954, no. 23, pp. 530-531; 17 February 1958, no. 65, pp. 74-75.
- <sup>14</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 June 1957, no. 8, pp. 258-259.
- <sup>15</sup>Ibid.; also Robert L. Taylor, Registrar, CCNY to Pearl B. Max, Administrator, BHE, 26 September 1952, CC Files, 4.11, Admissions.

<sup>16</sup>The Division of Teacher Education of the Board of Higher Education established closer ties to the Board of Education in order to prepare the estimated 16,000-19,000 new teachers who would be required by New York City by 1961. See "On the Campus--Future Teacher Shortage," Alumnus, vol. 49, no. 6, April 1954, pp. 8-9. The buttressing of relations between the BHE and the Board of Education also was to facilitate the generation of special admissions programs in the early 1960s.

<sup>17</sup>Adele Bildersee, Chairman, Committee on Uniformity in Admissions to the Administrative Council, BHE, 25 September 1953, CC Files, 4.14, Uniformity of Admissions; Buell G. Gallagher, President, CCNY, "Historical Data on Admissions," 9 January 1964, CC Files, 5.13, Admissions-I. Also, BHE, Minutes, 18 October 1948, no. A, pp. 459-461; 8 April 1949, no. 3, pp. 152-157; 21 November 1949, no. 9, pp. 536-537; 20 November 1950, no. 16, pp. 574-575; 19 November 1951, no. 10, pp. 636-637; 20 October 1952, no. 91, pp. 588-591; 17 November 1952, no. 14, pp. 626-629; 19 October 1953, no. 10, pp. 512-515; 16 November 1953, no. 21, pp. 574-575; 30 September 1954, no. 23, pp. 530-531; 22 November 1954, no. 11, pp. 682-683; 21 November 1955, no. 10, pp. 658-661; 16 April 1956, no. 13, pp. 202-205; 19 November 1956, no. 10, pp. 614-619; 22 April 1957, no. 8, pp. 142-145; 18 November 1957, no. 12, pp. 470-473; 21 April 1958, no. 13, pp. 136-139; 17 November 1958, no. 8, pp. 518-519; 20 April 1959, no. 6, pp. 143-149; 16 November 1959, no. 6, pp. 534-539; 25 April 1960, no. 8, pp. 140-143; 21 November 1960, no. 11, pp. 558-563; 17 April 1961, no. 6, pp. 160-163.

<sup>18</sup>Strayer Report, p. 467.

<sup>19</sup>Strayer Report, pp. 487-492.

<sup>20</sup>Strayer Report, pp. 710-711.

<sup>21</sup>BHE, Minutes, 25 September 1944, no. B, pp. 337-339; 11 December 1944, no. B, pp. 470-473; 19 February 1945, no. B, pp. 46-47; 19 November 1945, no. 4, pp. 358-361; 17 December 1945, no. 4A, pp. 392-393; 18 February 1946, no. 6, pp. 44-49; 22 April 1949, no. 9, pp. 111-119; 15 December 1947, no. 4, pp. 523-527.

<sup>22</sup>Chapter 695 of the Laws of New York, 30 March 1948. See also, Chapter 698 of the Laws of New York, 30 March 1948.

<sup>23</sup>Chapters 695 and 698 of 1948. Also, BHE, Minutes, 12 January 1948, no. 2, pp. 6-11; 16 February 1948, no. B, pp. 55-57; 15 March 1948, no. B, pp. 98-101; 19 April 1948, no. 5, pp. 153-154; 21 June 1948, no. 9, pp. 246-249; 21 June 1948, nos. 134, 135, pp. 378-381; 15 November 1948, no.

2, pp. 526-533.

<sup>24</sup>BHE, Minutes, 28 September 1948, no. 113, pp. 454-455.

<sup>25</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 June 1948, no. 134, pp. 378-381.

<sup>26</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 June 1948, no. 8, pp. 246-249.

<sup>27</sup>BHE, Minutes, 15 November 1948, no. 2, pp. 526-533; 17 January 1949, no. 92, pp. 46-47; 18 April 1949, no. 3, pp. 160-165; 24 October 1949, no. C, pp. 473-477; 20 November 1950, no. B, pp. 567-571.

<sup>28</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 June 1948, no. 9, pp. 246-249; 21 June 1948, no. 35, pp. 378-381; 18 April 1949, no. 3, pp. 160-165; 15 May 1950, no. 19, pp. 260-261; 22 January 1952, no. 74, pp. 42-43; 16 June 1952, no. 133, pp. 432-435; 15 June 1953, no. 146, pp. 418-419.

<sup>29</sup>The Division of Teacher Education had been organized in 1950. See BHE, Minutes, 20 March 1950, no. 4, pp. 112-113, regarding Article XI, sec. 110-A of the Bylaws.

<sup>30</sup>BHE, Minutes, 25 April 1960, no. 2, pp. 136-143; 16 May 1960, no. 85, pp. 252-253; 23 January 1961, no. 71, pp. 40-41. Chapter 418 was enacted on 8 April 1960.

<sup>31</sup>BHE, Minutes, 18 December 1961, no. 6, pp. 736-739.

<sup>32</sup>See, for example, BHE, Minutes, 21 February 1949, no. 8, pp. 52-55; 21 March 1949, nos. 6A, 12, pp. 106-111; 16 May 1949, no. 2, pp. 196-203; 20 April 1953, no. 2, pp. 172-175; 12 April 1954, no. 6, pp. 192-199; 18 March 1957, nos. 2, 3, pp. 81-83; 17 February 1958, nos. 5, 7, pp. 34-35; 16 February 1959, no. 2, pp. 36-39; 20 April 1959, nos. B, 2, pp. 143-149.

<sup>33</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 March 1949, no. 6A, pp. 106-111; 8 April 1949, no. 3, pp. 152-157; 20 November 1950, no. B, pp. 567-571; 15 December 1952, no. 4, pp. 684-689.

<sup>34</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 April 1958, no. 3, pp. 132-133; 15 December 1958, no. 6A, pp. 600-603; 16 November 1959, no. 9B, pp. 534-539. In 1945, 61% of those granted teaching licenses in New York City were graduates of the municipal colleges. See BHE, Minutes, 19 November 1945, no. 4, pp. 358-361; 15 December 1945, no. 4A, pp. 392-393.

<sup>35</sup>Chapter 636 of the Laws of New York, 20 April 1940.

<sup>36</sup>Chapter 190 of the Laws of 1945 and sec. 151-e of the BHE Bylaws facilitated the waiver of New York City

residence for War-veterans. See above, Chapter VI.

<sup>37</sup>BHE, Minutes, 20 June 1950, no. 23, pp. 314-317; 25 September 1950, no. 102, pp. 500-503; 16 April 1951, no. 7, pp. 162-165; 17 November 1952, no. 12, pp. 626-629; 15 June 1953, no. 2, pp. 275-277; 28 September 1955, no. 16, pp. 456-459; 18 March 1957, no. 4, pp. 81-83; 22 April 1957, no. 3, pp. 142-145.

<sup>38</sup>BHE, Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Higher Education Acting as the Board of Trustees of a Community College, 20 February 1956, no. C5, pp. S-8-11. To be designated here as BHE, Community College Minutes.

<sup>39</sup>BHE, Minutes, 28 September 1955, no. 16, pp. 456-459; 23 September 1957, no. 18, pp. 348-349; 21 October 1957, no. 6A, pp. 406-407.

<sup>40</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 October 1957, no. 6A, pp. 406-407. Approximately 5% of those enrolled in teacher training programs were New York State residents. See BHE, Minutes, 15 December 1958, no. 6A, pp. 600-603.

<sup>41</sup>Chapter 451 was enacted on 2 April 1945; Chapter 433 on 4 April 1946. The New York City Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences, established in Brooklyn, came under the aegis of the BHE in 1953 as The New York City Community College. See BHE, Minutes, 16 April 1945, no. 6C, pp. 107-115; 20 May 1946, no. 2, pp. 159-163; 20 April 1953, no. 3, pp. 172-175; 28 September 1953, no. B, pp. 434-435; 28 September 1953, no. 14, pp. 442-443; 16 November 1953, no. 12, pp. 564-575; 18 January 1954, no. 88, pp. 54-55; 12 April 1954, no. 7, pp. 192-199. Pursuant to Chapters 271 and 525 of the Laws of 1953, and Chapters 147 of the Laws of 1954, de facto BHE governance of this Institute began in July 1957.

<sup>42</sup>Owen D. Young, Report of the Temporary Commission on the Need for a State University (16 February 1948). The State University of New York was created under Chapters 695 through 698 of the Laws of 1948, signed into law on March 30, 1948.

<sup>43</sup>Donald P. Cottrell, Director, with Adrian Rondileau and Leo S. Schumer, Public Higher Education in the City of New York: Report of the Master Plan Study (January 1950), p. 3. To be designated here as the Cottrell Report.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

- <sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 12-13, 32, 44.
- <sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 7.
- <sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 3, citing Ordway Tead, 1946 Annual Report of the Chairman of the BHE.
- <sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 17.
- <sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 16.
- <sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 16.
- <sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 17.
- <sup>53</sup>Ibid., pp. 16-17.
- <sup>54</sup>Ibid., pp. 8, 39-42.
- <sup>55</sup>Ibid., pp. 8-10, 18-24. The Cottrell plan followed, to a large extent, the four-stage plan outlined by the Administrative Council. See Gideonse, "The Scope of Higher Education in New York City," 17 March 1947.
- <sup>56</sup>Cottrell Report, p. 9.
- <sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 31, citing Ordway Tead, Chairman of the BHE.
- <sup>58</sup>George D. Strayer and Louis E. Yavner, Directors, Administrative Management of the School System of New York City: Report of Survey of The Board of Education and The Board of Higher Education (Mayor's Committee on Management Survey, Education Management Study, October 1951), Chapters XXVII through XXXI, pp. 1001-1186. To be designated here as the Strayer-Yavner Report.
- <sup>59</sup>Ibid., pp. 1008-1111.
- <sup>60</sup>Ibid., p. 1036.
- <sup>61</sup>Ibid., pp. 1032-1033.
- <sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 1022.
- <sup>63</sup>Ibid., p. 1063.
- <sup>64</sup>Ibid., pp. 1062-1063.
- <sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. 1064. The Colleges' unusually high retention rate exacerbated the problem of limiting admissions. The transformation of Hunter College in the Bronx in 1947 and CCNY in 1951 to co-ed institutions were "at-

tempts to lessen the pressures upon the entire municipal system of higher education." See p. 1095. Also, see BHE, Minutes, 20 October 1947, no. B, pp. 420-433; 22 January 1951, no. 3, pp. 3-5.

<sup>66</sup>Strayer-Yavner Report, pp. 1064-1065.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 1065.

<sup>68</sup>Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report for the President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947. Known generally as The Truman Report.

<sup>69</sup>Strayer-Yavner Report, pp. 1052-1053, 1066.

<sup>70</sup>Young, The Need for a State University, 16 February 1948; Chapter 696 of the Laws of 1948.

<sup>71</sup>Strayer-Yavner Report, p. 1055, citing the SUNY Master Plan of 1 June 1950.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., pp. 1056-1058.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., pp. 1059-1061, 1071.

<sup>74</sup>See, for instance, Cottrell Report, pp. 8, 39-42.

<sup>75</sup>Strayer-Yavner Report, p. 1072.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 1082.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 1083.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., pp. 1080-1081.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., pp. 1097-1102.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., pp. 1112-1113.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., pp. 1104-1105.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., pp. 1108-1110.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., pp. 1127-1128.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid., pp. 1114-1127.

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., p. 1176.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., p. 1182.

<sup>87</sup>Ibid., pp. 1176, 1003-1005.

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., p. 1176.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., p. 1176.

<sup>90</sup>Ibid., p. 1185.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., p. 1185.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., p. 1009.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., p. 1010.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., p. 1179.

## CHAPTER X

## ACCESS IN THE 1950s: THE SECOND-TIER STUDENT

A. The School of General Studies

## 1. Establishment

In Fall 1950, the Evening and Extension Divisions of the municipal colleges were re-organized. The School of General Studies would encompass all non-Day Session programs: it would have jurisdiction over evening degree courses, as well as diploma and certificate courses, all non-degree work, including adult education, and over all non-matriculating students.<sup>1</sup> In creating the School of General Studies, the BHE once again re-affirmed its mission to serve the people of the City of New York:

In recent years, the education of students seeking degrees in the Evening Session and adults not working toward a degree has developed into a significant function of the municipal colleges. It is continuing to grow in scope and in the number of students.

[The] adult students [enrolled in these programs] are much more heterogenous in background and age than Day Session students enrolled for a degree.

In the light of these considerations, there have evolved differences in educational objectives and, in turn, a more intimate contact with the community outside the College. In the attempt to serve the community, these programs tend to become decentralized, so that classes may be offered in different neighborhoods for individuals or groups such as industrial plants, social organizations, city agencies and

departments, housing developments, or parent-teacher organizations. Decentralization of this kind requires a constant awareness of the way in which the educational effort is progressively serving the needs of the community.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, the recommendations of the Strayer Report to extend the educational services of the Colleges were formalized by the creation of the School of General Studies.

## 2. The Associate Degree: Accreditation

In September 1952, The City College of New York began officially admitting persons to the School of General Studies as Associate degree matriculants in the Liberal Arts and Sciences. In doing so, CCNY became the second of the municipal colleges to offer the Associate in Arts degree, following Brooklyn College's 1941 lead.

The question may be legitimately raised as to why it took until 1952 for City College to offer Associate degree programs. This degree had been gaining in popularity for more than twenty-five years: indeed, Brooklyn College lagged behind the national trend when it instituted the program in 1941.<sup>3</sup> How then was it possible that City College, the municipal college system's largest and most prolific unit, offering the richest and most diverse course offerings, would not feature this program until the Strayer Report and the work of its succeeding committees would finally bring the A.A. degree to CCNY?

An attempt has been made here to supply an answer

to this question. It may be suggested that the delay in instituting the Associate degree is attributable to two overlapping factors: historical circumstance and President Wright's opposition to such programs.

The documentation exists to demonstrate that a number of key City College administrators, beginning in 1939, made ongoing efforts to deal in a logical and coherent manner with the Evening Session's second-tier students. Nobably, President Nelson Mead, Robert Love, Assistant Director of the Evening Session and Dr. Walter Knittle, Director of the Evening Session issued several position papers and reports urging the establishment of degree programs for the Special student.<sup>4</sup>

In addition, several committees, sponsored either by CCNY, the BHE, the Joint High School-College Articulation Committee or the municipal colleges' Council of Evening Session Directors urged the creation of an independently-administered, degree-granting School of General Studies.<sup>5</sup>

All of these proposals were issued between 1939 and 1949. In 1941, Brooklyn College initiated its A.A. programs. CCNY redesignated its second-tier students: Limited-Matriculants became Special students. It is understandable that City College was hesitant to embark on any new project, both during the War years or in the post-War period. The exigencies of the War crisis and the post-War

adjustment contributed to the tabling of the various proposals.

In addition, however, there is reason to believe that President Wright was personally opposed to the creation of these two-year programs. Wright's comments on a 1946 recommendation to grant the Evening Session the option of determining its own curriculum were as follows:

To put it frankly, we do not have any intention of entering upon such a program at the present time, and, I might add, I don't see anything to be gained but a great deal to be lost by entering upon it at any time.<sup>6</sup>

A similar suggestion issued in 1947, urging all the municipal colleges to establish Schools of General Studies, was discovered in Wright's files with the following hand-written notation:

Not interested in pushing.<sup>7</sup>

It thus appears reasonable to conclude that beyond the fact that these proposals were issued during a critical and frenetic period, it was President Wright's own personal opposition to any reorganization of the Evening and Extension Sessions of the College which delayed the institution of Associate degree programs at CCNY.

### 3. Associate Degree Students

Accompanying the initiation of Associate degree programs at CCNY in 1952 were administrative concerns regarding the issue of student merit. Two specific themes emerged as key considerations: student retention and stu-

dent scholarship. By 1955, City College had accumulated a substantial amount of information regarding its second-tier students. The results of these studies, summarized here, provided, to a large extent, the rationale for the establishment of a series of community colleges operated under the jurisdiction of the BHE.

Reports on the operation of the School of General Studies indicated that more than 50% of Associate degree candidates enrolled at CCNY between 1952 and 1955 had formerly been registered as Special students in the Evening Session. These students were different from Day Students, graduating with Associate degrees at the age of 28 or 29.<sup>8</sup>

In May 1955, an ad hoc CCNY Committee on Standards issued a major report on the operation of the Day and Evening Sessions. The Committee had been created to deal with "the ever present problem of maintaining high educational standards in the Evening Classes":

- Are they the same in the evening as in the day?
- Are they as high, even though they are different?
- What should be done to improve or raise the standard?<sup>9</sup>

Concern was also voiced over withdrawals "among scholastically qualified Evening Sessions students."<sup>10</sup>

The report issued the following findings:

- a) In general, the scholarship of Evening Students "would appear to approximate that of Day Students rather closely."

- b) Evening grades were "slightly but consistently lower" than those of the Day Session (75% versus 71%).
- c) Evening Session students exhibited a more variable performance. Day Session grades tended to cluster around a mean.
- d) Evening Session matriculants contained a greater proportion of students with averages below a "C" than did Day Session students. Evening Session non-matriculants had an even higher proportion of failures.<sup>11</sup>

A special section of the report was devoted to "A Follow-Up Study of the First Class Entering the Associate in Arts Program." The study found that although 72% of the entering class had withdrawn prior to the completion of the first year, 75% of those who withdrew did so while being in good standing. The remaining group, by the second year of the program, was split rather evenly between A.A. candidates and matriculated B.A. candidates in the Evening Session. Thus, a vastly increased amount of individual guidance was urged.<sup>12</sup>

The report then examined the relationship between high school average and scholarship in the College. The remaining group of 51 students was divided as follows:

Group A: averages between 65% and 72%

Group B: averages between 73% and 79%.

There were no students in the group with averages above 79% since those with an average of 80% or higher enrolled for Baccalaureate degrees as Fully-Matriculated students.

Three conclusions were issued:

- a) There was no discernible relationship between high school standing and a student's withdrawal from the College.
- b) Twice as many Group A students (from the lower quintile) were dropped for poor scholarship than in the higher one.
- c) Those in Group B were as likely to improve their status by matriculating for the B.A. as to maintain themselves in good standing as A.A. candidates.

Despite the low frequencies of the study, as "important difference" in the scholarship of students was noted between those who fell into the fourth rather than the fifth quintile. On the other hand, the rate of attrition was "surprisingly similar" for both groups.<sup>13</sup>

A second study which appeared in the mid-1950s which examined the status of Associate degree students was the Evaluation of City College by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.<sup>14</sup> In discussing the "refreshing and worthwhile approach" presented by the new CCNY A.A. program, the Committee noted the following:

It is interesting to note that while this [degree program] does not parallel the first two years of study in the College, [it] can be accepted as the equivalent of these years for the student who, on its completion, decides that he or she would like to continue to the Bachelor's degree.<sup>15</sup>

The studies mentioned here, and others conducted in the mid-1950s, alluded to an ongoing institutional ambivalence concerning access policy as related to "com-

petent" but not "superior" students.<sup>16</sup> The problem had existed at City College from the time of the Depression: from the creation of the category of the Limited-Matriculated student in 1932. Yet, as on prior occasions, the College's administration was inclined to view these students in a favorable light. Thus, CCNY did not act, in any manner, to screen second-tier students who wished to continue in the College's "upper division" (junior and senior years) on par with those students who were initially accepted as Baccalaureate-matriculants. No additional qualification, certification of competence or passage of a special examination was required for A.A. holders for transfer to the B.A. program.<sup>17</sup>

Thus, the mid-1950s saw a re-affirmation of the belief that even the less-than-superior student was indeed capable of pursuing and maintaining a good college performance, to the point of the successful completion of the Baccalaureate course. Shortly thereafter, the School of General Studies, reflecting this view, issued new admissions regulations:

- a) Students presenting high school averages of 75% or better may be admitted to the Evening Division as Special students in the School of Technology or as Associate in Arts degree candidates.
- b) Students with a high school average below 75% may be admitted if they achieve a minimum composite score of 148.<sup>18</sup>

#### 4. Non-Matriculants

The mid-1950s also saw a re-evaluation at CCNY of the status of Non-Matriculated students in the Evening Session. This group had grown to a sizeable proportion of the Evening registration in the late-1940s and early-1950s, despite limitations of facilities.<sup>19</sup> Although evidence presented in several studies appeared inconclusive, Bernard Levy, Director of the School of General Studies, urged "more stringent control" over the enrollment of Non-Matriculants.

Levy's concerns were enlarged upon by the 1955 Mid-States Evaluation.

The student body in the Evening Session differs in many respects from that attending the Day Session. In addition to the obvious differences in age, employment status and the like, it should be pointed out that the Evening Session has many more Non-Matriculated, Special and A.A. [A.A.S.] than it has matriculated students. The former are not of the same caliber as the day students.

Unless there is a high rate of elimination of these students in the Freshman and Sophomore classes, it would seem that the maintenance of the same standards in the Evening and Day Sessions is in some jeopardy.<sup>20</sup>

As a result of these concerns, in Fall 1956, a regulation was passed which required all Non-Matriculants to maintain a "C" average or be barred from further registration.<sup>21</sup>

#### B. High School-College Articulation

In Spring 1954, a study entitled "Municipal College Admissions: A Study of Trends" was released.<sup>22</sup> The

major finds of the report challenged predictions issued in the Cottrell Report, and, in fact, suggested that the problem of the lack of provision of higher educational services at the municipal colleges in the 1950s was a more severe problem than anticipated. Thus, the following was noted:

Over the years, there has been a continuous though not steady increase in admissions to the four municipal colleges. This increase has occurred regardless of such conditions as economic depression, war, prosperity and the decreasing number of young people of college entrance age.<sup>23</sup>

This finding thus challenged Cottrell's formula of three factors which may be used to explain fluctuation in municipal college enrollments:

1. the available college age population
2. the proportion of youth ready, able and willing to enroll in college
3. available municipal college facilities.<sup>24</sup>

Yet, despite a low birthrate between 1913 and 1935, actual enrollments did not bear out an expectation of low college attendance. The number of births would have to be used in conjunction "with other variables" to predict college enrollment. These might include migration patterns, but also factors "not subject to prediction." Unpredictable elements included but were not restricted to economic conditions, job opportunities, national defense requirements for college age youth, the return of the veterans, the Federal government's method of paying for their higher education, and the current standards of admission to each

of the four colleges.<sup>25</sup>

A second finding of the April 1954 report indicated that

Although the number of graduates from public high schools who are eligible for college has not changed materially, the percent of such eligibles has been on the decrease.<sup>26</sup>

Three primary components were identified as having a direct bearing on the enrollment of Freshmen in the municipal colleges. These factors, although intrinsically related to the operation of the public school system by the Board of Education, warranted serious consideration by the municipal colleges. They were as follows

1. Attrition Rates

- of those who entered high school
- of those who graduated high school
- of those who applied for college entrance
- of those who applied to the municipal colleges
- of those who were accepted to the municipal colleges
- of those who enrolled in the municipal colleges.

2. Number and Type of Diplomas granted to graduates of [public] high schools.

3. The proportion of each diploma group applying for entrance to the municipal colleges.<sup>27</sup>

Clarke, Orleans and Reiter, the authors of this study, thus noted the dramatic growth in the proportion of "general" diplomas awarded to high school graduates. In 1943, 13% of high school graduates received this degree; by 1953, 34% of all diplomas were "general" degrees.

The following table illustrates the profile of applications to the municipal colleges in 1953:<sup>28</sup>

TABLE 10  
MUNICIPAL COLLEGE APPLICATIONS, 1953

| <u>Type of Diploma</u>   | <u>A. Percent of High School Graduates</u> | <u>B. Percent Applications to College</u> |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Academic                 | 48%  | 85%                                       |
| General                  | 34%  | 6%  |
| Commercial               | 14%  | 4%  |
| Other (mainly Technical) | 4%   | 6%  |
|                          | 100%<br>(39,837)                           | 101%<br>(18,656)                          |

The "general" diploma was not based on the Board of Regents examination requirements. The municipal colleges were not in the habit of inquiring what type of high school diploma was held by an applicant. Nonetheless, a basic question emerged. It was, "To what extent do general diplomates qualify for college admission?"<sup>29</sup> The following was presented as a tentative answer:

A relationship may well exist between the number of applications from a diploma group and the number of students considering themselves eligible for college admission. The College Registrars feel that the "general" diploma is selected by students who are not interested in college entrance. The Registrars suspect that the "general" diplomates who apply for admission may contribute a disproportionate share of those rejected by the Offices of Admission. There is the further probability that students are guided by the high schools from "academic" to "general" diploma candidacy if their scholarship is not up to standards.<sup>30</sup>

Thus, the municipal colleges, in the mid-1950s, began facing what would evolve as a critical problem in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s.<sup>31</sup> On the one hand, numerous reports had pointed to the increasingly urgent and growing need to extend post-secondary education to a vastly larger segment of the high school population. Recommendations had been issued that the municipal colleges should cater to, through traditional liberal arts or newly-developed "general" curricula, at least 50% of the high school graduating class. Efforts were urged to reduce the high school average required for admission, adjudged to exceed even requirements for quality private universities.

On the other hand, the Colleges began to deal with qualitative differences in the preparation of students applying for admission. While the Clarke, Orleans and Reiter report certainly buttressed contentions that the Colleges were not serving a sizeable section of the City's high school graduates, the issue emerged as to whether the new segments were, in fact, prepared for a college education--even after completion of high school. The adequacy of the increasingly popular "general" diploma as preparation for a college education was thus questioned by admissions administrators. Similarly, the existence of a "tracking system" within New York City's high schools was recognized. "Academic" coursework was assigned to students deemed suitable college material; "general" programs to those deemed not able to pursue a college education.

The "tracking system" operated in the Board of Education's high schools served a dual and increasingly problematic function from the vantage point of the municipal colleges. On the one hand, the awarding of different types of diplomas served to control, to some extent, the ever-increasing demand for admission to the Colleges. Thus, theoretically, at least, "good college material" would be allocated academic programs and encouraged to apply to the municipal colleges; the remaining group of students would already have been screened and channelled away from pursuing a traditional higher education.

Yet, simultaneously, the municipal colleges, in the 1950s and 1960s, would be called upon to broaden the scope of their operation, and to expand their mission to serve the people of the City of New York. By the late 1960s, the CUNY system would be called upon to provide post-secondary education for all of New York City's high school graduates. Ultimately, the implementation of the Open Admissions policy would require the acceptance of high school graduates possessing not only "academic" diplomas with lower grade point averages, but also those with "general" diplomas, who, in many cases, were to lack basic skills necessary for pursuing a college career.<sup>32</sup>

### C. The Community Colleges

In November 1953, the BHE began seriously entertaining motions to convert the part-time Associate degree pro-

grams offered in the newly-created Schools of General Studies to full-time status at junior colleges. Within the previous few years, enrollment in the Evening Sessions had grown. The plan for a series of two-year colleges organized under the jurisdiction of the BHE grew more plausible and a necessary addition to New York City's educational system.<sup>33</sup>

Control over the Schools of General Studies had grown in complexity in the 1950s. Administrators had long recognized that students of the caliber of those who attended community colleges in other states attended the municipal colleges' Evening Sessions.<sup>34</sup> The Evening Session registration, however, included not only these second-tier students, but also a large proportion of matriculated students who fully met all requirements for the Baccalaureate programs of the Day Session. Estimates on the proportion of these students, who were not charged tuition, reached 65% of the Evening Session enrollment at CCNY. Assessment of the fees generated by the SGS grew increasingly complex.<sup>35</sup> Since the SGS provided for several types of students, "the process of assessing [credits and income for each of these groups of students] is a complicated one. Very often, estimates made by the Colleges and the Board are significantly different from [those of] the [New York City] Budget Director."<sup>36</sup>

With expansion efforts made more urgent by forecasts of increasing demand for collegiate services, the

BHE embarked on a massive capital construction program.<sup>37</sup> First priority was given to a two-year unit in Richmond, which might, as enrollments warranted, be expanded to a four-year facility. In April 1955, Staten Island Community College was established. The college's opening was heralded as being "in light of a 100-year tradition [of] citizens of New York City concerned with the educational needs of young people of college age."<sup>38</sup> Public higher education thus reached Staten Island more than half-a-century after the Consolidation of New York. Yet enrollment was curtailed due to a lack of a permanent campus: the crowded situation was "an omen of things to come."<sup>39</sup>

No sooner had plans been discussed for SICC, than the BHE began consideration of additional similar units in the other boroughs of New York City.<sup>40</sup> In April 1956, the BHE approved in principle the establishment of a two-year college in the Bronx.<sup>41</sup> Shortly thereafter, the Mayor went on record as being in favor of such a unit.<sup>42</sup> The proposal was referred to the Board of Estimate on October 22, 1958.<sup>43</sup> In January 1957, Bronx Community College was officially approved and opened without an actual plant. Negotiations with the Board of Education were undertaken to secure the old Bronx High School of Science for the college. In the interim, classes were conducted at the Park Avenue center of Hunter College. Finally, in February 1959, the college did acquire the old building as the Bronx High School of Science moved to new

quarters at Bedford Park.<sup>44</sup>

Even the new college faced an acute space shortage. Enrollment was frozen at 1200 for the Day Session; 1700 in the Evening Session. Only approximately one-third of qualified applicants were admitted; thousands of other, less-qualified students would never be admitted even to part-time, terminal vocational courses.

We must have space, and only if we have space can we reach the potential growth for education in the Bronx.<sup>45</sup>

In May 1958, the BHE approved in principle the establishment of a community college in Queens.<sup>46</sup> Following negotiations with SUNY, the BHE-sponsored Queensborough Community College was created in 1959 and opened in September 1960.<sup>47</sup>

By 1961, the Board of Higher Education would have established three new two-year colleges; the New York City Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences would have become part of the municipal college system in 1957.<sup>48</sup> Admissions requirements were set at a 75% average in high school studies, or a composite score of 150. Tuition was set at \$125 per term for New York City and New York State residents; tuition was free for those who met entrance requirements to the four-year colleges, but opted for a two-year course.<sup>49</sup> The ratio of students admitted to transfer or to terminal programs was set at approximately 50/50, depending on the availability of facilities for specific programs at the individual colleges.<sup>50</sup> The three community

colleges were accredited to award the A.A. and A.A.S. degrees.<sup>51</sup>

Admission to the Evening Session of the community colleges required the following:

- a high school diploma
- evidence of "physical fitness"
- evidence of "good citizenship and moral character"
- adequate high school preparation in math and physics.

Students would be admitted to the Evening Session as Non-Matriculants provided that they were "deemed qualified for enrollment." Each student would be interviewed by an admissions counselor. Tuition was set at \$10 per credit hour, with an additional \$6 charged per extra hour.<sup>52</sup>

The creation of the community colleges as the official home of the "second-tier" students would revive, particularly in the 1960s, the issue of student merit. But even prior to the creation of The City University of New York, the problem emerged. All three community colleges immediately established remedial reading courses for their students; Bronx Community College, through a Ford Foundation grant, conducted a more thorough "Pre-College Enrichment Program" for its Freshmen.<sup>53</sup>

Transfer regulations between junior and senior colleges were subject to constant debate and review. In 1957, a committee of the Legislative Conference, the faculty union of the municipal college system, issued the following statement:

We now find ourselves confronted with the problem of extending educational opportunities beyond the high school without reducing the quality of the education at present prevailing in the city colleges. We must guard against confusing the ideal of equality in educational opportunity with the fiction of equality in educational capability. The danger of possible deterioration of standards stems from the [projected] plans to establish transfer programs in the community colleges, which will then serve as feeders to the city colleges.

Is it not reasonable to expect that many students who were refused admission to a city [senior] college and have enrolled in a transfer program would not be content with a second class diploma from a community college? Would they not exert every effort to make the transfer program serve as a back door to elude the entrance requirements?

If the transfer from a community college to the junior year of a city [senior] college can be made with profit to the transfer student and without imperiling academic or professional standards, we can cooperate sincerely in its operation. But we should be alert to any danger to our academic standards or our professional interest that may lurk in any administratively operated transfer program, however well intended it may be in conception.<sup>54</sup>

Despite, or because of the pre-set ratio of terminal to transfer students, demand for transfer programs escalated.<sup>55</sup> By the end of the decade, the majority of A.A. holders from the community colleges were transferring to the senior units.<sup>56</sup> These transfers further exacerbated the problem of limited facilities at the senior colleges.<sup>57</sup> Different transfer regulations were imposed by the different senior colleges, complicating an already difficult situation.<sup>58</sup> The concerns articulated prior to the creation of CUNY would become prophecies of acute administrative, pedagogical and normative dilemmas of the late-1960s and 1970s.

#### D. Summary

During the 1950s, the city colleges embarked on a series of actions which granted official recognition to second-tier students. As the School of General Studies was organized, the Associate degree certified and community colleges established, college administrators increasingly began to suspect that the division between the superior and the competent student might not only be one of a differential in high school averages and test scores, but may also entail qualitative differences in secondary school preparation. It was noted that distinct "academic" and "general" programs were offered in New York City's high schools. This "tracking system" served a dual function: on the one hand, it allowed for a dramatic increase in high school graduation rates. On the other hand, the system acted as an agent of control, serving to limit access to Baccalaureate programs to the "cream" of those earning "academic" high school diplomas.

The expansion of access to public higher education in New York City, particularly after the establishment of the community colleges, would raise, once again, and intensify in the 1960s, ongoing debates regarding student merit and transfer privileges.

<sup>1</sup>BHE, Minutes, 15 May 1950, no. 22, pp. 260-261.

<sup>2</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 April 1950, no. 25, pp. 206-209.

<sup>3</sup>United States, Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States (1976), series H690-H692.

<sup>4</sup>Mead to Carman, 5 April 1939; Mead, "Report for 1938-1939," c. Spring 1939, p. 16; Dr. Walter A. Knittle, "Memorandum on a Two-Year Evening Session Curriculum for Adults," c. 1945-1946, CC Files, 3.51, Evening Session; Acting Dean Mayers, "Report to Members of the Evening Session Advisory Council and the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum," 2 December 1955, "Appendix A," pp. 1-22, CC Files, 4.23, School of Business-I.

<sup>5</sup>Mead to Carman, 5 April 1939; "Comparison by College of Selected Data Compiled from Student Questionnaires for the Evening Sessions of New York City's Colleges," 2 October 1939, CC Files, 3.12, Evening Session Committee; Evening Session Committee, "Letter and Report to the BHE," 21 December 1939, CC Files, 3.12, Evening Session Committee; BHE, Minutes, 11 June 1940, no. 2, pp. 356-357; Committee on Program and Personnel, "A Brief Summary of a Proposal for the Reorganization of the Evening and Extension Sessions of the Municipal Colleges, plus, A Summary of Proposal for the Expansion of Higher Education and Non-Matriculated Adult-Level Education in New York City," 25 June 1946, CC Files, 3.44, Evening Session; Harry N. Wright, President, CCNY to Walter A. Knittle, Director, Evening Session, Main Buildings, 1 October 1946, CC Files, 3.52, Evening Session; A. Broderick Cohen, Director, Evening and Extension Sessions, Hunter College, "Resolution Adopted by the Council of Evening Session Directors," 7 March 1947, CC Files, 3.52, Evening Session; BHE, Minutes, 21 March 1949, no. 9, pp. 106-111.

<sup>6</sup>Committee on Program and Personnel, "Proposal for the Reorganization of the Evening and Extension Sessions," 25 June 1946; Wright to Knittle, 1 October 1946.

<sup>7</sup>Cohen, "Resolution of Evening Session Directors," 7 March 1947, containing 22 March 1947 notation.

<sup>8</sup>Bernard Levy, Director, Uptown Center, School of General Studies, Evening and Extension Divisions, "Report for the Academic Year, September 1952-June 1953," June

1953, CC Files, 4.22, Reports; Levy, "Report for the Academic Year, September 1953-June 1954," 31 July 1954; Mayers, "Report to the Evening Session Advisory Council," 2 December 1955, p. 5; Levy, "Report for the Academic Year, September 1955 to June 1956," 1 October 1956.

<sup>9</sup>Love, "Notes on Developments and Plans in the Evening and Extension Division," 3 May 1954.

<sup>10</sup>Levy, "Report for the Academic Year, September 1953-June 1954," 31 July 1954, p. 5.

<sup>11</sup>The Committee on Standards, "Report," 12 May 1955, sections I, II, III, pp. 1-3, 8-11, CC Files, 4.22, Reports.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., section VII, pp. 1-2.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., section VII, pp. 1-6.

<sup>14</sup>Middle States Association, Report (4-7 December 1955), pp. 73-77.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 67.

<sup>16</sup>Philip H. Brunstetter, "Summary and Recommendations from A Study of Student Withdrawals at the CCNY Uptown Center, Day Session, in 1951," (New York: Teachers' College, 1956), pp. 140-142, CC Files, 4.22, Reports. This study suggested a high correlation between admission to the B.A. program on the basis of the composite score, and withdrawal from the College.

<sup>17</sup>In recent years (since 1978), CCNY has administered to all its students a "two-year" proficiency test in reading, writing and mathematics. See Office of Academic Affairs, CUNY, "Freshman Skills Assessment Program-Student Information Bulletin." Similar screening devices are employed at other colleges throughout the United States.

<sup>18</sup>Levy, "Report for the Academic Year, September 1955 to June 1956," 1 October 1956, pp. 4-5.

<sup>19</sup>Levy, "Report for the Academic Year, September 1952-June 1953," June 1953, p. 1; Levy, "Report for the Academic Year, September 1953-June 1954," 31 July 1954, pp. 15-16.

<sup>20</sup>Middle States Association, Report (4-7 December 1955), pp. 74-75.

<sup>21</sup>The Committee on Standards, "Report," 12 May 1955, section II, p. 2; Levy, "Report for the Academic Year, September 1955-June 1956," 1 October 1956, p. 2; "College to Clean Out Dead Wood in Evening Session," in Catholic Views (An Undergraduate Newspaper of the City College Evening Division), November 1956, p. 1, CC Files, 4.12, Special Committee on Religion, 1955-1957.

<sup>22</sup>Daniel P. Clarke, Jacob S. Orleans, and Sidney R. Reiter, Office of Research and Evaluation of Teacher Education, CCNY, "Municipal College Admissions: A Study of Trends," April 1954, CC Files, 4.22, Reports.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., pp. 11-14.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., pp. 45-50.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., pp. 48-51, adapted from tables 4.2, 4.3.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>31</sup>See, for instance, Edward B. Fiske, "Academic Courses Lose Favor," The New York Times, 26 April 1983, pp. C1, C8.

<sup>32</sup>An additional matter which became a volatile issue in the late-1960s was the overlapping, or convergence, of the granting of the "general" diploma to lower-class and minority students, versus the awarding of the "academic" high school diploma to the City's middle-class, predominant white students.

<sup>33</sup>BHE, Minutes, 16 November 1953, no. 12, pp. 564-575; 17 May 1954, no. 8, pp. 256-261; 30 September 1954, no. A, pp. 497-501; 28 September 1955, nos. B, C, 2, pp. 435-441; 24 September 1956, no. A, pp. 455-461. Also, Clarke, Orleans, and Reiter, "Municipal College Admissions," April 1954, p. 2; Joseph B. Cavallaro, Chairman, BHE to the Members of the Faculties of the Four Municipal Colleges, February 1955, reprinted in BHE, "Quarterly Newsletter," CC Files, 4.22, Reports; Assistant Registrar [unidentified], School of Business and Civic Administration to Professor Lewis Mayers, The College, regarding Programs below the Bachelor's Degree level in Institutions

of Higher Education, 20 January 1956, CC Files, 4.23, Evening and Extension-Downtown-IBT; Robert L. Taylor, Registrar to Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, President, The City College, 21 February 1957, CC Files, 4.11, Admissions.

<sup>34</sup>See, for instance, BHE, Minutes, 10 March 1937, pp. 170-173; 21 November 1938, no. 60, pp. 1110-1113; 16 January 1939, no. 72, pp. 108-109; 15 May 1939, no. 91, pp. 558-561. Also, Gideonse, "The Scope of Higher Education in New York City," 17 March 1947.

<sup>35</sup>BHE, Minutes, 16 February 1953, no. 6, pp. 56-59; 19 December 1955, no. 2, pp. 718-719; 21 May 1956, no. 30, pp. 270-275; 23 September 1957, no. E, pp. 340-343; 16 December 1957, no. D, pp. 590-595; 16 December 1957, no. 3, pp. 600-605; 15 December 1958, no. 2, pp. 590-593; 16 February 1959, no. 4A, pp. 36-39; 21 March 1960, no. 5A, pp. 75-79.

<sup>36</sup>BHE, Minutes, 15 December 1958, no. 2, pp. 590-593.

<sup>37</sup>BHE, Minutes, 20 February 1950, no. A, pp. 54-61; 22 January 1951, no. B, pp. 3-5; 21 May 1951, no. 18, pp. 246-249; 19 June 1951, no. 1, pp. 472-473; 22 January 1952, no. 5, pp. 2-5; 17 May 1954, no. 8, pp. 256-261; 19 November 1956, no. 8, pp. 614-619.

<sup>38</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 May 1954, no. 8, pp. 256-261; 18 April 1955, no. 8, pp. 208-213; 28 September 1955, no. 2, pp. 435-441; BHE, Community College Minutes, 24 September 1956, no. CA, pp. S-27-31. SICCC was established under sec. 126 of the Education Law.

<sup>39</sup>BHE, Community College Minutes, 28 September 1961, no. CA, pp. S-65-67.

<sup>40</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 May 1954, no. 8, pp. 256-261.

<sup>41</sup>BHE, Community College Minutes, 16 April 1956, no. C7, p. S-18.

<sup>42</sup>BHE, Community College Minutes, 24 September 1956, no. CA, pp. S-27-31.

<sup>43</sup>Pardue and Ryder, p. 21.

<sup>44</sup>BHE, Community College Minutes, 21 January 1957, no. C5, p. S-2; 18 February 1957, no. C2, pp. s-9-11; 23 September 1957, no. CB, pp. S-34-35; 18 November 1957, no. C2, pp. S-44-45; 21 April 1958, no. C4, pp. S-20-21; 28 September 1959, no. C2B, pp. S-44-45; BHE, Minutes, 21 April 1958, no. 3, pp. 132-133.

<sup>45</sup>BHE, Community College Minutes, 26 September 1960, no. CC, pp. S-48-51.

<sup>46</sup>BHE, Community College Minutes, 19 May 1958, no. C22, pp. S-26-31.

<sup>47</sup>Pardue and Ryder, "Appendix A"; BHE, Community College Minutes, 15 July 1958, no. C4, p. S-40; 17 November 1958, no. C12, pp. S-57-58; 15 December 1958, no. C6, pp. S-59-63; 20 April 1959, no. C5, pp. S-19-21; 25 April 1960, no. C2, pp. S-18-21; BHE, Minutes, 20 April 1959, no. 2, pp. 143-149.

<sup>48</sup>Sponsorship of the New York City Community College of Applied Arts and Sciences was transferred to the BHE on July 1, 1957. This ended a twelve-year period when the Institute existed as an independently-operated public college. See BHE, Minutes, 12 April 1954, no. 6, pp. 192-199; BHE, Community College Minutes, 22 October 1956, no. C1, p. S-33. The drive to place the technical institute under BHE jurisdiction may be compared with the 1930 struggle of the BHE to control the newly-created Brooklyn College.

<sup>49</sup>See BHE, Community College Minutes, 19 December 1955, no. C7, pp. S-1-4; 20 February 1956, no. C5, pp. S-8-11. Non-New York State residents were charged \$375 per term. New York City contributed \$250 per student who was a resident of the City; \$125 for each New York State resident. Counties of residence were charged \$125 for each New York State student in attendance at the New York City community colleges. By 1959, tuition fees at the three community colleges had risen to \$525. See BHE, Community College Minutes, 19 May 1958, no. C19, pp. S-26-31; 16 March 1959, no. C22, pp. S-12-17; 20 April 1959, no. C4, pp. S-19-21; BHE, Minutes, 18 May 1959, nos. 17, 18, pp. 226-231.

<sup>50</sup>BHE, Minutes, 16 April 1956, no. 9, pp. 202-205; 21 May 1956, no. 30, pp. 270-275; BHE, Community College Minutes, 20 May 1957, no. C7, pp. S-24-27; 29 September 1959, no. C2B, pp. S-44-45.

<sup>51</sup>BHE, Community College Minutes, 20 February 1956, no. C6, pp. S-8-11; 16 April 1956, no. C6, p. S-18; 19 May 1958, no. C15, pp. S-26-31; 21 November 1960, no. C29, p. S-72.

<sup>52</sup>BHE, Community College Minutes, 24 September 1956, no. C7, pp. S-27-31; 17 December 1956, no. C7, pp. S-37-39; 15 June 1959, no. C21, pp. S-38-39.

<sup>53</sup>BHE, Community College Minutes, 16 February 1959, no. C3, p. S-7; 25 April 1960, no. C12, pp. S-18-21; 19 December 1960, no. C4, pp. S-73-79. Remedial English had, on one prior occasion, been offered for foreign students

attending CCNY. See BHE, Minutes, 24 June 1946, no. 11, pp. 204-205.

<sup>54</sup> Joseph M. Feld, Chairman, Committee on the State University to Dr. Walter Willig, President, SICC, plus, "Report of the Legislative Conference of the City Colleges," 27 March 1957, pp. 1, 2, CC Files, 4.34, SICC. Also see BHE, Community College Minutes, 20 February 1956, no. C3, pp. S-8-11; 17 February 1958, no. C6, pp. S-6-7, regarding the controversy over transfers from community to senior colleges.

<sup>55</sup> BHE, Community College Minutes, 28 September 1959, no. C2B, pp. S-44-45; 26 September 1960, no. CC, pp. S-48-51.

<sup>56</sup> BHE, Minutes, 28 September 1959, no. 2B, pp. 354-357; 28 September 1961, no. 5C, pp. 384-389; BHE, Community College Minutes, 24 September 1962, no. CA, pp. S-65-69.

<sup>57</sup> BHE, Minutes, 28 September 1961, no. 5C, pp. 384-389.

<sup>58</sup> BHE, Minutes, 13 December 1960, no. A, pp. 630-637; 17 December 1962, no. 2, pp. 670-675; BHE, Community College Minutes, 20 February 1961, no. C2, pp. S-8-11.

## CHAPTER XI

THE MUNICIPAL COLLEGE SYSTEM AT THE  
TURN OF THE DECADEA. The Space Problem

Even with the stabilization of enrollment in the early-1950s, CCNY's space shortage persisted.<sup>1</sup> In September 1951, the College had become a co-ed institution; the creation of the School of General Studies and the accreditation of the Associate degree programs in 1952, as well as an expansion of post-graduate work during the 1950s overtaxed the institution. Referred to derogatorily as a "classroom factory," the College instituted such emergency measures as the rehabilitation of basements and attics. These facilities were "clearly far from satisfactory." The loss of Army Hall by CCNY, and its conversion to P.S. 192 further exacerbated matters. The lack of space ultimately resulted in the "denial of admission to worthy high school graduates."<sup>2</sup>

In desperation, CCNY President Wright issued "A Plea for the Purchase of the Manhattanville Property." He thus called upon the City of New York "to do the obvious: acquire for its great free college the absolutely essential space."<sup>3</sup> The purchase was finally concluded, but occupancy

of the new site was deferred for lack of funds.<sup>4</sup> In September 1954, the College occupied South Campus, an 18-1/2 acre property along Convent Avenue, extending from 130th to 135th Streets. In Fall 1955, the College began conducting classes on its new campus.<sup>5</sup>

Yet the addition of South Campus did not dramatically ease overcrowding: the College was "now overcrowded in pleasant surroundings." Upon occupancy of the new property, CCNY was forced to relinquish to New York City Army Hall as of July 1, 1955.<sup>6</sup> Thus, despite the addition of ten buildings, containing 86 classrooms, the acquisition of the Manhattanville property yielded to CCNY only a net gain of ten classrooms.<sup>7</sup> CCNY began discreet discussions to acquire the High School of Music and Art, situated between the College's North and South Campuses.<sup>8</sup>

By the late 1950s, both the Downtown and the Uptown Centers of CCNY were again facing acute space shortages. In 1957, CCNY received 2000 applications, yet accepted under 200 new students. "The Board attributes the situation to a lack of adequate facilities."<sup>9</sup> Registrar Taylor stated, "With an increased demand for admission, it is quite possible that our standards for admission may have to continue to rise if we are to keep within our physical facilities and staffing."<sup>10</sup> The situation at the building on 23rd Street and Lexington Avenue was depicted as "indescribably congested, well-nigh fantastic." Plans were initiated to construct a "skyscraper college," with

"high speed elevators." The situation caused students and faculty to "jam waiting cues like the Times Square subway in rush hour. Inevitably, they arrive irritated and late. What a way to run a College!"<sup>11</sup>

When the new Cohen Library was finally opened in May 1958, more than 35,000 books which had been kept in dead storage for three decades were finally made accessible.<sup>12</sup> The College also accelerated construction of the new Technology Building, scheduled for completion in 1960. The Technology Building, Steinman Hall, was actually opened in Fall 1962, making available 33 more classrooms.<sup>13</sup>

Meanwhile, President Buell G. Gallagher initiated discussions with City officials to obtain additional facilities. The long-considered proposal to surrender the High School of Music and Art to CCNY and relocate the school in the Lincoln Center area of the City was revived, and received BHE approval.<sup>14</sup> Efforts were also made to utilize Jasper Oval, awarded to the College during the World War II years as the site of a future science and physical education building.<sup>15</sup>

A space shortage was also felt at other municipal colleges. Throughout the post-WWII era, Hunter, Brooklyn and Queens Colleges attempted to expand their campuses and renovate old facilities.<sup>16</sup> The exclusion of applicants was directly attributed to the lack of accommodations.

The lack of space results in the denial of admission to a great number of worthy graduates of the city high schools as a result of which, undeniably, the community sustains a great loss in being unable to provide adequate facilities for the training of many promising young citizens.<sup>17</sup>

College administrators also raised admission standards in order to "freeze enrollments." "Enrollment could be 12,000 (in the Brooklyn College School of General Studies) if we followed admissions standards that were in effect three years ago. We have been moving all standards up as 8,500 is all we can handle."<sup>18</sup> Thus, at the threshold of the 1960s, and the imminent arrival on-campus of the post-War "baby boom," the Colleges still faced the apparently chronic space problem. The lack of facilities, which resulted directly in the limitation of the size of the incoming class, would become an increasingly critical dilemma as the decade progressed.

#### B. State Funding

With the creation of community colleges in New York City, the municipal college system, operated under the BHE, received its first State monies since 1948.<sup>19</sup> Under section 6307 of the State Education Law, the State supplied one-half of the capital costs and one-third of the operating costs of two-year colleges.<sup>20</sup> The latter years of the 1950s decade saw ongoing efforts, by City and BHE officials, to obtain a similar funding formula for the first two years of education in the four-year colleges.

The campaign waged in Albany to obtain additional

State monies for the municipal college system was based, almost entirely, on the premise that higher education had been defined, since the creation of SUNY in 1948, by the State government as a function of the State. The establishment of community colleges within the geographic boundaries of New York City under the "community college formula" served to buttress the City's claims to State assistance for its colleges and to intensify lobbying efforts. It should be recalled that City officials, since the termination of World War II, had consistently been calling upon the Albany government to meet its responsibilities toward higher education in the Downstate area in the same manner as it was subsidizing Upstate colleges.<sup>21</sup>

Beginning in 1957, a variety of proposals and bills were introduced into the Legislature which would have provided State funding for the municipal college system.<sup>22</sup> All efforts proved unsuccessful, until the passage of Chapter 392 of the Laws of 1959. This bill became section 6215 of Article 125 of the State Education Law.<sup>23</sup> The 1959 bill provided State funding for one-sixth of the operating costs of the first two years of the senior colleges. No funds were provided for the acquisition of properties or capital construction costs. Teacher training programs were not to be included in calculations for State funding under Chapter 392; these would be funded independently.<sup>24</sup>

The following year, Chapter 418 of the Laws of 1960 provided New York City's municipal college system with

additional State support. This bill supplied one-third of operating costs in the first two years of undergraduate studies and one-half of capital costs of the municipal colleges. Appropriations for the full operating costs of teacher training programs were also granted.<sup>25</sup>

With the passage of these bills, the municipal college system removed restrictions on the admission of New York State residents who were not residents of the City. Such students, and their county-of-residence, were each charged one third of the operating costs for their education.<sup>26</sup> A special resolution provided for the continuance of New York State students in the municipal college system, beyond the junior year, provided that they met the same requirements as did transfer students.<sup>27</sup> A supplementary bill was passed in Fall 1960 which, as a direct result of increased revenues provided by Chapter 418, allowed the admission of 428 extra students: 271 New York City Freshmen, and 157 out-of-City students.<sup>28</sup>

### C. Attacks on the Municipal College System

#### 1. The Free Tuition Issue

The bills providing State aid to New York City's colleges were enacted at a critical point in time. In Winter 1958-1959, the city government of New York had slashed 5% in City College's operating budget. New York City's Chamber of Commerce, The New York Times, and other

concerns began issuing statements in favor of the imposition of tuition charges at the Colleges. The CCNY Alumni Association, which had long identified as its main aim "the safeguarding and extension of free higher education," issued the following statement:

There is one alternative: state aid. The only other possibility, the imposition of tuition fees on the student body, is unacceptable to the overwhelming majority of City College alumni. It would mean the end of free higher education in this city, as we and the generations before us have known it.<sup>29</sup>

The Alumni Association thus energetically lobbied for the passage of State aid bills. In exchange for this support, the Colleges would admit non-New York City, New York State residents on a tuition-free basis.

It was felt that the imposition of fees on one group of students would provide a precedent that, in time, might be used as an argument by local "economy" groups for levying tuition fees on students from New York City as well.<sup>30</sup>

The plan for the imposition of tuition provided for a "means test" which would exempt students from low-income families from payment. This plan was vigorously attacked not only by the Alumni Association, but by other organizations in the City. On pragmatic grounds, the means test was criticized as a measure which would set up a large bureaucracy, thereby already squandering a large percent of anticipated income from tuition. Additionally, estimates of the Colleges' student bodies defined 50% as coming from low income groups, with an additional 25% from lower-middle income families. These persons would be completely or par-

tially exempt from payment of tuition fees.<sup>31</sup>

The imposition of tuition was also criticized on normative, and later, on political grounds. The proposed abolition of the free tuition policy of the Colleges was characterized as a measure which would instantly destroy the essential character and the mission of the Colleges.

For the plain truth is this: free higher education is a necessity. Not primarily because the students themselves will profit as individuals--but because the city, state and nation will profit from it. Today, in the most complex era of history human beings have ever known, educated minds are more important than ever before.<sup>32</sup>

The Colleges had, since the founding of The Free Academy, through their policy of free higher education, served as a "welcoming beacon to the eager, ambitious children" of immigrants from Europe. As a "dramatic symbol of hope and democratic opportunity--a place where ability alone was the sole criteria of how far an individual could go," the Colleges provided the means for each new group of Americans "to climb to the next highest rung of the socio-economic ladder."<sup>33</sup>

Today, there are new groups of young people desperately eager for the door of opportunity to be opened to them. These are the children of Negro families and Spanish-speaking families from the Caribbean who are now enrolling in increasing numbers at the city colleges. They are the youngsters who ask only for a chance to make their own contribution to the fabric of American society, students who come from under-privileged homes where, in many instances, a college education is still a strange concept. They need every bit of encouragement and support they can get.<sup>34</sup>

Thus, the rhetoric utilized in defense of the free tuition policy drew upon elements of the mission of the

Colleges which had emerged over the previous century. Higher education--and particularly, a free higher education, available to all possessing an ability to profit from it--was essential to civic well-being. It provided a critical avenue for individual social mobility. Additionally, the Colleges of New York City had served, and intended to continue to serve, a unique purpose: the advancement and integration of diverse ethnic groups into the economic and social fabric of the nation.

The strongest attack on the Colleges' free tuition policy emerged in The Heald Report of November 1960.<sup>35</sup> This report to Governor Rockefeller and the State Board of Regents was characterized by the Alumni Association as "one of the most dangerous threats ever made to free higher education in The City of New York." In particular, the Report urged the imposition of a uniform tuition fee throughout the State of \$300. Rebates would be available for students of families with incomes under \$5000.<sup>36</sup>

As on prior occasions, the Alumni Association was the staunchest defender of the free tuition policy. The existence of tuition fees at SUNY, which was merely ten years old, did not logically justify a similar system at the municipal colleges.

[SUNY] does not pretend to be selective in its admissions nor are its academic standards comparable with the highly selective standards of the city colleges.

To institute a tuition fee for the municipal colleges would open the door to further attempts to impose an

artificial and damaging uniformity at the "lowest common denominator" which in the long run would depress academic standards at the city colleges.<sup>37</sup>

Tuition would continue to rise "as a result of political and economic pressures" to a point where "all but the rich and well-born" would be "priced out of the higher educational market."<sup>38</sup>

The proposal to allow rebates on tuition was particularly repugnant. Characterized as a "dressed-up version of the traditional 'pauper's oath' which was discarded by educational pioneers more than a century ago," the "degrading and demoralizing" procedure would "humiliate and discourage many able students"--particularly those from non-White ethnic groups.<sup>39</sup>

The Alumni Association was joined in its campaign against tuition fees at New York City's colleges by a wide range of civic groups. These included the Urban League, the Public Education Association, the United Parents Associations, the New York City Committee on Intergroup Relations, the City Central Labor Council, and others. Additionally, key newspapers and college officials issued statements in support of the free tuition policy. A campaign was mounted to fight "any attempt to delete from the charter of the city colleges the phrase calling for the extension of the benefits of education gratuitously."<sup>40</sup>

The campaign in Albany would prove only partially successful. In April 1961, a small clause in an unrelated

bill would give the BHE discretionary power to decide upon the imposition of tuition at the municipal colleges. These developments will be discussed below.

## 2. The City/State Struggle for Control

With the passage of Chapter 418 of 1960, State officials and others renewed efforts to incorporate the City-operated college system into the State University of New York. Attempts had been periodically made at least since the inception of the Board of Higher Education in 1926 to destroy the independent, local nature of New York City's colleges. On several occasions, bills had been introduced into the Albany legislature to dissolve the BHE and/or the municipal college system.<sup>41</sup>

But the most direct attack on the municipal college system appeared in The Heald Report. The report recommended the administrative reorganization of the city college system, with the governance of the Colleges being "radically revised to include [a sizeable number of] representatives of the State University."<sup>42</sup> This recommendation was particularly vexing in view of the fact that of the one hundred consultants to the report, "not a single one represented the BHE or the city colleges--despite the fact that the municipal college system was the largest higher educational complex in the nation." The Heald Report thus appeared to reject the concept of local autonomy, or "home rule" in educational matters. The Alumni Association,

and other groups, fought for the maintenance of the principle that "State aid to education should not be followed by State control. We will oppose any attempt to wrest control of the Colleges from the citizens of this city and turn the municipal college system into a political grab-bag."<sup>43</sup>

The Heald Report issued yet an additional recommendation which denigrated the municipal colleges' traditions and achievements. Heald proposed the state-wide establishment of new institutions which would offer doctoral degree programs. A unit on Long Island, in Stony Brook, was envisioned as that center which would serve the New York City area. In issuing this proposal, the State Committee ignored the Colleges' existing Masters programs, which served in excess of 10,000 students. No notice was taken in the Heald Report to BHE plans to expand these Masters programs through the Doctoral level.<sup>44</sup>

#### D. The Committee to Look to the Future

In Spring 1959, the BHE appointed a Committee to Look to the Future (CLF). By Fall 1960, the Committee, chaired by Mary S. Ingraham, had begun reporting to the BHE. After completion of statistical and factual profiles on the College system and New York City's population, the CLF sponsored the following resolution:

It is the purpose of the Board to do all we can to open the doors of our colleges to a larger number of qualified high school students and to extend educational opportunity to such students.<sup>45</sup>

In committing the Colleges to the extension of higher education in New York City, the Board commented:

Of course, we need space. The question that we have before us is: Space for whom? For how many? Space for what? The nature of the space and the location.<sup>46</sup>

Thus, the expansion of access in the 1960s would be critically concerned with the issues of student merit and the availability of facilities, as well as an expansion and re-definition of the mission of the Colleges.

The report of the Committee to Look to the Future was submitted to the BHE on December 13, 1960. The proposal challenged the substance and thrust of The Heald Report, as related to New York City's colleges.

The major recommendation pertained to the reorganization of the municipal college system. "The name of The College of the City of New York should be changed to indicate university status."<sup>47</sup> The university would build upon the 113-year tradition of free undergraduate education and develop additional programs leading to the M.A., Ph.D. and other professional degrees. The City of New York, containing the largest pool of academic talent which could be channelled into graduate instruction, was now, with the advent of significant State assistance, in a position to embark on this expanded venture.

While the CLF urged joint planning and cooperation with the New York State Board of Regents, SUNY, the State Legislature and the Governor, the integrity and independence of the municipal college system would be preserved,

and, indeed, strengthened. Thus, a Chancellor would conduct liaison activities as well as serve as the chief educational officer of The City University. The Chancellor, as Chairman of the Administrative Council, would also be responsible for the administration of university-wide policy: for the initiation and implementation of policies set by the BHE.<sup>48</sup>

Thus, the new City University of New York would not be absorbed into the State University system and would not be controlled by State officials. On December 19, 1960, the Board of Higher Education resolved that the name of the municipal college system be changed to The City University of New York. Legislation would be sought to include the new name in section 6202 of the State Education Law.<sup>49</sup>

For the next few months, a campaign was fought in Albany to officially create The City University of New York. The BHE saw The City University as "performing a significant role in helping the state discharge its obligations regarding higher education."<sup>50</sup> Thus, efforts were undertaken to insure that CUNY be assured a status "co-equal with SUNY," and be permitted to prepare its own Master Plan.

In addition, New York sought to preserve its 113-year mandate of tuition-free higher education for residents of the City, while continuing to receive State funding. As

has been noted earlier, a threat to both of these goals appeared in motions to change the orientation of the BHE through the appointment by State officials of additional BHE members.<sup>51</sup> Nonetheless, on April 11, 1961, Chapter 388 was signed into law, creating The City University of New York.<sup>52</sup>

Yet the success of the legislative battle was not complete. On the same day, April 11th, another bill, Chapter 389, creating a statewide Scholar Incentive Plan, was signed into law. This bill contained a clause, section 21, which repealed the tuition-free mandate of the municipal colleges and substituted therefor a tuition policy at the discretion of the Board.<sup>53</sup> Thus, the sentence in section 6202 of the Education Law which required the Board to "furnish the benefits of collegiate education gratuitously to citizens who are actual residents of the city" was deleted. For the next fifteen years, a battle would be waged in Albany, in New York City and within the chambers of the BHE over the imposition of tuition fees at the municipal colleges.<sup>54</sup>

The authority to award the Ph.D. degree was granted by the Board of Regents to The City University of New York in November 1961.<sup>55</sup>

#### E. Toward the 1960s

With the creation of The City University of New York in April 1961, the municipal college system embarked

on a new era in its history. For the first time in nearly one hundred years, all of New York City's collegiate institutions would be, in fact and not only on paper, governed by the same policies. The BHE would finally attain the binding "legislative" power over individual college activities intended in the 1926 law which created that body. Furthermore, the various colleges would now be subject to the administrative authority of a "chief executive": the Chancellor of The City University.

The creation of CUNY also spurred-on the absorption of a significant undertaking by the CUNY system. Heretofore, evaluations of and long-range planning for the municipal college system had been undertaken on a sporadic basis, almost entirely by independent "outside" concerns. Now this function would be internalized within the CUNY system. The development of a centralized administration for all public post-secondary education in New York City would give rise to a series of detailed, yearly Master Plans for the CUNY system. The ability to set an overall goal for the mammoth educational bureaucracy would, in the 1960s, foster a rapid growth in the number of municipal colleges, more fluid and uniform transfer regulations between junior and senior colleges and a series of innovative and imaginative "special admissions" programs.<sup>56</sup>

But the "new" municipal college system would face in the 1960s a series of increasingly difficult, complex and intensifying dilemmas. The major problem would be one

of "supply and demand": applications to all of the University's units and programs would far exceed available spaces.<sup>57</sup> The number of high school graduates who would apply to the Colleges was and would be described as a "tidal wave."<sup>58</sup>

The space problem intensified the debate concerning the two major themes which controlled access to public higher education in New York City: student merit and the mission of the colleges. Concern was voiced over the raising of admission standards "beyond the point which separates good college material from those with marginal ability."<sup>59</sup> Yet simultaneously, the University was urged not to pursue a policy of "arbitrary expansion of the undergraduate enrollment if it means a lowering of academic standards." Thus, a distinction was drawn, already before 1961, between "free higher education for the able" and "free higher education for all."<sup>60</sup>

In the 1960s, as a result of both historical circumstance and internal organizational development, the mission of the Colleges, as related to student access, would be vastly expanded. Consideration would be given increasingly to the integration of the second-tier, the "competent" student, into the University system.<sup>61</sup> Additionally, the municipal colleges would develop unique programs geared for a third-tier of students: the admittedly "unprepared" student.<sup>62</sup> Student transfer between programs would emerge

as an ever-more-critical issue.

The broadened mission of the College system and the degree of actual implementation of expansion efforts would necessitate a vastly expanded capital and operating budget for the municipal colleges. Increasingly, the State government would be called upon to assume a larger share of the cost of higher education in New York City. The campaign by CUNY advocates to obtain this funding would be based on the claim that the State fully assume its responsibility to fund post-secondary education.<sup>63</sup>

Efforts to increase State assistance to The City University system would, however, bring about challenges to the independence of the CUNY system, especially as related to the State University of New York system. In particular, the free tuition policy of the Colleges would be jeopardized in the aftermath of the imposition of the Open Admissions policy.

#### F. Summary

As the 1950s came to a close, the municipal colleges faced both long-standing and severe, newly-emergent problems. Inadequacy of facilities, despite ongoing coping measures and even capital improvements, persisted as a major impediment to the expansion of access to post-secondary education within New York City. The advent of State funding to the Downstate area, to the measure granted Upstate State University of the New York units, was to benefit the

municipal colleges enormously. Nonetheless, State aid proved to be the catalytic agent which jeopardized the independence, integrity and local nature of the municipal colleges.

The legislative federation of The City University of New York was to precipitate the unparalleled growth of the College system. Nonetheless, the simultaneous legal negation of the "free tuition mandate" would propel the University into a bitter struggle in Albany. This ongoing battle would result in 1976 in the demise of the 129-year tradition of free public higher education in New York City.

<sup>1</sup>In 1953, the BHE noted that the Colleges were entering upon "a period of downward adjustment of admissions averages." This was caused by an unprecedented movement from the City to the suburbs, with population replacement "by an immigrant group which does not present applicants for admission to college." See BHE, Minutes, 19 October 1953, no. 10, pp. 512-515.

<sup>2</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 February 1949, no. 9, pp. 52-55; 21 March 1949, no. 15, pp. 106-111; 16 May 1949, no. 2, pp. 196-203.

<sup>3</sup>Wright, "No Other Place To Go," c. 1950.

<sup>4</sup>BHE, Minutes, 20 November 1950, no. 14, pp. 574-575; 19 May 1952, no. 2, pp. 233-235; 20 April 1953, no. 2, pp. 172-175; 28 September 1953, no. B, pp. 434-435.

<sup>5</sup>"On the Campus-Student Center Site," Alumnus, vol. 46, no. 4, March 1951, pp. 10-11; Wright, "A College Leads, A College Learns," 14 April 1952, pp. 67-69; "On the Campus--Student Union Site," Alumnus, vol. 48, no. 1, October 1952, pp. 6-7; Morton Gottschall, "Student Center in Sight," Alumnus, vol. 48, no. 3, February 1953, pp. 8-9; "The New South Campus," Alumnus, vol. 49, no. 2, November 1953, pp. 2-7; "New Names for College Buildings," Alumnus, vol. 50, no. 1, October 1954, pp. 2-9; "Evacuation of Army and Finley Halls by July 1, 1955," c. Spring 1955, CC Files, 4.14, Joint Consultation Meeting; "On the Campus--The New South Campus Opens," Alumnus, vol. 51, no. 1, October 1955, pp. 10-15; Buell G. Gallagher, President, CCNY, "The New . . . and the Old," 9 November 1955, CC Files, 4.25.

<sup>6</sup>Wright, "A College Leads, A College Learns," 14 April 1952. Army Hall had been acquired on February 22, 1943. See BHE, Minutes, 21 February 1949, no. 9, pp. 52-55.

<sup>7</sup>BHE, Minutes, 17 April 1961, no. 71B, pp. 224-229.

<sup>8</sup>BHE, Minutes, 23 January 1956, no. 10, pp. 22-23.

<sup>9</sup>"Enrollment Pressures," Alumnus, vol. 53, no. 4, January 1958, pp. 2-7.

<sup>10</sup>"Have City College Students Changed?" Alumnus, vol. 53, no. 5, March 1958, pp. 2-11.

<sup>11</sup>Buell G. Gallagher, President, CCNY, "The Baruch School: Capital Budget Needs," 29 June 1957, CC Files, 4.23, School of Business-I.

<sup>12</sup>"The New Cohen Library," Alumnus, vol. 53, no. 6, April 1958, pp. 2-7.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.; "The New Tech Building," Alumnus, vol. 53, no. 7, June 1958, pp. 2-7; "David B. Steinman Hall," Alumnus, vol. 56, no. 3, December 1960, pp. 2-9; BHE, Minutes, 24 September 1962, no. A, pp. 457-465.

<sup>14</sup>Buell G. Gallagher, "Removal of High School," Letter to The New York Times, 18 February 1957; "On the Campus-[assorted regarding] Dr. Buell G. Gallagher," Alumnus, vol. 56, no. 7, June 1961, pp. 2-9.

<sup>15</sup>BHE, Minutes, 16 December 1957, no. D, pp. 590-595; 26 September 1960, no. 4A, pp. 356-359; 13 December 1960, no. A, pp. 630-637; 20 March 1961, no. 2, pp. 88-89; 17 April 1961, no. 71B, pp. 224-229; 28 September 1961, no. 5C, pp. 384-389; Harry N. Rivlin, Acting President, CCNY, "Report," 31 August 1961, CC Files, 4.25.

<sup>16</sup>BHE, Minutes, 18 March 1946, no. 15, pp. 78-81; 22 September 1947, no. B, pp. 368-371; 20 October 1947, no. 10, pp. 420-433; 15 November 1948, no. 6, pp. 526-533; 24 October 1949, no. C, pp. 473-477; 16 February 1953, no. 6, pp. 56-59.

<sup>17</sup>BHE, Minutes, 22 April 1946, nos. 2, 3, pp. 111-119; 17 November 1947, no. 6, pp. 468-471; 21 February 1959, no. 9, pp. 52-55; 15 February 1954, no. 9, pp. 62-69.

<sup>18</sup>BHE, Minutes, 24 September 1956, no. B, pp. 455-461; 23 September 1957, no. E, pp. 340-343; 28 September 1959, no. 2, pp. 354-357.

<sup>19</sup>Chapter 695 of 1948 had provided a State subsidy for the College's fifth year teacher training programs.

<sup>20</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 May 1956, no. 32, pp. 270-275; 22 September 1958, no. 15, pp. 380-383; BHE, Community College Minutes, 15 December 1958, no. C2, pp. S-59-63.

<sup>21</sup>BHE, Minutes, 22 April 1946, no. 2, pp. 111-119; 21 April 1947, no. 2, pp. 152-153; 17 November 1947, no. 6, pp. 468-471; 15 December 1947, no. 4, pp. 523-527; 15 March 1948, nos. B, 4, pp. 98-101; 15 November 1948, nos. 2, 6, pp. 526-533; 21 February 1949, nos. 8, 9, pp. 52-55; 8 April 1949, no. 3, pp. 152-157; 17 March 1952, no. 5, pp. 104-105; 21 April 1952, nos. 3, 4, pp. 172-179; 17 Novem-

ber 1952, no. 6, pp. 626-629; 20 April 1953, no. 2, pp. 172-175; 12 April 1954, no. 6, pp. 192-199; 28 September 1955, no. B, pp. 435-441.

<sup>22</sup>BHE, Minutes, 18 March 1957, nos. 2, 3; 22 April 1957, no. 2, pp. 142-145; 23 September 1957, nos. B, E, pp. 340-343; 16 December 1957, no. D, pp. 590-595; 17 February 1958, nos. 5, 7, pp. 34-35; 17 February 1958, no. 68, pp. 74-75; 21 April 1958, no. 3, pp. 132-133; 22 September 1958, no. 15, pp. 380-383; 15 December 1958, no. 6, pp. 600-603; 16 February 1959, no. 2, pp. 36-39; 16 March 1959, no. 2, pp. 73-79; BHE, Community College Minutes, 18 November 1957, no. C2, pp. S-44-45.

<sup>23</sup>Laws of New York. Chapter 392, enacted on 16 April 1959. This act, and Chapter 418 of 1960, were sponsored by State Legislators Mitchell and Brook.

<sup>24</sup>BHE, Minutes, 20 April 1959, nos. B, 2, pp. 143-149; 20 April 1959, no. 75, pp. 206-207; 18 May 1959, no. 75, pp. 206-207; 18 May 1959, no. 16, pp. 226-231; 16 November 1959, no. 74, pp. 608-611; "On the Campus--Budget Request," Alumnus, vol. 55, no. 1, October 1959, pp. 14-15; "On the Campus--Out-of-City Students," Alumnus, vol. 55, no. 3, December 1959, pp. 8-9.

<sup>25</sup>Laws of New York. Chapter 418, enacted 8 April 1960. See especially sections 3, 4, 5, 6. Also, BHE, Minutes, 21 December 1959, nos. 10, 15, pp. 626-631; 21 March 1960, no. 5A, pp. 75-79; 25 April 1960, no. 2, pp. 136-143; 16 May 1960, no. 85, pp. 252-253; BHE, Community College Minutes, 19 December 1960, no. C1, pp. S-73-79.

<sup>26</sup>BHE, Minutes, 20 April 1959, no. 75, pp. 206-207; 18 May 1959, nos. 16, 17, pp. 226-231; 21 December 1959, no. 15, pp. 626-631.

<sup>27</sup>BHE, Minutes, 16 May 1960, no. 15, pp. 224-225; 21 November 1960, no. 83, pp. 628-629; 15 May 1961, no. 18, p. 249.

<sup>28</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 November 1960, no. 6, pp. 558-563.

<sup>29</sup>Harold A. Lifton, "A Crisis at the College," Alumnus, vol. 54, no. 1, October 1958, pp. 8-13; Clifford O. Anderson, "The Case Against Tuition Fees," Alumnus, vol. 55, no. 1, October 1959, pp. 6-9.

<sup>30</sup>Lifton, "A Crisis at the College," October 1958.

<sup>31</sup>Anderson, "The Case Against Tuition Fees," October 1959.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid.

<sup>35</sup>Henry T. Heald, Chairman, with Marion B. Folsom and John W. Gardner, Meeting the Increasing Demand for Higher Education in New York State, A Report to the Governor and the Board of Regents from the Committee on Higher Education (Albany: November 1960). To be designated here as The Heald Report. The Committee on Higher Education had been appointed by Governor Rockefeller; Heald was President of The Ford Foundation.

<sup>36</sup>Clifford O. Anderson, "A Reply to the Heald Report," Alumnus, vol. 56, no. 4, January 1961, pp. 2-9.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid.

<sup>40</sup>Murray A. Gordon, "Let's Keep Our City Colleges Free," Alumnus, vol. 56, no. 5, March 1961, pp. 2-7.

<sup>41</sup>See, for instance, BHE, Minutes, 22 April 1930, pp. 202-205 and 12 March 1931, pp. 196-197 regarding the "Downing-Steingut bill" to abolish the BHE and establish in its stead a "University of Greater New York." Other such attempts were made to place New York City's colleges under direct New York State control. See, for instance, BHE, Minutes, 27 February 1939, no. 5, pp. 336-337; 19 February 1945, no. 2, pp. 46-47; 16 April 1945, no. 6, pp. 107-115; 18 February 1952, no. 13, pp. 54-55; 15 February 1954, no. 6, pp. 62-69.

<sup>42</sup>Anderson, "A Reply to the Heald Report," January 1961.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.; Gordon, "Let's Keep Our City Colleges Free," March 1961, esp. pp. 6-7.

<sup>44</sup>Anderson, "A Reply to the Heald Report," January 1961.

<sup>45</sup>BHE, Minutes, 26 September 1960, no. 4A, pp. 356-359; 21 November 1960, no. 7, pp. 558-563. Mary Ingraham had long been active at the BHE in efforts to upgrade and extend offerings of the Evening Sessions.

<sup>46</sup>BHE, Minutes, 26 September 1960, no. 4A, pp. 356-359.

<sup>47</sup>BHE, Minutes, 13 December 1960, no. A, pp. 630-637. The corporate name "The College of the City of New York" has not been used in this work in order to avoid confusion with the name "The City College of New York," the institution founded in 1847 as The Free Academy.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.; The appointment of a Chancellor had been considered on prior occasions since the post-World War II era. See, for instance, The Strayer Report; also, BHE, Minutes, 21 April 1952, no. 4, pp. 172-179; 17 November 1952, no. 6, pp. 626-629; 30 September 1954, no. A, pp. 497-501; 18 April 1955, no. 7, pp. 208-213; 20 June 1955, no. 2, pp. 315-317; 28 September 1955, no. B, pp. 435-441; 24 September 1956, no. A, pp. 455-461; 23 September 1957, no. C, pp. 340-343; 28 September 1959, no. 2A, pp. 354-357.

<sup>49</sup>BHE, Minutes, 19 December 1960, no. 5, pp. 650-653.

<sup>50</sup>BHE, Minutes, 13 December 1960, no. A, pp. 630-637.

<sup>51</sup>BHE, Minutes, 23 January 1961, no. 6A, pp. 2-5; 20 February 1961, no. 4, pp. 43-45.

<sup>52</sup>Laws of New York. Chapter 388. Enacted 11 April 1961. Also, BHE, Minutes, 17 April 1961, no. 3, pp. 160-163.

<sup>53</sup>Laws of New York. Chapter 389. Enacted on 11 April 1961.

<sup>54</sup>The loss of the tuition-free mandate also spurred CCNY President Buell G. Gallagher to resign. Gallagher, who had been a staunch advocate of the establishment of The City University and the provision by the State of substantial monies for graduate programs in New York City, was elected Chancellor of the State College System in California. Harry N. Rivlin, Dean of Teacher Education, was appointed as CCNY's Acting President. Gallagher would return to CCNY as President in January 1952. See BHE, Minutes, 17 April 1961, no. 71, pp. 224-229; 15 May 1961, no. 4A, pp. 232-233; "Gallagher Insists on City University," The New York Times, 15 March 1961; Leonard Buder, "Gallagher to Head California Colleges," The New York Times, 7 April 1961; "City Gives Award to Dr. Gallagher," The New York Times, 17 May 1961; "On the Campus--[assorted regarding] Dr. Buell G. Gallagher," Alumnus, June 1961, pp. 2-9.

<sup>55</sup>BHE, Minutes, 24 September 1962, no. A, p. 459.

<sup>56</sup>The need for long-range planning had grown during the late-1950s. The Committee to Look to the Future, under section 6202 of the Education Law, organized a Master Plan Study for CUNY. See BHE, Minutes, 19 November 1956, no. 8, pp. 614-619; 27 October 1958, no. 7, pp. 452-455; 20 March 1961, no. 2, pp. 88-89; 19 June 1961, no. 9, pp. 302-305; 28 September 1961, no. 4, pp. 384-389; 23 October 1961, no. 6A, pp. 552-553; 21 November 1961, no. 5, pp. 626-635.

<sup>57</sup>BHE, Minutes, 28 September 1959, no. 2B, pp. 354-357; 25 April 1960, no. 2, pp. 136-143; 26 September 1960, no. 4A, pp. 356-359; 13 December 1960, no. A, pp. 630-637; 17 April 1961, no. 71B, pp. 224-229; 28 September 1961, no. 5C, pp. 384-389; BHE, Community College Minutes, 28 September 1959, no. C2B, pp. S-44-45; 26 September 1960, no. CC, pp. S-48-51; 20 February 1961, no. C2, pp. S-8-11; 28 September 1961, no. CA, pp. S-65-67; Gallagher, "Removal of High School," The New York Times, 21 February 1957; "On the Campus--Enrollment Pressures," Alumnus, January 1958, pp. 2-7; "Have City College Students Changed?" Alumnus, March 1958, pp. 2-11; Lifton, "A Crisis at the College," October 1958; "City College Head Fights Entry Bar," The New York Times, 7 February 1960.

<sup>58</sup>Lifton, "A Crisis at the College," October 1958; BHE, Minutes, 20 December 1965, no. 10, pp. 542-547.

<sup>59</sup>BHE, Minutes, 13 December 1960, no. A, pp. 630-637.

<sup>60</sup>Lawrence Podell, "The Alumni Take a Census," Alumnus, vol. 53, no. 7, June 1958, pp. 10-11, citing results of a survey of CCNY graduates.

<sup>61</sup>See, for example, Robert L. Taylor, "Will Your Youngster Get into College?" Alumnus, vol. 56, no. 3, December 1960, pp. 2-9.

<sup>62</sup>See, for example, "On the Campus--Operation Talent Search," Alumnus, vol. 55, no. 1, October 1959, pp. 14-15. College Discovery and SEEK would become the most famous of these CUNY endeavors.

<sup>63</sup>Lifton, "A Crisis at the College," October 1958; "The President's Report," Alumnus, vol. 55, no. 6, December 1960, pp. 16-21.

## CHAPTER XII

## CONCLUSION

This work has examined the relationship between educational policy and social policy. We have traced and analyzed the determinants and processes effecting access to The City College of New York. We have also identified the articulated rationales for the continuance of a system of free public higher education in New York City.

The dominant characteristic portrayed by CCNY has been the continual expansion of access: expansion of the size of its student body, of its physical plant, of the scope of its curriculum and of the diversity of its constituency.

From the inception of The Free Academy until the legislative federation of CUNY, the institution extended post-secondary educational benefits to an ever-increasing pool of students. This was accomplished despite constant technical and administrative difficulties, despite the absence of funding available to tuition-charging and private colleges and despite occasional setbacks. The 1960s witnessed an exacerbation of impediments to this expansion: nonetheless, the extension of access continued, even accelerated during this period.

A single continuously-evolving element was responsible for the growth of the municipal college system. This factor, the mission of The City College, was apparent already within a few years after CCNY's creation.

The Free Academy was established to provide a quality curriculum, comparable to that of Ivy League colleges. CCNY was to train the social and economic elite, thus supplying future political leadership. Simultaneously, the College was created to serve the electorate of New York City. A practical curriculum was to supply vocational training for the City's working classes. The College was also to instill manhood and citizenship in its students. Thus, the middle and working classes would be taught their civic responsibilities; all classes would be taught mutual respect for the other distinct groupings within the City.

By the post-Civil War era, CCNY, but especially the newly-founded Normal College for Women, had assumed the responsibility of adequately preparing the City's public school teachers. This service to the City grew in proportion and importance as waves of Eastern European immigrants were absorbed by New York. The socialization and acculturation of these new groups was incorporated into the College's mission.

The emergence of new trades and occupations gave rise to the articulation of the final element of CCNY's mission, the overcoming of class barriers. Heretofore, diverse economic and social groups had been accepted into

the College for different ideological reasons. Each class had been and was prepared for its own unique task within society. Now, however, the education of lower classes would facilitate class mobility. Education, and in particular, higher education, was regarded as that agent which could engender movement between social groupings and end inherited economic privilege.

By the time of the centralization of New York City's public school system and the consolidation of Greater New York, the mission of the municipal colleges had been fully developed. The abolition of class privilege became the critical factor in the rationale for the expansion of free public higher education in New York City. From the turn of the century until 1961, and indeed, up to the late 1960s, leaders and supporters of the municipal college system did not enumerate any additional reasons for the need for higher education. Already articulated goals of catering to the City's government and business needs, as well as the engendering of an economically self-sufficient and politically enlightened citizenry were reiterated. The "frontier" of CCNY's mission became the extension of collegiate services to a larger and more diverse student body.

New York City had, in 1870, extended the benefits of higher education to women. The Hunter College mission echoed and even went beyond that espoused by City College. At CCNY itself, women students were not considered an in-

tegral part of the student body. Thus, the enrollment of women at the Day Session of the School of Business was eliminated in 1933 as the result of a shortage of facilities. In 1943, however, women were admitted to CCNY's three professional schools only because of the sudden need for additional students. Yet women were not denied a public post-secondary education: centers were available in Manhattan, The Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens. Sexual discrimination was thus not a major access issue at the municipal colleges.

In 1898, City College began courses to assist the City's public school teachers. In 1913, municipal employees were admitted to CCNY's Evening and Extension Division. During the first decades of the twentieth century, public administration and education were certified and promoted by CCNY. In 1939, the Division of Public Service was formalized, offering pre-service and in-service training for the police and fire departments. In 1954, the Police Academy was incorporated into CCNY's Baruch School of Business.<sup>1</sup> All of these measures not only reinforced the notion of service to diverse City agencies, but extended post-secondary education to an additional group of persons: New York's civil servants.

In the early part of the twentieth century, higher education was also brought to the newly-incorporated boroughs of the City. Geographic accessibility to the municipal colleges became an integral factor in considerations

of the plant expansion of CCNY. Residents of all of the City's neighborhoods and boroughs would be served by the burgeoning collegiate system.

The inclusion of commercial and mechanical arts courses in City College's curriculum served two purposes. The College catered to the industrial needs of business and engineering concerns within the City. More importantly, however, the goal of training citizens to be economically productive was attained through these early vocational programs. This facet of CCNY's mission was strengthened with the formalization of the Business, Engineering and Technology Divisions.

The process of educating New York's working classes was uniquely advanced with the establishment of the Evening Session in 1909. Persons who could not afford the luxury of forfeiting a full-day's pay while attending college could now enroll in night classes. These students were often as academically deserving as those enrolled in the Day Session: in general, however, they were not as economically self-sufficient. Higher education, for the promulgation of upward mobility, was thus a singularly important theme in the Evening Session.

The Adult Education Program and the Veterans Intensive Business Training Program served a purpose similar to that of the Evening Session. While offering only non-degree programs, these CCNY extension branches catered to working persons most-in-need of additional training. In

addition, business and commercial firms within the City were supplied with qualified personnel by these endeavors.

The creation of new tiers of students similarly extended public higher education to groups heretofore not served by the College. Without the existence of these distinct categories, given existent admissions criteria and the shortage of facilities, many less-qualified students would have been denied access to any form of public higher education. The admission of second-tier Limited-Matriculants and third-tier non-matriculants was precipitated by historic social crises: the Depression and World War II. In like manner, the Evening Session had been created earlier in response to industrialization. We may suggest that the Open Admissions policy was similarly the product of historic circumstance: the social upheavals of the 1960s. Thus, the major social crises of the 20th century engendered the unique climate and the specific conditions which resulted in dramatic attempts to broaden access to the municipal college system.

In 1944, the Strayer Report targeted 50% of New York City's high school graduates as deserving a free four-year college education. Virtually all other high school graduates would be afforded the opportunity to pursue a two-year post-secondary education of either a general or vocational nature. The Cottrell and Strayer-Yavner Reports amplified aspects of Strayer's 1944 recommendations. These three reports, however, addressed the

question of who should be educated, not why free public higher education should be provided. The reasons why that education was beneficial or necessary were assumed: they remained identical to those articulated during CCNY's earlier years.

In the mid-1960s, the College Discovery and SEEK programs admitted students not academically qualified even for Associate degree programs: a third tier of students. As noted, this type of student had been accepted by the College during the 1940s and 1950s. In the post-War period, however, underprepared students remained in the Evening Session or in off-campus programs, enrolling only as fee-paying non-matriculants. The 1960s programs, however, admitted these students as tuition-free matriculants. College Discovery and SEEK, among other novel remedial programs, were specifically instituted as overt attempts to increase minority and non-white representation among CCNY's student body. These programs thus extended CCNY's service to yet an additional segment of New York's population.

The language embodied in the 1966 CUNY Master Plan was the most dramatic articulation of CCNY's mission since the publication of the 1944 Strayer Report. The BHE announced its intention to offer admission to 100% of New York City's high school graduates by 1975: the plan for allocating students imitated that proposed by Strayer in 1944. The services of the College were to be extended to their fullest capacity. Yet even this historic an-

nouncement addressed only part of CCNY's *raison d'être*: who should be educated. The rationale for New York City providing and students pursuing a college education remained unchanged.

CCNY's mission thus reflected the ideas of the school of thought which portrayed education as providing an avenue for the social mobility of members of lower and rising classes and status groups. Thus, even while education may serve the purposes of upper classes by inculcating in the population its social and political duties, it may also provide job training and vital credentials for the lower and middle classes, giving them the opportunity for individual advancement.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, education and educational institutions may become agents for structural and cultural changes. They may engender in the lower classes economic and political ideals which have not been realized yet in society.<sup>3</sup>

In addition, in the United States, education has continuously been used to acculturate new immigrants. Thus, education became, again, the means by which new ethnic groups were either taught to accept the dominance of older groups or to assert their own individual or group aspirations. Education, in the latter case, has proven to be the means for overcoming the limits of the ongoing class system and for supplying new avenues for social mobility.<sup>4</sup>

To the degree that American society expanded and became more democratic, social class became an ever-more

achieved rather than an ascribed social characteristic. Social class became contingent, to a large measure, on the level of educational attainment. In this context, educational institutions were constantly subject to ideological conflict as espoused by different class, social and ethnic groups. In previous centuries and decades, this controversy revolved around primary and secondary education; in the twentieth century, the debate escalated to the arena of higher education. This occurred because higher education was increasingly seen as the crucial gateway to social mobility. The question of who would be the beneficiaries of higher education was not only an ideological issue, but also a political decision.

In Spring 1969, the admission of additional non-white minority students was demanded. These students typically were less academically qualified than other high school graduates: it was feared that most would require extensive remediation. The BPRSC's admissions demand, as noted in Chapter I, generated unprecedented and overwhelming opposition. Yet why was there such controversy? Minority students were already being admitted to CUNY through its special programs, College Discovery and SEEK. Why was the BPRSC's demand for the relatively-restricted expansion of access so blatantly rejected in favor of completely unrestricted access, the Open Admission policy?

The matter is puzzling. We can understand that having announced that CUNY would embark on an open enroll-

ment plan by 1975, it was possible for Bowker, given the situation at CCNY and in New York City in Spring 1979, to institute Open Admissions already in 1970. But why was there such opposition to the admissions demand? Why the public denunciations? Why the demonstrations and the riots?

Concerns were articulated that the admission of unprepared students would result in the exclusion of academically qualified students; that the admission of minority students would force the exclusion of white students. In light of the College's chronic shortage of facilities, these were legitimate and immediate problems. It was also suggested that a period of planning, preparation and experimentation was necessary prior to the CUNY-wide implementation of an open enrollment access formula. We have also noted opposition to the institution of an ethnic quota system of admissions at CUNY and the political mobilization of numerous interest groups around the admissions issue. Quotas at public institutions were legally prohibited; the subject of ethnicity had been officially taboo. Religious or racial quotas, as we have noted, had never been utilized or considered for use by the municipal colleges as overt bases for admission. Yet even the convergence of all of these factors does not sufficiently explain the Spring 1969 crisis.

We may suggest that a far greater issue was at stake. A monumental challenge to CCNY's mission was being

articulated. For the admissions demand, as posed by CCNY's BPRSC, did not address the question of who should be admitted to the College. Rather, radical groups were raising the question of why students should be accepted.

As suggested here, the extension of access to the municipal college system during the 20th century was accomplished by expanding the number and types of students allowed into CCNY. The College existed, however, for the same purposes articulated already in the 19th century: supplying a quality education, instilling manhood and citizenship, training teachers, the socialization and acculturation of immigrants and the promulgation of social class mobility. Vocational training, serving individual, government and business needs, was also stressed.

Now, however, a battle was being waged over a strident attempt to add a new dimension to the rationale of service to the public. The BPRSC intimated, nay, demanded, that CCNY's mission encompass the elimination of "institutional racism." That was the reason why minority students should be admitted: to correct an imbalance, an injustice, in the educational, economic, social and political order of the City, State and Nation.

Not once in the history of The City College had ethnicity, as an access criterion, ever been the manifest object of public debate. Discussions regarding student admissions had always incorporated and subsumed religion, national origin and race, the three facets of ethnicity,

within considerations of the expansion of access to different economic classes. Furthermore, not once in over eighty years had a challenge to the *raison d'être* of CCNY even been raised. The mission had endured, without addition or modification, since 1884. The elimination of class differences had been articulated as the final and the essential component of the College's notion of service to the public. Individual social mobility was, and could always be viewed in 20th century America, as a defensible rationale for the continuance of educational organizations. But the admission of students for the avowed purpose of eliminating alleged institutional racism was highly suspect: it was decisively rejected in 1969.

What Chancellor Bowker did, knowingly or not, was to redirect and to rephrase the admissions demand. Thus, the struggle was reinterpreted: the BPRSC's original demand was discarded. Instead, the BHE and The City University acceded to the demand for the extension of higher education to all New York City high school graduates--particularly those from the lower working classes. The goal of incorporating and integrating ethnic minorities into CUNY's student body would not be accomplished by instituting a policy which manifestly sanctioned admission on the basis of ethnic origin. While *de facto* admissions on the basis of race were tolerated, on a limited-scale, in CUNY's College Discovery, SEEK and One Hundred Scholars Programs, the BHE would not and could not institute such a policy on

a wide-range, de jure basis.

The Open Admissions policy thus buttressed CCNY's traditional *raison d'être*: the component which stressed upward mobility was reinforced. Simultaneously, however, the Open Admissions policy adroitly circumvented radical demands to redefine the College's concept of service to the public. The element of CCNY's mission which promoted social class mobility was combined with the re-legitimization of the previously-announced goal of 100% enrollment of high school graduates. A new CUNY-wide policy was thus instituted. Open Admissions not only appeared to emulate other open-access formulas in the United States, but was regarded as politically acceptable and administratively feasible.

We have presented here findings which support the hypotheses suggested in Chapter I. The expansion of access to free public higher education in New York City was an ongoing, critical and controversial theme throughout the history of CCNY. Admissions did not suddenly become an issue during "the five demands conflict" of 1968-1969. Access had been, was and will probably remain intrinsically related to the existence and development of the municipal colleges.

We have identified and examined several critical factors apparent in the Open Admissions debate. With one exception, notably the dimension of ethnicity, all issues apparent in 1968-1969 had already been vocalized as ongoing access concerns prior to the announcement of the Hundred

Scholars Program of August 1968 and the subsequent Spring 1969 crisis at CCNY. Issues of access apparent in 1969 will now be discussed in the context of prior admissions considerations.

The issue of student merit was critical to access considerations from the inception of The Free Academy. Admissions tests were administered throughout the history of CCNY. On occasion, attendance and/or graduation from a lower school was an additional or alternate requisite for admission. After 1924, high school average became the critical element determining acceptance: a small proportion of students continued to be admitted on the basis of admissions tests. Beginning in 1941, a composite score, utilizing both high school average and admissions tests, regulated the admission of students not accepted on the basis of the matriculation average. High school performance and composite score ratings continued to regulate admission to CCNY until September 1970.

Throughout the history of the institution, CCNY administrators restricted admission to the "student of merit." Four modes of access existed prior to the institution of Open Admissions. These were changed because of specific pressures external to the College, including modifications within New York City's school system. The abolition of the common school attendance requirements in 1878-1882 was effected largely because of Catholic lobbying in Albany for an "Open College." Proponents of the measure

did not define the proposed change in admissions policy in religious terms. It was argued, however, that students who attended private (including parochial) schools were systematically being excluded from the College. In 1878, religious interests emerged as a factor effecting access: this was, however, the only time prior to 1968-1969 when any aspect of ethnicity was to appear even as a latent consideration in access deliberations.

The "Open College" debate also raised the question of the relationship and responsibility of public tax-supported institutions to private, individual tax-paying groups within New York City. But it was the relationship between the City's colleges and the remainder of New York's school system which, for the entire history of the College, was the underlying theme influencing changes in the actual mode of access to the College. This relationship was an aspect of the 1878 debate; it was also the element which generated the 1900 and 1924 changes in the mode of access to CCNY. The 1900 option of allowing high school graduates to enter CCNY automatically was the result of the dramatic growth of public secondary education in New York City. The 1924 decision to establish a matriculation average was the outcome of a determination by the City's educators that not all high school graduates were college material.

Substantive changes in the mode of access were thus primarily determined by the issue of student merit,

but always in the context of a critical examination of the relation of the College to the remainder of the City's public school system.

Within each mode of access, we have documented numerous, minute, incremental modifications of admissions standards. Some of these changes occurred as a result of experimentation with the appropriate method of measuring student merit. More frequently, standards of admissions were either raised, or, as during the World War II era, lowered, dependent upon the availability of facilities. The continuous re-articulation of the *raison d'être* of the College, its mission, provided a constant ideological incentive and organizational pressure not only for expansion of the College's physical plant, but also for the maximal utilization of every inch of available space. Thus, as noted, given an almost perennial space shortage, the space issue (and concomitant budgetary priorities) tended to reinforce the merit principle and to exacerbate the severity of admissions standards.

The space issue had thus persisted throughout CCNY's entire history as a critical access consideration. After the federation of CUNY in 1961, the college system embarked on a vast capital construction program. Yet beyond the establishment of new colleges, coping measures instituted to alleviate the 1960s space crisis exerted an intensifying problematic influence on administrative and admissions procedures. Thus, during the 1960s, "tempora-

ry" facilities were leased and constructed; the Colleges also began conducting classes on Saturdays. Both of these measures generated massive public debate.<sup>5</sup> For the first time in its history, the capital growth dimension was not the only controversial aspect of the space issue. Coping measures also became conspicuously volatile and critical admissions considerations. By the time the Open Admissions crisis emerged, the question of where to accommodate enrolled students--not to mention thousands of additional Freshmen--was of paramount concern.

Other issues most apparent during the 1969 crisis also existed in earlier eras. The relationship of CCNY to government institutions, particularly to the State legislature, was a theme influencing access to the College. A chronic condition of governance of the municipal colleges was the legal prohibition and consequent inability of the Board to impose tuition charges on Day Session matriculants. The relationship between access and law was thus a constant, though primarily a latent issue, until 1961. After 1961, with the removal of the free tuition mandate, the legal status of CUNY's access policies was subject to continuous debate, both in Albany and New York City.

The issue of the relationship between the municipal colleges and State law was, however, apparent as a conspicuous access concern during the 1940s and 1950s. The legal option of waiving the admissions requirements of United States citizenship and residence in New York City generated

a host of BHE Bylaws and Resolutions which selectively implemented these principles. Thus, the admission of non-citizens and non-residents were themes which did not surface in the 1968-1969 debate: these two access issues were largely resolved prior to the Open Admissions controversy.

A related issue, but one which was not articulated in 1969, nor, for that matter, during the entire history of CCNY, was the statutory basis of provisions effecting access to CCNY. It is thus interesting to note that Open Admissions was enacted and implemented without formal inclusion in the BHE's Bylaws: the new policy was accepted and instituted only on the basis of a Board Resolution.

The involvement of political leaders in the policy-making and administration of CUNY in the late-1960s was also not a new issue. In like manner, the mobilization of diverse pressure groups around the issue of student access did not suddenly appear as a novel theme in 1968-1969. The Mayor of New York had been and was responsible for the appointment of Board members; local civic organizations had been largely responsible for the establishment of collegiate units in Brooklyn, Queens and Staten Island. What did make "the five demands conflict" so unique was the direct and intense participation of so many diverse groups in numerous and varied political actions in Spring 1969. The Open Admissions issue became a crisis of unprecedented dimensions not only because of the convergence of a multiplicity of access considerations at one moment in time,

but also because of the massive mobilization of pre-existent and spontaneously-emergent groups, both within the CUNY-community and from the City of New York at large, around the issue of student admissions.

As noted earlier, two components of the concept of ethnicity emerged in 1968-1969 as critical factors in the debate regarding access to CUNY. The explicit advocacy of national origin and race as primary bases for admission was a new phenomenon. Religion had been an influential, though not a manifestly articulated admissions consideration in the "Open College" debate of 1878. The religion of incoming students was not, however, an overt admissions issue. Clergymen and religious institutions may have and probably did sporadically influence access to the municipal college system. Thus, for example, it has been widely suggested that Hunter College, Downtown, remained an exclusively female unit primarily at the behest of the Catholic Church. Such decisions, however, were not the object of official discussion or public record. Until the 1960s, religion, as related to admissions criteria and policy, did not surface as a controversy.

While never an explicit determinant of admissions, religious affiliation was a key element of student life at CCNY. Thus, it was widely known that after 1900, at least 75% of the College's students were Jewish.<sup>6</sup> It has been suggested that a major reason for this phenomenon was the exclusionary admissions policy maintained by many U.S.

universities. The restriction of attendance at these colleges to but minimal numbers of (East coast) Jewish students enhanced the probability that Jews would attend CCNY, an institution where such quotas were never even contemplated.<sup>7</sup>

It may be suggested, however, that the College's own admissions regulations also fostered the attendance of Jewish students. CCNY's academic selectivity, coupled with the stipulation that access be extended only to residents of New York City, proved favorable to the College's acceptance of Jewish students. A preponderance of Jewish students at CCNY was further insured by restrictive housing practices in the City's suburbs.<sup>8</sup> Jews tended to excel in the City's high schools and to apply for admission primarily to the municipal colleges. They also tended to remain within New York City rather than move to Nassau or Westchester counties. The Jewish composition of the municipal college system's student body was thus a reflection of the convergence of these diverse social conditions.

During the 1960s, with the advent of the post-World War II "baby boom," CUNY instituted emergency coping measures. The initiation of Saturday classes became the catalyst for the mobilization of some Jewish groups in New York City around the admissions issue. At that point, the issue of the racial composition of CUNY began to evolve as a consideration of admissions policy.<sup>9</sup> The BHE's determination to broaden the representation of non-white stu-

dents within the municipal college system gave rise to the creation of novel admissions programs.

It was, however, not until the advent of the Hundred Scholars Program and the articulation of "the five demands" that race and national origin exploded as overt, specifically-articulated access concerns. In 1968-1969, demands were made for the mass admission of Black and Hispanic students. Knowledge of the Spanish language was to be a pre-requisite for teaching in New York City's public schools. The BPRSC demanded that the theme of the elimination of institutional racism be incorporated into CCNY's mission. The three dimensions of ethnicity--religion, national origin and race--and BHE attempts to deal with ethnicity in a traditional but coherent manner, transformed the already-critical admissions issue into an unprecedented and singularly volatile confrontation.

The final element apparent in the 1969 admissions controversy had also existed throughout the history of the municipal college system. This was the issue of the internal, organizational development of the Colleges and their attempt to predict, plan for and implement admissions programs. As noted earlier, a plan for open enrollment was already enunciated in CUNY's 1966 Master Plan. In this light, despite notable changes in the student allocation schema, the implementation of Open Admissions in 1970 instead of in 1975 was viewed as an acceleration of the over-all timetable. It should also be recalled that the

1966 Master Plan resembled, to a significant extent, the plan for the expansion of the municipal college system proposed in the 1944 Strayer Report. Thus, the mass extension of free public higher education had been a long time in the making.

But the groups who in 1968-1969 agitated for the expansion of access to CCNY were largely ignorant of the details of the 1966 Master Plan. Certainly, most had never even heard of the Strayer Report. The student groups who articulated "the five demands" therefore constituted a new and independent force. The conflict between long-range planning and ad hoc historical circumstance thus emerged once again in 1969.

Urgencies of the critical moment had resulted, in 1932, in the creation of a second tier of students in the Evening Session. Contingencies of the enrollment crisis of 1943-1944 had brought about the admission of a third tier of students, the non-matriculants. In earlier periods, the consolidation of New York City facilitated the establishment of collegiate centers in the newly-absorbed boroughs. The creation of the Evening Session was largely a response to the industrialization of the City. All of these changes were effected, to a significant degree, because of pragmatic necessities. Many critical elements of CCNY's access policies had thus developed as a result of internal, administrative dynamics and reactions to contingencies and circumstances beyond the control and prediction

of any Board or College President. The desire for administrative efficiency and integration, capital and operating budgets, and the availability of facilities, to name but a few considerations, ultimately effected access policy. These factors were crucial determinants of student admissions at CCNY as much, or even more, than previously-articulated theoretical, ideological or organizational statements of principles or goals. It may therefore be said that the minutiae of procedural decisions, effected on an ad hoc, pragmatic basis, often were and often are precisely the critical elements which influence, formulate and ultimately determine the direction and implementation of a given social policy.

<sup>1</sup>BHE, Minutes, 21 November 1938, no. 2, pp. 1062-1065; 15 May 1939, no. 91, pp. 558-561; Mead, "The Annual Report," September 1940, pp. 2, 51; The Special Committee on Trends, "Report on the Division of Public Service," September 1942; Pardue and Ryder, "Appendix A."

<sup>2</sup>See, for example, Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, The American Occupational Structure (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963); John A. Brittain, The Inheritance of Economic Status (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1977); David L. Featherman and Robert M. Hauser, Opportunity and Change (New York: Academic Press, 1978); William H. Sewell and Robert M. Hauser, Education, Opportunity and Earnings: Achievement in the Early Career (New York: Academic Press, 1975).

<sup>3</sup>See, for example, James Bryant Conant, The Citadel of Learning (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956); James Bryant Conant, Education and Liberty: The Role of the Schools in Modern Democracy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953); George S. Counts, Education and American Civilization (New York: Teachers College Press, 1952); John Dewey, Liberalism and Social Action (New York: Capricorn Books, 1935); John Dewey, The School and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956); Charles William Eliot, Educational Reform: Essays and Addresses (New York: The Century Company, 1909); T. H. Marshall, Class, Citizenship and Social Development (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1965).

<sup>4</sup>See, for example, Morris Isaiah Berger, "The Settlement, The Immigrant and the Public School" (Ph.D. dissertation, Teachers College, 1956); Selma Berrol, "Immigrants at School, 1898-1914" (Ph.D. dissertation, The City University of New York, 1967); Sherry Gorelick, "Social Control, Social Mobility and the Eastern European Jews: An Analysis of Public Education in New York City, 1880-1924" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1975); Stephen Steinberg, The Academic Melting Pot: Catholics and Jews in American Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974); Ralph Howard Weisz, "Irish-American and Italian-American Educational Views and Activities, 1870-1900: A Comparison" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1968).

<sup>5</sup>See BHE, Minutes, c. 1963-1968.

<sup>6</sup>See, for example, Glazer and Moynihan, p. 155; Irving Howe, World of Our Fathers (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976), pp. 280-282; Steinberg, especially, pp. 9-21.

<sup>7</sup>See, for example, Glazer and Moynihan, pp. 155-159; Steinberg, especially pp. 5-31; Harold S. Wechsler, The Qualified Student: A History of Selective College Admission in America (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977), pp. 131-185.

<sup>8</sup>See, for example, Glazer and Moynihan, pp. 159-165.

<sup>9</sup>See BHE, Minutes, especially for 1966.

APPENDIX A  
PRESIDENTS  
OF  
THE CITY COLLEGE

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Horace Webster                                    | 1849-1869                              |
| Alexander Stewart Webb                            | 1869-1902                              |
| Alfred George Compton - Acting<br>President       | Dec. 1902 - Sept. 1903                 |
| John Huston Finley                                | 1903-1913                              |
| Adolph Werner - Acting President                  | 1910-1911 and<br>Nov. 1913 - Nov. 1914 |
| Sidney Edward Mezes                               | 1914-1927                              |
| Carlton Brownson - Acting<br>President            | Dec. 1918 - June 1919                  |
| Frederick Bertrand Robinson -<br>Acting President | June 1926 - Feb. 1927                  |
| Frederick Bertrand Robinson                       | 1927-1939                              |
| Nelson Prentiss Mead -<br>Acting President        | Sept. 1938 - Feb. 1941                 |
| Harry Noble Wright - Acting<br>President          | Feb. 1941 - Dec. 1941                  |
| Harry Noble Wright                                | 1941-1952                              |
| Buell Gordon Gallagher                            | 1952-1969                              |
| Harry N. Rivlin - Acting<br>President             | June 1961 - Feb. 1962                  |

APPENDIX B  
CHAIRMEN  
OF  
THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Year Elected

|      |                      |
|------|----------------------|
| 1926 | Moses J. Stroock     |
| 1932 | Mark Eisner          |
| 1938 | Ordway Tead          |
| 1953 | Joseph B. Cavallaro  |
| 1957 | Gustave G. Rosenberg |
| 1966 | Porter R. Chandler   |

APPENDIX C

BHE BYLAWS: STUDENT ADMISSIONS

Amendments to Major Codifications

| <u>Content</u>   | <u>1939 Version</u>    | <u>1955 Version</u> | <u>1959 Version</u> |
|--|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Citizens, who are N.Y.C. residents, in courses leading to the B.A.--free; additional technical, professional or special courses, to citizens who are N.Y.C. residents and to qualified non-matriculants--free or otherwise | §151-a*                | §210-a              | §17.1               |
| Non-citizens, who are N.Y.C. residents, if they or their parents applied for citizenship--free   | §151-b(1)*             | §210-b(1)           | §17.2-a             |
| Non-citizens, who are N.Y.C. residents, as non-matriculants--pay fees  | §151-b(2)<br>[3/17/41] | §210-c(1)           | §17.3-a             |
| Foreign exchange students--free  | §151-c<br>[9/23/40]    | §210-b(2)           | §17.2-b             |

\*Adopted as Article X of the 1932 version of BHE Bylaws on 6/29/38.

| <u>Content</u>  | <u>1939 Version</u>              | <u>1955 Version</u>  | <u>1959 Version</u>                                    |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Citizens of foreign nations, as matriculants--free                | §151-d<br>quota: 25<br>[9/23/40] | §210-b(3)<br>quota: 50   | §17.2-c<br>quota: 50                                   |
|   | quota: 50<br>[5/19/52]           |  | quota: 75,<br>including 25<br>from Africa<br>[1/23/61] |
| Non-resident WWII veterans, for 7 years, under GI bill            | §151-e<br>[10/22/45]             | --   | --   |
| Non-resident sons or daughters of BHE or staff members--free      | §151-f<br>[4/16/51]              | §210-b(4)  | §17.2-d  |
| Citizens, even non-residents, to A.A./A.A.S. programs--pay fees   | §151-g<br>[6/15/53]              | §210-c(2)  | §17.3-b  |
|   |                                  | §210-c(2)<br>At fee rate<br>of non-matriculants<br>[10/21/57]                      |  |
| Non-citizens and/or non-residents, to graduate programs--pay fees | §151-g<br>[6/15/53]              | §210-c(2)  | §17.3-c  |
|   |                                  | §210-c(3)<br>N.Y.S. residents<br>in Teacher Education programs--free<br>[10/21/57] |  |

| <u>Content</u>   | <u>1939 Version</u> | <u>1955 Version</u>    | <u>1959 Version</u> |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Children of U.N. personnel:<br>25 to colleges, 25 to HC<br>Elementary and High Schools--<br>free | §151-h<br>[6/15/54] | §210-b(5)              | §17.2-e             |
| Residents of U.S. territory,<br>dependency or possession,<br>10 students--free                   | §151-i<br>[1/17/55] | §210-b(6)              | §17.2-f             |
| Citizens, who are non-resi-<br>dents, to State-aided (Edu-<br>cation) programs--free             | --                  | §210-b(7)<br>[9/28/55] | §17.2-g<br>§17.3-c  |
| Children of N.Y.C. employees<br>who are required to live<br>outside N.Y.C.--free                 | --                  | §210-b(8)<br>[4/22/57] | §17.2-h             |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

The following items are located in the Archives of the Board of Higher Education of The City of New York.

- Board of Higher Education. Bylaws. 1926-1976.
- Board of Higher Education. Document Collection. 1969.
- Board of Higher Education. Minutes of the Proceedings. 1926-1976. (Designated here as BHE, Minutes.)
- Board of Higher Education. Minutes of the Meetings of the Board of Higher Education Acting as the Board of Trustees of a Community College. 1955-1976. (Designated here as BHE, Community College Minutes.)
- Board of Higher Education. A Forty-Six Year Summary of the Board of Higher Education of The City of New York. Compiled by Pardue, Duncan B., and Ryder, Suzanne P. December 1973.
- Board of Higher Education. Progress Report: September 25-December 5, 1969. December 1969.
- Board of Higher Education. Second Interim Revision of the 1964 Master Plan for the City University of New York. June 1966. (Designated here as BHE, 1966 Master Plan.)
- Board of Higher Education. "Summary of Public Hearings Before the BHE on the Report of the Commission on Admissions." 22 October 1969; 5 November 1969.
- Board of Higher Education. University Commission on Admissions. Report and Recommendations to the Board of Higher Education. 7 October 1969.

The following items are located in the Archives of the Library of Brooklyn College of New York.

- Brooklyn College. Bulletin. 1940-1942.

The following items are located in the Archives of the Morris R. Cohen Library of the City College of New York.

- City College. Alumni Register: The College of the City of New York, 1853-1945. Edited by Donald A. Roberts. 1946.
- City College. The Alumnus. 1926, 1932, 1941 through 1976.
- City College. Board of Trustees. Minutes of Proceedings. 1847-1929. (Designated here as CC Trustees, Minutes.)
- City College. Bulletin. 1925-1961.
- City College. Bylaws. 1847-1929.
- City College. The Campus. 1968, 1969.
- City College. Executive Committee. Minutes of Proceedings. 1847-1900. (Designated here as CC Trustees, Minutes.)
- City College. Observation Post. 1968, 1969.
- City College. Presidential Files. (Designated here as CC Files, drawer number, file name.)
- City College. Year of Dedication, 1955-1956.
- Cottrell, Donald P.; Rondileau, Adrian; and Schumer, Leo A. Public Higher Education in the City of New York: Report of the Master Plan Study. Albany: January 1950. (Designated here as The Cottrell Report.)
- Daily News (New York), 1969.
- Daily News. World Almanac and Book of Facts. New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, 1973.
- Daily World (New York), 1969.
- Heald, Henry T. Meeting the Increasing Demand for Higher Education in New York State. Albany: November 1960. (Designated here as The Heald Report.)
- The following items are located in the Archives of the Library of Hunter College of New York.
- Hunter College. Board of Trustees. Minutes of Proceedings. 1871-1900. (Designated here as HC Trustees, Minutes.)

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.  
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.  
Report of the Evaluation of The City College, New  
York, New York. 4-7 December 1955. (Designated  
here as Middle States Association. Report.)

The New York Post, 1969.

New York State. Education Law. 1847-1976.

The New York Times, 1932, 1969.

O'Brien, Katherine L. "Annual Report on the Office of  
 Adult Services, New York Public Library, for 1960-  
 1961." 1961.

Spaulding, Francis Trow. High School and Life: Report of  
the Regents' Inquiry. New York and London: McGraw-  
 Hill Book Company, 2nd printing, 1938.

Strayer, George D., Director. Report of a Survey of the  
Colleges Under the Control of the Board of Higher  
Education of The City of New York. Albany: Legis-  
 lative Documents, 167th Session, January 1944,  
 "Appendix II," pp. 386-711. (Designated here as  
The Strayer Report.)

Strayer, George D., and Yavner, Louis E., Directors. Ad-  
ministrative Management of the School System of  
New York City: Report of Survey of The Board of  
Education and The Board of Higher Education. New  
 York: Mayor's Committee on Management Survey, Octo-  
 ber 1951. (Designated here as The Strayer-Yavner  
Report.)

United States. Bureau of Education. Annual Report of the  
Commissioner of the Bureau of Education. Washing-  
 ton: 1878, 1905.

United States. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Cen-  
 sus. Historical Statistics of the United States:  
Colonial Times to 1970. Washington: Government  
 Printing Office, 1976.

Young, Owen D., Chairman. Report of the Temporary Commis-  
sion on the Need for a State University. Albany:  
Legislative Documents, 16 February 1948. (Desig-  
nated here as The Young Report.)

B. Secondary Sources

- Berger, Morris Isaiah. "The Settlement, The Immigrant and the Public School." Ph.D. dissertation, Teachers College, 1956.
- Berrol. Selma. "Immigrants at School, 1898-1914." Ph.D. dissertation, The City University of New York, 1967.
- Blau, Peter, and Duncan, Otis Dudley. The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963.
- Bowker, Richard Rogers. The College of the City of New York, 1847-1895. New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1895.
- Brittain, John A. The Inheritance of Economic Status. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1977.
- Buros, Oscar Kristen, ed. The Third Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1949.
- Collier's Encyclopedia, 1962 ed. S.v. "Military Service," "Veterans' Benefits."
- Columbia Encyclopedia, 1950 ed. S.v. "New York State," "Selective Service."
- Conant, James Bryant. The Citadel of Learning. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Education and Liberty: The Role of the Schools in a Modern Democracy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.
- Cosenza, Mario E. The Establishment of The College of The City of New York as the Free Academy in 1847. New York: Teachers College Press, 1925.
- Counts, George S. Education and American Civilization. New York: Teachers College Press, 1952.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Dewey, John. Liberalism and Social Action. New York: Capricorn Books, 1935.

- . The School and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Draper, Andrew S. "The New York Secondary School System." in Annual Report of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Education. Washington: 1905, pp. 143-149.
- Eliot, Charles William. Educational Reform: Essays and Addresses. New York: The Century Company, 1909.
- Featherman, David L., and Hauser, Robert M. Opportunity and Change. New York: Academic Press, 1978.
- Glazer, Nathan, and Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1963.
- Gordon, Sheila C. "The Transformation of The City University of New York, 1945-1970." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1975.
- Gorelick, Sherry. "Social Control, Social Mobility, and the Eastern European Jews: An Analysis of Public Education in New York City, 1880-1924." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1975.
- Hammack, David Conrad. "Participation in Major Decisions in New York City, 1890-1900: The Creation of Greater New York and the Centralization of the Public School System." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1973.
- Harris, Townsend; Bosworth, J.S.: and Mason, John L. Memorial. New York: George F. Nesbitt, Stationer and Printer, 1847.
- Henschel, Albert E. Municipal Consolidation: An Historical Sketch of Greater New York. New York: n.p. 1895.
- Horowitz, Murray M. Brooklyn College: The First Half-Century. New York: Brooklyn College Press, distributed by Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Howe, Irving. World of Our Fathers. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- Lavin, David E., and Neumann, Florence M. "Reaction to Confrontation: Let Everyone In." in Lavin, David E.; Alba, Richard D.; and Silberstein, Richard A. Right Versus Privilege: The Open Admissions Experiment at The City University of New York. New York: The Free Press, 1981, pp. 1-27.

- Marshall, T. H. Class, Citizenship and Social Development: Essays. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1965.
- Mayer, Martin. "Higher Education for All?: The Case of Open Admissions." Commentary (February 1973).
- Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Oxford History of The American People. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Palmer, R. R., ed. Atlas of World History. New York: Rand McNally and Company, 1957.
- Ravitch, Diane. The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805-1973. A History of the Public Schools as Battlefield of Social Change. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Rudy, S. Willis. The College of the City of New York: A History--1847-1947. New York: The City College Press, 1949.
- Sayre, Wallace S., and Kaufman, Herbert. Governing New York City: Politics in the Metropolis. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1960.
- Schudson, Michael S. "Organizing the 'Meritocracy': A History of the College Entrance Examination Board." Harvard Educational Review 42 (February 1972): 34-69.
- Sewell, William Hamilton, and Hauser, Robert M. Education, Opportunity and Earnings: Achievement in the Early Career. New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Steinberg, Stephen. The Academic Melting Pot: Catholics and Jews in American Higher Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1974.
- Stokes, I. N. Phelps. The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909. New York: Arno Press, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. New York Past and Present: Its History and Landmarks, 1524-1939. New York: Plantin Press, 1939.
- Surrey, David S. Choice of Conscience: Vietnam Era Military and Draft Resisters in Canada. New York: Praeger Special Studies, J. F. Bergin Publishers, 1982.

- Tyack, David B., ed. Turning Points in American Educational History. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967.
- Van Pelt, Daniel. Leslie's History of Greater New York. Arkell Publishing Company, 1899.
- Veysey, Laurence R. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Wechsler, Harold S. The Qualified Student: A History of Selective College Admission in America. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977.
- Weisz, Ralph Howard. "Irish-American and Italian-American Educational Views and Activities, 1870-1900: A Comparison." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1968.
- Women's City Club of New York Inc. The Privileged Many: A Study of The City University's Open Admissions Policy, 1970-1975. New York: n.p., 1975.