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To What Extent does a Social Compact Exist between Higher Education and Society: A study of two Minnesota Universities

Laurie Woodward

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the nature, applicability and usefulness of social contract theory, and the resulting compact between higher education and society as a way to understand the growth and development of higher education in the United States. The goal is accomplished with an in-depth look at two different universities in the state of Minnesota at four different periods or pivotal points in the history of higher education in the United States. The underlying assumption was that if there is a social compact between higher education and society, traces of its existence would be found in the historical evidence concerning the relationship of these two institutions to society at distinct points in time.

The study reaffirms the idea that the social compact between higher education and society is a shared reality, constructed and reconstructed each time that expectations of either party change – it is a social construct. As such, it is always changing and reforming as colleges and universities balance demands from the public and services they provide. The nature of the compact has changed as the nature of Higher Education has changed.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Newman and Couturier (2002) contend that higher education has always occupied a special place in society, that it is “the creator of knowledge, a producer of leaders and the engine of the economy and in return has received public support, reduced public scrutiny, and exemption from taxes” (p. 6). In their book, *The Future of Higher Education*, the authors go further saying that institutions of higher education were intended to serve as social critics, providing the basic societal need of truth, rationality, objectivity, and integrity (Newman, Couturier, & Scurry, 2004). In a recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Harry Lewis (2007) says that higher education has a moral responsibility to prepare students for civic engagement and that “the spiritual ideal of American democracy will not survive if universities fail to preserve it” (p. B20). Colleges and universities have also been seen as avenues for social mobility and levelers of society in the United States (Tocqueville, 1835/1966).

This role that higher education has played in the history and development of American society is often described as the compact, charter, or contract between higher education and society (Kezar, 2004). Although the compact is viewed as largely symbolic by some authors, it has been used by scholars and civic leaders in various stages of the development of higher education to invoke themes of democracy, access, citizenship, and other public benefits of higher education. Modern scholars seem to be using the concept of the compact to influence and perhaps to change the culture of higher education and to rebuild
public support for it in our contemporary world (Mills, 1988). By reminding educators about the social compact between higher education and society these authors are attempting to: a) underpin and emphasize historic roles of higher education, perhaps even harkening back to a more traditional approach to curricular development where leadership and civic responsibility are taught along with vocational skills, b) redefine colleges and universities as instruments of social mobility and access for all, c) place a higher emphasis on teaching, learning and research for public good, d) demonstrate the link between higher education and democracy, e) rejuvenate public interest in and funding of higher education, and f) reinforce the value of higher education.

Many contemporary authors contend that the social compact between the nation and higher education has been weakened if not broken (Kezar, Chambers & Burkhardt, 2005). The idea that the role of higher education in developing citizenry and enhancing society has been replaced by financial and marketplace concerns is prevalent in contemporary scholarly writings (Kezar et al., 2005; Newman & Couturier, 2002; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). So, too, is the idea that the basis of support for higher education is shifting. Lower levels of public funding, calls for accountability and standardized testing, and the emergence of a plethora of for profit institutions are all indicators of this downward shift in support for higher education (Kezar et al., 2005).

Respect for the institution of higher education has also waned (Bok, 2003). Some scholars claim that society simply has less respect for all public institutions and that higher education still maintains its place as number two
behind the military ("American Council," 1997). Others blame the declining respect for higher education on the high participation rates that have allowed the public to become more familiar with the institution of higher education and less likely to hold it on a pedestal. Immerwahr and Johnson (2007) contend that there is a difference between public perception of higher education and the perception held by leaders in government, higher education, the media, and corporate sectors. The public views higher education from the perspective of the individual and the leaders view higher education from the perspective of the needs of society and the economy. In either case, this perceived lack of respect for higher education is evidenced by lowering levels of state and federal support, decreased public support, and frequent calls for accountability.

In *Higher Education for the Public Good*, authors Kezar, Chambers and Burkhardt (2005) discuss the social compact between higher education and society, with a focus on the responsibilities that higher education has to society. This includes educating citizens to serve our democracy, training leaders for public service, and developing ways to improve society. In *The Making of an American High School*, Labaree (1988) suggests that the high school was founded to produce citizens for the new republic but soon transformed into a way for individuals to change their status in society. Brint and Karabel (1989) state that one of the original functions of the community college was to foster “the development of a citizenry fully equal to the arduous task of democratic self governance” (p. 232). More recently, a group of doctoral students at the 2006 Hawaii International Conference on Education wrote a paper titled “Renewal of
the Unspoken Compact: Counteracting the Impacts of Globalization on Higher Education.” These students and many others suggest that society initially founded institutions of higher learning for the good of society and question if these institutions are still fulfilling this role.

In an attempt to address concerns about accountability, funding, competition from the private sector, and respect for the institution of higher education, scholars seem to be focusing on the idea of a social compact (Newman et al., 2004). Many books and articles discussing higher education’s divergence from its original social compact have been published (Kezar et al., 2005). Some authors contend that funding issues have led higher education away from its intended social responsibilities as it becomes more dependent on corporate sponsorship for its research funding. (Kezar et al., 2005; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Others discuss issues of globalization that overshadow national interest (Newman et al., 2004). A third group of scholars seems to be responding to the neoliberal demand that public costs of higher education be further curtailed by reminding us of the role that higher education plays in maintaining our democracy (Kezar et al., 2005).

In the flurry of writing on this topic, few scholars have taken the time to scrutinize the role that social contract theory played in the development of higher education in America or even the degree to which a social compact between higher education and society ever existed. If it can be shown that a social compact existed as more than a rhetorical justification for our system of higher education, it would add weight to the debate about the future roles and goals of
higher education. If it did not exist and if social contract theory had no impact on the development of higher education, the nature of the argument might be altered significantly.

Higher education literature seems to use the words contract, covenant, compact, and charter almost interchangeably. In defining a social contract, Rousseau (2002) says that “each of us puts in common his person and all his power under the supreme direction of the general will; and, in return each member becomes an indivisible part of the whole” (p.164). Locke, Hobbes, and their contemporaries consider a social compact to be an agreement people make among themselves to create a government to rule them and to protect their natural rights (Smith, 1974). In this agreement the people consent to obey the laws created by that government (Pestritto & West, 2003). John Fiske, in his 1890 Treatise on the Origin of Civil Government in the United States says that the word charter originally meant simply a paper or written document, carefully preserved as irrefragable evidence of the transaction. The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (2001) uses the word covenant to describe the relationship between higher education and society. These words are all being used to define the socially articulated relationship between higher education and society.

It’s important at this point to note the difference between a) social contract theory, which essentially states that government cannot exist unless the individuals involved consent to being governed and b) the give-take relationship between higher education and society, which will be called the social compact for
the purposes of this paper. The latter, the social compact between higher
education and society, can be considered a manifestation of that former
overarching philosophy as applied to a specific agency of society. The same
thought process could be applied when considering the military, the health care
industry, transportation, or any of the other services that support our democracy.
However, the topic and content of this paper is higher education and how its
development has been influenced by a social contract notion and the resulting
compact between higher education and society.

In summary, as modern authors continue to discuss the broken compact
between higher education and society, it becomes increasingly important to look
at its historical underpinnings and evolution.

*Purpose of the Study*

This dissertation will explore the nature, applicability and usefulness of
social contract theory, and the resulting compact between higher education and
society as a way to understand the growth and development of higher education in
the United States. This purpose will be accomplished with an in-depth look at four
distinct Midwestern colleges and universities at four different periods or pivotal
points in the history of higher education in the United States. The underlying
assumption is that if there is a social compact between higher education and
society, traces of its existence will be found in the historical evidence concerning
the relationship of these four institutions to society at distinct points in time.

The issue which gives impetus to this study is an assertion by a group of
contemporary authors that the social contract between higher education and
society has been broken and is in need of repair (Kezar et al., 2005). Following this line of reasoning, a natural question to ask is about previous examples of the social compact at work in higher education. This study is an attempt to understand and respond to the idea that social contract theory played a significant role in the development of higher education and to identify and provide examples of that role throughout four distinct periods in the history of American higher education.

The study will feature an historical approach guided by traditional archival methods. Historical analysis is “a method of discovering, from records and accounts, what happened in the past” (Marshall & Rossman, 1994, p. 89). The goal will be to find traces of the social compact between higher education and society at pivotal points in the history of higher education. If a social compact exists between higher education and society, institutional traces of its existence should be found most easily at the intersections between key points in the history of our country and the role of higher education within it (pivotal events) and the responses and developments in select institutions. Triangulation of information from both primary and secondary sources will be used to establish the validity of the traces of a social compact between the selected institutions and society.

Assumptions

In this paper I make the assumption that social contract theory provides a meaningful way to look at the history of higher education. Thus, my second assumption is that if a social charter ever existed between higher education and society, institutional traces of its existence should be found most easily at the
intersections of key points in the history of higher education and the responses from select institutions.

Research Questions

This paper will primarily address the following questions:

1. Can evidence of a social compact between higher education and society be found at specific points in time and as a result of pivotal events in the history of higher education at the two Minnesota Universities included in this study?

2. How has the compact changed over time and how do each of the institutions reflect the changes?

3. How has the evolution of the social compact affected the support that these institutions receive from society?

Theoretical Framework

In 1778, William Manning, a revolutionary war veteran from Massachusetts, provided early insight into the role of education in the founding of our country: “Learning & Knowledg is assential to the preservation of Libberty & unless we have more of it amongue us we cannot seporte our Libertyes long” (as cited in Crane, 1963, p. 52). This quote demonstrates both the unique role that higher education has played in the development of our country and shows how social contract theory gives way to the understandings that specific agencies support the maintenance of our way of life.
The premise of social contract theory was central to the founding of our country. It is the idea “that government must be based on an agreement between those who govern and those who consent to be governed” (Pestritto & West, 2003, back cover). The concept of social contract theory is primarily found in philosophy, political science, and sociology and is used to describe an implicit agreement between a state and its citizens (or a group and its members). Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau are primary philosophers associated with this theory, which is often considered the theoretical groundwork for democracy.

Theory plays a central role in educational inquiry although its meaning seems to vary throughout the literature. In the article “What’s the Use of Theory,” Thomas discusses the difference between personal theory and grand theory (1997). In this paper, social contract theory is the “grand” theory. The term has been used by scholars for centuries to describe the connections between individuals and their governments (Smith, 1974). It is considered to be one of the underlying ideas that led to the founding and development of our country and is the basis for social compacts between various agents of government and the individuals they serve (Smith, 1974). The grand theory of the social contract provides a consistent way for us to look at the interaction between man and his government. This consistent vantage point makes changes throughout time appear more obvious. My assumption is that events in the history of specific institutions of higher education will provide evidence of the social compact and how it has changed over the years.
Significance of the Study

The potential worth of this study is evident in two domains. First, it may add to the body of knowledge about social contract theory and the history of higher education. Second, the study may provide application of a more practical nature. Thelin (1982), in a discussion about historical research, says that it is as important to be able to respond critically to information encountered as it is to generate data. In this case, the data already exists and the role of the researcher is to gather, organize, and analyze information in order to enhance understanding and perhaps offer insight into solutions for existing areas of concern in the field.

The study may lend fuel to several ongoing debates in the field of higher education, including: public vs. private benefits of higher education (Bowen, 1980; Kerr, 1963; Kezar, 2004), access and equity (Astin, 1985; Brint & Karabel, 1989; U.S. Department, 1998), and quality vs. quantity (Cohen, 1987; Gardner, 1961). This historical study may provide an additional lens (Freeland, 1992; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 1982) through which to view the growth and development of higher education. Taken together, these things may be used to enhance discussions about policy decisions on local, regional, and national levels and can impact future funding of higher education (Institute, 1998).

It is my hope that this paper will also provide historic incentive to revive the link between higher education and society. We don’t know if it is ivory tower elitism or open door access or other issues that have contributed to the decline in respect or value of higher education. We do know that students are paying a higher portion of their tuition bill than ever before and that contemporary society
seems less inclined to support our institutions of higher education (Immerwahr & Johnson, 2007). It is my belief that discussions about the value of higher education to society (not just employment potential for the individual student) will result in stronger funding and support for higher education and will strengthen the tie between higher education and the public it serves.

The accountability issues that are currently being addressed throughout higher education can also be impacted by this study. If, by acknowledging the existence of a charter between higher education and society we can better demonstrate the value of higher education, accountability may be less of an issue. An issue of concern today centers around the multiple missions of higher education and how one group of institutions can meet all of its expectations. An understanding of the historical role of higher education in society may help guide discussions about what higher education should be held accountable for today. If it is true that the compact between higher education and society continues to shift, then this study may help to reinforce the importance of continuous reevaluation of the needs of society and the responsibilities of higher education to respond.

While there are plenty of accounts of social contract theory (Hobbes, 1651; Locke, 1689; Rousseau, 1762) and numerous accounts of the history of colleges and universities in the United States (Freeland, 1992; Geiger, 2004; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 1982;) the perspective presented in this paper will be unique. A blending of the two topics designed to find evidence of a social charter between American society and higher education may provide a new paradigm for each. By studying history we “remember” things that have been forgotten over
time, and it is my intention that this study will be a reminder of why colleges and universities are important to our nation.

Limitations

The cultural and sociological context in which this study is founded contributes to the possibility of some observer bias. My field of study, which includes political science, public administration, and higher education, as well as my professional experiences in the field of higher education, may have colored my opinions about the subject being studied. In particular, my experiences over the past 20 years advising and guiding students through the processes of building student organizations and planning activities and events for their communities has impacted my thinking about higher education’s responsibility in educating students for citizenship. The experience that led most directly to my interest in social contract theory and ideas about common good was the development and implementation of a formal program of leadership studies. I believe that the college experience is incomplete without some understanding about personal leadership and the role that an individual plays in his/her society. These opinions may inadvertently be projected in this study. The very notion of qualitative and historical research precludes absolute objectivity. “Clear threats to accurate perception in terms of previous experience in the research setting, personal values, and characteristic assumptions add obvious bias and must be addressed in the proposal” (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 1993, p. 114). This limitation may be lessened by the methods employed in the study, triangulation of sources and
the inclusion of multiple institutions of higher education as subjects over multiple time periods.

Methods employed and availability of information might be considered a second limitation to this work. This study concerns itself with events long since past. The reliance on historical documents, secondary sources, and contextual artifacts may not present the complete picture. Traces of the social compact between higher education and society might be overlooked because they are not evident in available resources. Again, triangulation of information and the use of multiple institutions and time periods minimize the impact of this limitation.

**Delimitations**

Although the intent of this paper is to identify trace elements of the historical social compact within American higher education, it is important not to presume that the findings would be similar across the entire field. The decision to restrict this study to specific institutions and time periods allows for a thorough investigation of available evidence. While this choice is intended to enhance depth and trustworthiness of the study, it limits generalization. So while the research method should be replicable across a broader array of cases, similar results should not be assumed. “The generalizability of this study will be a function of the subject sample and the analysis employed” (Locke et al., 1993, p. 17).

**Definitions**

One of the difficulties in looking at the social charter between higher education and society is the mere definition of *society* in our country.
Sociologists define society as a group that “is composed of people who interact, usually in a defined territory, and share a culture” (Brym & Lie, 2005, p. 62). Culture is then defined as “the sum of practices, languages, symbols, beliefs, values, ideologies and material objects that people create to deal with real-life problems. Cultures enable people to adapt to and thrive in their environments” (Brym & Lie, 2005, p. 62). So society may refer to a particular people such as “American Society,” but it can also be explained as an organized group of people associated together for religious, cultural, political, or other purposes. I propose that American society is made up of vastly different groupings of individuals who have vastly different ideas about the nature of our social charter with higher education.

*Benefits of Higher Education*, a 1998 report from the Institute for Higher Education Policy, provides a clear definition of public and private goods that can be provided through higher education (“Institute,” 1998). Public benefits of higher education include such things as a strong economy and increased civic participation. Private benefits of higher education may include individual wealth and quality of life.

When referring to *institutional traces*, I am speaking of bits of evidence that demonstrate that the institutions being studied acknowledge the existence of a social compact between higher education and society and are taking action or talking about taking action in fulfillment of the compact. *Pivotal points* in history are defined as specific time periods where significant changes in the nature of
higher education occurred that can be expected to affect the role of higher education in United States society.

Organization of the Study

This historical treasure hunt to locate and identify traces of the social charter between higher education and American society will be organized into eight chapters. The first chapter provides an introduction to the concept and underlines the value of this particular line of research. An in-depth discussion of social contract theory and its impact on the development of our country and our system of higher education will be provided in Chapter II. Chapter III will be a discussion of the methods to be employed throughout this historical study. It will include some general commentary on each of the four time periods to be studied, the founding era, the early 1900’s, the 1960’s, and the 2000’s. In addition, an introduction to the institutional cases that comprise this study--University of Minnesota, and Minnesota State University, Mankato--will be included.

Chapters four through eight will follow each of the four institutions through their founding, 1900-1910, the 1960’s and the 2000’s. Each chapter will begin with a discussion of the pivotal points that impacted the development of higher education in the era and continue with a look at how each of the four institutions responded to the needs of the time. The final section of each chapter will address how changes to the social compact in each era impacted the support that each institution received from society. The content of these four chapters are intended to reveal institutional traces of the social compact between higher education and society at various times in the history of the United States. The
final chapter will summarize significant findings and offer concluding thoughts
and implications as well as insight into future study possibilities.
Chapter 2: In the Beginning

Introduction

The history of higher education in America predates the founding of our country by over 100 years. At the time of our declaration of independence from England in 1776 there were already nine colleges in existence in America: Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, New Jersey, King’s Philadelphia, Rhode Island, Queens, and Dartmouth (Rudolph, 1990, p.1). The students who were educated in these institutions became ministers, lawyers, teachers and businessmen in the new world and “were instrumental in creating and sustaining the political, social, economical, cultural and religious institutions and infrastructure that enabled the survival and eventual growth of the colonies” (Kezar, 2004, p. 431). These institutions and their graduates had a profound influence on the development of our nation. Many of the signers of the Declaration of Independence had attended college and many others were men of learning, having read such works as Locke, Hobbes and Blackstone (Walsh, 1935, p. 33).

The underlying philosophy of the Declaration of Independence can be traced to Locke’s second treatise, On Civil Government (1690), a document written to justify the English revolution of 1688 (Smith, 1974, p. 3). Colonists ventured to the new world to escape injustice, religious intolerance, and to build a new life in America, bringing with them ideals of freedom and opportunity. Rudolph (1990) says that in some ways the revolution was fought twice, first in
the hearts and minds of the colonists and then on the battlefield. Fictional accounts of early American pioneers and settlers carrying copies of Blackstone, Locke, Hobbes and the like in their saddle bags are anecdotal evidence of our nation’s early fascination with philosophies of self governance. Early settlers began to think about religion, government, and education just as soon as they had provided for basic needs.

Is the relationship between social contract theory, the founding of our country, and the role of higher education strong enough to have created a compact between higher education and society? This chapter begins with a discussion on the origins of a social contract theory and then moves into a discussion of its role in the founding of the United States. It continues with a discussion of the growth and development of higher education during those early years, and finally discusses parallels that might lead to a conclusion about the existence of a charter between higher education and American society.

Social Contract Theory

Philosophers have been discussing social contract theory since around 400 B.C. In the “Crito,” Socrates argues that it would be wrong to break out of jail because he would be breaking his contract with Athens. By choosing to live in Athens, Socrates had agreed to a social contract. He believed that adult citizens had the choice of staying under the law of the society or moving to another place. In the “Phaedo,” where Socrates actually drinks poison because the state ordered it, Socrates discusses the good life and the relationship of the spiritual man to his world (Livingstone, 1948, p. 96). In the Republic, Plato suggests that moral
behavior is sort of a social contract, and that individuals behave morally initially because they want others in society to behave the same way, but also because being good has intrinsic value. It’s important to note that Plato does not speak of a written contract, or even a promise to obey the law. Although the underpinnings of social contract theory can be traced back to the writings of Plato and Socrates, it was a group of 17th century scholars that intrigued American colonists.

In the 17th century Hobbes renewed public interest in social contract theory. His writings, formed in the aftermath of the English Civil War, center on the idea that government, law, and order are necessary for a good life. The absence of those things quickly reduces man to a state of nature, and that state is definitely worse than the alternative of submitting to be governed. Hobbes believed that the social contract would lead to an era where man understood that the common good meant that all members of society’s lot in life improved and that by helping others they also helped themselves.

In an edited version of *Leviathan*, C.B. MacPherson (1985) begins by asking “why in the second half of the twentieth century do we still read Hobbs, who wrote three centuries ago” (p. 9)? Macpherson (1985) asserts that it is because Hobbes was an analyst of power, which is still an important issue of modern society. Although Hobbes was an analyst of power, his chief concern was peace, and he approached his work from a scientific perspective. These are things we still value today, and thus the writings of Hobbs remain relevant to our modern world. At the time of our country’s founding, however, it was Hobbes’ concentration on peace, particularly the avoidance of civil war, which had a
strong impact. Many colonial discussions debated the true nature of social contract theory, including Hobbes’ ideas and the ideas of later scholars.

Rousseau put forth his view of social contract theory in 1762, saying essentially that certain goods and services are produced for the benefit of the entire society. In Rousseau’s view there exists a reciprocal relationship between the rulers who are responsible for the good of the individuals and individuals committed to the common good. Rousseau defines the common good as that which a rational man would desire, and in his Emile defines education as a service that produces both a more engaged and productive citizen. He believed that benevolence could be taught in an empathetic and caring environment such as the family unit. Rousseau’s work is often cited as a piece of the philosophical underpinning of modern philanthropy and the development of non-governmental organizations dedicated to enhancing the common good. Hobbes and Locke believed that even in the state of nature, man had moral obligations to others that they were not free to ignore. Rousseau believed that it was necessary for humans to be taught that rights and duties tend to be reciprocal, and that happiness comes in part from promoting the happiness of others (Pestritto & West, 2003). He also believed that education was necessary in order for the naturally whole man to live in society (Rousseau, 1994). Rousseau picks up where Socrates left off in defining the good life, he defines it as those things which improve the human condition, beginning with the basics of security, food and shelter, health and wellness and finally the arts, music and pursuits of the mind. He begins to define what our constitution later labeled “happiness” as in the pursuit of Life, Liberty and the
pursuit of happiness. He says that humans must be educated to understand what is good and that true citizenship requires participation. Rousseau (2002) maintains:

As soon as public services cease to be the principle concern of citizens and they prefer helping with their wallets rather than their persons, the state is already on the brink of ruin.” (p. 220)

Many scholars consider Rousseau’s writings to be a key source of democratic idealism. It is easy to see where his work struck a cord with our founding fathers.

To renounce our freedom is to renounce our character as men, the rights, and even the duties, of humanity … Now as men cannot generate new strength, but only unify and control the forces already existing, the sole means that they still have of preserving themselves is to create, by combination, a totality of forces sufficient to overcome the obstacles resisting them, to direct their operation by a single impulse, and make them act in unison.

(Rousseau, 1994, p. 50)

These words and ideas are reminiscent of a uniquely American document that was published a decade later: “When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands …” (Smith, 1974, p. 27).

While Hobbes and Rousseau seemed to view the social contract as an explicit, actual agreement, Plato viewed it as implied. Locke saw the contract in more of a conceptual sense. Locke expressed concern about the problems that might exist in a place without government and through his writings promoted a
solution to the problems. He argued that in a state of nature, people might feel free to do anything of their choosing, but ultimately, their rights will not be protected and they will feel insecure.

Locke argued that in exchange for security and protection, people should consent to give up some of their freedom. He considered this agreement to be a social contract or compact. Thus Locke states that a social contract is an agreement people make among themselves to create a government to rule them and protect their rights. John Locke wrote about education in his Essay concerning Human Understanding and in a collection of letters. Locke believed that one of the major goals of a good education was self-discipline and said “He that has not mastery of his inclinations, he that knows not how to resist the importunity of present pleasure or pain, for the sake of what reason tells him is fit to be done, wants the true principle of virtue and industry and is in danger of never to be good for anything” (as cited in Sahakian, 1970, p.73).

Blackstone also endorsed social compact theory, but is most well known for his writings about common law. Through his writings, common law can be seen as a primary result of social contract theory. It is the set of laws that the people agree to follow in order to preserve their freedom and create societies in absence of legislative action. Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England* is considered to be the definitive pre-Revolutionary War source of common law. The United States Supreme Court often quotes from Blackstone’s work when discussing the intentions of the framers of the constitution. Regarding the idea of a social contract, Blackstone (1765-69) says:
The whole should protect all its parts, and that every part should pay obedience to the will of the whole: or, in other words, that the community should guard the rights of each individual member, and that (in return for this protection) each individual should submit to the laws of the community: without which submission of all it was impossible that protection could be extended to any. (p. 47-48)

Blackstone’s words can be found in a wide variety of publications from western novels to modern Supreme Court decisions. It is important to note, however, that Blackstone’s notion of social contract theory, law, and legitimacy was very different than that of Locke, Hobbes and Rousseau. Blackstone was an Englishman who believed that the colonies were subject to England, and notably, he died in 1770, prior to the Revolutionary War.

The essence of Blackstone’s work involves the assimilation of natural rights (social compact theory) with common law, blending the principles of liberal political theory and the practices of English common laws. Michael Zuckert says that “partly because of Blackstone, the Americans could at once think of political society as the rationalist product of a social compact and as an entity shaped and governed by a law built on custom, deriving its authority from antiquity and ‘grown’ character” (Pestritto & West, 2003, p. 43).

In solving the paradox between common law and social contract thinking, Blackstone writes that “the social contract does not exist – and yet it must be understood and implied… because it expresses the fundamental truth underlying the function, nature, and proper operation of society and government” (Pestritto &
Thus Blackstone believed the contract to exist as an understood and implied factor. He uses the idea of social contract theory to put forth the idea that de facto power and authority are not one in the same. Men give power to one another and can take it away. Blackstone also talks about natural liberty belonging to all men and that one generation cannot bind the next to a particular government or way of life.

From the blending of the two theories, common law and social contract, Blackstone begins to talk about the role of education. He makes it clear that legal science should be taught at the universities and says that university graduates will become:

The guardians of the English constitution, the makers, repealers, and interpreters of the English laws; delegated to watch, to check, and to avert every dangerous innovation, to propose, to adopt, and to cherish any solid and well-weighted improvement; bound by every tie of nature, of honour, and of religion, to transmit that constitution and those laws to their posterity. (Pestritto & West, 2003, p. 44)

Blackstone uses social contract theory to explain the idea of “the consent of the governed” and talks about the role of education in the continuance of government and society. He says that a better education will help senators and citizens to understand existing laws and their value (Pestritto & West, 2003).

A more modern perspective on social contract theory was presented by John Rawls in 1971. His book, A Theory of Justice, revived interest in the idea of
a social contract and linked it firmly to the concept of public good. He provides a
general definition of justice near the beginning of his book: “All social values-
liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the basis of self respect- are to be
distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any, or all of these values is
to everyone’s advantage” (Rawls, 1999, p. 62). In the book, Rawls discusses the
problems of distributive justice and social welfare by developing two principles to
explain his position— the liberty principle and the difference principle. The first
principle centers on the idea of social and economic opportunities being open to
all but designed to provide the benefit of the least well-off members of society.
The difference principle is the idea that inequality is only justified if to the
advantage of those who are less well-off (Rawls, 1999). Rawls work includes
discussions about the role of civil society and the common good. He defines
primary social goods as: liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the basis
of self-respect. Rawls believed that any unequal distribution of these primary
social goods should be to the advantage of those at the bottom of the socio-
economic ladder.

The difference principle, as Rawls defines it is not the same as redress, but
it achieves the same goal of providing opportunity to those who need it most
(Rawls, 1999). His work helps to explain the concept of equality of opportunity
and how access became part of the mission of institutions of higher education. In
addition, Rawls clearly discusses the value of education in our society, saying
that, ”the value of education should not be assessed solely in terms of economic
efficiency and social welfare” and that one of the most important roles of
education is in “enabling a person to enjoy the culture of his society and to take part in its affairs, and in this way to provide for each individual a secure sense of his own worth” (Rawls, 1999, p. 101).

Rawls work is also useful in linking social contract theory to the idea of a social compact between higher education and society. He discusses “the arrangement of major social institutions into one scheme of cooperation” (Rawls, 1999, p. 54) and specifically talks about education saying that, “institutions of liberty and the opportunity for experience which they allow are necessary, at least to some degree, if men’s preferences among different activities are to be rational and informed” (p. 210) Rawls is clear about the idea that some social institutions are necessary for the preservation and elevation of society, and so society has an extreme interest to uphold and support those organizations.

Social contract theory continues to be an evolving concept. First it was used as a way to explain what moves individuals from a state of nature to a state of society and later to describe the roles of citizens and government in society. As societies evolved the emphasis moved from safety and security toward creature comforts including economic, social and cultural enhancements. More recent usage of the concept includes ideas of concern for the welfare of others, socio-economic justice, and a view of the world as a single society. Discussions about what encourages people to cooperate range from the initial idea of people banding together for the reasons of safety and security to rationality, enlightened self interest, empathy, and altruism (Gauthier, 1986; Kohn, 1992). The meaning of a good life has been altered as societies have become more complex and
intertwined. Today, discussions about social contract theory often evolve into discussions ranging from common good to socio-economic status, philanthropy, and the roles of government and individuals.

Social contract theory informs the practice of higher education and is the basis of the compact between higher education and American society. Our forefathers believed that an educated populace was required in order for our form of government to be effective. For a government to go beyond insurance of safety and preservation of personal property, the people being governed must have an understanding of the common good and their individual responsibility in creating it. By educating people to think critically about the principles of human freedom, property and rights, the as well as responsibility to others, higher education contributes significantly to the maintenance of our society.

Social Contract Theory and the Founding of the United States of America

The role that social contract theory played in the founding of our country can be demonstrated through some of our earliest documents. According to Smith (1974) in *On Civil Government*, Locke talks about humans in the state of nature, the role of the social contract, and states that acts of government must be in accord with moral principles. Locke argues that if a government seriously impinges on the rights and interests of society, that the people should replace it and create a new government. Although Thomas Jefferson omitted a specific reference to social contracts, he did assert the natural “equality of men and their self evident natural rights” (Smith, 1974, p. 3).
The Declaration of Independence was both a justification for the revolution and an implied promise that American governments would be founded on the will of the people. Shortly after the writing of the Declaration of Independence, revolutionary assemblies in most states began to write constitutions. All of the state constitutions had common features: popular sovereignty, eclipse of the executive, legislative supremacy, and limited government. Popular sovereignty is the idea that the people are the source of governmental authority. Eclipse of the executive refers to the notion of limited power allotted to the state’s leading authority or governor. The majority of governing authority, making laws, electing officials, and determining policy was left to the legislatures. With regards to limited government, the Virginia constitution of 1776 was most strident. It included a bill of rights and incorporated guarantees to protect the liberties of the individual (Smith, 1974).

Throughout the founding era (1760-1805) influences of Locke and Hobbes are evident; however, it’s important to note that the second most quoted secular author of the time was Blackstone (Pestritto & West, 2003). His blending of the two theories of common law and social contract, his assertion that one generation’s contract cannot bind another generation, and his declaration that education was essential to the continuance of government is at the root of the idea of a social compact between higher education and society in the United States today. Given the influence of Blackstone, it is no wonder that once the war had been won and the constitution written, many of our founding fathers turned their
efforts toward the furthering of higher education in the newly formed United States.

*Higher Education in the Colonial Period*

The idea of higher education in the United States predates the Revolutionary War by over 100 years, so it stands to reason that continuance of government was not the only basis for its emergence in the colonies.

After God had carried us safe to New England, and wee had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our lively-hood, rear’d convenient places for Gods worship and settled the Civill Government: One of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance Learning, and to perpetuate it to Posterity.... (*New England’s*, 1865, p. 23)

This quote comes from a monograph written in 1643 titled *New England’s First Fruits*. It demonstrates the importance of education to our country’s earliest settlers and begins a discussion about the founding of Harvard.

The first colleges were created to educate church leaders as the settlers were “dreading to leave an illiterate Ministry to the Churches, when our present Ministers shall lie in the Durt” (*New England’s*, 1865, p. 23). By 1646, over 100 Cambridge and Oxford educated men had immigrated to New England. These were the men who founded Harvard, and their sons were Harvard’s first students. Rudolph (1990) says “the really important fact about Harvard College is that it was absolutely necessary. Puritan Massachusetts could not have done without it” (p. 5). These earliest settlers came to the new world with a sense of mission and
purpose, intending to lead lives that “served God and their fellow man in the fullest, they acknowledged a responsibility to the future” (Rudolph, 1990, p. 6). This sense of purpose and responsibility to the future meant that they had to educate their future leaders. “A learned clergy and a lettered people” (Rudolph, 1990, p. 6) were central ideas in the social development of New England; the development of Harvard College was a natural result of these ideas. The colony in New England believed that it needed leaders “disciplined by knowledge and learning, it needed followers disciplined by leaders, it needed order” (Rudolph, 1990, p. 7).

It’s important to note the religious beginnings of higher education in America and the role these institutions played in the development of society at that time. It is also important to note that the separation that exists today between religion and civil society did not exist during the colonial and founding eras of our country. There was a blending of religious and secular leadership that influenced the lives and activities of early Americans. The colonial college was a frontier college, formed in order to perpetuate a society of like-minded individuals. “The American college was founded to meet the spiritual necessities of a new continent” (Tewksbury, 1932, p. 55). Harvard was founded in 1636 under the auspices of the Congregational Church in New England to provide an educated ministry for the area. The College of William and Mary was developed about 60 years later by the Anglicans in the colony of Virginia for the same reason. All of the first nine, and in fact most of the colleges developed before the Civil War, had religious beginnings. The relationship between religion and governance was
much more entwined at that point in American history than it is today. The earliest settlers came to this country seeking religious freedom, and thus the ideals of religion, society, and governance were not seen as the separate issues that they are today (Tewksbury, 1932).

These early institutions were developed with mostly private funds, a charter or grant of land from English authority, and survived through the generosity of the publics and churches they served. The College of William and Mary was founded by royal charter in 1693 for the purpose of ensuring that youth were “piously educated in good letters and manners” (Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 33) and it was expected that the colony would draw its public servants from the graduates of that institution.

*The First Revolution*

Ideas that strongly influenced higher education at the time of the revolution came from France. Perhaps as a result of the war and as a result of growing French involvement in our country, students turned to more secular interests. Political questions became more interesting than religious ones and a spirit of free thought ran through the institutions. In an autobiography from 1865, Lyman Beecher talks about Yale: “Yale College was in a most ungodly state. The College church was almost extinct. Most of the students were skeptical, and rowdies were plenty. Wine and liquors were kept in many rooms, intemperance, profanity, gambling and licentiousness were common” (as cited in Tewksbury, 1932, p. 60). Religious leaders became defensive and students began to aggressively seek changes in college curriculum.
The second chapter of Rudolph’s *The American College & University* is titled “Legacy of the Revolution.” In this chapter, Rudolph begins by reminding us that in addition to being “creatures of the reformation” the colonial colleges were also “creatures of the Renaissance and therefore cherished the humanistic ideal of classical scholarship” (1990, p. 23). The earliest curriculums included Latin, Greek logic, philosophy, Hebrew, and rhetoric. The German influence on colonial education was largely curricular and leaned toward the teaching of science, math, and the more useful arts. This shift toward a more scientific and math-based curriculum in colonial colleges was gradual yet significant. Hofstadter and Metzger write that “by the eve of the Revolution everywhere more attention was being paid to the natural science and mathematics.” (as cited in Rudolph, 1990, p.30).

The rise of science in the colonial colleges is said to have led to the development of an atmosphere of freedom and inquiry. Rudolph (1990) contends that the American Revolution began, in a sense, when William Smith established a new curriculum for the College of Philadelphia that included sciences and practical studies as one third of the total curriculum. Smith’s goal was to meet the needs of the growing American population. About this Rudolph (1990) says:

The Revolution was first made in the minds of men who became accustomed to thinking of themselves as Americans, who at first unconsciously and then openly spoke of the English as ‘they’ instead of ‘we’. The Revolution was made wherever Americans discovered and emphasized the differences between colonial
necessity, colonial aspiration, and colonial purpose and what England expected them to be. Higher education’s responses to American aspirations as opposed to English needs helped to fuel the revolution. (p. 33)

The separation of church and state was almost nonexistent until after the end of the Revolutionary War. In fact, a standing order in religion had been established in nine of the 13 colonies and five of them had gone so far as to prevent other religious interests from developing colleges in their colonies. Virginia, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire forbade competing religious interests from starting colleges until some point after the Revolutionary War. This insured that the individual colonies grew in the manner of their earliest settlers and also explains in some part why the colonies struggled to unite as one nation.

Although the first amendment provides for separation of church and state, the question of denominational churches and separation of church and state with regards to colleges was not truly addressed until the Dartmouth College Case decision of 1819. Prior to that, efforts were made to involve state representation in almost all of the colonial colleges, and three of them-- Columbia, Pennsylvania and Dartmouth--were taken over by the states for a period of time (Tewksbury, 1932). In Dartmouth vs. Woodward (1819) the Supreme Court decided that New Hampshire state legislature did not have the right to alter the charter of Dartmouth College without its consent, and to do so would be a violation of article 1, section 10 of the United States Constitution, which forbids a contract to be altered by the
state (Smith, 1974). Thelin (2004) says that Dartmouth Case was more about contractual obligations and less about the creation of two distinct types of higher education. He says that the distinction between public and private institutions remained blurred well into the late 1800’s, when it was first used to differentiate between voluntary relief efforts such as the Red Cross and federal programs to provide medical service in the Civil War.

Tewksbury (1932) says that the achievement of a separation of church and state is one of the most significant events in our history as a nation, it radically altered the development of our social institutions, and it is the basis of many of the unique characteristics of our society. He quotes James Bryce as saying “of all the differences between the Old World and the New World that this separation of church and state is most salient” (Tewksbury, p. 154). He says that the uniquely American characteristics of higher education began as a result of this separation.

To Sustain the Nation

Although education is not mentioned specifically in the Articles of Confederacy, the Constitution, or the Bill of Rights, it was a subject on the minds of many of the founding fathers. Calls for a national university, the creation of new state institutions of higher learning, increased governmental control of private institutions, and the inclusion of provisions for higher education in the northwest ordinance are evidence of the perceived need. Our founding fathers believed that the key to building a government of the people was to educate the people. This is evidenced by the push to establish a national university that began
prior to the signing of the Declaration of Independence and continued through the time of the Civil War.

The failure to establish a national university during the constitutional convention can be understood by considering the role of religion and states’ rights issues. In the early eighteenth century, sectarian and political interests vied for control of existing colleges and turbulent controversy ensued. State sovereignty also played a role in the decision not to establish a national university. Concerns about location, curriculum, and power outweighed arguments in favor of a national university. The one exception that scholars often point to in discussions about the lack of a national university in our country is the establishment of a national Military academy at West Point in 1802 and the Naval Academy in 1845 (Thelin, 2004). Crane (1963) says that “a central university was as distasteful to many Americans as a national bank, and for similar reasons, which had little to do with its educational merits” (p. 10). Although it never came to fruition, discussions about the need for a national university highlight the importance our founding fathers saw in higher education. Several of our founding fathers, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin spoke eloquently about the need for a national university.

In a letter written in 1795, George Washington outlined some of his reasons for wanting a national university system and offered to endow it with some of his own personal resources. He was concerned about impressionable youth going overseas to be educated because they might return with a different set of values. He also believed that a national university would bring together future
leaders from the various colonies, which in turn would help to unify our nation.

In his own words, Washington wanted to:

See a plan adopted, by which the arts, sciences and belles-lettres could be taught in their fullest extent, thereby embracing all the advantages of European tuition, with is necessary to qualify our citizens for the exigencies of public as well as private life; and (which with me is a consideration of great magnitude) by assembling the youth from different parts of this rising republic, contributing from their intercourse and interchange of information to the removal of prejudices, which might perhaps sometimes arise from local circumstances. (Hofstadter & Smith, 1961)

Thomas Jefferson was also a strong proponent of education, as noted in various speeches and particularly by his proposal for educational reform in 1779. However, Jefferson’s views on higher education fed beliefs about the aristocratic nature of colleges. In a letter to Peter Carr in 1814, Jefferson shared his belief that higher education should be provided for a qualified few who have proven their ability in elementary and general schools. He said “the mass of our citizens may be divided two classes – the laboring and the learned. The laboring will need the first grade of education to qualify them for their pursuits and duties; the learned will need it as a foundation for further acquirements” (Crane, 1963, p. 39). Later in the same document, Jefferson divided the learned class into two groups, the wealthy who “may aspire to share in conducting the affairs of the
nation or to life with usefulness and respect in the private ranks of life” and those destined for learned professions.

Although Jefferson’s views on higher education were considered elitist because his proposals divided the American people into classes, he firmly believed that education was vital to the growth of our new nation and spent the latter part of his life working toward the establishment of the University of Virginia. During his time as a member of the Virginia Assembly, Jefferson drafted four pieces of legislation dealing with education. He considered these bills to form “a system by which every fiber would be eradicated of ancient or future aristocracy and a foundation laid as a government truly republican” (Fine, 1945, p. 35). Given the preceding quote, it seems fair to say that rather than elitist, Thomas Jefferson believed in meritocracy.

Meanwhile in the north, another of our founding fathers was working on another plan for education in the new nation. “The germ of the University of Pennsylvania was a little pamphlet entitled Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania, Benjamin Franklin, Printer, 1740 (Slosson, 1910, p. 349). Franklin has some revolutionary proposals in the pamphlet – proposals which are still evident in modern curriculum. He believed that English should be taught as a language and that all college students should learn to speak, read, and write proper English. Franklin also thought that colleges should provide training for citizenship and commercial pursuits.

Franklin was one of the earliest American proponents of democratic education. He believed that the new nation would need educated citizens to lead,
to build the economic wealth of the nation, and to ensure the rights that had been won. Franklin thought and wrote about the need for an educational system through which every citizen would be provided the opportunity to learn to read and write (Fine, 1945). The voices of Franklin, Jefferson and Washington clearly identified a need for a national university or at least a collection of universities and colleges that taught men how to live in our society. They saw a need for leadership to preserve the ideals of the new nation and to enhance the quality of life for its citizens.

*Argument for the Existence of a Social Charter between Higher Education and Society*

The examples above demonstrate the importance that our founding fathers placed upon the role of the college in educating citizens, developing future leaders, and sustaining the new democracy. Their dedication to building institutions and the use of public funds to support the new institutions provide some evidence of a mutually supportive relationship between higher education and society at that point in our history. When public funding wasn’t available, Colleges and universities still enjoyed tax exempt status, protection through legally incorporated structures, freedom from onerous oversight, and a degree of respect as a valued social institution.

Throughout our history private citizens, corporations, religious leadership, and philanthropic organizations have understood the need to underwrite higher education and donated money and resources in order to insure the survival and growth of higher education. Thelin (2004) discusses the role of philanthropy in
the development and growth of higher education in the United States. He says that the interplay between higher education and organized philanthropy is essential to understanding the higher education landscape.

The belief that education was necessary to sustain our nation was strong among political, religious, and economic leaders throughout the founding and early development of our democracy. Benjamin Rush, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence wrote in 1788 that the new government would fail “unless the people are prepared for our new form of government by an education adapted to the new and particular situation of our country” (Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 153). The charter of the University of Georgia in 1785 provides a strong example of the relationship between our new government and higher education. It begins with this thought:

As it is the distinguished happiness of free governments, that civil order should be the result of choice, and not by necessity, and the common wishes of the people become the laws of the land, their public prosperity, and even existence, very much depends upon suitably forming the minds and morals of their citizens. (Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 151)

Social Contract theory provides a way of thinking about the obligations of a government and its people. It defines the obligations that society has to its membership as well as the responsibilities that individuals have to their society. Citizens or individual members of society have obligations to obey the laws, participate in elections and problem solving, think critically about issues
concerning the fate of society and contribute to the common good. The
government as the leader of the society has the duty of protecting the society and
its individual members, assuring life, liberty and providing services that enhance
the common good. From the works of Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau we begin to
understand that individuals gather together to form governments for protection
and to preserve the basic rights of citizens. Rawls’ *A Theory of Justice* sheds a
more modern and practical light on the concepts of social contract theory and
provides an understanding of how the role of the social compact and the definition
of public good have evolved over the years.

**Social Compact and the Public Good**

If the social compact between higher education and society is intact, it
follows that some public good comes from higher education. In 1831-32, Alexis
de Tocqueville, a young French aristocrat, spent nine months touring the United
States. He detailed his accounts in the book *Democracy in America* where he
coined the terms public and private good. Since that time numerous scholars have
sought to re-define and refine these concepts.

Tocqueville (1835/1966) was impressed by American’s ability to blend
the ideas of self-interest and public interest. He talked about two habits or virtues
that were essential in the new democracy-- the habit of association and the habit
of self-interest rightly understood. In the United States in the early 1800’s,
Tocqueville (1835/1966) defined common good as, “all the arrangements and
conditions that make it possible for the individual and for small social units to
work together in an orderly fashion towards fulfillment of their divinely willed
purpose – the development of personality and the fostering of culture” (p. 517). This definition taken together with his discussions about self interest and association is far removed from the detailed report about the public and private benefits of higher education developed by the Institute for Higher Education Policy in 1998. In fact, Tocqueville suggests that the concept of common good operates best at a high level of abstraction. Our constitution was written to limit government to the will of the people – an educated people capable of reflection and choice. He says that a pre-determined common good would fail to meet the social and dynamic character of human life. Regarding education specifically Tocqueville wrote, “They all agree that the spreading of education, which is useful to all peoples, is an absolute necessity for a free people like theirs” (Pierson, 1959, p. 74).

In his book, Higher Education and Its Useful Past, Thelin (1982) warns us that institutional change and terminological change complicate historical research. In the case of this study, both must be considered, as the institutions being studied have changed, as has the idea of common good. This complicates the study because the whole concept of the charter between higher education is based on the idea that higher education furthers the common good and is therefore worthy of support and respect from society.

The definition of public good has changed over the years as the needs of our society have changed. The chart below summarizes the public and private benefits of higher education as outlined by the Institute for Higher Education Policy in 1998, as earlier enumerated by Howard Bowen in 1980. These
contemporary definitions of the concepts of common good and self interest are far more concise than the abstract definitions supplied by Tocqueville over 100 years ago. An important part of the research for this paper will be to consider the definitions of common good and self interest as they relate to the compact between higher education and society in each of the time periods being studied.
Table 1. *Reaping the Benefits: Defining the Public and Private Value of Going to College.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public - Economic</th>
<th>Private - Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increased Tax Revenues</td>
<td>• Higher Salaries and Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater Productivity</td>
<td>• Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased Consumption</td>
<td>• Higher Savings Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased Workforce Flexibility</td>
<td>• Improved Working Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decreased Reliance on Government Financial Support</td>
<td>• Personal/Professional Mobility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public - Social</th>
<th>Private - Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced Crime Rates</td>
<td>• Improved Health/Life Expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased Charitable Giving/Community Service</td>
<td>• Improved Quality of Life for Offspring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased Quality of Civic Life</td>
<td>• Better Consumer Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Cohesion/Appreciation of Diversity</td>
<td>• Increased Personal Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved Ability to Adapt to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• and Use Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More Hobbies, Leisure Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Bowen says that for generations, people have thought that American Colleges and Universities were worth what they cost because of the individual and societal benefits produced. He says that until recently, these benefits have been enough to justify substantial public and philanthropic costs, and that higher education has traditionally been rationalized in broad philosophical terms. Bowen
goes on to say that “since higher education is only one of myriad influences in the development of individuals and the progress of society, it is extraordinarily difficult to single out its distinctive effects” (Bowen, 1977, p. iii). He says that the time has come to gather the scattered knowledge of the outcomes of higher education and goes on to identify those outcomes in his book Investment in Learning. The challenge of this research in to link the goal of higher education with the idea of common good and to find concrete examples of how specific institutions upheld their social compact.

Summary

Through this in-depth discussion of social contract theory and its impact on the development of our country and our system of higher education the existence of a social compact between higher education and society seems quite obvious. It seems clear at this point that at the time of our nation’s founding there was a clear give-take relationship between higher education and society, and the role of the college was to perpetuate government by developing citizens and future leaders and to drive the economic engine of our new democracy. The mutual need demonstrates that higher education was perceived to be a common good to be supported by society, in effect creating a compact between higher education and society. Thus social contract theory is a valid perspective through which to study the history of higher education and it seems as though there was a social compact between society and higher education at the time of the founding of the United States. We now know that the social compact existed through the records of discussions recorded during the constitutional convention, through
records of efforts to create a national university, through the writings of our founders, and through reading the charters of state universities developed immediately following the revolution.

One of the objectives of this dissertation will be to determine if evidence of the compacts existence throughout various stages of the history of higher education in the United States. This and the other research questions raised in the first chapter of this paper will be addressed in future chapters.
Chapter 3: Method

Introduction

This chapter describes the research process used in this study. It begins with some comments about the value and significance of historical research. Then a review of the research questions will be followed by an explanation of the research design to be used in this dissertation. Sample selection will be deliberate in order to provide an in-depth analysis of specific cases and a section explaining the selection of these cases will follow. Next, an explanation of the data collection process to be used involving review of primary and secondary historical documents will be presented. Finally, I will discuss the analysis and interpretation of the data to be collected.

Researchers study history to gain a better understanding of current conditions (Cates, 1985). In this case, I am interested in the claim by many modern scholars of higher education that American colleges and universities should honor duty to society. The purpose of this study is to consider the question of a social charter between higher education and American society in order to shed light on the relationship between American higher education and the society in which it exists. My assumption is that if there ever was a social charter between higher education and society, institutional traces of its existence should be found most easily at the intersections between key points in the history of higher education (pivotal events) and the responses from select institutions.
Lancy (1993) lists several steps in the process of historical inquiry: 1) developing a “hunch” and deciding to test it, 2) reviewing secondary sources to learn what other scholars have said about the subject, 3) identifying and analyzing primary source materials and 4) constructing an historical narrative. He says that there are many intervening steps involved in the analyzing of information and “constant movement between primary and secondary sources to determine the meaning of one’s findings” (p. 269).

He goes on to say that most historical inquiry begins with an idea about the causes or circumstances of an event in the past and the decision to test that idea or assumption. The next step in the research process would be to see what other scholars have said about the topic by reviewing secondary sources in a manner that is similar to a traditional literature review found in most dissertations. A review of secondary sources provides the researcher with context and helps with the development of primary sources. According to Lancy (1993), the most critical step in historical research is “identifying and analyzing primary source materials” (p. 267). This step is usually taken after a thorough review of applicable secondary sources and often requires interplay between primary and secondary sources.

Archives include a wide variety of public and private records and are the primary source of data for historical research (Jones, 1985, p. 105). There are two approaches that researchers use when examining or re-examining historical data, archival research and content analysis. Archival research uses records and statistics to examine questions of current interest. Content Analysis uses all sorts
of texts including speeches, journals, books, newspapers and reports for the same purpose. Archival researchers rely on quantitative statistics to analyze the archival data they uncover. Content analysis is a more qualitative approach relying on the organization, coding, and interpreting of a wide variety of data to draw conclusions. This study will be a content analysis of archival materials (Jones, 1985, p. 104).

The study of history is contextual, focuses on behavior in natural settings, is holistic, and requires interpretation on the part of the researcher (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2005). In this paper, I will be studying higher education in the context of a social charter, that is, the relationship between American society and our colleges and universities. By first identifying expressed societal needs within a period of history and then considering the behavior (responses) of select institutions of higher education, I hope to identify traces of the social charter. This type of research involves looking at the totality of the time period, the developmental needs of society, and the issues impacting higher education. This paper will require the interpretation of context, content, and behavior in order to draw conclusions.

Although there is fallibility and bias in historical research, Marshall says that “historical research is particularly useful in obtaining knowledge of previously unexamined areas and in re-examining questions for which answers are not as definite as desired” (Marshall & Rossman, 1994, p. 90). Gall, Gall and Borg (2005) say that historical researchers are post-positivist, acknowledging potential for error but believing that careful and thorough work yields the ability
to understand and share interpretations of what happened. Jones mentions three advantages to the use of content analysis in a research project such as this; 1) it is hard to bias data that already exists, 2) the collection of data is non-reactive, that is it can’t change anything, because it has already happened, and 3) it’s unobtrusive.

Research Questions

A broad definition of qualitative research presented by Straus and Corbin (1990) says that “any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification” (p. 17) includes historical research. In a qualitative design, research questions serve as boundaries and guides for the study (Merriam & Simpson, 1984). They serve to focus the study and are developed from the problem statement. Gall et al. (2005) list five types of historical inquiry: 1) study of social issues, 2) study of specific individuals, educational institutions and social movements, 3) exploration of relationships between events, 4) synthesis of data, and 5) reinterpretation of past events. Reviewing my problem statement in light of these five types of inquiry has helped me to identify my preliminary research questions:

1. Can evidence of a social compact between higher education and society be found at specific points in time and as a result of pivotal events in the history of higher education at the two Minnesota universities included in this study?
2. How has the compact changed over time and how do each of the institutions reflect the changes?

3. How has the evolution of the social compact affected the support that these institutions receive from society?

These research questions will be considered as preliminary because the nature of qualitative research is emergent, and additional themes might arise from the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, these questions will serve to guide the direction of my research and provide boundaries to what could otherwise become an exhaustive and lengthy study.

Research Design

Qualitative research has its roots in many academic disciplines (Gall et al., 2005), and involves a variety of approaches. The study is a content analysis (Jones, 1985) of archival data in order to explore the relationship between events in the history of the United States and the history of selected institutions of higher education in order to resolve the research questions listed above (Gall et al., 2005). It can also be considered in light of a second of the five classifications outlined by Gall et al. (2005) as an “investigation of society and culture” (p. 477). In this study the relationship of events is intended to shed light on the needs of society, the demands on higher education and what higher education adapted as its role in society and saw as necessary to maintain its legitimacy with the body politic at each time period being studied.

Sample selection. “Where quantitative researchers seek casual determination, prediction, and generalization of findings, qualitative researchers
seek instead illumination, understanding and extrapolation to similar situations” (Hoepfl, 1997, p. 48).

Sampling the materials to be analyzed is a major part of most content analysis research because a researcher can not look at all possible information so he/she is forced to set boundaries. The aim is to develop samples that are representative of the phenomenon to be studied; however generalizability of the study is often limited by the sample selection. Essentially it is only acceptable to generalize the results of a content analysis to the population of texts that were sampled. The researcher must demonstrate that the sample is unbiased if he/she wants to apply the study findings beyond the sample population (Jones, 1985).

This historical dissertation will look for institutional traces of the compact at selected points in the history of higher education. My assumption is that the intersection between pivotal events, the needs of society, and the responses of select institutions will provide institutional traces of the social charter. Deciding which institutions to study and what time periods to study is an important starting point for this research. Considerations center on the idea of developing a research project that was doable in a reasonable amount of time, and creating something that would be broad enough to answer the various research questions adequately yet detailed enough to provide rich understanding.

Time periods. The pivotal events in history are selected from specific time periods throughout the 350-year history of American higher education. These events and the time periods in which they occur are selected both because they are well documented as significant periods in the history of higher education and
because the researcher has reason to believe that institutional traces of the social
charter are most likely to be evident at those points in time.

The four periods identified for study are loosely tied to the eras
represented in Rudolph’s *The American College and University* (1990). The four
time periods selected for study in this paper were chosen from discussions with
my major professors and initial research into the pivotal events in the history of
United States higher education that occurred in each of the time periods. Because
colleges and universities take time to respond to stimuli, the research will be
concentrated on a period up to 10 years after the pivotal events occurred. My plan
is to focus on actions, artifacts and documents of specific institutions in four eras.

Starting at the time of each institutions founding will provide insight into
the Universities’ original purpose and justifications. Effects of the Morrill Act
and the adaptation of the German Model of higher education should be evident
between 1900 and 1910. The growth of higher education after WWII, increases
in federal research support and the importance of racial desegregation and mass
higher education should all be evident in the 1960’s. Finally, the 2000’s will be
included because the effects of state funding reductions, neoliberalism, the
accountability movement and academic capitalism should be evident.

In this study, I have looked at the way two different institutions have
responded to the various stimuli provided by society throughout history.
Although the conditions have changed over the years, I hope to find evidence that
the social compact between higher education and society is still intact through this
research.
Information rich samples. Selection of institutions to include in this study is based partially on the probability of finding trace evidence of the social charter. My theory is that institutions with historical significance or institutions that have been mentioned liberally in the literature are more likely to yield these trace elements. Other considerations that make institutions information rich include existence of secondary source material and mention in respected history of higher education textbooks. The University of Minnesota meets this criteria well, with the availability of several house histories, and an excellent university archive. Minnesota State University Mankato has been included in the study because of my proximity to the institution and the fact that it has a well organized and preserved university archive where I can practice the art of historical research before moving on to the other intuitions selected for this study. MSU Mankato will serve as almost as a pilot for the rest of the research.

Variety. Another consideration in the selection of institutions for this study is the representative nature of the institutions; size, mission, and curriculum all impact the role each plays in society. Thus, the decision to include both a large and smaller University in the state of Minnesota.

Convenience. Lastly, institutions are selected based on convenience and availability of archival data about the institution. On-line institutional archives are an important consideration as they positively impact the research process by making information readily available. Initially I intended to select schools from a list of the best institutional archives in the United States. Through exhaustive research, I found that no such list exists. So instead, I contacted the society of
higher education librarians and asked for recommendations about which colleges and universities have great historical archives on-line. Those inquiries provided the starting point for selection of institutions to include in this study.

Rudolph provides an extensive historiography of higher education in the United States at the conclusion of his book *The American College and University* (originally published in 1962) and when the book was re-published in 1990, Thelin updated that historiography. These two sources contain a comprehensive list of colleges and universities about which books have been written. Because secondary sources such as these house histories are essential in the historical research process (Marwick, 1989), I compared institutions in the historiographies with the institutions recommended by the society of higher education librarians and then reviewed information on the various college library web sites to select the colleges and universities for inclusion in my study. Finally, I shared my selection of institutions with members of my dissertation committee to gain expert opinions confirming the selected schools.

Two Cases. I have selected two very different universities in the Minnesota as cases for this study. They are: The University of Minnesota and Minnesota State University, Mankato. The University of Minnesota was selected because of its status as a major public research institution; it is also the state land-grant institution. Minnesota State University, Mankato began its existence as a Normal School in the late 1800’s and today serves as one of the largest members of the state university system in Minnesota.
These institutions have been selected systematically and deliberately. They are from the same geographic area and were all founded within 20 years of each other. These similarities will be of value as I look at the needs of the region and the responses of the institutions. The selection includes large and small, and research and liberal arts institutions. This again was deliberate so that differences in institutional mission could be considered as part of the research.

Both of these institutions selected have one or more books specifically written to chronicle their history and development and are prominently mentioned in compilations of higher education historical works. In addition the institutions have well-developed archives and a good deal of historical references on-line. The breadth and depth of information available about these institutions should add to the quality of this project.

In 1851, seven years before Minnesota became a state, the University of Minnesota opened as a Preparatory School. The school closed during the Civil War, but it reopened in 1867 and was designated as Minnesota’s land-grant university. The University grew rapidly in size and stature, offering its first Ph.D. in 1888. Today, the University of Minnesota has 3 campuses, 18 regional extension offices, and an annual budget of over 2.6 million dollars. It has an enrollment of 65,000 students and over 4000 faculty members. It is among the top research institutions in the United States and was an early member of the prestigious American Association of Universities.

Minnesota State University, Mankato is one of seven state universities serving the citizens of Minnesota. Minnesota State Mankato was originally
established in 1868 as a Normal School to train teachers. It awarded its first four-year degree in 1927, and became a member of the State University System in 1975. Approximately 80% of Minnesota State, Mankato students are from southwest Minnesota. It is an undergraduate, regional institution with ambitions to become more. The university will begin offering doctoral degrees for the first time in the fall of 2007. Minnesota State, Mankato hopes to expand its current enrollment of 13,500 students to 20,000 students within the next five years.

Data Collection

There are four methods that qualitative researchers primarily rely on for gathering information. They are participation in the setting, direct observation, in-depth interviewing and document review (Marshall & Rossman, 1994). The qualitative method of document review is unobtrusive and can be a valuable way to portray the values and beliefs of participants in a given environment, and it is the only method available to conduct this particular research. “Historical analysis is a method of discovering from records and accounts what happened in the past” (Marshall & Rossman, 1994, p. 89). This research project will involve the review of archival documents and house histories from the selected institutions as well as archival and secondary documents related to the selected pivotal events in order to identify institutional traces of the social charter between higher education and society. Preliminary source documents (bibliographies, directories and general indexes) will be used to determine which primary and secondary sources to review for the information gathering process (Marwick,
Primary sources are those which were generated during the period being studied; they are relics and traces left from the past. Secondary sources are accounts created later, not by a participant in the era or activity being studied, such as reports and references in history books (Marshall & Rossman, 1994).

Historical research is fascinating to me partly because I know these events and the people involved really existed, however much of history may be altered or lost. Selective deposit is the phrase Russell Jones uses to describe the idea that not everything that happened was recorded. Some information was intentionally left out and some was not thought important enough to be included. He says that even public documents such as the Congressional Record are subject to selective deposit because senators and representatives are allowed to edit the record (Jones, 1985, p. 115).

Marshall and Rossman (1994) describe several potential weaknesses associated with historical analysis as a data collection method, they include:

1. Especially dependent upon the honesty of those providing the data.
2. An overly artistic or literary style of presentation can obscure the research.
3. Quality of the study can be highly dependent on the “goodness” of the initial research questions.
4. Highly dependent upon the ability of the researcher to be resourceful, systematic and honest to control bias.

In the development of this proposal, each of these four considerations had been taken into consideration and accounted for. The honesty or accuracy of
historical documents becomes less of an issue when the researcher looks for patterns of data and reoccurring themes. The researcher should always be looking for the negative instance (Marshall & Rossman, 1994, p. 145). The reliance on multiple sources and triangulation of data will limit the impact of overly artistic or literary documents. For this dissertation, I have written and re-written my research questions a number of times until they were logical and met with the approval of my dissertation committee. Finally, the idea that good historical research is highly dependent upon the ability of the researcher to be resourceful, systematic and honest to control bias requires some consideration.

The identification of common themes and potentially related concepts will be facilitated through the use of qualitative research software called HyperResearch. Colleges and universities may demonstrate evidence of their role in supporting societal needs in a variety of ways. Evidence of a compact between higher education and society may be found in the financing of higher education, its policies and practices, historical interpretation, symbolism and rhetoric. Every effort will be made to triangulate information in order to verify its accuracy. Triangulation is defined as “the use of multiple data-collection methods, data sources, analysts, or theories as corroborative evidence for the validity of qualitative research findings” (Gall et al., 2005, p. 640).

In a simple example, suppose that society was concerned with the issue of the cost of health care for its citizens and asked for support from higher education in developing a solution to the problem. My research responsibility would be to look through archival records to develop a picture of how each institution being
studied responded to the concern. Did the university president give a speech about how to train more health care workers, was a report generated discussing ways to lower tuition or offer scholarships for nursing students, did the institutional outreach department provide workshops on healthy lifestyles? Although keeping health care costs down is not a direct responsibility of universities, by providing research that supports the effort the university is enhancing the common good. The purpose of this research is to learn how specific institutions have responded to calls from society for support in order to enhance quality of life and support the common good of our society.

Although no research on human resources is being conducted in this study, university requirements include the completion of an IRB review. Prior to beginning the actual collection data, I filed a request for IRB exemption for this dissertation, and that exception was granted.

Inquiry Audit

Dependability of the study is an important consideration in historical research. It is a measure of the stability of data over time. Dependability is similar to the quantitative research criterion of reliability except that it excludes changes that happen because of purposeful methodological decisions made by the researcher (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 242). Changes that occur because of methodological decisions by the evaluator or because of modifications to the design of the study do not necessarily detract from the dependability of a study if a dependability audit is part of the research process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 242) A dependability audit trail is a technique for recording methodological
changes in the data collection process. It is a way of documenting the logic of process and method decisions that occur in an emergent design such as the one being employed in this study.

Confirmability means that the data, interpretations and outcomes of the research are contextually based and not just figments of the researcher’s imagination (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 243). It means that the data can be traced back to its sources and that interpretations are logically assembled, structurally coherent and corroborated. A conformity audit trail that assures both data and analysis processes are available for inspection by outside reviewers will be produced as part of this study.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that the dependability and confirmability audit trails be considered together. An inquiry audit which incorporates both dependability and conformability information can be likened to a fiscal audit incorporating both dependability of process and confirmability of product. The audit trail I will provide will be in the form of a journal that includes a detail of procedures used. The journal will include; location of raw data, analysis notes, reconstruction and synthesis products, process notes, personal notes and preliminary developmental information, as well as a reflexive component (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 320-321).

Analysis and Interpretation

“Content analysis differs from casual evaluations and descriptions of textual material primarily in that it forces you to be explicit about the criteria you have applied and the rules by which you have applied them” (Jones, 1985, p.118).
The key to interpretation of the information gathered through this research is to specify the characteristics that I want to identify, and content analysis is a way of explicitly identifying the characteristics of archival material (Jones, 1985). “Data Analysis is the process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the mass of collected data. It is a messy, ambiguous, time-consuming and creative process” (Marshall & Rossman, 1994, p. 111). It is not linear or neat and each step in the process can be repeated several times. The process of data analysis includes the following five steps: 1) organizing the data, 2) generation of categories, themes and patterns, 3) testing of emergent hypothesis against the data, 4) searching for alternative explanations and 5) writing the report. It is an iterative process that may require repetition of the five steps, turning the analysis back on itself several times to test, extend and clarify information. There are two potential approaches to structuring the analysis of data. One approach involves generating categories in advance which can provide a focusing device for the study, but this procedure can also become to limiting. The other approach is to allow themes to emerge as the data is collected (Marshall & Rossman, 1994). My own process will be a hybrid of the two approaches, gathering all available data from the first university that I study, Minnesota State University, Mankato and allowing themes and patterns to emerge from that data. I will then test those, themes and patterns against the data from the other three institutions. Although additional themes and patterns may emerge at the other three institutions and those will be included in the study, I hope to set the basis of my study with the research from Minnesota State University, Mankato.
Holsti suggests five guidelines for constructing content analysis categories: 1) categories should reflect purpose of the research, 2) categories should be exhaustive, that is all related items should fit within the categories, 3) categories should be mutually exclusive, 4) independence of categories, assignment of a single item should not impact the assignment of other items, and 5) the single classification principle, which means that the researcher cannot mix different levels of analysis in the categories (as cited in Jones, 1985, p. 125).

Analysis and interpretation of data collected will be an ongoing process. Constant comparisons, theoretical coding and micro analysis will be among the analysis and interpretation techniques used in this project. Constant comparisons are important because the nature of historical research is similar to a treasure hunt. One new piece of information leads to another and each new piece of information makes a situation appear more clearly or adds nuance, and identifies patterns and ideas as they emerge. So analysis of preliminary information will tell me where to dig further and will help me to make cohesive use of the available resources. Theoretical coding is simply the coding of specific ideas so that they may be examined together at a later time. Theoretical coding leads to the development of themes. Conclusions should be documentable in terms of the coding system and demonstrably triangulated by reference to multiple data sources (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 15). Micro-analysis of specific details throughout the study will lend credibility to the information gathered and the findings presented.
Summary

“The greatest problems for the new historians are surely those of sources and methods” (Burke, 2001, p. 1) I have found that comment to be true with relation to developing and articulating the method for this study. Thus, I have borrowed ideas and methods from a variety of qualitative research designs in order to develop the methodology for this study.

Cartwright in 1953 and Stone et al in 1966 issued statements about the relative lack of value of content analysis as a research method. “One of the most serious criticisms that can be made of much of the research employing content analysis is that the ‘findings’ have no clear significance for either theory or practice” (as cited in Jones, 1985, p. 130). “A large portion of studies bearing the label of content analysis have been mechanical, superficial tabulations of who says how much of what to whom” (as cited in Jones, 1985, p. 130). Jones rebuts these two statements by saying that when used correctly, content analysis can be genuinely helpful in cases where the research questions are clear, the coding categories and rules are explicit and the research process is thoroughly documented.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methods to be employed throughout this study. Historical research is neither as precise nor as orderly as quantitative research; in fact it can be quite “messy.” Throughout this paper every attempt will be made to document process as well as procedure in order to guide the reader through the processes of the researcher. This process
orientation will add to the credibility of the research and the quality of the final report.
Chapter 4
The Founding Era, 1851 - 1877

Introduction
The United States was rapidly evolving during the founding era of Higher Education in Minnesota. When the University of Minnesota was founded in 1851, Millard Fillmore was president of the United States, and the next five presidents would each serve only one term in office. Turbulence surrounding the growing differences between the northern and southern states would lead to the Civil War, which lasted from 1861 until 1865. Abraham Lincoln, the 16th President of the United States, signed the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863 and was assassinated in 1865. The 14th Amendment entitling all persons born or naturalized in the United States to citizenship and equal protection under the law was passed in 1866, giving free male slaves the right to vote. Western expansion continued and six new states were added to the union. Congress authorized the construction of a transcontinental railroad in the early 1860’s, and it was completed in 1869. Agriculture was the prime economic driver in the southern and western states, and industry was growing in the north and east. The Morrill Act of 1862 helped to stimulate the growth of universities, as the nation began to build for the future. Higher Education was growing and changing as rapidly as every other aspect of our nation at this time in history.

Higher Education in the United States

John Thelin titles the section of his book on higher education from 1860 – 1890 as “Diversity and Adversity: Resilience in American Higher Education.” This title is an apt reflection of this period in the history of higher education in our
country as it was a time of war and a time of transition for higher education. Liberal arts institutions slowly gave way to German influences and became universities. Curricular changes toward a more practical vocationally-based higher education encouraged a new breed of student. The movement toward a common grade school education for all citizens was strengthening and there was a need for teachers.

During this time of change, colleges and universities faced strong challenges. Religious interests thought that higher education should remain their responsibility. Financial support for higher education was inconsistent and often dependent upon local support and generous philanthropy. Educators had to convince their publics of the value of college because America was a land of new opportunities that did not necessarily require a college education. And across the country, colleges and universities were beginning to grapple with the idea of college for women and sometimes even co-educational opportunities.

According to Thelin (2004), the Civil War and the Morrill Acts also had significant impact on higher education. Thelin suggests that the impact of the Civil War on higher education was both positive and negative. He describes the Civil War era as a time “of pervasive influence on the entire life of the nation” (Thelin, 2004, p. 74). The Civil War era provided opportunities for passage of previously stalled legislation such as the Morrill Land Grant Act; authorization for the building of a transcontinental railroad, which helped to spur economic growth and expansion in the western territories; and the Homestead Act of 1862, which permitted citizens to receive 160 acres of public lands and then to purchase
it at a nominal fee after living on the land for five years. The Civil War era also has been credited with broadening of academic opportunities for women and curricular diversification.

Rudolph (1990) writes that the Civil War “clarified the dimensions and the prospects of the American Experiment”, it “conquered space, freeing thousands of Americans from a village orientation” and “suggested remarkable opportunities in markets, created railroads and in needs created by an expanding population” (p. 265). He also writes that the Civil War proved that popular government would work (Rudolph, 1990). However, as conventional wisdom would suggest, a major war also disrupts business as usual; men enlist in the Army instead of the university, and resources and political attention are diverted toward war time activities and away from the needs of institutions of higher education.

Contributing significantly to the development of higher education in the United States was the passage of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1867. The provision of resources helped the universities to develop and in some cases endowed them for a lifetime. The land grant acts also contained stipulations about what and how the institutions should teach. The average citizen also began to believe in the usefulness of a college education in part because of the stipulations of the Morrill Acts.

The Morrill Act “donated Public Lands to the several states and territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanical arts” (Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 568). Funds from the sale of those lands were to be used for the:
Endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanical arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the states may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life. (Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 568)

There was little federal oversight as to how the states used their land grants beyond the initial terms of the act. States sold their allotments of western lands as they saw fit and raised revenues for the development of colleges and universities that met the needs and desires of their constituencies (Thelin, 2004). And although Tewksbury (1932) maintains that “the national government in initiating a policy of federal aid to higher education in the early days of our history through the provision of land grants to individual states, was not so much concerned with the furtherance of the cause of higher education as it was with the settlement of the vexed problem of the reduction of public debt” (p. 184), Rudolph (1990) would disagree and argue that the Morrill Act positively changed the outlook of the American people toward college going.

Curricular reform dealt with both the diffusion and advancement of learning. Ideas about how to reform curriculum came primarily from German influences and American need (Rudolph, 1990). From Germany, scholars and university builders borrowed ideas of combining research and teaching, academic freedom, provisions for advanced studies, and differentiation between
philosophical studies and technical non-scholarly curricula. Certification and organization were also hallmarks of the German model (Thelin, 1982). Scientific advancements made by German scholars during the period helped to further ignite change throughout American higher education.

In 1874, James Morgan Hart wrote an article comparing the German University to the American College. According to Hart, the object of a German University was *Wissensensehaft*, which means knowledge in the purest sense of the word, “ardent, methodical, independent research after truth in any and all of its forms, but wholly irrespective of utilitarian application” (as cited in Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 572). Hart also described two conditions necessary in a German University: *lernfreiheit* or freedom of learning and *lehrfreiheit*, which meant that the professor was free to teach whatever he wanted to teach in the way he wanted to teach it (as cited in Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 572). Hart maintained that the German University:

> Does not attempt to train successful practical men, unless it be indirectly, by giving its students a profound insight into the principles of the science, and then turning them adrift to deduce the practice as well as they can from the carefully inculcated theory.

> Its chief task, that to which all its energies are directed, is the development of great thinkers, men who will extend the boundaries of knowledge. (as cited in Hofstadter & Smith, 1961 p. 579)

The German influences on higher education included the ideas of freedom for faculty to teach what they saw fit and freedom for students to choose what to
study. The German influence also helped in the development of research-based higher education and the development of graduate and theoretical instruction. American need added a practical approach to higher education in the United States. The combination of the German model that stressed the creation of new knowledge together with the American need for a practical education formed the basis for what became the American University.

Rudolph (1990) writes that “a country that was hurrying into the future required colleges that would hurry along with it. The American colleges would therefore experience the same challenges as political parties, state constitutions and economic institutions. They would be asked to pass the test of utility” (Rudolph, 1990, p. 111). The idea of utility, that colleges should teach subjects that would have some practical value for the students, became popular because of two stimuli—the Morrill Act of 1862 and the spread of an elective approach to course selection that allowed students to customize their education toward their future goals (Veysey, 1965). The philosophical German approach to higher education and the American need for utility both helped to formulate what would become a uniquely American style of higher education.

Another challenge facing higher education during this era that was also of concern to the citizenry of the states was the inconsistency of primary education. During this time colleges and universities spent a good deal of their resources on preparatory programs because they felt that incoming students lacked sufficient preparatory education. Basic education was irregular, unregulated, and often unavailable. Since responsibility for education belonged to the states, there were
vast differences in what schooling was provided. Newly formed states had less formalized educational opportunities in place, but as populations began to grow the need for common schools became more evident.

In speaking about the organization and role of the university at his inaugural address, President Elliot of Harvard made this statement: “A university is not built in the air, but on social and literary foundations which preceding generations have bequeathed” (as cited in Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 603). He was talking about grammar schools and the need for a systematic and organized approach to primary education. He recognized and articulated the need for colleges and universities to support, encourage, and advocate for universal primary education.

The common school movement was active in the United States from about 1840-1880. Horace Mann, the first Secretary of Education from Massachusetts, advocated for common school education for every child. He believed that common schools would be the great equalizer for American society. His work and that of others like him helped to focus public attention on the need for a common system of schooling and on the need for trained teachers, which led to the Normal School movement. Westward expansion, immigration, and a rapidly growing population all increased the need for an organized, effective system of elementary education. According to Rudolph (1990), “the first task before the state universities was to discover a bridge between the free public elementary school and the public university” (p. 281). By 1872, state universities in
Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin were beginning to work out certificate systems with area high schools (Rudolph, 1990).

Yet another challenge facing higher education was resistance from religious interests who opposed the development of state universities across the nation throughout the pre-civil war period (Greer, 1951). Tewksbury’s survey of pre-civil war state universities in 1932 led him to conclude that:

In almost every instance the state institutions that were established encountered serious opposition from the religious interests which were in control of higher education during the middle part of our history. The American people, it would seem, were not willing in that era to accept the apparent implications of the principle of the separation of church and state, which called for state universities of a more or less secular character. Thus the state universities of this country were obliged to pass through a long period of disfavor before they finally won for themselves a secure place in the affections of the people. (1932, p. 206)

Rivalries between denominational and secular interests often shaped state strategies regarding the use of land grant monies and the development of new universities. In Kentucky, religious denominational disputes caused the state legislature to remove the land grant programs from Transylvania University and create a new state institution on the other side of town, Kentucky State College. Similar experiences happened in several states as states struggled with the
decision about where and how to use land grant monies (Thelin, 2004).

According to Rudolph (1990):

The American state university would be defined in the great Midwest and West, where frontier democracy and frontier materialism would help to support a practical-orientated popular institution. The emergence of western leadership in the movement stemmed in part from the remarkable rapidity with which western states were populated and from the accelerated speed with which their population grew. Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, among others, found that the small denominational colleges with their feeble endowments and backward-glancing curricula could meet neither the needs of a growing population nor its preferences.

(p. 277)

During this time in history, there were also abundant financial challenges for colleges and universities. “One of the most perplexing historical riddles in American Higher Education is how colleges planned and then implemented their annual budget” (Thelin, 2004, p. 99). Coping with the Financial Panic of 1857, developing a large and prosperous enough citizenry to support higher education, and demonstrating need for higher education among the local constituency were among the challenges of early university leaders.

In 1856, the United States entered a period of recession, and by mid 1857 successive failures of banks, railroads, and other businesses led to what was called the Panic of 1857. Over 5,000 businesses failed in the United States, and there
were fears that the US Federal Government would be unable to pay its obligations. Panic and depression spread to Europe and parts of Asia. This depression era was brief, but recovery was slower in the northern portions of the United States. Several of the northwestern states did not see full recovery until near the end of the Civil War (Stamp, 1990). Many prospective students went to work instead of to college because of the economic conditions, and a college education was not yet viewed as important to success.

Other challenges to the development of higher education in this time period were the multitude of opportunities available, and the perception that a collegiate education lacked utility. Westward expansion, rapid industrialization, and immigration provided a wide range of opportunities for the industrious young man. A college education was not seen as the only or even the best way to earn one’s fortune. Educators had to convince the farmers and ranchers and businessmen and laborers that there was utility and value to the college experience. “Colleges struggled to persuade young Americans to go to college rather than pursue other adventures. Also the economic environment between 1860 and 1890 was such that college attendance, let alone a bachelor’s degree, was hardly a prerequisite for professional pursuits” (Thelin, 2004, p. 99). Thelin explains that farmers doubted the value of agricultural education, and thought that it would have little influence on crop production, so they were leery of both providing tax dollars to fund higher education and of sending their sons to college.
Perhaps the most dramatic challenge facing higher education was its attempts to provide for the higher education of women. For the most part, expanding higher education to women was seen as an extremist activity and was unpopular with most Americans during this time (Thelin, 1982). Still, in 1860 there were at least 45 institutions of higher education for women in the United States. The institutions were called by a variety of names, and offered a variety of curricula ranging from finishing school programs to vocational training, professional education, and the liberal arts.

One exception to unpopularity of higher education for women was in the area of teacher education. It was seen as respectable for women to teach basic reading and writing skills to children, and thus women were included in the Normal School and Teachers College movements. Some of these institutions for the training of teachers were co-educational and some were for women only. Thelin (2004) says that:

The history of the normal schools is confusing because it is not always clear how they were classified in the education taxonomy. At times they were lumped with secondary schools. At other times they were considered a distinct category within higher education. Finally, at some universities, they were seen as one of the academic tracks. (p. 85)

During the era being studied in this chapter, teacher training was not yet considered an academic subject worthy of university study.

The time between 1851 and 1877 was a time of significant change for higher education in the United States. Through German influence and American
need, the classical liberal arts college began to give way to the American University. Public primary education became more common, and because of the Land Grant Act, state universities began to grow. About this era, Thelin (2004) argues that although the Civil War and the Morrill Act were significant national events, their influences were really the results of innovations of colleges and the states. He says about higher education in the mid-nineteenth century America that “the national trends took their lead from an interesting array of state and local initiatives” (Thelin, 2004, p. 74). It is to some of those state and local initiatives that this paper now turns.

Minnesota

Minnesota became a territory of the United States in 1849 and then became a state in 1858. The state’s population grew tremendously between 1850 and 1860. According to the 1850 census there were 6,077 non-Indian settlers and 31,700 Indians, and by 1860 the non-Indian population was 172,072. The area first attracted fur traders and loggers, who were followed by wheat farmers. In the late 1800’s the state became the flour milling capital of the world. Iron mining and railroads also influenced the growth of the state. The settlers who first came to Minnesota were largely of Scandinavian and German descent who came to Minnesota because of the similarities in climate to the homes they had left. Many of these settlers came to the new country with firm ideas about how their society should work and the value of education.

Minnesota was a new state when the Civil War started, and it was one of the first to contribute troops to the Union effort. Governor Alexander Ramsey was in Washington when the war started on April 13, 1861 and immediately sent
a telegram requesting volunteers. Twenty-two thousand Minnesotans (13% of the state’s total population) served in the Civil War, and the 1st Minnesota Volunteer Infantry gained fame for its role in the Battle of Gettysburg (Folwell, 1926).

In August of 1862, Minnesotans faced a second military challenge with the Dakota Uprising. This conflict occurred for a variety of reasons, including the harshness of the preceding winter, which was extremely hard on the Dakota Indians who were starving as a result of the low crop harvest, and the failure of the Federal Government to provide promised annuity goods and cash. Because most of the military in Minnesota had left to support the Civil War effort, Minnesota settlers were left without protection. Several small communities in southwest Minnesota were decimated, and over 500 Minnesotans and unknown scores of Indians were killed in the uprising. Eventually, Lincoln sent troops to quell the uprising in September, and the conflict ended with the mass hanging of 38 prisoners on December 26, 1862 (Carley, 1976).

The two universities featured in this study were founded during this era. The University of Minnesota was founded in 1851 and Minnesota State University, Mankato in 1867. Although their founding dates are 16 years apart, their stories parallel each other in interesting ways. From the beginning, each was designed to be part of a system of education for the state. Kiehle (1903) opens his discussion of the history of education in Minnesota by saying, “The planting and fostering of a system of education in a new state is the most far-reaching event in its history” (p. 7). He goes on to say, “The pioneers who did this service stand as the representatives of the world's civilization at its high water mark” (Kiehle,
1903, p. 7). Minnesotans began to develop institutions of higher education even before the territory became a state and included the idea of higher education in the state constitution.

The 8th article of the Minnesota state constitution begins with the following statement: “The stability of a republican form of government depending mainly upon the intelligence of the people, it shall be the duty of the Legislature to establish a general and uniform system of public schools” (as cited in Anderson & Lobb, 1921, p. 238). Later in the same section it states:

The location of the University of Minnesota as established by existing laws, is hereby confirmed and said institution is hereby declared to be the University of the State of Minnesota. All the rights, immunities, franchises and endowments heretofore granted or conferred, are hereby perpetuated unto the said University, and all lands which may be granted hereafter by Congress or other donations for said University purposes shall vest in the institution referred to in this Section. (as cited in Anderson & Lobb, 1921, p. 238)

The University of Minnesota was founded in 1851 as a preparatory school seven years before Minnesota became a state. It closed during the Civil War and re-opened as a university in 1867. The Mankato Normal School, which later became Minnesota State University, Mankato, was founded a year later in 1868. In their early years, each of the institutions faced similar challenges: concerns about value and utility from a questioning public, which led to uncertain and often
inadequate financial support; low admission standards and the need to offer preparatory programs; and an evolving curriculum.

*University of Minnesota*

St. Paul and Minneapolis extend from the Mississippi River like the legs on a pair of trousers. Where they join is the University of Minnesota… (Schulman, 1943). In describing the founding years of the University of Minnesota, the first issue is to identify which years those might be. The idea of the university was first expressed by Governor Ramsey in 1851, and it existed in a state of incubation for the next 18 years. The true beginning of the institution can be considered to be 1869 with the decision to hire its first president, William Watts Folwell. However, the proceeding years established an important foundation for what was to come.

The University of Minnesota was one of 21 state universities founded before the Civil War, and one of 14 founded in post-revolution states (Tewksbury, 1932, p. 169). It faced a variety of issues that hindered its early development including financial difficulties and competition from religious interests. In addition, Minnesota’s diverse and growing populous was ill-prepared and unsure of the need for higher education. Two national issues also impacted the development of the University of Minnesota: the civil war and the Morrill Act, which provided the first federal support for higher education in American history.

Like most of the states that came into the union after the revolutionary war, the state of Minnesota was given land grants from the national government for the purpose of starting a university. Minnesota received three land grants
from the national government: in 1857 the year before it achieved statehood, in 1861, and again in 1870-- totaling 82,640 acres (Tewksbury, 1932, p. 197). The first grant was reserved for the state in 1851, but not actually received until 1857. During the ensuing time period the regents of the university were primarily engaged in managing the financial affairs of the university. By the time the first grant was actually received, the new university was at the point of insolvency due to risky land deals made in hopes of future large dividends. In *Education in Minnesota* Kiehle says:

> The history of the university, from the date of its establishment by the territorial legislature to that of its reorganization under its present charter is one of continuous struggle against adverse circumstances, a premature organization under the stress of a frontier enthusiasm and hopefulness, which resulted in financial embarrassment, and the suspension of the educational department. (1903, p. 45)

After a series of misadventures, a site for the campus was established in 1854, and its first building was under construction when the financial crisis of 1857 hit. Construction was halted and only one wing in the proposed building was completed by 1860. For the next eight years the building remained unused and “nothing seemed to prosper excepting the interest on the $65,000 debt that the new university owed” (Kiehle, 1903, p.45).

In 1860 the university was reorganized and the new Board of Regents, which included the state’s governor, found that the university’s indebtedness had grown:
Statement of the Indebtedness of the University in amounts due

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>$4,833.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>$19,130.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>$59,511.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.G. Riheldaffer</td>
<td>$117.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Atwater (probably)</td>
<td>$1,913.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated interest</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$93,506.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The new regents, including O.C. Merriman, John Pillsbury, and John Nichols spent the next several years working to erase the university’s debt. Fifteen thousand acres of land grants were sold and additional property gained in government grants (Morrill Act) in 1862 and 1870 allowed the university to become free from debt. The first ever state appropriation of $15,000 for repairs on the university building allowed it to finally open a preparatory department in 1867 and finally as a university in 1869 (Kiehle, 1903).

Philanthropy also played an early and prominent role in the development of the University of Minnesota. Although their job as regents was to extricate the university from debt by overseeing the sale of lands granted to that purpose, Pillsbury, Merriman, and Nichols spent large amounts of personal funds in their efforts to put the university in a position to move forward. Pillsbury became
known as the “Father of the University” for his service and support to the University of Minnesota (Keihle, 1903, p. 51). Pillsbury continued to serve and financially support the university until his death in 1901, contributing personal funds to build two public libraries, a boarding home for young women, and a biological science hall for the University of Minnesota.

The approach of the Civil War and opposition of religious interests in the state stalled forward movement in the university’s development, and further added to its financial difficulties. In 1861, Edward D. Neil, Chancellor of the State University and State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Minnesota resigned his positions to serve as Chaplain of the First Minnesota Regiment of Infantry (Kiehle, 1903). Minnesota was the first “western” state to send troops to support the Federal Government during the Civil War. The 22,000 troops sent to defend the unity of our nation not only significantly reduced the number of available young men to recruit for college it, turned attention away from the needs of the fledgling university.

Religious opposition emerged in large part because several religious denominations had already opened colleges in Minnesota prior to the inception of the University of Minnesota. Baldwin College (later renamed Macalester College), was opened in 1854 by the Presbyterians in St. Paul. The Methodists established Hamline University in 1854, and opened it to men and women in 1857. The Episcopalians opened Carleton College in 1870, and the Catholics established St. John’s College in 1864. Folwell addressed some of these specific challenges the young university faced in a speech he gave in 1918 at the
institution’s 50th anniversary celebration and the inauguration of President Barton. He said:

There was not only indifference on the part of a large public and in the legislature – there was opposition. That which gave most concern came from the friends of denominational colleges which had been opened or projected. These good people were sincere in their conviction that no college could be a safe and wholesome place of education, unless under an aggressive religious and preferably denominational regime. In their view a college was an instrument of church propaganda…. From pulpit and press the lovely epithets of godless and infidel were repeated with a frequency that became tiresome. The outpourings had their effect on the university – and that was to make all concerned with its government and instruction the more scrupulous in conforming to the common usages of Christianity. (Folwell, 1918, p. 14-15)

After the Civil War, the Morrill Act provided new energy for those interested in building the University of Minnesota. In 1868 the University of Minnesota was reorganized under a new charter and “launched upon a career of real usefulness to the state and the nation” (Tewksbury, 1932, p. 206). The university opened in 1869 with a class of 13, a preparatory enrollment of 217, and 9 faculty members. The university’s first president was William Folwell, who spent the next 15 years organizing and developing the university. The young
university immediately became involved in issues impacting the public it was built to serve, diversity of the student body, curricular reform, and teacher education.

Attempting to explain why higher education seemed to take precedent over the establishment of common schools in the state of Minnesota Kiehle (1903) writes:

The noticeable characteristic of our own, and of all educational history, is in this, that provision is first made for the higher education and leadership of those who control and give direction to the institutional life. If society has an intelligent, virtuous and philanthropic leadership in a few good men and women, the masses will follow and obey in confidence. (p. 13-14)

In reality, both elementary and higher education grew in tandem, supporting each other’s growth and development.

The question about female students arose prior to the arrival of the university’s first president. Principal Washburn of the preparatory division put the matter to a faculty vote. The faculty held with traditional thought and voted not to admit women. However, the Board of Regents proved more responsive to popular opinion and overruled the faculty and decided to admit women on an equal basis with men (Kiehle, 1903, p. 57).

In his inaugural speech President Folwell (1869) talked about the social contract between higher education and its public saying that “the university is essential to the well-being, rather than to the being of the state” (p. 3), and then he answered the question “what then can the University do for the State?” with this:
First of all she can form the head and crown of our system of schools, sending her life-giving influence to its remotest fibers. The University should be the great Normal School for teachers of High Schools, Academies and Colleges. The University, by refusing its degrees and honors to illiterate and unworthy candidates can not only raise the standard of scholarship in all the schools, but can elevate the professions from the low condition into which they have confessedly fallen. And there is another consideration, which ought to be mentioned here- The University in organizing colleges of medicine and law, owes it to the people not merely to instruct the few to heal diseases, and manage suites at law, but to teach the many how to keep well and out of litigation. . . . The University will accumulate and maintain a great Library, to which all citizens can resort for complete information on any useful subject. Next to the instruction, the library is the great interest of the University.

(1869, p. 3)

Folwell goes on to discuss museums of history, natural history and art, and research. He cites an example of the potential value of agricultural research, “If the sum of $20,000 in research expense, could result in but one species of the apple, sure to thrive in Minnesota, no one would call that money ill spent” (1869, p.5). Finally he says that Minnesota needs intelligent voters and experts in legislation and military defense.
Such are some of the services the University can render to the state, and are so many reasons why she is bound to interfere in its behalf . . . . The students of the State University, beneficiaries to a great degree of the State, may be regarded as being, in a sort, engaged in the public service, enjoying the public bounty upon condition of, and only during good behavior. (1869, p.6)

In return for all that the university will give the state; Folwell says that the state should provide the university with three things: necessary funding and resources, authority to self govern, and trust (Folwell, 1869). Although he uses different words, it is obvious that the first President of the University of Minnesota believes that there is a social compact between the university and the public it serves.

A major issue facing President Folwell upon his arrival at the university was the curriculum. When the University of Minnesota first opened, most of its offerings were preparatory in nature. The lack of educational opportunities in the state was staggering. There were very few common schools, almost no graded grammar schools, and no preparatory or high schools. In addition to the preparatory courses, the college offered a classical college curriculum, featuring Greek, Latin, mathematics, philosophy, and history. Early writings about the University suggest that the University of Minnesota demonstrated significant progress toward two curricular goals under the leadership of President Folwell: articulation of the industrial sciences and development of departments within the colleges of science, literature, and the arts. According to the article “Progress in Agriculture by Education and Government Aid” in The Atlantic Monthly (April
“One of the most salutary effects produced by the Morrill Act was the lively interest and discussion respecting the proper organization of the new institutions to be formed under it, which arose wherever the law was carried into effect” (p. 12). Conditions of the Morrill grant and demands from the public as well as needs of society dictated that the curriculum be broadened beyond the traditional liberal arts offering. “In their planning for the future the Board of Regents recognized the enlarging scope of education as demanded by our industrial civilization” (Keihle, 1903, p. 57). The regents demonstrated this by calling for five or more colleges within the University of Minnesota to provide for the various professions that might support the needs of the state’s citizens.

Issues surrounding the development of the College of Agriculture plagued Folwell throughout his tenure. Across the state there were arguments about the inclusion or exclusion of the College of Agriculture, with powerful local interests such as the Grange requesting that it be a separate institution. About agriculture, Folwell believed that agricultural research could be an important asset for the state and used the example “If the expenditure of $20,000 could result in discovering but one species of the apple, sure to thrive in Minnesota, no one would call that money ill spent” (Folwell, circa 1869-1887). Across the nation, university presidents were facing similar challenges with the concept of agricultural education. The issue was addressed in an Atlantic Monthly journal article, “It is not for the purpose of learning how to plow and hoe, but why to plow and hoe at all, and when and where to do it to the best advantage, that parents are willing to send their sons to the colleges” (“Progress,” 1882, p 12).
Another of President Folwell’s initiatives was to consider the relationship between the need for a classical and professional education and how the University of Minnesota could provide for both. President Folwell outlined a plan to allocate the first two years of collegiate study towards general culture, the classics, and philosophy and the second two years toward professional preparation (Kiehle, 1903). This was the beginning of what would come to be called the Minnesota Plan. Folwell’s Minnesota Plan included both offering a wide range of college coursework as well as graduate and professional programs. His idea was met with skepticism by traditionalists who believed that the curriculum should emphasize Greek, Latin, and classical studies. Folwell’s championing of his plan led to a faculty protest in 1879 and eventually to his decision to resign from the presidency in 1884.

Folwell campaigned vigorously for the whole of education in Minnesota, claiming that the university could not reach its full potential until the students coming to it were adequately prepared. Throughout his tenure as president and beyond he campaigned for a system of education that included graded schools and public high schools for all citizens of the state of Minnesota. In 1872, he spoke for the University Board of Regents to a convention of county and city school superintendents. He said that the great German universities depended on the gymnasia to provide qualified students and that the American University should depend on high schools in much the same way. About the future of education in Minnesota he made three assumptions:
1. That there shall be at length a comprehensive organization of public education in Minnesota, embracing all grades.

2. That the State University may form the “roof and crown” of a noble structure of High Schools based firmly on the broad foundation of the common schools of the State.

3. That the Superintendents, principals and teachers of the High and graded schools, one and all, will now and always, co-operate with the University authorities in securing that actual union so essential alike to the schools and University.

(Folwell, 1872, p. 2)

Despite all that was accomplished in the first 10 years of the University of Minnesota, President Folwell looked back on the years between 1869 and 1879 as a rough period for the state and its university. He said that the seventies were a period of hard times, listing the Civil War in which one-half of Minnesota’s voting population had enlisted, the Dakota Uprising, the economic panic of 1873, the 4-year grasshopper scourge, and the blizzard of 1873. He said that both public and private charities were strained to avert starvation during the time, and it was no wonder that enrollment in the university of Minnesota grew slowly (Folwell, 1918).

The Minnesota Alumni Weekly (1913) sums up Folwell’s influence on the university like this:

Among the important events of Dr. Folwell's administration was the organization of the geological and natural history survey,
the organization of the state high school board to encourage the establishment of high schools, and the organization of the medical department as an examining board. The far reaching effects of the high school board, particularly, mark its establishment as a matter of unusual importance. (University of Minnesota, 1913, p.4)

**Mankato Normal School**

Mankato Normal School was authorized by the Minnesota State Legislature in 1866, and faced many of the same initial challenges as the University of Minnesota. At that time, Normal Schools were being established across the country as a way to develop teachers for common schools. According to an article first published in the *Illinois Teacher*, the first Normal School was established in Massachusetts in 1839 and by 1870, there were 35 such institutions located in 17 states. Courses of study ranged from 1 ½ to 4 years and the curriculum varied from the classical to elementary English and reading to mathematics and some science and arts at the different institutions.

The need for teachers in Minnesota was great because of the rapidly expanding population. The Mankato Normal School was the second of three Normal Schools authorized by the Minnesota State Legislature. When it opened its doors in the fall of 1868, over 70 potential students arrived to take entrance exams. This surprised Principal George Gage who had purchased a dozen pencils to be used by the students he anticipated on that opening day (”Normal School Opens,” 1868). The admitted students attended classes in rented space in the Methodist Episcopal Church that first fall, and later in the semester the school
moved to newly renovated, but rented quarters. The school continued to exist in rented facilities through 1870. The new Normal School at Mankato faced a variety of challenges ranging from financial instability to arguments over admissions requirements, curriculum, and value to the state of Minnesota.

The Minnesota State Legislature provided the first challenge to the institution in the legislation that authorized its existence. The town of Mankato was required to donate $5,000 before the school could be established. It was a matter of some pride that the citizens of Mankato raised that money, especially after some of the neighboring towns had accused them of forfeiting the rights to the school. In an editorial from the *Mankato Weekly Record* the author writes “Our citizens fully appreciate the importance of this school and will not only cheerfully contribute the amount necessary to secure its permanent location here, but will also aid in its maintenance after it is once established” (“The Normal School,” 1867). Daniel Buck, a Mankato attorney and member of the state legislature was the town’s leader in securing legislation that allowed the city to sell bonds as a way of raising the $5,000 to establish the school.

Difficulties in obtaining state funding delayed the construction of a dedicated school building until 1869. Even then, as one historian reported, “The necessity and physical appearance of the building were both critically questioned and passionately supported” (Anderson, 1987, p. 73). Senator Everett P. Freeman of Blue Earth County proposed the bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Normal School at Mankato. In his speech he avowed the need for teacher
education in Minnesota and praised the citizens of Mankato for their efforts in support of the institution (Legislative Notes, 1869).

The elaborate ceremony and parade planned to mark the laying of the cornerstone for the new Normal School building was a demonstration of community interest and affection for the new institution. The article “Laying the Cornerstone” from the *Mankato Weekly Union* in June of 1869 describes a parade and day of festivities marking the laying of the corner stone for the Normal School building saying that “the day proved that the citizens of Mankato are fully alive to the work of education and have a full appreciation of the honor and benefit conferred upon Mankato by the State in giving us the location of the Second State Normal School” (“Laying,” 1869). Another local newspaper had to print the picture and description of the building in two successive issues because of high demand. Citizens wanted to save the paper and send it to relatives and friends out east. The paper’s editor believed it to be “one of the very best immigration documents we can send abroad” because:

> A paramount consideration with the better class of people seeking new homes in the west is to secure the advantage of good schools. Mankato is highly favored in this respect, as well as in its manufacturing and commercial advantages, and to make these facts widely known should be the aim of every citizen, for they will contribute largely to our speedy growth and prosperity” (“State Normal School at Mankato,” 1870).
They buried a box near the cornerstone of the new building, and a look at
the contents of that box, now in the Minnesota State University, Mankato’s
archives provides witness to the day’s events. The box held constitutions,
membership lists of the various lodges in Mankato, business cards and handbills
from local merchants, bank drafts and coins, newspapers, student rosters, Normal
School Board Reports and more (Old Main, 1869-1969).

In his address that day, Principal Gage talked about the need for continued
community support and the value that the school would provide. He said, “Upon
yonder corner-stone let this temple of learning rise, and let it tell to future
generations, that the settlers of this young and vigorous State were not unmindful
of that which is the bulwark of free institutions, the common school” (Legislative
Notes, June 26, 1869).

As the first principal of the school, Gage’s responsibilities included
teaching, supervising his teaching staff, raising money to build a permanent
school building, and recruiting students. He was hired by the Normal School
Board and reported to both the State Normal School Board and a local Prudential
Committee. In addition to building the Normal School building, Gage was
responsible for establishing admission standards, developing a curriculum, and
hiring a small staff. Gage struggled for state funds and dealt with continuous
criticism of normal schools by opponents of the institution. In a thesis about the
eyearly history of the Mankato Normal School, Debra L. Anderson described
Gage’s administration as follows; “…in sum, under Gage’s direction Mankato
Normal School was characterized by controversy, uncertainty and growth”
(Anderson, 1987, p. 77). Citizens and politicians debated the need for normal schools in Minnesota for a variety of reasons that included cost, value to the state, and even quality of teachers produced.

Newspapers and public records describe heated debates over state allocations, admission standards, curriculum duplication, tuition, and attendance at the model school. All of this was indicative of the criticism and mixed views that society had about the Mankato Normal School and its development.

In 1869, the Normal School Board reported that its schools were “literally the cornerstones of our common school system and as such must be adequately supported by the state” (“Minnesota Executive Documents,” 1860-1900). However, fighting between the three towns where Normal Schools were located in Minnesota—Winona, Mankato, and St. Cloud—and economic hardships made funding erratic and insufficient, and the future of the Normal Schools tenuous.

Significant competition among the cities, towns and counties of Minnesota during the 1860’s and 1870’s led legislators from neighboring communities to suggest that the Mankato Normal School be closed and turned into a home for orphans. Charges against the Mankato Normal School were numerous: it was too expensive, the state only needed one teacher training school, teachers didn’t need to attend a normal school, all they needed was a teaching certificate, and the graduates of Mankato Normal School didn’t teach after graduation. All of these claims were refuted colorfully in the Mankato newspaper. In response to an article in the Rochester Post, the Mankato Weekly Record states,
It is true that Mankato is rapidly outstripping Rochester as a commercial point, has already a larger population and business, and is the best wheat market in the State, and has a better and larger county to support it than any other interior town in southern Minnesota, but all this should not so excite the envy of the *Post* that it would lend its influence to such Democrats as Dick Jones in his efforts to check the progress of popular education in Minnesota for the benefit of the Democratic Party.


Other articles of about the same time, reported job placements of the first 10 graduates of the Mankato Normal School and remarked on the efficient and effective use of state dollars by the institution.

Among the complaints levied against the Mankato Normal School, the majority were proven false. The school’s detractors accused it of being nothing more than a glorified common school for rich people’s children in Blue Earth County, and said that few if any of the graduates planned to teach in the state. They accused Normal School students of being poorly prepared and condemned the need for preparatory coursework. Gage’s annual report of 1870 included demographic information about the incoming class of 45 students:

- Average age of 19
- Birthplaces predominantly Eastern or Midwestern states
- 17 students from Blue Earth County
- 29 had parents who were farmers, and other parental occupations included merchants, mechanics, ministers, bankers, and others.
• Half had taught in common schools prior to their attendance at the Normal School.

• Average score on the entrance exam was 63.7 (Minnesota Executive Documents, 1860-1900, p. 436

Gage quickly noted differences in prospective students’ preparation and ability. Probably because of this, he divided the teacher training program into four sections, A-D, each lasting about a semester, but repeatable if necessary. Students who scored poorly on entrance exams or who had little teaching experience began in the D section. Seasoned teachers began in the B section, and were ready to graduate in about 2 terms. Sessions C and D included educational basics such as reading, writing, arithmetic, history, and geography, while sessions B and A focused on teaching skills. Gage addressed the problem of under-qualified students throughout his tenure as principal. In 1872 he proposed that there be two educational tracts, one for those who intended to teach in common schools and another for perspective teachers of graded schools.

In exchange for free tuition, students were asked to sign pledges to teach in the state of Minnesota for two years after completing their course of study. This was in response to criticism about the value of Normal Schools and their graduates to the state. Records from the first several graduating classes show that the vast majority of students honored their pledges and taught in Minnesota for at least two years.

This article from the *Mankato Weekly Union*, dated August 28, 1870 describes the young institution and the town’s pride in it quite well:
This prosperous institution for the training of teachers will enter upon a third year of its existence on the 7th of September next. The new Normal building will at that time be completed, and all departments of the school will then occupy it for the first time. The building is commodious and in general admirably adapted for the purpose designed. Candidates for admission must be 16 years of age, possess good health, a good moral character, and pledge themselves to teach for two years after graduating. The school year is divided into two terms of twenty weeks each and the courses embrace two years. The ordinary expenses in attending this school for board, $3.50 to $4.00 per week, for use of textbooks, $1.50 per term of twenty weeks. The Model Schools of the institution are three in number, grammar, intermediate and primary. Tuition, $4.00, $3.40 and $3.00 respectively, for a term of ten weeks, which must be paid strictly in advance. All letters of inquiry should be addressed the Principal, Geo. M. Gage, Mankato, Minnesota. (Mankato Weekly Union, 1870)

Gage and his staff initiated several programs that would later be considered community education and involved themselves in community activities. The Weigel Musical Institute began in the fall of 1869 and provided daily recitations in vocal and instrumental music that the townspeople could participate in. Professor Weigel also offered music lessons to interested community members. Principle Gage led a Reading Circle that provided
entertainment and culture for those interested on Monday evenings throughout the fall and winter ("Announcement," 1872), and a variety of other performances by Normal School students and their instructors are mentioned in the local newspapers.

In the early years of its existence, the students primarily came from around the Mankato area. They were either day students who lived in town, or they boarded with local residents while school was in session. As the school grew, more and more students came from longer distances and had to board in town, especially over the winter. Since most of the students attending the Mankato Normal School supported themselves, finding reasonably priced room and board was a priority. Principal Gage was an early proponent of housing students on campus and proposed making part of the Normal School building function as a dormitory. He believed that the state had a responsibility to provide housing for those students who came from out of the immediate community. It is unclear if this came to pass during Gage’s tenure at the Mankato Normal School.

An early tradition that demonstrated community interest and appreciation for the Normal School was the final examination process which was open to the public. In January of 1871, the Mankato Weekly Record reported attendance between 1,200 and 1,500 citizens watching the exams. David L. Kiehle, county superintendent of public instruction for Filmore County acted as inspector for the examinations. At that first graduation ceremony, Gage reminded the students that the state of Minnesota had provided their education and the graduates were bound
to the state and should fulfill their pledges and exert an influence on the common schools ("Normal School Graduation,” 1871)

Mankato Normal School was open to men and women from the beginning, and classes were always coeducational. Teaching was a career option that seemed to be open to women. There was, however, a difference in the rate of pay for male and female teachers in Minnesota. In a report by the State Superintendent of Public Education from 1870, the average monthly salary for male teachers was $37.14 and the average monthly salary for females was $23.36 ("Salaries, 1871).

Another indication of the difference in attitude toward male and female teachers is the short tenure of Miss Julia Sears as the second principal of the Mankato Normal School. When Gage left his position as principal of the school in order to become Superintendent of Public Instruction for St. Paul, he recommended that Sears take his previous position as principal of the Mankato Normal School. She was hired in that role for a one year period at a salary $500 less than Principal Gage had been receiving so that the school could afford to hire a man to see to the physical structure of the school. The next year she was offered an assistant position, so that a man could be hired to be the new principal of the school. About the demotion, and subsequent elimination of her position, the Mankato Weekly Review reprinted an article from the Minneapolis Times that said “that lady has been very badly used by the Normal Board, and the revolt of the pupils of the Mankato Normal School perfectly justified. Such shabby treatment of a lady, who is universally admitted to be one of the best educators in the state,
should be met with the severest reprobation by the people” ("Mankato Normal School,” 1873).

The centralization of the Normal School system in Minnesota and the Sears Rebellion that marked the end of her tenure were the two most notable aspects of Sears’s administration. Sears continued to build the school along the path that Gage had set. Criticism of the Normal Schools continued, partially as a result of the financial difficulties the schools presented. An article in the Mankato Weekly Record, written to discredit negative editorials in neighboring newspapers expressed amazement that anyone would measure the value of Normal School education in monetary terms (“Normal School Education,” 1873). The article went on to compare the costs of the Mankato Normal School with the Deaf, Dumb and Blind Asylum in Faribault and the St. Peter Insane Asylum. It was calculated that a Normal School education cost the state $28.00 per pupil per year, and over $88.00 per person per year at those other institutions.

The remarkable part of her administration was her gender, and the debate about her ability to lead the school continued throughout her tenure in office. In November of 1872 the Prudential Committee report praised her work, but still noted that she needed a male assistant to do the heavier or physical work.

A more centralized control over the state of Minnesota’s three Normal Schools came as a result of criticism about value and ongoing financial difficulties. The schools were initially established with an understanding that local community support and involvement was important. Thus the communities where they were located contributed money toward each of the school’s
development and continued to be actively involved in their governance through the Prudential Committees. Because of this, the main objective of the normal schools was to respond to local interests and to maintain a relationship with the state governing board (Mitau, 1977). Governor Horace Austin initiated the move toward centralized control in his 1873 annual message to the state. He believed that criticism of the Normal Schools would be eliminated if the schools were centrally managed. The state legislature acted on the Governor’s suggestion and by March 7, 1873, the new board was established and the Mankato Prudential committee ceased to exist. Gage was elected president of the board (“Normal Board Elected, 1873).

Despite funding issues, statewide criticism of the Normal Schools, and a change in governance structure, the year concluded favorably and newspaper articles indicated that Principal Sears was well respected and liked by the public, her staff, and students. Still, she was not reappointed for the next year, which contributed to the school’s first student protest. The issues surrounding Sears’s replacement as Principal, demoting her to Assistant Principal, and then her subsequent removal as Assistant Principal caused 41 students to withdraw from the Normal School in the fall of 1873 and write a petition requesting her reinstatement. New Principal David C. John took a hard line against the protestors and publically suspended the students. He stated that the students could only return if they admitted their error and promised good behavior in the future. Only a few returned and eventually thirty-two students were expelled. About the rebellion, John said, “The rebellion seemed to be gaining strength; a
The spirit of defiance became more apparent every day; I saw the growing danger of daily contact between the loyal and disloyal pupils, and feeling assured that all hope of submission was at an end, I determined to resort to the only alternative which remained” (John, 1873, p. 891). The expelled students were barred from enrollment at either of the state’s other Normal Schools and the University of Minnesota.

The conflict played out in newspapers across the state with some supporting the Normal Board and some supporting Sears. Final resolution to the issue didn’t come until 2009 when a new residence hall at Minnesota State University, Mankato was named the Julia A. Sears Hall in her honor.

In the midst of this conflict, John assumed his new role as principal of the Mankato Normal School. He served in that role from 1873 – 1880. Hallmarks of John’s administration were the establishment of tougher admission standards and a more rigorous curriculum.

John believed that public opposition to Normal Schools was the result of low standards and the failure of normal school graduates to excel as teachers. He proposed a three part solution to the problem:

1) Keep tuition free and also pay a portion of the student’s room and board costs.

2) Give faculty power to release students who were not suited to teaching work.

3) A new testing method to be overseen by the County Superintendent of education. (John, 1873)
He also believed that normal schools were crippled by the use of enrollment figures as measures of quality. Standardization, organization, and evaluation were key aspects of his administration. During his time in office teaching certificates were developed and implemented, and Teaching Institutes for Common School Teachers became regular offerings of the Normal School. The Teachers Institutes went a long way towards helping the public to approve and understand Normal School techniques and helped to build community and regional support for the Mankato Normal School. John summarized the first 10 years of Mankato’s Normal school with the following:

The school has had a hard struggle for existence, partly in consequence of errors, which are the invariable outgrowth of inexperience in new enterprises; partly in consequence of a quadrennium of local devastation, and partly in consequence of opposition to normal schools per se, which in the year of 1876 was strong enough to defeat the appropriation necessary to its sustenance.

It has, however, passed its period of probation successfully, and the stern discipline to which it has been subjected has developed a thoroughness and efficiency which could scarcely have been achieved had public sentiment been universally favorable. A good school cannot be made to order. . . . It is a growth, a development . . . and time is an essential factor in its production. (Catalogue, 1877-78, p. 7)
Summary

The two schools experienced some similar hurdles in the earliest years of their history. Challenges from public officials and citizens about the value of the institutions, financial instability, secular interests, and basic organizational structure impacted both the University of Minnesota and the Mankato Normal School in the beginning. The biggest differences between the two institutions revolved around ownership and prestige. Both institutions were lucky enough to have powerful and committed champions who worked to insure their success, and from the beginning leaders in the state seemed to understand the value of education and that articulation between levels of instruction were important.

From the beginning, the University of Minnesota was perceived as belonging to the entire state, and as it grew, it became a source of pride to the whole state. The view of the Mankato Normal School was much more parochial. This is perhaps because of the other state Normal Schools at St. Cloud and Winona and the competition for resources, students, and statewide support that the three schools engaged in. The majority of teachers produced at the Mankato Normal School stayed in the southwestern part of Minnesota which might have contributed to the idea that the institution was only of benefit to the local citizens. In addition, the local control of the Normal Schools in Minnesota during the founding years might have added fuel to the idea that they didn’t serve the entire state effectively. Another possible explanation might stem from the legislative method from which the Normal Schools were created with representatives and senators vying for a variety of state agencies that could enhance the commerce of
their own districts. Whatever the reason, this local ownership perspective made it difficult for the Normal Schools to gain funding or state wide credibility.

The University of Minnesota was a source of pride to the state of Minnesota and it was evident that the Federal Government was encouraging the growth and development of institutions of higher education in the states. The various federal land grants to support higher education demonstrate the national commitment to higher education, and the states all seemed to be in a competition to develop quality institutions. The Normal School movement was much quieter and did not have strong national support.

Leadership and support for education as a whole was evident at this time. A small group of men seemed to champion education from common school through University. David Kiehle who wrote *Education in Minnesota* in 1903, serves as a good example of the education leaders in the state of Minnesota during its early years. Kiehle served as Commissioner of Education for the State and later became the first chairman of the Pedagogy Department in the College of Education at the University of Minnesota. George Gage served as the first principal of the Mankato Normal School, then worked to build a system of graded schools in Minneapolis and finally helped to promote the development of high schools in the state. President Folwell, who first ran the University of Minnesota, gave speeches across the state emphasizing the importance of civic education while he chaired the University of Minnesota’s Department of education. He later wrote a four volume history about the state of Minnesota, and helped to found the Minnesota Historical Society. John Pillsbury served on the Board of Regents for
the University of Minnesota for almost 30 years; he also served in a variety of political offices and spent two terms as governor of the state. These men and others like them built Minnesota’s education system, and all seemed to understand that all of the various parts, common schools, graded schools, high schools, normal schools and the state university were important to the growth and development of the state of Minnesota.

In both cases it is clear that there was a clearly articulated agreement about the role of the institution to serve the population of the state. In his inaugural speech President Folwell talked about the social contract between higher education and its public “The university is essential to the well-being, rather than to the being of the state” and “The students of the State University, beneficiaries to a great degree of the State, may be regarded as being, in a sort, engaged in the public service, enjoying the public bounty upon condition of, and only during good behavior” (Folwell, 1869). In return for all that the university would give the state, Folwell maintained that the state should provide the university with three things: necessary funding and resources, authority to self govern, and trust (Folwell, 1869, p. 8). Although he used different words, it is obvious that the first president of the University of Minnesota believed in a social compact between the university and the public it serves.

In 1874 the Blue Earth County Superintendent of Schools, E.C. Payne said that the true purpose of a Normal School is not to educate young men and women, but to take young men and women after they are in a measure educated and train them in the aptitudes and theories of teaching. And in speaking about the need to
fund the Normal Schools sufficiently, he said that “the state has no interest and no
duty paramount to that of sustaining generously and heartily these institutions
dedicated to the professional education of its teachers” (“Editorial,” 1874).

Although the relationship between the Mankato Normal School and its
public was simpler than the one that the University of Minnesota enjoyed with its
public, it is clear there was a relationship. If the state and the community
provided funding, the Normal School would provide teachers for the common
schools. Providing additional explanation about the value of the Normal School
and why the town of Mankato should support it, Daniel Buck said “the Normal
School will bring to our place a superior class of citizens. It will bring talent,
wealth, business and a more elevated and refined state of society. It will raise the
standard of intelligence and education, and be a proud, enduring monument of the
generosity and wisdom of our people” (Mankato Weekly Record, 1866).

The single purpose of the Normal School helped to define its mission to
the public, and also made it an easier target for those who disapproved of that
single mission. The University of Minnesota was established to provide leaders
for the state in a variety of fields, as well as to conduct research and provide
services for the good of the state. Its multiple purposes made it appear useful to
more residents of the state.

An important difference between the two institutions was in how they
were created. The University of Minnesota was by constitution an entity of the
state. The state’s founding fathers thought that having a state university was so
important that it was included in the constitution, and granted some ongoing
support from state land grants. The Mankato Normal School was formed by legislative act, which subjected it to a great deal of debate, and made it more vulnerable to the whims of the state legislature.

Funding for the two institutions was also quite different. Between state and federal land grants, the University of Minnesota was soon able to create its first endowment, the University Fund. The University Fund supplemented annual state appropriations and was an important resource in the growth of the institution. The Mankato Normal School had only state appropriations, tuition, and income from the preparatory school upon which to rely. As a result, the Normal School grew much more slowly, and every aspect of its development was scrutinized in the state legislature.

The next chapter will consider the development of both institutions in the 1900-1910 time period and to what extent they continued to honor the social compact between higher education and the public they were designed to serve.
Chapter 5
The Early Years, 1900 – 1910

Introduction

The political and social environment of the United States changed significantly in the years between the founding era of higher education in Minnesota and 1900. There were 45 states in the Union and most of the west was settled. Communication and transportation from coast to coast was no longer the struggle it had once been because train travel and the use of the telegraph were commonplace in the United States by 1900, and the telephone technology was becoming more readily available. Industrialization and agricultural advances gave most Americans a greater degree of leisure time than ever before.

The four month long Spanish American War started and ended in 1898. Historians say that it made Theodore Roosevelt a hero and the United States an international power (Virga, 1997, p. 195). At the end of the war, the United States had a colonial empire that included Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines. The United States fought for the next four years to retain its hold over the Philippines and lost over 4,000 men in the struggle.

Although the formal reconstruction of the southern states had ended in 1877, the United States continued to struggle with cultural differences. Tensions between northern and southern citizens did not end with the war and immigrants brought new cultural identities and ways of life to the United States. As living conditions deteriorated due to economic crisis and famine in southern and Eastern Europe, tens of thousands of immigrants came to the United States, reaching a
million a year by 1902. Many of these immigrants worked in the factories and mills on the east coast, helped to build railroads, and developed farming communities in the western states. Women from all walks of life began to demand the right to vote and to control their own destinies. Immigration to the United States, the abolition of slavery, and issues of women’s rights began to change the fabric of daily life in the United States (Borrows, 1999).

Citizens and immigrants alike were concerned about education in the United States during this time. Education was seen by many as a way to succeed in life in the United States. By 1900, children from the ages of 8 to 14 were required to attend school in 31 states. By 1910, according to the US Census, 72% of all American children were attending school, with about half of those attending one-room schools. In 1900, high school curriculum began undergoing some fundamental changes from classical studies to more practical education. The high school diploma was becoming more commonplace, and it was rapidly becoming a requirement for college admission. As more and more citizens took advantage of public education opportunities, the demand for higher education grew.

Higher Education in the United States

In 1900, there were no standards, and really no common understanding about what higher education should be. Yet nearly all institutions of higher education enjoyed a growth in demand from prospective students and interest from prospective benefactors. During the time from 1890 to 1910, commercial and industrial expansion provided impetus for increased philanthropic activity that helped to create strong endowments for many public and private universities.
Thelin (2004) constructed a composite profile of the American university by looking at the characteristics of great American universities (as defined by Slosson, in his book *Great American Universities*, written in 1910). Those characteristics include philanthropy on a large scale, presidential presence, professors as professional experts, pedagogy, professional schools, professionalization of students, facilities, and the dynamics of the academic enterprise (Thelin, 2004, p. 127).

The time between 1880 and 1910 has been characterized by historians as a time of “university-builders.” The national wealth of the United States doubled between 1895 and 1915, and the uneven distribution of this new wealth created a group of extremely well to do businessmen. Some of these wealthy businessmen worked hard and competed to develop the American university. They were joined by university presidents who were equally competitive and committed to the development of great institutions of higher learning.

Commercial and industrial expansion helped to create a period of philanthropy that made the founding of well-endowed universities possible. Captains of industry like John D. Rockefeller and Cornelius Vanderbilt donated huge sums of money to build universities as their personal memorials. The general public was well informed about the generosity of the donors and the universities that they were supporting because of new inventions in printing that led to regional and national periodicals such as *Harpers, Atlantic Monthly, The Independent* and *McClure’s*. These magazines were favorite reading among middle class Americans during the early 1900’s (Thelin, 2004). In 1918, Jesse
Brundage Sears wrote *Philanthropy in the History of American Higher Education*, in which he theorizes on why individuals donated money toward higher education. He concludes “that the dominating motive in educational philanthropy has been desire to serve society; or, if we prefer, desire for a very high type of notoriety. So far as social progress is concerned, these are but two views of the same thing” (Sears, 1990, p. 109).

Eventually philanthropic efforts turned more toward foundation building. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Rockefeller General Education Board are two examples of foundations that were developed by wealthy philanthropists to help shape the development of higher education. These organizations and others of a more secular nature pushed for standards, funded specific areas of research, and generally found ways to reward universities who aligned philosophically with their ideals (Thelin, 2004).

The role of university presidents also began to change around 1900. As colleges and universities grew in size and scope, college presidents found themselves overwhelmed with the responsibilities of supervision, instruction, and administration while concurrently contending with current demands and still protecting campus traditions. As a result, the job of the president shifted from teaching to more administrative in nature as the presidents employed administrative support staff and discontinued their teaching efforts. As the president's duties evolved into three primary areas--administration, supervision and instruction--organizational structure began to emerge. The result was a more formal organization of administrative structure. These changes altered the nature
of colleges and universities and gave some astute university presidents time for public speaking, writing, and engagement in the national dialogue. Consequently, some college and university presidents enjoyed almost celebrity status during this time. Individuals like William Rainy Harper from the University of Chicago, and Charles W. Eliot from Harvard were recognized as national experts. They wrote articles that were published in national magazines like the *Atlantic Monthly* and regional and national newspapers. These celebrity presidents were involved in community and state politics, and they attracted and interacted with business leaders. These presidents were very successful in garnering large scale donations for their institutions and helping to define state and national higher education policy.

As the new century began, the new organizational structure became one where "the teacher and the patriarch was giving way to the business executive" (Schmidt, 1930, p. 101). “The faculty were seen as the employees, the trustees as the employers, and the president was seen as the superintendent of the plant” (Rudolph, 1990, p. 165). The supervision of students became the responsibility of a dean. Classroom instruction and curricular design were delegated to specialists in each department. The president was expected to have strong financial skills, have organizing ability, and be able to build morale and prestige for the institution. With the increasing complexity of the institution because of growth, college administration was being changed from a profession to an art (Schmidt, 1930). Industrial organizations now provided the models for academic structure.
This was probably the first time in history that the question “Why can’t universities be run like businesses?” was asked.

The Association of American Universities was founded in 1900. Its charter members included Johns Hopkins, Columbia, Harvard, Cornell, Yale, Clark, Catholic University, Princeton, Stanford, and the Universities of Chicago, Pennsylvania, California, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Membership in the organization quickly became a measure of recognition and status. The organization began to set standards for membership and through those standards influenced the growth and development of a host of state and private universities (Thelin, 2004).

Private agencies entered the higher education arena largely because of the lack of standards for higher education and because of their desire to influence the positive growth and development of those institutions through their philanthropic activities. Organizations such as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Rockefeller General Education Board developed and adjudicated ratings for American universities. Coercion and incentives from the foundation board of directors were used to encourage universities to include professional schools and to adhere to reasonable criteria of admissions, instruction, and certification. Thelin (2004) writes that “the foundations probably acknowledged and promoted those universities that were already reasonably strong and sound, and raised the floor for others” (p. 111).

According to Thelin (2004) “the new visibility of the emerging university was most evident literally in its architecture” (p. 115). Wealthy donors wanted
memorials to their gifts, which in turn led to the architecturally pleasing use of stone and brick, and to the gothic and colonial style buildings that grew on college campuses. Libraries, dormitories, science labs, and lecture halls were being built at a rapid rate. The competition between colleges and universities to see who could build the most beautiful and interesting campus was evident. The curiosity of the American public was piqued by the architecture itself and by the articles that journalists wrote about the campuses. The campuses became tourist attractions and sources of inspiration to the American people largely because of these new buildings and efforts to beautify campuses (Thelin, 2004).

Wealthy patrons were not the only source of additional revenue for colleges and universities. By the early 1900’s they were becoming recognized for their ability to research and propose solutions to regional and national problems. Through a variety of legislation the federal government began to fund research activities particularly in the area of agriculture.

The Hatch Act of 1887 gave federal land grants to states in order to support the development of agricultural experiment stations. These stations were usually connected with land grant state colleges and universities. They were valuable examples of how universities could provide information and service to the general public, and they were useful in establishing professors as professional experts. Many of the experimental stations created under the Hatch Act became part of the state cooperative extension services that were developed in 1914 under the Smith Lever Act.
One of the best examples of a professor as a professional expert was Woodrow Wilson. He began his professional career as a professor of history and political science and then served as President of Princeton University from 1902 – 1910. He was asked to run for the Governor of New Jersey and won that office in 1911; two years later he became the 28th President of the United States.

Throughout his political career he talked about the value of education. Wilson used the nation’s institutions of higher education for help in researching issues of the day, and expected great service from those institutions.

The topic of research has to be included in any discussion of faculty as professional experts. “The founding of Johns Hopkins, the flood tide of influence from German universities, and the academic boom of the nineties all contributed to the fixing of research as an indelible commitment of the leading American universities” (Geiger, 2004, p. 58). Although American universities had a commitment to research by 1900, it wasn’t until 20 years later that they were identified as our nation’s primary source of scientific research. In 1900 the federal government was spending about $11 million a year on scientific activities, primarily at government research bureaus. Meanwhile, the universities were developing expertise and debating about the balance between teaching and research for faculty members.

“The first decade of the century, then, witnessed an intermittent debate between those who thought the University should place more emphasis on teaching and scholars who demanded a greater accommodation of research” (Geiger, 2004, p. 72). State legislators and the public associated research and the
accumulation of knowledge with useful knowledge, and promoted the practice of research under those circumstances. Efforts to establish a balance between teaching and research were ongoing between 1890 and 1930. In an effort to define that balance, teaching time and class size were limited, and research gradually moved from an option to a responsibility. The democratization and self-governance of the faculty unit played a large role in the uniquely American decision to combine both roles as the responsibility of the professor. The debates about the balance between research and teaching would eventually lead toward the tenure system. Interestingly, the idea of service seems to have carried little or no value in this debate.

In 1915 the AAUP published the paper “General Declaration of Principles.” The paper focused on academic freedom, and reflected some of the best thinking about higher education in the era. It listed three primary purposes of the university in reference to academic freedom: 1) “to promote inquiry and advance the sum of human knowledge,” 2) “to provide general instruction to the students,” and 3) “to develop experts for the various branches of the public service” (as cited in Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 862-7). With regards to item 3, the authors of “General Declaration of Principles” discuss the idea that in order to develop experts for the community’s use, professors have a public trust to teach the truth that they believe and to encourage critical thinking and inquiry.

Not only did the role of the professor change during this time period, so did the methods used for teaching. Through most of the 1800’s memorization and recitation were the primary educational tools; now lectures, lab work, independent
research, and class discussions were implemented. The evolution of colleges of education, normal schools and the growth of the k-12 system all helped to establish these new teaching methods, and they were promulgated throughout colleges and universities.

There were three factors that led to a large increase in the numbers of students attending college or university, and the increase in college graduates that subsequently occurred. First, the continued development of an educational system in the United States as evidenced by increasing numbers of graded and common schools and the rapid growth in acceptance of high school education helped to develop a larger pool of potential college students. Secondly, college attendance was also helped by the curricular changes that had materialized over the past several decades, making a college degree more useful. And thirdly, industrialization and machinery had eliminated some of the need for manual labor, creating leisure time which could be used for continuing education. In addition, this was the time of opportunity for Americans, and higher education represented one path toward achievement.

An additional component worth consideration is the new attitude of ambition and goal orientation that was becoming prevalent as middle class students flocked to the university to change their lot in life. Students were coming to college better prepared and with more of a sense that they were going to college to learn a profession that would serve them in the future. Agriculture, engineering, and military science were among the more technical offerings of many universities. The addition of professional schools of business, law, and
medicine further enhanced this idea that students were coming to college to create their future.

The changing identity of the student body was also reflected in the development of extracurricular activities and experiences. College newspapers, intercollegiate sports, literary societies, fraternities and sororities, and alumni groups became a part of collegiate life. As the enthusiasm for these types of activities grew, the popular media began to emphasize the co-curricular activities rather than the academic and scholarly activities on the college campus. All of these things helped to establish the popular notion of what a university really was, and the popular media embraced this ideal.

The ideal of the university became reality during the time between 1870 and 1910. During that time the appeal of higher education surged for both benefactors and potential student. Some historians called this period the “Age of the University” (Geiger, 2004; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2004), but liberal arts colleges also thrived during this period. Higher education in every form was viewed as a way for a young man (or woman) to make his future. Philanthropists saw colleges and universities as either a way to memorialize their successes or as a way to help shape American society. These two things came together to help American colleges and universities standardize and organize themselves into the beginnings of our modern system of higher education.

The funding of higher education has been an interesting phenomenon throughout its history. In the chart below, Sears (1990) shows us that the total percentage of university income received from governmental sources grew from
just under 14% in 1900 to 30% in 1910. Donations or benefactions actually
decreased by about 11% during that same time period. Tuition and fees remained
fairly consistent between 24 and 26% of total university income.

Sources and amounts of income for higher education in the United States, each
fifth year from 1871 to 1915 (abbreviated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>$24,528,197</td>
<td>19220,297</td>
<td>11,592,113</td>
<td>18,737,145</td>
<td>6,561,235</td>
<td>80,438,987</td>
<td>187.73</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>4,386,040</td>
<td>8,375,793</td>
<td>6,110,653</td>
<td>10,840,084</td>
<td>1,964,002</td>
<td>31,676,572</td>
<td>88.51</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>382,265</td>
<td>4,248,143</td>
<td>2,275,967</td>
<td>6,282,461</td>
<td>6,561,235</td>
<td>13,388,836</td>
<td>30.06*</td>
<td>38.5*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For year 1870

Note: From Philanthropy in the History of Higher Education (reprint Ed.) (p. 55)
by J.B. Sears, 1990, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers. Copyright 1922 by

As higher education began to take its modern form, so too was the United
States becoming an international power, placing new demands on the institutions
of higher education. Higher education institutions were now expected to meet
capacity to educate an ever growing number of students, to provide expert advice
from college and university professors, and to provide the technological and
social advantages that could be developed through research and a more educated
population. Competition among the states was strong during this era, and
Minnesota was busy building its reputation.

Minnesota

Governor John Lind was inaugurated on January 2, 1899, and his
administration heralded the progressive era in Minnesota history (Chrislock,
1971, p. 9). The population of Minnesota grew from about 172,000 in 1860 to 1.7
million in 1900 (Mitau, 1977). By 1900 about 600,000 residents lived in urban settings and the remaining 1.1 million maintained an agrarian lifestyle. Two industries, flour and lumbering, joined farming as the main sources of occupation for Minnesotans in the early 1900’s and the “Twin Cities” of Minneapolis and St. Paul became a metropolitan center of trade, industry, and finance (Folwell, 1929).

A myriad of state laws and regulations that impacted the growth and development of city and county governments within the state were implemented after an amendment to the Minnesota Constitution allowing for home rule of cities and counties was passed in 1896 (Folwell, 1929). Tax reform, treatment and maintenance of the insane, and better management of the penal, correctional and charitable institutions of the state were among the progressive goals of Governor Lind when he was elected in 1899. The state legislature acted on his proposal to develop a state board of control for charitable and correctional institutions, but the bill was enhanced to include the state university and normal schools. Although Governor Lind and his successors disapproved of lumping higher education institutions with the others, the legislation stood for several years. The state board of control was finally relieved of financial responsibility for the University and Normal Schools in 1905 (Folwell, 1929).

In a move to enhance the quality of schools, the legislature implemented a state-wide program of examinations and certification for teachers in 1899 (Kiehle, 1903). Additional steps were taken to improve the quality of teaching in the early 1900’s, including state funding for common, graded and high schools, and
Summer Institutes for Teachers at the University of Minnesota and the Normal Schools. Teaching was becoming a profession in Minnesota. There were about 600,000 school-age citizens in Minnesota in 1900, and more than 50% of those attended one of the 7,303 public schools in the state (Folwell, 1926). High schools had become more numerous and 1 in 10 students of the appropriate age group attended high school. Talk of articulation between high school and the university continued to grow. In 1900 there were also 4,000 churches in Minnesota, and church property was valued at $30 million (Folwell, 1926).

While religion and education seemed to be ingrained in the fabric of life in the state of Minnesota, Lass (1977) tells us that agrarian discontent had become an increasing concern since the 1850’s. Wheat farmers often did not realize the good life or profits for which they had dreamed and worked. Costs of production, milling, and transportation to market minimized their profits and caused greater dissatisfaction. Agrarian disappointment led to a lack of enthusiasm and support for higher education, and a mistrust of the role of agricultural education in the state (Lass, 1977). The development of Agricultural Experimental Stations as a result of the Hatch Act of 1887 and their eventual evolution into Cooperative Extension Services as a result of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 helped to ease farmers’ misapprehensions about higher education and government intervention in general.

*University of Minnesota*

In 1884, Cyrus Northrop became the University of Minnesota’s second president when President Folwell stepped down to assume a faculty role on
campus. Most of the issues between the President and the Board of Regents and the President and the public were immediately dropped since Northrop chose not to champion the Minnesota plan. He eliminated the requirement of a high school degree for admission to college, and he pacified the denominations who had considered the university to be a “godless” institution. In his inaugural speech he emphasized stability, courtesy, and patience. With regard to the curriculum, Northrop initially backed away from the German model of offering the students a range of subjects from which to study, because he believed that his students were not ready to make such sophisticated decisions. Northrop’s actions, though seemingly counterintuitive at the time to the mission of the university, served to both grow enrollment and increase public support for the institution.

The University of Minnesota grew by leaps and bounds under the tutelage of President Northrop. During Northrop’s presidency from 1884 – 1911, the University of Minnesota expanded from a campus of 5 small buildings to two campuses with over 40 buildings and a football stadium. Enrollment went from less than 300 students in 1884 to over 6,000 students in 1911. During Northrop’s tenure, the university curriculum was broadened considerably and several new colleges were formed, including the Colleges of Education, the College of Social and Political Science, the Colleges of Law and Medicine and the School of Agriculture.

As the University of Minnesota was growing, it was paying attention to those same issues that Slosson itemized in his discussion about the characteristics of a great university. Although the University of Minnesota was not one of the 14
institutions that founded the Association of American Universities in 1900, Slosson still included a chapter about the University of Minnesota in his book *Great American Universities* in 1910. This indicates both the degree of volatility and competition that existed among the various institutions of higher education and the amount of growth that occurred at the University of Minnesota during that 10-year period. Development of standards, presidential presence, professors as professional experts, professional schools and awe inspiring facilities were all among the things that would move the University of Minnesota into the top tier of institutions in higher education in the nation.

*Standards*

The University of Minnesota, and its first president were given a good deal of credit for the development of public education in Minnesota. In a booklet prepared for Dr. Folwell’s memorial convocation, the State Board of Education wrote:

> When in 1869, Dr. William Watts Folwell came to the presidency of the University of Minnesota, the public schools of the state were practically without organization or standards . . . By his own uniting efforts, backed by such adherents as his strong, intelligent leadership attracted, Dr. Folwell succeeded in 1878, in securing from the legislature the passage of a bill which he himself drafted, providing for state assistance in the support of public high schools, the establishment of standards through state inspection and the free
admission to those schools of any properly qualified citizen of the
state. (Folwell Vertical File, Memorial Convocation, 1930)

These efforts toward creating a system of education for the state of Minnesota set
the stage for the development of standards of admission for the University of
Minnesota.

When President Northrop became president of the university in 1884, he
discontinued the requirement that students complete high school before entering
the university because he believed that the decision was premature. Instead, he
worked with Folwell and others to campaign for improvements to the statewide
system of education. By 1900, there were finally sufficient numbers of high
school graduates in Minnesota to make it possible to require high school
graduation as a requirement for admission to the university.

Along with increasing requirements for potential students came increasing
requirements for faculty members. By 1910, all faculty members were required to
hold doctoral degrees and to continue their own research. The University of
Minnesota faculty began contributing to scholarly publications and to attract
renowned scholars.

Organization

The university organizational structure took shape during the early 1900’s
with the development of colleges and departments. Dr. Folwell described the
university of the early 1900’s as:

There was a time, when the president of an American College was
little more than a mere primus inter pares. He had his share of
teaching and took his turn in the chapel devotions. . . . The old time has passed; and the old way must pass. The modern university was burst on the country with meteoric suddenness and is a vast and multifarious organism, with a personnel and a budget equal to those of a considerable city. Like a great industrial concern it needs a general manager clothed with ample discretionary powers, and charged above all else with the selection of men and the supervision. the judicious supervision, personal or otherwise of their work. (Folwell, 1918)

Presidential Presence

The Minnesota Board of Regents often asked the advice of President James B. Angell of the University of Wisconsin about matters pertaining to the governance of the University of Minnesota. When they sought his advice in selecting a new president for the University of Minnesota, he recommended Cyrus Northrop saying that he was “a ready speaker and a man of good presence” (Gray, 1951, p. 81). The regents hired Northrop for exactly that reason as well as his adaptability and conciliatory nature. Within a year of his arrival he had already won the respect and admiration of the regents, the legislature, and the education community in Minnesota. At his inauguration, one year after Northrop’s arrival at the University of Minnesota, spokesman for the graduating class, James Gray said that “in a year President Northrop had won not only the heads, but the hearts of the students” (Gray, 1951, p. 85). In 1908, the “Illustrated Sunday Magazine” of the St. Paul Pioneer Press featured “Proxies of State Universities and Colleges of
the Northwest” with 3 full pages and 28 photos of the leading educators of the
time. Cyrus Northrop, President of the University of Minnesota, was featured
prominently in the article and pictorials (Minnesota Historical Society (MHS)
Scrapbook, date, p. 105).

Throughout his 28-year reign as president of the University of Minnesota,
Northrop came to be beloved by citizens of the state of Minnesota and respected
across the nation. His published book of speeches includes one on the excellence
and value of patriotism that was so well received that Theodore Roosevelt
requested it be printed in full in local newspapers (MHS Scrapbook, 1901).
Northrop’s work inspired many of his former students and faculty members to go
on to become presidents of other universities, helped the University of Minnesota
to become a well respected institution, and helped the citizens of Minnesota to be
proud of the university.

Professional Experts
There are several good examples of how Minnesota was able to use
faculty from the University to provide expert advice and guidance to the state.
Perhaps the most important example of professors as professional experts is the
growth and development of agricultural education at the University of Minnesota.

In a speech to the State Horticultural Society, President Northrop talked
about the value of agricultural education. He praised its work in developing fruit
that would grow in Minnesota’s cold climate, and used that as an example of how
university research could be put to practical use. He said:
But a few years ago it was supposed that Minnesota was too cold for the successful cultivation of fruit. But you thought otherwise. You experimented and persisted in your experiments when the results were most discouraging. By your wise perseverance and intelligent skill you have made Minnesota the prize bearer of the nation for excellence of apples; you have made it almost the peer of any in the abundance and deliciousness of grapes. (Northrop, 1910, p. 7)

Later in the same speech, Northrop addressed the primary problem of agricultural education:

The problem of agricultural education is one of the most difficult of all educational problems, because back of it is a host of people who do not expect to go to college for an education, and yet insist that in some way the college shall benefit them, help them to do better work and to get larger returns. How the wishes of this large class can be met, except by the publication of the results of experiments, by the holding of farmers’ institutes in all parts of the state, and by the education of students who as practical farmers shall be examples of skilled workers in agriculture, I do not at present see. (1910, p. 20)

Agricultural Education remained a problem for many years. The School of Agriculture attracted the sons of farmers for short periods of time, but the idea of a College of Agriculture was harder to develop. It attracted few students and
graduated even fewer. It was constantly under attack from members of the Grange and other farm oriented organizations. Northrop and Professor Porter, Dean of the School of Agriculture, traveled around the state speaking in support of the College of Agriculture, making presentations at state and county fairs in an effort to develop support for the program. Time and time again the members of the legislature attempted and failed to separate the agricultural school from the state university, and they failed largely because of the constant attention that Northrop paid to this area. He understood that by separating the agricultural education from the state university resources for higher education in the state would be divided.

The Hatch Act of 1887 gave additional federal land grants to states and encouraged creation of agricultural experimental stations and the communication about new farming techniques. It provided the impetus that the state needed to jump start the agricultural education program at the university. One of the ideas that came out of the Hatch Act initiative was the Farmer’s Short Course. This was a 10-week program designed specifically to help dirt farmers increase their yields. In 1900, fifty farmers were taught about business and how to market their products, soil conditioning, and other subjects of interest.

In order to meet the needs of the Minnesota farmers and their sons, the Agriculture School had to operate differently than the rest of the university. Classes couldn’t start until the crops were out of the fields and the students had to be back home by planting time. An initiative that created good will for the Agriculture School was the idea of home projects. Students would be given
research projects to do over the growing season and then would study the results at school the next fall. As fathers and neighbors watched these research projects unfold, they began to understand the value of agricultural education.

The program grew to be respected through its outreach and service. An example of the ingenuity of the faculty was the Creamery Contest. One professor traveled all across the state visiting dairy farms in order to find a model dairy farm. Once he discovered the best possible example, the winner was publically recognized, the farmer’s techniques were incorporated into the curriculum, and students were encouraged to visit the farm.

An article in the *St. Paul Globe* on Sunday, August 24, 1902 demonstrates pride the variety of schools in St. Paul. It also makes specific mention of the University of Minnesota and its agricultural programs:

> Perhaps first in importance because of its being carried on under state supervision is the University of Minnesota and the State Experimental Farm and Agricultural College. In the University, the state has an investment of nearly $2,000,000 and annually dispenses knowledge to nearly 3,500 persons of both sexes. What claims the Saintly City lacks in its disputed ownership of the university, it fully compensated for in the state experimental farm and college. Located near the farm grounds it is one of the greatest institutions of its kind in the United States. Nearly 1,200 pupils annually, many of them from beyond the borders of our state,
receive instruction in scientific farming and stock raising. (MHS Scrapbook, 1902, p. 69).

The College of Agriculture grew to include state wide extension programs and experimental stations. It included an agricultural high school and training program for those who didn’t want a four year degree, and by 1894 had developed a home economics program for farm girls who wanted to continue their education. Faculty from the College of Agriculture also ran summer institutes for Normal School students and rural teachers, believing that common school teachers should be able to teach basic agricultural skills to their students in rural areas. The programs that were developed brought the latest research from the university into the lives of rural Minnesotans. These efforts helped to extend the reach of the university across the state and provided rural Minnesotans with practical research-based information that helped to improve their lives. By 1903, there was strong support for agricultural education in the media, as evidenced by this article from the St. Paul Pioneer Press on Sunday, March 1, 1903:

Two things raise the American farmer from the status of the European peasant, civil freedom and intellectual freedom. In the United States he is the proprietor of his estate and his survival and economic position is such that he is able to learn the science of his calling and employ his mind to a more enlightened development of its possibilities. The college of Agriculture is now a necessary adjunct of every state university and the federal government yearly
expends a large sum in publishing the results of experiments made
at the different station. . . (MHS Scrapbook, 1903, p. 158)

In 1904 the *St. Paul Globe* ran an article titled “High Honor for Professor
Hays,” detailing the research that led to the development of two special varieties
of wheat that yield an average of 13% more than what was previously being used.
According to the article, research like this demonstrated the value of the
university to the citizens of the state and surrounding region. In another article in
the same paper, the *St. Paul Globe* dedicated two full pages to the contributions of
Alumni from the University of Minnesota, saying that “Alumni record shows that
graduates of the University of Minnesota were to be found in almost every
country on the globe, but that the majority remained in or near the Twin Cities”

*Pedagogy*

David Kiehle became a professor of pedagogy at University of Minnesota
after being Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Minnesota, so he
had firsthand knowledge about the condition of teaching in Minnesota. At the
time Normal Schools were responsible for the production of common school and
K-8 teachers. The University was concerned primarily with the education of high
school and Normal school teachers. Kiehle spent the latter part of his career
researching the best ways to educate future teachers for the states graded and high
schools. Through his efforts and those of his fellow professors in the education
department, the quality of education for the whole state was improved. However,
the quality of the facilities remained questionable, prompting a story in the *St.
Paul Dispatch in 1907 titled “Falls Behind other States.” The article details the University’s urgent need for a properly equipped College of Education (MHS, Scrapbook, 1907). As a result of this article and additional lobbying the next year, the state legislature funded a new building for the College of Education.

**Professional Schools**

From almost the beginning of its existence, the University of Minnesota offered some courses in Civil Government and by 1879 there was a Department of Political Science led by President Emeritus Folwell. Throughout his career he argued for a more prominent place for the topic within the university offerings. In a speech recognizing the newly created school of Social and Political Sciences, Folwell spoke about the role of Civic Education in the university:

> It would seem that a state university supported by the contributions of the people at large is in an eminent way bound to teach those things which are necessary for public duties. Here if anywhere the men who are to conduct the public business and guide public affairs ought to find instruction and opportunity for research. Training for business management, banking and transportation is hardly of less importance. The administration of institutions of public and private charity and penal establishment calls for and more for educated talent. For these ends and the like the College of Social and Political Sciences is to be built up. (Folwell, circa 1903-5)
Folwell went on to say that to argue about the importance of civic education would be a waste of time because the university by its very nature has an obligation to train young men for the discharge of public duties on a local, state, national, and international levels. “The state university has for its leading purpose the preparation of men and women for high social and public function” (Folwell, circa 1903-5)

*Professional students*

As you can see by the chart below, the University of Minnesota had not really begun to recruit or sponsor graduate students by 1908. In fact the state legislature only authorized the development of a graduate school in 1905 so long as it was self supporting. In *Great American Universities*, Slosson (1910) called graduate work the distinguishing feature of the University, and noted with disappointment the University of Minnesota’s lack of progress in this regard. It seems clear that research by graduate students was not considered an important part of the compact between higher education and the public it served at this time in history in Minnesota.
In the professional schools of law and medicine, the university did a little bit better. By 1905 the majority of students in these professional schools had some undergraduate experience and many of them had completed bachelor’s degrees.

*State funding and Philanthropy*

Resources for the growing university came from two primary sources: state allocations and philanthropy. A small amount of the university’s income came from tuition and fees, and the Permanent University Fund, which was created through the sale of lands set aside for university use by the federal government. Philanthropist John Pillsbury was a long time supporter of the University and was often referred to as the Father of the University of Minnesota.
A series of articles by the *Minneapolis Times* commemorating the work of Mr. Pillsbury, published upon the unveiling of a statue in his honor at the University of Minnesota campus simply said, “Good Work Rewarded” (MHS Scrapbook, 1902). Pillsbury’s legacy of service, both as an advocate of the university to state officials and as a philanthropist, helped to carry the university through the decade after his death in 1901 (Folwell, 1929).

President Northrop was an excellent fund raiser for the university. In 1910, Slosson said that “practically all of the 6,300 living alumni have been educated by him” (p. 254) and that President Northrop was known and loved by a large proportion of his current and former students. This helped a great deal when it came to fundraising for the institution. An article from the *St. Paul Pioneer Press* in 1902 demonstrates both positive support for the school of architecture and the university as a whole. “Mr. Ludden’s gift (of $5000 to the University of Minnesota) will add to the proof of an awakening public interest in this scientific side of farm life” (MHS Scrapbook, 1902, p. 23)

In Gray’s history of the University of Minnesota’s first hundred years Gray (1951) says that the budget itself tells a version of the University’s history:

> Obviously the fundamental reason for the maintenance of a state university is the belief on the part of the people that it helps to preserve the gains already achieved in the values of human society and it works consistently as the active agent of progress toward the achievement of further gains. Co-equal
with the state itself, the university makes a comparable claim upon the loyalty of the whole people for support. (p. 563)

During the first 100 years of its existence, the state provided an average of 40% of the University’s budget, plus additional allocations for construction and building projects. Permanent university funds derived from sales of lands acquired through the various land grant acts provided another 5% of total university funding. Slosson (1977) tells us that the University of Minnesota was more fortunate than many other states with regard to the disposition of its Land Grant awards. The state was able to retain a large portion of its grants and these lands contained extensive iron ore deposits, and according to the State Auditor’s estimate would eventually be worth $30,000,000 or $40,000,000. Although securing funds for the university became easier after 1887 because of the popularity of President Northrop, by 1910 the university still had no regular budget and remained at the mercy of the legislature each session. In 1893 a mill tax was approved to give the university $95,000 each year as a base budget. This sum proved to be insufficient to sustain the growing university and the tax was raised again in 1897 after a legislative battle between Fred Snyder (the son-in-law of John Pillsbury) and Ignatius Donnelly. A series of financial depressions reduced the ability of citizens to pay their taxes and the legislature was forced to make deficiency appropriations. The financial crisis led to a friction between the university and the state that strained the relationship that President Northrop had worked so hard to create. Gray (1951) writes:
At the close of the Northrop administration in 1910 the university had an enrollment of five thousand students and these it served without benefit of a budget. The accounting offered by the treasurer presented a welter of details out of which the evidence emerges that expenditures for current support plus capital outlay for buildings and grounds plus deficits made the operation of the university an awkward and uncomfortable affair in which two million dollars were involved. John Lind, President of the Board of Regents, looked unhappily at the figures and urged upon the Governor the necessity of managing some sort of increase in the annual appropriation for current expense. (p.568)

Problems

When Northrop took over the presidency of the University of Minnesota he faced two problems that were not uncommon to growing state universities in the middle and western states -- lack of support from rural constituents and sectarian interests.

The issue of lack of support from rural interests was largely resolved with the growth and development of the College of Agriculture as described above. Despite the progress that Northrop and others made good progress in that area, rural farmers were slow to accept the value of the university. Many sons and daughters left the farm to attend college and never returned. The University also initiated several programs designed to provide direct service to the public during
this era. This helped to enhance the value of the University to residents across the state.

Issues of denominational versus public higher education continued to vex segments of the population into the early 1900’s. On this subject, the Board of Regents said:

The establishment of a collegiate institution in a free State, and the conducting of its interests, should ever be upon liberal principles and irrespective of all sectarian predilections and prejudices. Whatever variations of sect exist in the United States, the great mass of the population professes an attachment to Christianity, and as a free people avow themselves to be Christian. There is common ground occupied by them all, sufficient for cooperation in an institution of learning and for the presence of a religious influence devoid of any sectarian forms and peculiarities, so essential, not only as the most efficient policy, but also for the development and formation of the most valuable traits of youthful character and qualifications for future usefulness. . . . Attempts made to exclude all religious influence whatever from colleges have only rendered them the sectarian engines of an atheistical or infidel party or faction, and so offended and disgusted the majority of the population, agreeing in their respect for common Christianity, that they have withdrawn their support, confidence, and respect for the university. (Cyrus Northrop Papers, circa 1884)
Northrop addressed issues of religion in the state university from the beginning of his tenure at the University. He began by declaring his personal beliefs and joining the Methodist Church in St. Paul. He stated publically that although he personally was ruled by his beliefs, the university would not be ruled by a single set of religious beliefs. The University would encourage and acknowledge belief in God, but leave the particulars up to individual students and staff. Northrop held daily services in the University Chapel and hundreds of students and staff participated each day. Through the speeches and personal attention that Northrop gave to the issue, it was largely resolved by the time he left office in 1910.

Northrop’s calm manner, his persistence and his ability to hire great people and encourage them to do great work set a foundation for the future of the University of Minnesota. He believed in the value of the University and worked with his faculty to demonstrate it on a daily basis to citizens of Minnesota. By 1909 the Minneapolis Times was linking ideas of religion and education together in positive ways, as evidenced by an article titled “The Higher Life in Minnesota’s Metropolis: Western Progressiveness is to be Seen in Religious and Educational Developments of Minneapolis.” The article praises how the university has enhanced the city: “It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the early establishment of the University of Minnesota has had much to do with the shaping of the city . . . a magnet to draw people, exceptional educational advantages… one of the foremost educational institutions of the country . . . vital force in nation’s economy” (MHS Scrapbook, 1909, p. 98).
Service to the public

The University of Minnesota found many ways to serve its public in the early 1900’s. The very best example is illustrated through its agricultural education. The university worked hard to develop the school of agriculture and to make it useful to the citizens of the state. The development of agricultural experimental stations and continuing education opportunities were both part of the push to include residents from across the state in the university. Several of the other colleges within the university developed programs designed to reach out. In the early 1900’s the college of business allowed non-students to participate in selected evening courses. Non-students who were 21 years old and able to benefit from the material were able to register and receive credit for the course for a fee of $5.00 (Folwell, 1908). Northrop’s successor George Vincent (1911-1917) felt that a true university should be an expert advisor to the state. Vincent said, “If the University is true to its mission it will put all of its resources and its trained experts at the service of the community” (Gray, 1951, p. 155).

In 1909, a colleague of President Northrop’s, Gifford Pinochet (1st Chief of the U.S. Forestry Service) echoed this feeling when he gave some advice to the University about how to replace its retiring president:

Find a man who unites citizenship and scholarship. In other words, a man capable of not merely directing studies, but making education a real preparation for life . . . which I am persuaded it fails to be in the best sense, in the great majority of our universities. (letter from Gifford Pinochet to Cyrus Northrop, 1909)
The advice seems to sum up President Northrop’s presidency and the goals of the University at the time.

*Mankato Normal School*

There were stark differences between the development of the University of Minnesota and what would eventually become Minnesota State University, Mankato. Mission, contribution to community, and levels of support from the publics they served were obviously different from the beginning, and the schools also grew at different paces. In this time period, Thelin’s composite profile of the American university which included standards, organization philanthropy, presidential presence, professors as professional experts, pedagogy, professional schools, professionalization of students and facilities can hardly be applied to the Mankato Normal School. Although Mankato Normal School made progress in some of these areas during the early 1900’s, the state of Minnesota would not authorize it to award college degrees for another 20 years.

The Mankato Normal School grew under the leadership of President Charles H. Cooper. He was selected as president of the Mankato Normal School in 1898 and was the second leader to hold the title of president and he served in that role until 1930. During his tenure in office the Mankato Normal school opened a laboratory school, built its first dormitory, and opened a classroom building named in Cooper’s honor. Much of the construction occurred between 1900 and 1910. A library large enough for 130 readers was built in 1907, the elementary school and gym were constructed in 1909, and the first Woman’s Dormitory was built in 1911. The ranks of teaching faculty at Mankato Normal
School grew from 23 in 1900 to 29 in 1910, the student population grew from 332 to 961, and the training school grew from 649 to 1,330 students during that same time (Catalogues of the State Normal School at Mankato, 1900-1901 and 1909-1910). The Mankato Normal School finally became Mankato State Teachers College in 1921 and the Wilson School as the training school came to be known was an important link between the Normal School and the Mankato Community. Three things impacted the growth of the Mankato Normal School during this era: 1) changing standards for admission and professionalism of teaching, 2) the growing importance of education to the people of Minnesota and the beginning of a system of progressive education in the state, and 3) disagreement about the value of Normal Schools and how they should be supported by the state’s citizenry.

Standards

“Nationally and locally, the years following 1900 were of great importance to education in general, and to the normal schools in particular. Based on earlier developments in the status and direction of public education, these years marked the significant advancement for teacher education, beginning to place it on the level of higher rather than secondary education” (Mitau, 1977, p. 11).

In 1899 the Normal Schools in Minnesota elevated academic admission standards to include high school graduation (Mitau, 1977). The idea that all Normal School students should have high school diplomas was not universally accepted, and attempts to increase the requirements for admission to Normal
Schools in the state brought about a good degree of dissention, and resulted in lower attendance for the schools. An article titled “Normal Schools Lose in Attendance” appeared in the *Minneapolis Tribune* in 1904, gleefully announcing that at the Mankato Normal School attendance decreased from 1,329 in 1899 to 596 in 1903. Despite the drop in attendance, the school began to demonstrate standards of performance through graduation exercises and worked in conjunction with the state school board to strengthen criteria for issuance of teaching certificates and normal school diplomas.

Normal Schools were not the only place to train for a career in teaching in the state of Minnesota during this time. In 1896, the teacher training program was offered in public high schools, and by 1910 there were 28 such programs in the state and 489 students being trained to become teachers. In addition, the college of education at the University of Minnesota was beginning to offer coursework for students who planned to teach in the state’s graded schools and high schools. The variety of options for teacher training in the state led some to question the cost and value of the Normal Schools.

The faculty of the Mankato Normal School was not viewed in the same light as the faculty at the University of Minnesota. However, they did live and work in the community and contributed to its growth. An item of pride for the Mankato Normal School was the credentialing of faculty. An article in the *Minneapolis Tribune* in June of 1905 announces the hiring of a college graduate to head the physical sciences department. “C. J. Posey, now a fellow in the University of Chicago, a graduate of the normal school at Normal Ill., and also of...
the University of Illinois, from which institution of learning he received his B.S. degree” (Minneapolis Tribune, June 2, 1905).

Youel (1968) says that the history and contributions of the faculty at Mankato Normal School have been lost. He says that they were primarily a teaching faculty and that their work was primarily in service to the school. The one exception he mentions is the contribution that Mankato Normal School Faculty made to the state by offering and participating in teacher institutes. These institutes were offered across the state each spring and were designed as a sort of continuing education for rural common school teachers (Youel, 1968).

Importance of education

The overall quality and accessibility of schools was an important factor to settlers in their decisions to relocate to Minnesota. When the Minnesota’s Normal Schools were featured in the Minnesota Educational Exhibit at the Chicago World’s Fair in 1893, the Souvenir Manual of the exhibit described the Mankato Normal School as:

The chief purpose of the school is special instruction in the science and art of teaching, but as in other Normal Schools a thorough system of academic instruction is both the basis and to some extent the medium of professional training. In the absence of Preparatory Schools, most pupils come with insufficient attainments and intellectual discipline to qualify them for immediate entrance upon a purely professional course of instruction. (1893)
“The Normal School by simply raising the problem of what a good school is and what good teachers are started the chain of reaction, primed an appetite for getting ahead by means of educational opportunity” (Youel, 1968, p. 15).

Teaching methods changed at the Mankato Normal School as changes in curriculum occurred. Initially the method of teaching included memorization and recitation of materials. This was a particularly useful teaching method while the school was in a remedial mode. However, once the school was able to institute admission standards, emphasis switched from teaching students the three R’s to teaching them how to teach.

Teaching methods included group work and practice teaching at the laboratory school (later known as the Wilson School), which was established in 1900. There were no professional schools associated with the Mankato Normal School and no professional students according to Thelin’s definition. However, the curricular developments that led to a third year of study and two levels of teaching certificates did add to the professionalization of students and the growing understanding that teaching was a real profession. One of the more interesting side notes regarding the effect of the Morrill Act was a decision by the University of Minnesota School of Agriculture. It decided to train Normal School students in basic agriculture. The premise was that Normal School graduates should also be able to teach basic agricultural skills to students in the rural common schools where they would be employed.
Value and support

Citizens had differing opinions about the value of normal schools, and the use of tax dollars to support them. The varying perceptions about the usefulness of normal schools to the state were manifested in a variety of ways; legislative attention, financial oversight, and through newspaper articles. Funding was a special challenge for the normal schools in Minnesota because they had to be funded through taxes and tuition. The common schools and the University both had income from land grants, but that source of funding was not available to the Normal Schools (Youel, 1968.) The legislative funding for Normal Schools in Minnesota remained tight through 1900. This was primarily due to financial difficulties throughout the state and a lack of understanding about the value at Normal schools in general.

The Normal School facilities grew slowly during this era. The article “What the Normal Schools Want” from the Minneapolis Tribune in February 1901 discusses the needs of the schools and indicates some legislative support for their growth:

The sum of $214,000 was asked for by Representative Mallory, in the house yesterday for the state normal school improvement fund. It is distributed among the different schools as follows: Winona, $59,000; Mankato, $39,000; Moorhead, $55,500; Duluth $23,500; St. Cloud $37,000. For the current year, 1902 Representative Anderson introduced a bill providing that Winona receive $10,000;
Mankato receive $10,000, Moorhead $14,000; Duluth $12,000; and St. Cloud $12,000.

An editorial appeared in the *Minneapolis Tribune* in December, 1901 describing one of the arguments about the value and purpose of Normal Schools in Minnesota. This article illustrates the level of competition between individual towns and their local newspapers in the early 1900’s in Minnesota:

There is an interesting discussion going on between the *Hastings Gazette* and the *Mankato Free Press* upon the relative merits of high schools and normal schools. The former paper says that if the money that had been spent on the normal schools of this state, since they started, had been divided among the high schools, there would be much more to show for it. The *Free Press*, on the other hand, says that while the high schools are doing splendid work in their line they cannot, for obvious reasons, engage in the special work of training teachers. The *Free Press* further asserts that the common and high schools of the state have been placed in the high position they maintain today through the aid of the normal schools in fitting teachers for their tasks. There is much force in this contention. An all-around educational system must embody the special training of teachers as well as the leading of pupils along the educational path from the primary school to the state university. It is quite possible that a greater proportion of the school money might be
profitably spent upon the primary and grammar grades since the larger proportion of scholars leave school before even entering the high schools; but money expended upon any schools not equipped with competent and skillful teachers would be wasted. (Editorial, 1901)

As a result of the mixed opinions about the value of Normal Schools, Legislators paid attention to both the budget and the production of the schools. They even took time to visit campuses, as this article from the Minneapolis Tribune in March 1905 illustrates:

Mankato, March 1, - About twenty members of the Minnesota legislature spent yesterday in this city discussing the needs of the normal school and thoroughly inspecting the institution. They were entertained by a committee from the board of trade and informed that the normal school needed a new library, a gymnasium and an increase in the current fund. The enrollment has increased fifty per cent in two years. In the afternoon the visitors were entertained at the Elks club. (Legislature, 1905)

An issue that impacted the growth and development of Normal Schools in the state of Minnesota and also demonstrates the level of politics surrounding the schools was the State Board of Control. Legislation passed in the late 1880’s that put fiscal control over most state operations, including hospitals, prisons and other governmental services under a State Board of Control also included the state Normal Schools. The Normal Schools and the communities that hosted them felt
that this extra layer of control impeded school progress and ability to provide service. This article by Ralph Wheelock, a reporter for the *Minneapolis Tribune* talks about the problem, and the Mankato Normal School’s attempt to extricate itself from the board:

> State Auditor Dunn was the best pleased man in the state yesterday when the trustees of the normal schools at Mankato and Moorhead sent their accounts to the Board of Control for approval. The auditor’s stand in refusing to pay warrants unless so approved brought about this result, coupled with the diplomatic methods of the big board.

> The auditor feels that his course has been endorsed and that his efforts to maintain the business advantages in the new methods, as shown in the matter of purchasing fuel alone, and the determination of the board to do away with partisanship in the control of the local institutions as shown in their decision to make no changes at Anoka or St. Cloud for political reasons, have been approved.

> In all probability there will be no further friction with the normal boards, while the status of affairs with reference to the state university will remain unchanged until the legislature meets. The latter institution has never agreed to come under the board of control and has been fortified by the attorney general’s opinion in its position. (1901)
All of the state’s normal schools struggled to thrive under the State Board of Control and the political struggle to remove the schools from the board’s authority raged for several years.

The State Normal Board continued to grow in importance and ability to exercise authority over the state’s five Normal Schools during the early 1900’s. An article in the *Minneapolis Tribune* on October 7, 1905 announced that the State Normal Board met in Mankato for the first time on that date. At the meeting, the variety of business included selecting a new purchasing agent for the schools, awarding contracts for maintenance work, reviewing campus reports and passing a motion allowing presidents of the various schools to visit back and forth with one another (“Normal Board Meets,” 1905).

President Cooper often talked about the value of the Mankato Normal School. In an article about the Mankato Normal School in the *Semi-Centennial of Mankato*, 1852-1902, Cooper details the financial benefits of the school to the town of Mankato:

- An average of 200 students per year for 30 years spending an average of $100 per year for a total of $600,000.
- State appropriations on an average of $20,000 for 30 years, or $600,000 spent for the most part on salaries and fuel and at least $450,000 spent with merchants in Mankato.
- Building and equipment parts purchased for the school supplied by Mankato merchants and workmen, $100,000.
Families drawn to Mankato by the school and estimate of their expenditures, $100,000. (1904)

Cooper says that:

Summing up these various amounts of income brought to our city by way of trade through the operation of the State Normal School we have the noble sum of a million and a quarter of dollars. In these days of enormous figures this may not seem as large as it once would have seemed. Yet a business enterprise that has expended among Mankato businessmen and workmen more than $40,000 per year for thirty years of the past and that gives promise of bringing an increasingly larger sum each year for an indefinite future period would appear to all who are interested in the city an enterprise to be valued for its past benefits and cherished for the promise that it is in it for future advantage to the city. (1904)

The dispute about the status and value of the Normal Schools continued throughout the period from 1900 until they became Teachers Colleges in 1921. Although Normal Schools were becoming Teachers Colleges in neighboring states and across the nation, this change did not happen in Minnesota until 1921. There were two primary obstacles to Normal Schools becoming colleges in Minnesota. The first had to do with their dependence on the legislature for appropriations and the competition that ensued with every other tax-supported activity. The second obstacle was the University of Minnesota who wished to retain her place as “the” University of Minnesota.
Wrapping it up

According to my premise at the beginning of this paper, the effects of both the Morrill Act and the adoption of the German model of higher education should be evident between 1900 and 1910. The effects are most notable in the case of the University of Minnesota but are still somewhat evident at the Mankato Normal School. The influences of the German model of higher education are recognizable in the variety of class offerings, and the organization of colleges within the University of Minnesota. It is also recognizable in the freedoms that both faculty and students had come to expect. The development of an educational system in Minnesota with common or graded schools and high schools also shows German influence. American high schools were modeled after the German Gymnasiums and served to prepare students for entrance to the university or career.

The biggest difference between the two institutions during this time period was in the scope of their missions. The University of Minnesota had a broad mission and grew in accord with the variety of responsibilities it was given, and the needs of its student population. The Mankato Normal School had a single purpose -- to train teachers for the rural Minnesota common schools.

Although both schools increased in size and stature during this time period, the University of Minnesota clearly grew at a much faster rate. The University had multiple funding sources including the Permanent University fund (derived from sales and lease of Land Grant acres), philanthropy, and fixed and supplemental state appropriations. The Mankato Normal School had to compete with the state’s four other Normal Schools in addition to the growing public
school system and all of the other state institutions that were being developed at the time.

Leadership was consistent for both institutions during this time. President Cooper served the Mankato Normal School for 28 years and President Northrop served the University of Minnesota for 27 years. Each of the presidents was active in his community and helped to promote the goals and value of education throughout the state. President Northrop had greater visibility and because of the wider mission of his institution, was able to demonstrate the value of university education to a wider constituency.

Minnesota was an agrarian state during the early 1900s, with almost 80% of its population making a living from agriculture. The development and growth of the School of Agriculture at the University of Minnesota, along with the statewide agriculture stations and continuing education opportunities went a long way towards making the University indispensable to farmers.

William Oxley Thompson, president of Ohio State University in 1908 said that as a result of the federal assistance granted to the state universities through the Morrill Act, the role of these institutions became clearer as “an institution is to be operated for the good it can do; for the people it can serve; for the science it can promote; for the civilization it can advance.” He believed that practical utility, not snobbish academic respectability or any notion of intellectual aristocracy must be the test of institutional integrity.

There were several issues of social need that both the University of Minnesota and the Mankato Normal School attempted to satisfy, and the progress
in every case was evident by 1900. However, these issues continued to be important for decades to come. For example: the effects of the Morrill Act impacted the University of Minnesota for decades and continues to be a source of pride for the university; the issue of teacher education led to development of graded schools, and eventually to articulation between high schools and college; the German influence that promoted change from college to university still impacts issues of choice and tenure today.

At both the University of Minnesota and at the Mankato Normal school, the leaders of the institutions expressed belief in the idea that public service is important. President Northrop once said that one of his objectives “is to make the it [the University] worthy of the state, a blessing to the people and an institution from which nothing shall go but good (Cyrus Northrop Papers, 1910).

Woodrow Wilson wrote a paper titled “Princeton in the Nation’s Service” in 1896. In that paper he clearly advocates that the university serves its public. Wilson begins by saying that in this country “it has never been natural for learning to seek a place apart and held aloof from affairs” and later in the article that “it is plain that it is the duty of an institution of learning set in the midst of a free population and amidst signs of social change, not merely to implant a sense of duty, but to illuminate duty by every lesson that can be drawn out of the past.” Wilson concludes the article by saying that it is not learning, but the spirit of service that will give a college place in the public annals of the nation” (cited in Hofstadter & Hardy, 1952, p. 685-695). It’s clear that both of these institutions worked to meet the needs of the public that they served and attempted to be an
asset to society. Both institutions received support from society, financial support when available, and trust and respect when earned.
The 1960’s was another time of turbulence and change for the United States. The Civil Rights Movement gained momentum from the Supreme Court ruling in Brown v. Board of Education in 1954, and continued to have a major impact on Higher Education. In 1957 the Soviet Union launched Sputnik and began a race to the moon, which the United States eventually won with help from institutions of higher education across the country. The Vietnam War divided the country, and students protested loudly. A beloved president, John F. Kennedy, was assassinated in 1963, and two other admired American leaders were shot and killed within the same decade.

American citizens protested issues of civil rights throughout the 1960’s. After federal troops forced integration of a high school in Little Rock, Arkansas in 1957, protests against discrimination in cities and on college campuses became commonplace. Voter registration drives in the South and issues surrounding housing discrimination in the northern cities increased social tensions. In 1964 the Civil Rights Law prohibiting discrimination based on race, color, sex, religion, or national origin was passed. Several years later Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 became law, prohibiting discrimination based on sex in all aspects of education.

The space race officially began in 1957 when the Soviet Union launched Sputnik, the first satellite to orbit earth. This represented both a potential threat to
national pride and to national security. As a result, science and science education became important concerns in the United States. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 helped to equalize educational opportunities for able but needy students. It also increased funding for scientific research and science education in the United States.

American involvement in the Vietnam War lasted from 1959 to 1975 and had a profound effect on American society. Over 59,000 American soldiers died in the war and its very existence divided national loyalties. Anti-war protests became common occurrences on college campuses, and in 1970, four college students were killed by Ohio National Guard troops at Kent State during an anti-war protest.

In the midst of societal turmoil from ongoing debate about civil rights issues and the Vietnam War, three American leaders were shot and killed. President John F. Kennedy was assassinated in 1963. Civil rights leader Martin Luther King Jr. and New York State Senator Robert F. Kennedy were both killed in 1968. Senator Kennedy was a presidential candidate at the time of his assassination. Both he and Dr. King had fought for civil rights throughout their careers.

Institutions of higher education mirrored the turbulence that was evident in American society during the 1960’s. Several factors significantly changed higher education in the United States. The colleges and universities experienced a surge in enrollment both as a result of World War II legislation and increased popularity. Federal interest and support of higher education had increased over the
previous decade. And the 1970 incident at Kent State University changed both the nature of the college campus and public perception of higher education.

*Higher Education in the United States*

Higher education in the 1960’s was largely shaped by three activities: World War II, the Vietnam War and the Civil Rights Movement. The impact of World War II included advances in research and research funding as well as increases in the numbers and types of students attending colleges and universities. The Civil Rights Movement resulted in a more diverse student body and more emphasis on access to higher education. Historians have dubbed the time between 1945 and 1970 as higher education’s golden age because of the public support for, and the growth in Higher Education in this era (Thelin, 2004).

Three important points in the development of higher education are worth mentioning at this point. First, the drift toward secularization that had been a gradual force in American higher education since its inception was complete by the 1960’s. Secondly, the development and implementation of curricular change continued throughout the 1960’s. And thirdly, the financing of higher education became a major change agent through the 1960’s and beyond as identified by Hofstadter in 1963 (Hofstadter & Hardy, 1963).

American colleges and universities played a significant role in the national war effort during the World War II era. They participated in important research and training activities that helped the United States win the war. As a result, in 1947, the President’s Commission on Higher Education determined that it was important to continue funding research during peacetime. The Federal
Government continued to fund research in the 1950’s and 1960’s, particularly in areas requiring applied technical research such as defense and agriculture. Competition with the Soviet Union and “Cold War” concerns led to increased funding for advanced studies in political science, foreign languages, physics, and chemistry. The enormous amounts of money being spent on research at institutions of higher education in the United States led to an unprecedented period of growth. In 1963, Clark Kerr wrote *The Uses of the University* discussing the idea of “Federal Grant Universities” and noting that at least 50 minor universities had become powerful science-based research institutions (Kerr, 1963). He included the University of Minnesota because of its ability to secure federal research grants (Kerr, 1963).

Hofstadter (1952) remarked on the relationship between research and higher education:  

> The universities carry the major burden of the research effort to advance knowledge. They provide direct services to the public in addition to the indirect one of educating its future members. They operate experiment stations, research laboratories and institutes, and adult training centers. They have, in short, become centers of practical as well as theoretical learning to which the public can resort with problems and from which comes a continual flow of organized information, data, analysis, criticism and expert opinion. They are no longer a luxury necessary to a high civilization, but a necessity for the continued operation of a prosperous society. (Hofstadter & Hardy, p. 140)
According to Geiger (2004):

The ideology of American science that emerged from WWI, and that was enshrined in the National Research Council, foresaw the advancement of knowledge led by a partnership between the universities, private industry, and philanthropic foundations. Universities and foundations, after a halting start had joined forces by the middle of the 1920’s to provide a powerful impetus to scientific development. The role of industry, however, was somewhat more equivocal. (p. 174)

However, by 1960 these relationships were firmly intact and beginning to serve as major funders of certain segments of the university campus.

The transfer of federal research money to higher education benefitted both public and private colleges and universities. Together with expanded access and increased public support, it spurred growth of existing campuses and caused new ones to be built across the country. According to one study, about 75% of all the buildings on college campuses today were built between 1960 and 1985 (Lucas, 1994).

After World War II the United States faced a problem of returning servicemen. The economy needed time to rebuild before there would be enough jobs for all those returning and the needs of the nation were changing. Partly for these reasons and partly out of gratitude for the service they had provided, Congress passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (1944), popularly known as the G.I. Bill. The introduction to a report titled “Losing Ground: A National

The passage of the G.I. Bill after World War II opened higher education to hundreds of thousands of American families who previously had no direct experience with education beyond high school. For the first time in history, the children of people with average financial means—the sons and daughters of farmers and repairmen—could get a college degree or could complete vocational training. In one generation, higher education in America was being transformed from an organization for the few to a core institution of democracy, as well as economic progress. And ever since, Americans have understood that making college affordable is a key that opens the door to college opportunity. (para 1)

The growing American population, the growing understanding that a college degree was essential to success in life, and accommodations for the returning servicemen all contributed to rapid growth on college campuses. Enrollments on some major university campuses grew from pre-war totals of around 5,000 to enrollments of up to 50,000 by 1960. State governments struggled to keep up with constituent demands for higher education and responded in a variety of ways. Expansion of existing institutions, development of branch campuses, support of private institutions, and building community college systems were all among the strategies used to build capacity within the nation’s system of higher education. State and federal funding continued to flow into
higher education during this period of growth which continued through the 1970’s.

The expansion in numbers and size of higher education institutions as well as the increase in student participation increased the need for administration and planning for individual institutions and the system as whole required new management techniques. This led to a variety of methods of state-wide coordination of higher education (Richardson, 1999) and increasingly complex bureaucracy on campuses. The need for infrastructure also gave rise to reliance on standardized testing for admission standards, which in turn led to debates over the ability of standardized tests to identify aptitude without bias toward race or socioeconomic class. Expressions of concern over the validity of standardized testing were symbolic of the questions about civil rights and social justice that raged in the 1960’s.

Beginning with Brown v. the Board of Education in 1954 and continuing though the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972, race remained an issue for higher education. The argument was often framed in terms of access, equity, and excellence. In numerous states where public universities were segregated by race, policies were challenged. In the south, the college campus came to be a real and symbolic focus of civil rights in American life. Across the country, students joined the conversation and so higher education institutions across the entire nation became part of the battleground for civil rights in America.
Other social movements in the 1960’s greatly impacted the tone, structure, and quality of higher education in America in a variety of ways. They not only aroused concern for the role and place of minorities in society but also created a need for increased and specialized services, which in turn increased the overall cost of higher education. For example, the idea of mainstreaming students with physical or learning disabilities became popular, as did the need to provide specialized programs for gifted students. The desire to integrate students of varying ability while providing necessary specialized services increased infrastructure on college and university campuses across the country. Diversification of curricular and co-curricular programs and the proliferation of counseling and student support services also increased budget demands in higher education. Faust (1993) was speaking specifically about Minnesota State University, Mankato when he wrote the following, but it could apply to nearly any institution of higher education by the end of the 1960s:

During these years society thrust new responsibilities on the colleges and universities, which placed a great burden on the administration and faculty of these institutions. They still had to teach the cultural heritage of the American people, but they also had to expand it to include the heritages of all peoples of the world. They had to address issues of civil rights, poverty, unemployment and social tensions within society at large, as well as those on the local campuses. Higher education is now conceived as a vehicle for addressing global and economic policies, as well as local and
individual concerns. These institutions are no longer dealing with
the intellectually elite, but are serving people with varying
abilities, different interests, dissimilar life styles and diversified
career goals. (p. 1)

Even as American college campuses were busy grappling with civil rights
issues and student protestation of the Vietnam War, they were also being asked to
accommodate unprecedented growth while still improving access equity and
equality. In terms of access, baby boomers were coming to college in
increasing numbers and with varying degrees of preparation. Students of color,
students of varying ethnic origin, veterans, and non-traditional students were
 clamoring for admission to college. The question of equity—who should be
admitted—surfaced. As institutions of higher education opened their doors to all
who would enter, the preparation of the entering student was not always a
constant. The conflict between access and quality became an issue of contention
between and among universities and the people that they served. Kerr (1963)
coined the term “multiversity” as a way to describe the American university under
pressure from its many publics. In his book, *Uses of the University*, he says:

The idea of a Multiversity has no bard to sing its praises; no
prophet to proclaim its vision; no guardian to protest its sanctity. It
has its critics, its detractors, its transgressors, it also has its barkers
selling its wares to all who will listen - and many do. But it also
has its reality rooted in the logic of history. It is an imperative
rather than a reasoned choice among elegant alternatives. (p. vii)
The Golden Age of Higher Education provided challenges as well as great opportunities for growth and development. Minnesota and its colleges and universities were not exempt issues of student unrest, and the challenges of a more diverse student body. Minnesota had to work to accommodate the needs and desires of its citizens with regard to higher education as well.

**Minnesota**

Minnesota played a prominent role in national politics in the 1960’s. Minnesota Governor Orville Freeman nominated John F. Kennedy at the National Democratic Convention in 1960. Freeman later served as Secretary of Agriculture for 8 years under both Kennedy and Johnson. Two members of the United States Supreme Court, Warren Burger and Harry Blackman, came from Minnesota. Senator Eugene McCarthy was a presidential candidate in 1968 and campaigned to end the Vietnam War. He lost the democratic nomination in 1968 to fellow Minnesotan and former Vice President Hubert Humphrey. Humphrey was largely responsible for the inclusion of a civil rights plank in the Democratic Party platform. Civil rights issues were at the forefront of Minnesotans’ minds. A boycott of local Walgreens drug stores in support of a national effort to integrate the chain of stores, a speech at the University of Minnesota by Martin Luther King Jr. in 1967, and the founding of the American Indian Movement to combat discrimination in Minneapolis and St. Paul are just a few of the civil rights incidents that impacted the state of Minnesota in the 1960’s. The population of the state of Minnesota was growing rapidly thanks to the post World War II baby
boom. Likewise, the population of young people hoping to attend college was growing.

*Higher Education in Minnesota*

In the book *Minnesota in a Century of Change: the state and its people since 1900*, Clifford Clark (1989) describes higher education in Minnesota:

> By mid-century, high school graduates wishing to continue their formal education in Minnesota had a rich array of options. Regional vo-tech schools offered practical training with relatively quick and rational entry into the job market. The state colleges still prepared graduates for careers in teaching, but they also offered basic programs in the liberal arts that could lead to professional or graduate work. The University of Minnesota provided the most comprehensive opportunities, with its several undergraduate colleges and many graduate and professional programs. All these options were part of the public education system in Minnesota. In addition, students could choose from among the states’ sixteen private liberal arts colleges. (p. 488)

Clark’s description of higher education in Minnesota in the 1950’s, however, does not reflect the concerns that state leaders were facing by the end of the decade. Robert Keller (1959) spells out these concerns in a report titled *Higher Education for Our State and Times*, written for the Legislative Commission on Higher Education:
1. The 53,941 full-time regular day students attending Minnesota’s 32 accredited public and private Colleges in the fall of 1958 was the largest enrollment in the history of the state.

2. The 97,313 full-time regular students forecast by these same schools by 1970 was the highest prediction made by these institutions. This forecast was also the most recent, being made in the fall of 1958.

3. Earlier forecasts of college enrollment for 1960 have already been passed and the number of students enrolled in 1958 was rapidly approaching the forecast made as recently as 1954 for 1965, the later having been based on the rate of college attendance and estimates of college-age population available at that time. (p. 15)

This report and others generated at about the same time make it clear that state leaders were concerned about the enrollment capacity of institutions of higher education in the state. The problem was two-fold: how to increase capacity and how to keep higher education affordable in Minnesota. Both the University of Minnesota and Mankato State College were called upon to help meet statewide demands for higher education. Those demands are well articulated by Faust (1993) in the following passage:

The American people have always had high expectations for their children when they achieve a college education. Simply put, a college degree is considered a key to a better job and a higher income. The more idealistic citizens view higher education as a
significant force for the amelioration of social injustices and as a creative agency for improvement of man and his society, as well as a conserver and transmitter of our most noble traditions. In short, a college education should improve the quality of life for anyone who attains a degree. (p. 8)

During the 1960’s both the University of Minnesota and Minnesota State University, Mankato were called upon to respond to society’s challenges. “Population explosion, social changes and student protests were but a few of the challenges to educational management that arose in the post war era” (Mitau, 1977, p. 46). Providing access to an increasing population of diverse students, providing opportunity for socioeconomic movement, developing the future work force of the state, and creating new knowledge and technological advances were among the challenges facing the institutions. Both schools adapted to meet these changing demands of the public.

*University of Minnesota*

James Lewis Morrill was president of the University of Minnesota from 1945 through 1960. In President Morrill’s inaugural address at the University of Minnesota in 1945 he spoke about the role of the university, the community, research, and the future. Morrill said:

The interaction of school and society at the level of research is a chain reaction, releasing endless energy, cultural, social, and economic. To underwrite the productive ongoing of the university
is the surest investment the people of Minnesota can make. (as cited in Lehmberg & Pflaum, 2001, p. 6)

During his time at the University of Minnesota, President Morrill oversaw the implementation of many of the initiatives that would change the face of higher education in the future; perhaps his inauguration speech was a harbinger of things to come. President Morrill saw, during his 15 years as president some significant events that changed the nature of higher education in Minnesota; the G.I Bill was passed and implemented, the post war baby boom brought record numbers of new students to college, the United States entered the space race against Russia precipitating the cold war. He said that all of these things that happened in the 1940’s and 1950’s had a profound impact on higher education and the impact would be most clearly felt in the 1960’s. Morrill presided over the university during a period of great growth. The university doubled in size growing from 11,000 students in the fall of 1945 to over 26,000 the very next year (“University, 1944-1970, p. 48). By the time Morrill left office in 1960 enrollment at the university had reached 29,000 students (“University,” 1944-1970, p. 207).

In addition to presiding over the university’s expansive post-war growth, President Morrill was known and respected for his championship of the value of research, the reorganization of the university senate and the faculty tenure code. In 1960, the university’s national prestige was high; federal support for research was at an all-time high, growing from just over $1 million in 1945 to over $15 million in 1960, and the university had created reentry programs for veterans and other student support programs that were nationwide models. Challenges he left
to his successor included planning for anticipated growth from the post-war baby boom, and a football team that ended the season in last place in its division (Lehmberg & Pflaum, 2001).

O. Meredith Wilson served as president of the University of Minnesota from 1960–1967. The university continued to grow rapidly during his tenure. In many ways he was as much of a university builder as presidents who came before him -- he oversaw the construction of 40 new buildings projects and worked to create a new campus across the river from the original campus. He opened new campuses at Morris in 1960 and at Crookston in 1966. Wilson worked hard to create and maintain strong working relationships with students, faculty, and the legislature. According to Lehmberg and Pflaum (2001), Wilson was to be remembered both for the relationships that he built and his emphasis on “development and qualitative growth in academic programs” (p. 110).

Malcolm Moos took over responsibility for the University of Minnesota in 1967. He was the first Minnesota native, and the first University alumnus to serve as president. President Moos was an advocate for cultural studies at the University of Minnesota and during his tenure programs for African American, American Indian, Chicano and Woman’s Studies departments were established. He used the word “communiversity” to describe the relationship and role that the University of Minnesota should ideally play in the state. Like his predecessor, Moos led the university through a period of intense activism. He remained accessible to students and encouraged them to exercise responsibility if they chose to participate in protest movements. In his official university biography,
the Minnesota Daily offered this insight into his administration: “Moos will be remembered as the man who tried to keep the University from flying apart as it was subjected to one of the most intense pressures in its history. We feel the legacy of his tenure will guide the University in surmounting these pressures” (University,” 2008).

For sake of comparison, it seems useful to assess the impact that Morrill spoke of using some of the general categories presented in Chapter 5 of this paper. The physical growth of the institution both in facility construction and capacity to accommodate students provides one measure of responsiveness to public demand. The organization of the institution, together with changes in academic offerings, curriculum and pedagogy address other areas of public interest. The University’s research agenda incorporates both the concept of faculty as experts and professional students. Community engagement, which was not one of Slosson’s measures of a great American university in the early 1900’s, has an added significance by the 1960’s. It can be assessed by looking at issues of presidential presence, faculty as experts and the activist orientation of students. In addition to Slosson’s measures, issues of access, equity and excellence become important during the 1960’s and can be addressed by first looking at University standards during the 1960’s. The mission of the university seemed to increase dramatically during this time and it may have impacted public perception of the University of Minnesota in the 1960’s.
Growth

The University of Minnesota grew from about 2,500 students at the turn of the century to a school with enrollment in excess of 54,000 by 1987. As the chart below shows, one of its largest periods of growth was during the 1960’s.

Fall Quarter Enrollment for Selected Years


The physical size of the University grew during the 1960’s with the development of branch campuses at Morris and Crookston and with the expansion of the Twin Cities Campus to an additional site across the river (Clark, 1989, p. 491). Over 40 new buildings were erected during the administration of President Wilson. President Moos continued the expansion effort, but urged the state legislature to consider growth on a system-wide basis. He talked about articulation between the K-12 system and higher education saying, “We must not create a layer cake of institutions exclusively concerned with different segments of our population. Rather we must seek a marble cake – sharing missions and
students. . . permitting them to move in a mobile market of educational opportunities” (Lehmberg & Pflaum, 2001 p. 112).

Organization

The organization or re-organization of an institution of higher education is usually done to enhance efficiencies, incorporate a new service or program, or to meet the needs of a changing environment. Most of the changes to the University of Minnesota’s organizational structure during the 1960’s were designed to either meet the needs of a growing student population or a new research initiative. There were, however a few changes to the organization of the university that are especially interesting in light of the elusive compact between higher education and the public it serves.

The creation of programs in areas such as Women’s Studies, American Indian Studies, African American Studies, Chicano Studies, and other similar programs can be seen as responsiveness on the part of the university. All of these programs were established in the 1960’s and early 1970’s during a time when civil rights issues were at the forefront of public thought. In fact, much of the credit for the establishment of these programs is given to a campus demonstration that occurred in January of 1969 that involved the occupation of the campus administration by a group of students calling themselves the Afro-American Action Committee (Lehmberg & Pflaum, 2001 p. 116).

Student anti-war protesters at the University of Minnesota demanded some changes to the organizational structure of the institution. During one particular rally and sit-in, students demanded that the university cease all war related
research, discontinue the ROTC program, and eliminate the Department of Criminal Justice. These changes did not occur, but led to civil debate and greater understanding.

Curriculum, pedagogy and student learning

Hofstadter said that a college curriculum is significant for two reasons: “It reveals the educated community’s conception of what knowledge is most worth transmitting to the cream of its youth, and it reveals what kind of mind and character an education is expected to produce” (Hofstadter & Hardy, 1952, p. 11). Of the University of Minnesota, Morrill writes, “The problem of present-day education, then, is not that it is over-professionalized but that it is under-liberalized. The newer task confronting liberal education is to take full advantage of career motivation and to permeate professional and vocational education with historical and social perspective, and with ethical meaning and orientation” (1960, p. 19).

Research agenda

The availability of federal research funds in the post-war years significantly impacted the research agenda of the University of Minnesota. In 1940-41, $485,000 was spent on research at the University, and about 30% of that came from federal funding. By 1960, federal research funding provided about 71% of the $15 million research budget. According to Lehmberg and Pflaum, “New fields of study were developed, and faculty members were called upon to advise in a range of research and public service projects; agricultural policies, the rebuilding of Seoul National University, social policy to rebuild Germany and
Research at the University of Minnesota was both theoretical and applied. It contributed to the wellbeing of the citizens of Minnesota in numerous ways. Examples can be found in several disciplines.

The plant pathology department at the University of Minnesota was the first in the nation. Normans-Borland, a 1942 Ph. D. graduate from the department, received a Nobel Prize in 1970 for genetic research on wheat. The research generated substantially higher crop tends for Minnesota farmers and helped to alleviate worldwide hunger (Clark, 1989, p. 494).

In 1961 the University of Minnesota was featured on three separate occasions in *Time Magazine*. (University of Minnesota, 2008). The January 13th issue featured Public Health Professor Ancel Keys and his research on the connection between cholesterol, diet, and a healthy heart. The second article featured the head of President Kennedy’s Council of Economic Advisors, Walter Heller, who was on leave from the Economics Department at the University of Minnesota while he served in Washington D.C. In the third article, the author describes the University as the brain center of the state, saying, “From its labs have come hardier hogs, wheat and strawberries. By developing a way to extract iron-ore from low grade taconite, the University helped save Minnesota's depleted Mesabi Range” (*Time Magazine*, 1961).

*Community Engagement*

The ongoing story of the College of Agriculture at the University of Minnesota could be told in several of the areas for discussion in this chapter. It certainly has a strong research agenda and a far reaching organizational structure.
However, it is best perceived as an instrument of community engagement. Clark (1989) wrote that “Over the decades the University’s work in agricultural education created a reservoir of good will more powerful in the public imagination, and longer lasting, than even the most victorious of Golden Gopher athletic teams” (p. 491). When the hundredth anniversary of the enactment of the Land-Grant Act was marked in 1962, it had become obvious how much that legislation influenced the growth and development of the University of Minnesota.

Although the College of Agriculture was initially established in 1874, it had trouble attracting students to its four year program. At this time, the School of Agriculture was far more popular; this was basically a secondary school that emphasized farming skills, giving “bright boys and girls who expected to become practical farmers and farmers’ wives a thorough look at modern method” (Gray, 1951, p. 323-324). The school was closed in 1960 because of declining enrollment, ending an era of service to the state. By this time students were choosing to enroll in the more advanced agricultural programs offered through the College of Agriculture. The Hatch Act of 1887 created experimental stations as part of the University of Minnesota’s Agriculture Extension Service in 1909. This service provided a balance between classroom and extension learning as well as a balance between pure and applied research. The Agricultural Extension Service engaged farmers through demonstrations and exhibitions at county fairs, the 4-H club programs, county farm bureaus, and a county agent system. The University’s work in agricultural education helped to develop links to rural communities and
developed appreciation and support for the institution. Despite the increased awareness and support of the College of Agriculture, Hofstadter (1952) reminds us that farmers were suspicious of book farming. “It was not until forty years after the Morrill Act that farmers overcame their distrust of the agricultural colleges, and in some circles it still lingers” (Hofstadter & Hardy, 1952 p. 111).

State Support

James Grey wrote the house history of the University of Minnesota’s first hundred years. He concluded his text with a section on the university budget. His words, together with those of the first president of the University of Minnesota are a good place to begin this discussion of the state’s support of its university.

An account of growth, change, and the budget at Minnesota may be completed appropriately by a backward glance at a prophecy made by Follwell in his inaugural address. An institution of the kind that he hoped to see the university become would have many and very heavy duties. If it was to execute them properly it “must be rich” and, since the “vastness of the concern” would exceed private means, there was but one resource. “The state must endow the university and if it would have the university in its full proportions, let her first count the cost and then take the million for her unit. Long since the state has learned to look at the million full in the face without experiencing dismay. Minnesota has counted the cost of having the university “in its full proportions” and found it to be justified. Today’s philosophy governing the duty of the
university toward the state and of the state toward the university
would satisfy even the exacting standards of the first president.

(Gray, 1951, p. 579)

In a speech toward the end of his tenure at the University of Minnesota,
President Morrill expressed a concern that the University always be concerned
with the value that it gives back to the state. He believed that the university had
an obligation to the public it served. “This is important: That the tax-contributed
millions invested annually by state appropriations in the ongoing of the state
university should yield real and realizable dividends – young men and women
who will be more capable in their careers and their communities by reason of their
training here and better citizens by reason of broader understanding” (Morrill,
1960, p. 25).

*Mankato State College*

Mankato State College was renamed twice between 1910 and 1960. In
1921 the Mankato Normal School became the Mankato Teachers College, and in
1957 was renamed Mankato State College.

Three men held the presidency of Mankato State College during the
1960’s. Dr. Clarence L. Crawford held the office for a 19-year period beginning
in 1946. He was succeeded by Dr. Melvin Scarlett who served as acting president
from 1965 – 66. Dr. James F. Nickerson began his duties as president in 1966
and served until 1973.

President Crawford awarded the college’s first Bachelor of Arts degree in
1947 and its first master’s degree in 1954. The Highland Campus of Mankato
State College was established during Crawford’s tenure. New buildings included a student union, residence halls, and a performing arts center. The enrollment at Mankato State College quadrupled during Crawford’s administration from 2,000 to over 9,500 students and the faculty grew to 450. This made Mankato State College one of the nation’s largest teacher training institutions (Mitau, 1977, p. 41).

Dr. James F. Nickerson began his duties as president in 1966. During Nickerson's presidency, a record enrollment of 14,000 students was reached, sixth year programs were authorized and the first specialist degrees were awarded. Trafton Science Center and an addition to the Centennial Student Union were completed on upper campus. Nickerson was described by Mitau (1977) as “a proud and self-proclaimed political liberal and educational innovator” (p. 47). He went on to say that Nickerson’s seven-year administration initially wrestled with enrollment booms and university status aspirations, but eventually found itself deeply involved in addressing the regional consequences of campus unrest and the profoundly disruptive institutional implications of major faculty reductions as a result of a sudden and steep decline in student attendance” (Mitau, 1977, p. 43).

Again, for the sake of comparison, it is useful to organize this analysis of Mankato State College in a similar manner to the previous chapter, and the discussion about the University of Minnesota presented above. A measure of response to public demand for higher education can be found in the growth of Mankato State College during the 1960’s. The organization of the institution changed out of necessity. Additional offerings, additional students, and additional
responsibilities required some reorganization of services and administration, and the development of a new campus. Because enhancements in academic offerings, curriculum, and pedagogy all impact student learning, they will be discussed as they relate to honoring the compact between the institution and the public it serves. In the case of Mankato State College, the research agenda of the institution was limited to issues of applied and practical nature. Presidential presence, faculty as experts, and the activist orientation of students will all be used as ways to look at how engaged the college was in its community. A look at the issues of access, equity and excellence will begin with standards. The mission of Mankato State College grew with each successive name change and finally the financial position of the institution during the 1960’s will serve as a measure of public support.

_Growth_

The state legislature changed all of the States Teachers Colleges to State Colleges in order to recognize the broader mission that the institutions had assumed. According to Theodore Mata, chancellor of the state college system, students attended the state colleges because they offered educational opportunities. The state college system was accessible, open academically, and relatively inexpensive. Although the colleges continued to train teachers, they also offered Bachelor’s degrees in a variety of areas.

The state college system grew to include two new colleges during this era. Southwest State College in Marshall was opened in 1963, and Metropolitan State, a college without facilities of its own, was opened in the Twin Cities in 1972.
These two institutions joined with the original five at Winona, Mankato, St. Cloud, Bemidji, and Morehead to comprise the state college system. In 1975 these seven schools were designated as state universities in recognition of their expanding role in providing higher education for residents of Minnesota. However, they were never intended to compete with the University of Minnesota, which was considered the state’s primary research institution (Clark, 1989, p. 496).

“In 1952 the nation faced one of its most drastic teacher shortages” (Hofstadter & Hardy, 1953, p. 97). This may account for the rapid growth in support and facilities for teacher’s colleges across the nation during this era. Mankato State Teachers College was no exception to the national trend. The entire state college system grew by leaps and bounds after World War II, from a total enrollment of 5,300 students in 1940 to 36,000 students in 1971 (Clark, 1989, p. 495). However, the growth in student enrollment was not equal across the five institutions. Mankato and St. Cloud experienced the most rapid growth.

### Teachers College Enrollments 1940, 1950, 1960 and 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>4,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mankato</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,854</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,930</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,488</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cloud</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>9,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorhead</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>5,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bemidji</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>4,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,315</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,899</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,677</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,269</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Mankato State Teachers College became Mankato State College in 1957, the first official plans were made for campus expansion to the present Highland Campus. With enrollment in excess of 7,000 (reaching nearly 12,500 by the end of the decade), cramped dorms forced the planning for new residence space to be included in the expansion to Highland Campus. Two new Residence Halls were completed and opened during the first half of the decade. Later in the 1960’s, an additional six buildings became occupied on Highland Campus: Armstrong Hall, Gage Center, Memorial Library, Centennial Student Union, the Performing Arts Center and Morris Hall. Mankato State College received a million square feet of new construction for educational purposes in the 1960’s.

**Curriculum, pedagogy and student learning**

According to Hofstadter (1953), “the curriculum is a barometer by which we may measure the cultural pressures that operate upon the school “(Hofstadter & Hardy, p. 11). In the case of Mankato Teachers College, the catalysts for change were rapidly increasing enrollment and a realization that a large percentage of the students in attendance had no intention of becoming teachers but were simply utilizing a convenient source of higher education to fulfill other ambitions. Additions to the curriculum in the 1950’s and 60’s were in direct response to needs of students and helped to change the status of the institution from a Teachers College, to a State College and eventually a State University. This change was not part of the state’s plan for its Teachers Colleges. A report commissioned by the legislature in 1950 titled *Higher Education in Minnesota* expressed some serious reservations about the future role of the institutions: “By
performing this extra job during the period of emergency these colleges gave
signal service to their communities and to the state. But the question of whether
these institutions can or should be encouraged and financed in the future to
expand both their teacher-training and their liberal arts addition should be
thoughtfully considered” (Minnesota Commission on Higher Education, 1950, p.
7).

Regardless of this report, large enrollments brought increased legislative
funding and additional faculty. The new faculty added new courses and enhanced
the curriculum. In the late 1950’s fifth year programs for teacher education were
introduced and by 1960 Mankato State College was offering both M.A. and M.S.
programs in a range of disciplines from Business Administration to History and
Mathematics (Mitau, 1977, p. 39). About this era, Mitau (1977) says:

Clearly the changes engendered by the academic boom following
World War II were irreversible. While nearly two-thirds of the
students continued to major in education, the essential character of
the teacher’s colleges had undergone substantial modifications...
they were now comprehensive, multi-purpose institutions. There

was no going back. (p. 40)

Research agenda

The research being done at Mankato State College in the 1960’s was
primarily related to education. A review of Master’s Thesis from that time period
reveals that the majority of work being done was either historical reviews of
educational activity or exploration of educational pedagogy.
Community engagement

Presidential presence, faculty as experts, and student activity can all be useful ways to look at how an institution engages with its community. Although Presidents Crawford and Nickerson were respected leaders in the Campus Community, the two elements of engagement that stand out during this era were the Wilson School and student activism.

The Wilson School was the laboratory school of Mankato State College, and it received a new home on the Highland Campus in 1959. Initially it was a K-12 public school sponsored by the College in conjunction with the community school district. In 1969 it became an experimental school with a 12-month schedule with no required classes or report cards. The personalized academic experience that the Wilson School provided was very popular within the Mankato community and the school received national acclaim for pioneering new techniques in curriculum design and development (Glines, 1996).

While the Wilson School provided a source of pride and an educational resource for the Mankato Community, student activism evoked different emotions for many residents. The 1907 Katonian Yearbook summarizes the town/gown relationship like this:

The town looks upon the college as a haven for radicals and left wingers. Townspeople are too quick to judge the student by his appearance. It takes more than long hair and jeans to turn a person into a radical. The college student thinks that the town’s only concern is making a fast buck off them. Students are
constantly complaining about the injustices being done to them by the Mankato community but yet the student makes no attempt to take constructive action to remedy the situation. Just as the town is quick to group all the college students into one category, so the college student is also quick to make generalizations regarding the town. Neither the town nor the college make any real attempts to understand each other. Rather, each prefers to complain and criticize each other and remains separate until tomorrow. (Katonian, 1970, p. 19)

President Nickerson spent a good deal of his time trying to mend town and gown relationships. Nickerson details this struggle in his book, *Out of Chaos* (2006), where he is quoted as saying, “Parades, bands, flag wavers, protest marches and political rallies are here to stay,” and “Let’s enjoy them, or at least hear what the opposition has to say” (p. 8). Nickerson was partially successful in his quest to help students express themselves without doing harm to the university and the community.

*State Support*

“By the end of World War II, almost everyone considered high school education the standard minimum achievement. Soon a third, then half, and more than half of the June graduates of high school were going on to college” (Youel, 1968, p. 12). In the 1960’s Mankato State College, like all of the other state colleges, was accepting any Minnesota student who had earned a high school degree. In a report titled *Higher Education for Our State and Times* (1959), the
state Director of Research projected huge growth in the numbers of prospective college students in the state, from about 53,000 in 1958 to 97,000 in 1970. As a result of this prediction, and a statewide belief that limiting access to higher education was not an option, the state provided an extraordinary influx of resources to expand campus infrastructure, and provide state aid to students. Mankato State College was provided with resources to double in size and offerings, and a statewide scholarship system was established.

*Wrapping it up*

According to my premise, the effects of the growth in higher education after World War II, increases in federal research support, and the importance of racial desegregation should have all been evident in the 1960’s. Both the University of Minnesota and Minnesota State College demonstrated significant growth during this era. Evidence of increases in federal research dollars was certainly evident by 1960 and continued to grow at the University of Minnesota through the decade. Racial desegregation did not play a significant role in the development of either institution at this time. The biggest impact on higher education in Minnesota and these two institutions in particular was that of mass education. Both of the institutions being studied grew in response to the increasing demand for access and both worked to maintain quality at the same time.

In pondering the growing demand for higher education in the state of Minnesota, the Legislative Commission on Higher Education (1957) determined that restricted enrollments would be a poor solution to the problem. They also
agreed that quality should not suffer as demand for higher education increased in the state. To meet the demands for access several steps were taken; the quality of K-12 education was enhanced in order to better prepare Minnesota’s students for college, the numbers and locations of community colleges were increased, the State Teachers Colleges became State Colleges, the University of Minnesota increased capacity and offerings, support was provided to private colleges and universities, and state scholarships were developed for needy students.

In 2005, Larry Faulkner, President of the University of Texas, defined the national concept of higher education in the 1960’s and how it should be financed. He said that the following summarized the social compact as it worked during the 1960’s.

- Essentially all high school graduates should have broad access to local and flagship public institutions, as well as to private institutions of varying character.
- Tuition and fees for undergraduate education at local and flagship public institutions should be low, no more than a couple of percent of the median family income and low enough that a student working a half-time job could pay them while also handling living costs.
- The states would finance the institution’s educational programs sufficiently to generate needed capacity and to keep tuition and fees to negligible levels.
The national universities would recruit faculties capable of forming the core research base for the nation.

Research operations would be financed by the Federal Government, private foundations, and interested corporations. State government would provide infrastructure, particularly physical facilities.

Graduate programs would be sustained by using students as apprentices in research and in the teaching of undergraduates.

Outreach would be financed in ways particular to its nature: cooperative extension in a federal-state partnership; off-campus instruction by the states or through tuition and fees; other efforts piggybacked on mainstream teaching and research programs.

(Faulkner, 2005, p. 5)

This summary could be applied to higher education in Minnesota and is the essence of how the social compact between higher education and society could be described at the time. About the University of Minnesota, President Morrill said the same thing in different words as he tried to define the relationship between the citizens of the State of Minnesota and the University in his book, *The Ongoing State University*.

The obligations of the state to its university are revealed as opportunities for its own advance. If it acts wisely, therefore, each state will encourage the resourceful diversity of its university’s program and purpose. In the broader discharge of
its educational responsibility, it will expect the university to
work with the public schools in discovering youth of
exceptional talent. It will encourage their advanced education
through maintaining tuition costs as low as possible and through
the provision of scholarships, where needed, by private gifts and
public assistance….The people of the state – and this is at the
heart of the matter- will realize and remember that high
purposes are exemplified and accomplished by men and women
of high character and competency…the great forward
movements in human societies have been born, always, of
crisis, representing fresh and inventive responses to human
needs. The responsibility of the people of a state to their
university becomes, therefore as great as their faith in the power
of inventive intelligence and informed good will, as compelling
as the highest aspirations of the human heart. (1960, p. 107)
Chapter 7

A New Century

Introduction

The current decade is again one of growth and change in the United States. President George W. Bush was elected in 2000 and served two terms as President of the United States. Major events during this decade include two bouts of economic trouble, a major terrorist attack on American soil, wars in Iraq and in Afghanistan, devastation from Gulf Coast hurricanes, and the election of our nation’s first African-American President. In 2008, Barack Obama was elected as our country’s newest president, and his administration immediately began responding to economic issues. Support for higher education as well as a whole host of services provided through our government are impacted by the swinging of the political pendulum. The 2000’s has included two such swings. President Clinton, a Democrat, was succeeded by George W. Bush, a Republican, in 2001. This election changed the tenor of American political thought, as did the election of Barack Obama in 2008. As Obama’s administration gets underway, we are seeing changes in national policy and international relationships.

On September 11, 2001, terrorists used hijacked airliners to destroy the World Trade Center Towers and to attack the Pentagon, killing over 3,000 American citizens. It was the first major terrorist attack in the United States in recent times, and it profoundly altered the disposition of our nation. It began a buildup of military readiness, provided impetus for the passage of the Patriot Act,
and ultimately led to wars in both Iraq and Afghanistan, which continue to this
day.

Economic conditions during this decade have vacillated greatly. In early
2000 the NASDAQ lost nearly 10% of its total value in three days when the “Dot
Com Bubble” burst. Internet stocks drove down the economy and were a primary
cause of economic uncertainty at the beginning of the decade. The “Real Estate
Bubble” began to deflate in 2007, causing another economic downturn that
continues to plague the United States. During times of economic instability,
higher education is often one of the first services to see a reduction in state and
federal funding. This occurred in the early 2000’s and is happening again in 2009
as states report cuts to higher education ranging from 3 to 30%. To offset this
reduction in funding, may colleges and universities are raising tuition by similar
percents.

In 1999 President Bill Clinton had high hopes and aspirations for the role
of higher education in the United States. In his final State of the Union address he
said:

Our administration has made education a high priority, focusing on
standards, accountability and choice in public schools, and on
making a college education available to every American -- with
increased Pell Grant scholarships, better student loan and work-
study programs, and the HOPE scholarship and other tax credits to
help families pay for college tuition. Because of these efforts, more
young people have the chance to make the most of their God-given
abilities, and take their place in the high-tech world of the 21st century. (Wooley & Peters, 1999-2010)

President Barack Obama also carries high hopes for higher education.

[President Obama] is committed to ensuring that America will regain its lost ground and have the highest proportion of students graduating from college in the world by 2020. The President believes that regardless of educational path after high school, all Americans should be prepared to enroll in at least one year of higher education or job training to better prepare our workforce for a 21st century economy. (“White House,” 2010)

In between these two administrations the United States endured a terrorist attack and 8 years of war that changed our national outlook. How the events of the 2000’s will impact the future of higher education remains to be seen, but the impact by state funding reductions, neoliberalism, the accountability movement, and academic capitalism is already perceptible. For the purposes of this paper the term neoliberalism describes a set of economic policies that have been prevalent in the United States over the past thirty years, including deregulation of private enterprise, a greater openness to international trade, reduction of expenditures for social services (such as education), and privatization of state owned goods and services. Replacing the idea of “the public good” with “individual responsibility” is often regarded as a sign of neoliberalism.

Higher Education in the United States

Higher education in the 2000’s has been shaped by national policy created in the past 30 years. Between 1980 and 2000 higher education faced a series of
changes and new responsibilities. Competition and cooperation in the global economy, socio economic concerns that led to a tax revolt at home, technological advancements, environmental concerns, and terrorism all contribute to an unsettled and changing environment for higher education.

The rise and fall in student populations during the last three decades made planning more difficult for institutions of higher education. The inclusion of access to higher education as an institutional responsibility required the provision of services for a more diverse student population and required the addition of staff and support services. Competition among institutions was heightened by a series of ranking systems. Higher education assumed a more business-like model as it grappled with increasing costs. The increasing reliance upon research funding and a new emphasis on community service by the federal government also impacted the development of colleges and universities during this time.

The current demand for accountability and standards in higher education is a result of society’s demand for colleges and universities to prove their worth. Three things stand out as reasons for this lack of faith in the value of higher education. First, a legacy of the 1960’s and early 1970’s was a perceived loss of confidence in higher education by those it serves. The college campus had become a focal point for political and civic activism and many perceived this as a failure on the part of the institutions to control the actions of their students. Parents began to wonder what was happening to the children that they sent away to college, and the public began questioning the value of a publically supported system of higher education. Secondly, the expanded role of the university
included an attempt to serve the diverse needs of all of its publics, making its entire efforts suspect. Thirdly, the changing demographics and needs of the student body created unique challenges for higher education. Reaffirmation of the value of higher education to the public it serves continues to be a goal of college and universities for numerous reasons including funding, prestige, and autonomous action.

As the mission for higher education has expanded, and as the number of student participants has risen, higher education has become more expensive. At the state level, higher education competes with an ever-increasing host of government services for state funding. In the early 1980’s a tax revolt started with California’s Proposition 13, and spread across the country as Americans became more and more concerned with the amount of taxes they payed and the services that they received. Higher education is often seen as an easy place to cut because of the multiple funding sources and its ability to raise tuition. In the 1970’s the federal government began providing financial aid to students. In 1972, the Pell Grant was created as a need-based federal financial aid program, though by 1978 the emphasis had swayed to provision of low-interest student loans for students in need.

The population of students attending college changed radically between 1970 and 2000. Although the number of students increased from a little over 8 million in 1969 to approximately 15 million in 2000, the growth was not as steady as it had been in previous years. By the early 1990’s universities were beginning to find it hard to sustain the level of growth to which they had become
accustomed. The first piece of legislation that impacted both the number and quality of students participating in higher education during this time period was an amendment to the Military Selective Service Act in 1971 that ended the policy of student deferment for the draft. In 1976 higher education saw the first real drop in student enrollment in over 50 years, with 175,000 fewer students enrolling in college than the previous year. By 1979 more than 50% of the students entering college were women, a trend that continues to this day. By 1991, over 60% of all high school graduates enrolled in college -- evidence that efforts to increase access to higher education were continuing to gain momentum. Christopher Lucas (1994) describes the changing student population like this:

By the mid-nineties the shape of higher learning in America bore scant resemblance to the overall pattern predominating a quarter-century before. Traditional students had dwindled in numbers, their places now occupied by a new breed of “nontraditional” collegians. By 1994 there were more women than men among the almost 14 million students enrolled on campuses across the country. Close to 45 percent were over the age of 25, including an estimated 300,000 over the age of 50. Minority Americans of varied hues and origins constituted about one-fifth of all enrollments in higher education.

Almost half of all college students were attending school part-time and intermittently rather than full-time and without interruption. The typical college undergraduate more often than
not was holding down a part-time job or was even employed full-time while pursuing his or her college degree. Thanks in part to an explosive growth in the number and size of large urban commuter campuses, there were more students living at home or off-campus than there were in dormitories or in fraternity or sorority houses. Married students or single parents with children to support while attending school had become commonplace. In stark contrast to the past, fewer than one-third of undergraduate college students toward the close of the century had declared a major in the liberal arts; and nearly 60 percent were pursuing occupational or professional studies, many of which had not been enshrined within a collegiate degree program or had even existed two or three decades previously. (Lucas, p. xvi)

In response to legislative mandates and public request, the nature and needs of students attending college changed significantly from 1970-2000. The 1972 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act included Title IX which prohibits discrimination based on gender, marital, and parent status with relation to a variety of educational factors. This affected changes in higher education that were especially noticeable in the funding of intercollegiate athletics, but also impacted spending and accommodations across campus. Title IX created the Basic Equal Opportunity Grant (later renamed the Pell Grant in 1980) that provided educational opportunities for disadvantaged students. Three specific pieces of legislation addressed the needs of disabled students: the Rehabilitation
Act of 1973, which protects and provides support for people with disabilities who participate in higher education; the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act, which made it easier for qualified students with disabilities to enter postsecondary education; and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in 1990 that provides additional protections.

Affirmative Action in enrollment decisions were debated in numerous cases. In 1978, the Bakke case made it all the way to the Supreme Court where it was found that a separate admissions process based solely on race at the University of California Davis Law School violated the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. The Bakke case forced the nation to reconsider the role of affirmative action in enrollment decisions, and in 1995 the University of California ended its affirmative action policies based on race. At the same time that affirmative action in admissions policies was being debated, the American Council on Education released a report titled “One Third of a Nation” that advocated for more support for minority group participation in higher education. In 1996, a ruling by the Supreme Court in United States V. Virginia Supreme Court determined that public colleges and universities could not operate as single sex institutions.

Partially as a result of the emphasis on access and opportunity, colleges and universities around the country increased opportunities for students to learn about diverse cultures. Student agitation in the 1960’s began the movement toward creation of centers for the study of ethnic culture and gender issues. Access and opportunity were buzz words in higher education during this time and
colleges and universities reacted to the demands by providing a host of new services and programs. Along with this came an increased emphasis on the idea that colleges and universities ought to prepare students for future employment, and more concern from corporations that college graduates were under prepared to join the work force.

Governmental and business involvement in the business of higher education came gradually, but by 2000 both had become major influences on the operations of colleges and universities. Federal support for higher education began with the land grant acts, and increased with the extension of research grants and training contracts that began prior to World War II. By 1990, according to Henry Rosovsky in his book *The University: An Owner's Manual*, the Federal Government had become the “financier of research, banker to students and universities, regulator, judge and jury of many academic activities” (1990, p. 14). Rosovsky argues that “virtually no university in this country can function without federal support” (1990, p. 14). The growth in corporate-academic partnerships has not only changed the nature of research being done on college campuses, but it has enhanced the perception that higher education is an industry and ought to be run like one. This has led to the onset of academic capitalism. Slaughter and Rhodes (2004) define academic capitalism as the “involvement of the University and its faculty in market-like behaviors, and tell us that it has become a key feature of higher education in the American higher education” (p. 37). Several pieces of legislation including the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980, which gave universities property rights for inventions developed using federal research
dollars, have added to the academic capitalism of the past several decades. Ability to generate research dollars provides universities with necessary revenue and allows faculty and students to undertake interesting and often lucrative research. The generation of research funding is one of the measures of a successful university.

Competition between colleges and universities has existed since the early days of Harvard and Yale, but it took a new twist in the 1970’s. The Carnegie Commission issued its first classification of institutions of higher education in 1973, with subsequent editions and revisions published in 1976, 1987, 1994, and 2000. This led to a more intense competition as institutions began jockeying for positions in higher divisions. The situation was compounded as popular magazines began to rank colleges and universities. The *US News and World Report* magazine published its first ranking of higher education institutions in 1983. In an article titled, “The Birth of College Rankings” Robert Morse (2008) says:

> When *U.S. News* started the college and university rankings 25 years ago, no one imagined that these lists would become what some consider to be the 800-pound gorilla of American higher education, important enough to be the subject of doctoral dissertations, academic papers and conferences, endless debate, and constant media coverage. What began with little fanfare has spawned imitation college rankings in at least 21 countries,
including Canada, China, Britain, Germany, Poland, Russia, Spain, and Taiwan. (p. 1)

The perception that colleges and universities are focused more on research dollars and national rankings than on the needs of the public they serve has helped to bring about a new area of focus from many institutions of higher education. Community engagement has made a resurgence in higher education within the past several years. In 1985 a national coalition of college and university presidents called Campus Compact was founded. The purpose of the new organization was to reaffirm the relationship between higher education and the public it serves. The Presidents’ Statement of Principles, written in 1996, summarizes the goals of the organization:

1. Campus Compact presidents strongly advocate the participation of students, faculty, staff, and higher education institutions in public and community service. Such service may range from individual acts of student volunteerism to institution-wide efforts to improve the social and economic well-being of America’s communities.

2. Campus Compact presidents share a resolute commitment to speak out on issues of public concern and to articulate ideas that contribute to the common good of American and global society. Campus Compact member presidents strive to influence the quality of civic discourse and to ensure that key issues of civic concern are fairly discussed in impartial forums.
3. Campus Compact presidents support initiatives that promote productive collaborations between colleges and communities. Such initiatives seek to create opportunities for renewed civic and community life, improved educational and economic opportunity, expanded democratic participation by citizens and the application of the intellectual and material resources of higher education to help address the challenges that confront communities.

4. Campus presidents support the development of opportunities that increase student, faculty, staff and alumni involvement in citizenship-building service activities. Community and public service, especially when linked to the core educational mission of the college and university, are powerful vehicles for developing citizenship skills—including participation in the political process—and the spirit of civic engagement required for life in a democratic civil society.

5. Campus Compact presidents support service learning because it enables students and faculty to integrate academic study with service through responsible and reflective involvement in the life of the community. (Presidents’ Statement, 1996)

Two Pieces of legislation followed the creation of this organization that further stressed the importance for higher education to be tied to its public. In 1990 the National and Community Service Act passed. The act established a basis for organized volunteerism and service on college campuses. It provided initial
funding for programs like AmeriCorps. It was followed by the National Service Trust Act in 1993. This act created the Corporation for National Service to direct AmeriCorps and Learn and Serve America.

American higher education has gone through significant changes in the last half of the twentieth century. Its institutions have grown in an attempt to accommodate goals of universal access and it has broadened to include support for the diversity of constituent needs. Although federal funding for higher education has grown over the years, institutions of higher education are finding it harder to compete with ever growing service needs on a state level. The expanded mission of higher education in conjunction with increased competition among colleges and universities for prestige and enrollment has increased the need for resources beyond the ability (or will) of the public to support. Growth to a large part has been financed through public and private grants and partnerships, entrepreneurial endeavors, and development efforts. The need to seek external funding while being saddled with increasing state and federal requirements is an issue of concern for many university officials. Others worry that the erosion of public support for higher education as evidenced by reduced resources and increasing calls for accountability is symbolic of the public’s lack of trust and respect for institutions of higher education.

Minnesota

Today Minnesota has about 5 million residents, and almost 60% of them live in the Minneapolis and St. Paul metropolitan area. The state is identified by its progressive politics and social policies. It is the only state in the Union that
supports the DFL (Democrats, Farmers, and Labor) party rather than the more common Democratic Party. The citizens of the state are recognized for civil involvement and high voter turnout.

With regard to higher education, the state merged three systems of higher education in 1995 to create statewide efficiencies. Those systems were the Minnesota State Universities, the Minnesota Community College System, and the Minnesota technical colleges. The new system, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MNSCU) currently supports the seven state universities and 25 state colleges. Each year there are about 250,000 students taking courses for college credit and an additional 140,000 students in non-credit courses (MNSCU, 2009). The University of Minnesota with its five campuses in the Twin Cities, Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Rochester, four regional extension offices, and 15 research and outreach centers serves over 66,000 students annually (UM, 2010).

Minnesota is known for its support of education. In 2002, Minnesota spent $279 per capita on higher education. The national average was $233. How this support will be impacted by recent cuts to state support of higher education in Minnesota remains to be seen. In a recent announcement, Governor Pawlenty announced a billion dollar cut in state support to higher education. The University of Minnesota will take 50% of that reduction in funding and the State University System (MNSCU) will have to absorb the remaining $500 million cut. Comparing the scores that Minnesota has received from Measuring Up report cards, affordability seems to have become a challenge for higher education in Minnesota, too. It is of special concern that poor and working-class families are
expected to devote 36% of their income, even after financial aid, to pay for the
costs at two-year colleges in the state.

Minnesota Measures Up:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


University of Minnesota

President Mark Yudof (president of the University of Minnesota from 1997 until 2002) demonstrated his belief in the relationship between the university and the public it serves by making it a priority early in his presidency to travel through the State of Minnesota to ask people what they wanted from their university. In his inaugural address in 1997 he emphasized six program priorities: agriculture, molecular and cellular biology, design, digital technology, new media studies, and continued attention to undergraduate education. He also spoke about the importance of access to the University. He said, “If we do not provide reasonable access...the state government will turn their backs on graduate education and research” (Yudof, 1997, p. 14). During President Yudof’s presidency, progress was made toward his goals and programmatic objectives.
He also initiated a renewed interest in university service on campus by creating a Council on Public Engagement.

Robert Bruinicks, who had served as Executive Vice President and Provost at the University of Minnesota, was selected to succeed President Yudof, and became the 15th President of the University in 2002. President Bruinicks continues to lead the University at this time. He continues to endorse the University’s missions of research and service to the state. He clearly articulates his view of the University’s compact with the public it serves on the university web site with this quote:

As the state's only land-grant university and its only comprehensive research university system, we are responsible, not just for the education of the state's people, but for ground-breaking research and the application of new knowledge to serve the greater good. ("University," 2010)

Yet in his 2009 State of The University address, President Brinks expressed doubt about the future relationship between the University and the public it serves.

Clearly, the value and impact of the University of Minnesota system extends well beyond our classrooms and laboratories. Yet despite tremendous progress, today we face historic challenges to our public mission. State support is on the wrong trajectory—and recent history shows that as state funding slips, so does our ability to compete for federal dollars and private support. ("University," 2010)
Annual budgets often provide a good indication of an institution’s relationship to
the public and a glimpse into the mission and values of the institution. This
statement from the university’s 2008 Annual Report provides a good description
of the University of Minnesota, main campus today:

The Twin Cities campus is the fourth largest campus in the country
in terms of enrollment (approximately 50,900 students) and among
the top seven public research institutions nationally. The
University is the state’s major research institution with
expenditures of approximately $564.9 million, $510.4 million, and
$478.8 million in fiscal years 2008, 2007, and 2006, respectively,
for research under various programs funded by governmental and
private sources. (“Annual,” 2008)

Changing demographics

Total enrollment at the University has remained fairly constant at about
50,000 for the University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus during the 40-year
period from 1970 to the present. Enrollment did bump up to almost 60,000
students during the 1980’s but fell rapidly as the University increased enrollment
requirements in the early 1990’s.
Competition and ranking

The decrease in enrollment was primarily due to a document produced by Interim University President Kenneth Keller. In 1985, at the prodding of then Governor Rudy Perpich, Keller wrote a document titled *Commitment to Focus*. This document summarized five years of University planning. The principle elements of the document included: “Strengthening graduate education and research, reducing undergraduate enrollment in order to improve the undergraduate experience, transforming the general college from a degree granting program to one that would offer developmental and enrichment skills. Each of the colleges was to focus on one area of unique strength, particularly research” (Lehmberg & Pflaum, 2001, p. 192).
One of the goals of the plan was for the University of Minnesota to move from among the top ten into the top five public research institutions in the nation. The plan met with mixed response according to D.J. Leary. Leary, a graduate of the University of Minnesota, is a well known political and public affairs media consultant in the state and region, he retired in 2005, but continues to blog about Minnesota affairs to this date. In an interview with Clark Chambers in October 1995 Leary talked about the pre-1980’s idea that it was the” birthright of the sons and daughters of farmers, and miners, and engineers, and working people that when they were born, they could go to this university” (Chambers & Leary, 1995). He recalled an experience at an event in rural Minnesota in the late 1980’s that demonstrated the anti-university sentiment that was being generated as a result of Commitment to Focus.

It was the major blow to the university, the university's long sense of ground and grassroots feeling, out there. I mean, it was palpable. I can tell you that one day I took the current president of the University of Rhode Island, Bob Carruthers – he was the head of the chancellor state university system – into the Fargo Forum just to do some briefing about state university budgets and things like that, an update because they had Moorhead State University there. That's a powerful newspaper. The publisher came into the meeting. The editors were in there. I looked around and saw this guy. They are just kind of antsy. Then, after a few minutes, there's this huge explosion. I can remember one was standing there saying, "You're
saying, goddamn it, that our kids are got to go all the way to Montana to get a Ph.D! We won't stand for that!” He [audience member] said, "Wait a minute, that's not me! That's not us." It didn't matter, they had this anger at the university that they were just going to lash out at anybody. Clearly, that was felt from the population and it was felt from their legislators. (Chambers & Leary, 1995, p. 22)

Today, the University of Minnesota web site boasts that Science Watch Magazine ranked it among the top 10 “Highest Impact U.S. Universities” and that it ranks 6th in terms of revenue generation from university-based technologies. University President Robert Bruinicks also announces what he calls an audacious goal on this web page. He says, “The new century also demands new thinking, and we’re in the midst of transformative change en route to becoming one of the top three public research universities in the world” (“University,” 2008). As the state’s only land grant institution, Bruinicks maintains that it has obligations to the greater good, that the university is committed to learning and public service and the economic welfare of the state. The question will be how to demonstrate a positive balance between the quest for prestige and continued benefit to the public the University of Minnesota serves.

**Diverse needs**

Meeting the diverse needs and desires of constituents can be a source of conflict between a university and the public it serves. Political and social
opinions vary on the value of these types of programs and the provision of them can even alienate some elements of the public. On the other side of the issue, failure to recognize and provide support for programs aimed at diverse and special populations will alienate other elements of the population.

Women and gender issues received lots of attention at the University of Minnesota in the 1970’s and 1980’s; the Women’s Studies Department was formed in 1972 and women’s sports programs began to grow as a result of Title IX legislation. After Marjorie Howard, the only woman on the Board of Regents found that there was almost a $10,000 difference in the salaries offered to male and female deans being hired in 1970, the situation was corrected and the University’s first equal opportunity office was created. In 1973, Shyamala Rajender sued the University after the Chemistry Department refused to consider her for a tenure track position. The positive verdict in the law suit had significant implications for gender equity in university hiring practices across the country (Lehmberg & Pflaum, 2001, p. 127-130).

Organization

As the university continued to grow through the decades it became a more complex organization. This quote from the University of Minnesota’s 2008 Annual Report describes the current status of the institution. The University of Minnesota (the University) is both a state land-grant university, with a strong tradition of education and public service, and a major research institution serving the State of Minnesota through five campuses: Crookston, Duluth, Morris, Rochester, and Twin Cities. The University is considered a constitutional corporation and an agency of the State of Minnesota. As a result of this unique status, authority to govern the University is reserved to the Board of Regents rather than state law. The University complies with state law when specifically included by statute or when compliance does not conflict with the University’s ability to accomplish its mission and purpose as established by the constitution of the State of Minnesota. (UM. Annual Report, 2008)

Research agenda

The University of Minnesota considers research to be one of its primary purposes. This is obvious today by reading President Bruinicks’ speeches and looking at the University web site. Medical and biotechnical research are among the specialties that the University of Minnesota is known for. Since the 1960’s the University has increased its emphasis on research and graduate education in these fields.
However in the 1990’s the federal government fined the University of Minnesota $32 million dollars and the NIH sanctioned the university for improper handling of grants. This was a result from business related to AntiLymphocyte Globulin (ALG), a transplant drug that was developed at the University of Minnesota. Research faculty at the university oversaw the development and manufacture of the transplant drug and the university profited from its sale. The government shut the operation down after 25 years because ALG never received federal approval.

The result of this scandal was a loss of prestige for the entire University, the University hospital was left near bankruptcy, and the University determined to clean up the institution’s research practices. Frank Cerra became Vice President of the Academic Health Center near the conclusion of the incident. He said, "We had, in a sense, betrayed our contract with the people of Minnesota. We had lost our sense of core values of who we are and why we're here, and I could do something to restore that" (Hughes, 2006, p. 7).

Today the University of Minnesota receives over $237.7 million in NIH grant funds and follows guidelines strictly. The medical school’s budget comes primarily from federal aid, private grants, insurance reimbursements from patients, and only 7% from state funding.

*Academic capitalism*
The 2008 Annual Report from the University of Minnesota reads like the financial report from a major corporation. There is lots of information about assets, liabilities, bonds, and donations. There is very little narrative at all and no mention of research accomplishments, student learning, or contribution to the public. Nothing in the report is designed to instill pride or a sense of public ownership and perhaps the annual report for the University no longer serves that purpose.

Another indicator of a more businesslike approach toward the management of the university is cost to participate. Tuition at the University of Minnesota has risen every year in this decade. This is partially due to rising expenses and partially due to decreasing public support. The 2008 Measuring up Report gives the state of Minnesota an F in affordability. This is due in a large part to the high cost of attending a community colleges in Minnesota, but it adds to the public perception that Higher Education statewide is becoming less affordable.

*Services provided*

There are many examples of service to the public that can be found in the University of Minnesota’s most recent history. The work of the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, the University Medical Center, and environmental research are all good examples of service to the state. What seems to be missing is a public knowledge about the service that the University of Minnesota is providing to the state.
The Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs was developed in 1995. It offers masters degrees in public policy and a variety of non-credit programs and services in order to prepare public servants for the state and the nation. The mission of the institute is “to combine graduate education for careers in all aspects of Public Affairs with functions of a policy think tank and a public service program-in the land-grant tradition” (Self Study Report, 1995).

D.J. Leary (1995) says that the university has done an extremely poor job of reminding the people of the state about its value, and uses this example about the University Medical Center to illustrate his point:

For instance, there was a time, four of five years ago, when there was a housewife in rural Kandiyohi County that had been rushed to the University of Minnesota and her life was saved by medical technology. Had she gone to the Willmar Hospital or had she been in Nebraska, that couldn't have happened. But there never was the sense transferred to the people, her friends and neighbors, and the people of Kandiyohi County - I had the discussion with the newspapers out there - of how important this university is to us as a people in western Minnesota, even though we may not go to school there, but what we get out of it. (Chambers & Leary, 1995, p. 3)

In another example of services provided but lack of positive reflection on the University, D. J. Leary talks about the wood products industry and research being done by the U of M.
The taxpayers of the state of Minnesota paid $1 million for a four-year generic environment impact study done on timberlands harvesting, looking ahead fifty years. It was forced by the environmental community. It is one of the more extraordinary pieces of science. There's nothing like it. There is an awful lot of it done under the College of Natural Resources, and a lot of Minnesota Ph.D.'s that did the science and the research on it, and a lot from around the country. Because they didn't find a train wreck in the forest and they came out saying, "These people seem to have managed it pretty well, as compared to Wisconsin or the Northwest that was having all the problems," the environmental community really didn’t like it. And the university ... I had lunch with these guys and the new dean the other day and I said, "(a) you got no credit and (b) you kept your mouth shut rather than standing up championing it." So, it was left to the industry and the industry came to me before it was completed and I said, "Let me tell you, the presumption is going to be that the industry on anything environmental is going to be against it. You've got to go out and applaud that a lot." They said, "Jesus! we don't even know what it said." I said, "Whatever it says, that's how you buy a place at the table to make what changes you've got." We were so effective at it – this isn't blowing my own horn but you get the client to go along with – that when they held the public hearings, I remember in
Bemidji a guy stood up and said to the hearing officer, "You don't understand, if they're for it, it's got to be bad." But at no time did the university's role in this—a third, 17 million acres, in this state are in forest land—life of the forest is known by one-half dozen people. (Chambers & Leary, 1995, p. 9)

As the interview continued, Leary repeatedly made the point that the university lacked the public relations skills to share the value it provides to the public it serves.

**Summary**

The mission of the University of Minnesota was derived in part from its status as a land grant state university to do the following:

- Provide basic education for all qualified citizens of the state who choose to attend; to offer such graduate and professional training as would benefit the community, including applied programs in agriculture, engineering, and business: to sponsor basic and applied research in all fields and academic disciplines; to serve the people through outreach or extension programs. (Clark, 1989, p. 491)

By comparing the quote above to a more recent description of the role of land grant institutions written in 1996 it is easy to see the evolution.

Through the years, land grant institutions have been understood at their best, to be the “creation and possession of the people.” Their purpose has been tied to the “practical” concerns of both vocation and citizenship. People have sought to make these institutions
places to develop a kind of education that engages a broad
diversity of people in the struggle to make a better life, not just for
themselves, but for the larger “commonwealth” of their
communities, states, and nation. (Peters, 1996, p.1)

The first quote talks about “qualified students” and choice, and the second talks
about diversity and struggle for individuals to make a better life for themselves,
thus emphasizing the idea that higher education is becoming a personal benefit
available to all regardless of ability, rather than a public good designed to engage
our most talented citizens. However, both quotes talk about the role that higher
education should take in developing citizens and enhancing community.

It’s obvious from the examples provided that the University does provide
value to the public it serves. In many ways it provides the economic and social
stimulus that drives the state of Minnesota. Former Governor Anderson believes
that the public should value the University for preserving the history and heritage
of the state. He said, "What nobler purpose can there be for a University than to
gather up the prizes of a culture – preserve them, propagate them, make them
available – so that the best of what has gone before can be preserved and built
on?" (Elmer L. Andersen, plaque at library named in his honor).

*Minnesota State University, Mankato*

In 1975 the legislature changed the name of Mankato State College to
Mankato State University in recognition of its enrollment of over 14,000 students,
diversified curriculum, and graduate programs. The university’s name changed
again in 1999 when it became Minnesota State University, Mankato. This newest
name change came as a result of petitioning the legislature and in recognition of the state wide service it provides. The years between 1970 and 2000 brought great changes to Minnesota State University, Mankato. Its campus was completely relocated to a new site and the number of students grew to over 14,000 students. The curriculum grew and diversified and the physical plant of the institution grew in proportion to new expectations. Two men led the university in the first decade of the 21st century. Dr. Richard Rush served as president from 1992 until 2001. He was succeeded in office be Dr. Richard Davenport, who is currently the President of Minnesota State University, Mankato (MSU). During his tenure at MSU, Dr. Rush;

repositioned MSU as a statewide University; enhanced the learning environment, particularly through expanded national and statewide programs and faculty support; refocused attention to external fund raising resulting in more than $35 million raised since 1994, more than the cumulative total of the University's previous history. He changed the name of the university to Minnesota State University, Mankato to reflect the institution's growing mission; created a regional lobbying group of community and business leaders to advocate for southern Minnesota at the Legislature; established and expanded the Global Wireless Education Consortium; created a business/industry partnership with South Central Technical College; planned and implemented Learning Communities, First Year Experience, Maverick Hall and Freshman Orientation;
instituted full-tuition Presidential Scholars program; and elevated
the men's hockey program to Division I, receiving NCAA approval
and admission into the Western Collegiate Hockey Association.
During his tenure, the Andreas Theatre was constructed, as was the
Taylor Center. ("Minnesota State," 2010).

The legacy of President Davenport’s administration is still being written.
To date he has strong relationships with the chancellor’s office and in the state
legislature resulting in positive support for the university. Two major construction
projects, Ford Hall (a 67,000 square foot science building) and Julia Sears Hall (a
new 600-bed dormitory), and the introduction of the first doctoral programs
offered by the university represent major accomplishments of his administration
to this point.

*Changing demographics*

MSU has also experienced fluctuating enrollment in the decades
between 1970 and today. Enrollment was as high as 16,500 during the late
1970’s, was down as low as 11,000 in the mid 1990’s and is currently just
below 14,000. Since over 90% of MSU’s enrollment comes from within
the state, changes in state demographics have been mirrored in campus
demographics. The state of Minnesota continues to experience a
migration of rural to urban population and this has impacted strategic
planning on campus. Recent immigration to the state has also impacted
the makeup of the student population at MSU. Hmong and Vietnamese
immigrants started to come to Minnesota around the mid-1970s, and more
recently displaced Somali immigrants, have made the state of Minnesota their home. These changes in state and campus demographics as well as an emphasis on attracting international students to MSU have resulted in the addition of a variety of new services designed to support the changing student body.

*Diversity needs*

MSU has had a department of Diversity Services since the early 1970’s and in 2007 created a Division of Institutional Diversity and named its first Vice-President for Diversity. The department serves four primary groups: Asian American, African American, Latino, and Native American students. The International Center reports through Academic Affairs and provides support to students from over 60 countries. Disability services programs are provided through Academic Affairs. The division of Student Affairs supports centers for LGBT, women, and veterans.

Meeting the diverse needs and desires of constituents can be a source of conflict between a university and the public it serves, and Mankato has experienced some conflict as a result of the changing student population. The more “urban” student population has challenged the city’s Office of Public Safety at times, and the city has become a more diverse environment partially as a result of changing campus demographics. City and county officials struggle to keep up with the needs of an increasingly diverse population.

*Competition and ranking*
Competition with the other six state universities has been a part of MSU’s history since the days of the Normal Schools, but more recently the University has been competing on a grander scale. President Davenport talked about the importance of ranking in his 2009 Convocation Address, when he proudly announced:

In the last few days, Forbes magazine released their rankings of the top universities and I am pleased to report that Minnesota State Mankato ranked in the top quartile and the highest ranking MNSCU institution. Several private colleges and the University of MN ranked above us. (MSU, 2009)

By statute, MSU is limited to “applied research” and the university is pushing that limit to the best of its ability as it strives to increase grant funding and recognition. Also in President Davenport’s 2009 Convocation Address:

Our university was named one of three U.S. academic partners in a new, International Renewable Energy Technology Institute to facilitate the exchange of ideas and technology between Sweden and the United States and this past fall, we hosted the first bioenergy symposium. We were pleased to receive $1.5 million from the Minnesota Legislature for our IRETI project and we look for this amount to be matched by the federal government this year. Additionally, the Minnesota Department of Economic Development awarded the University $743,000 for the renewable energy emissions lab and we are involved in a
partnership with other MNSCU institutions that received a $1
million training grant. (MSU, 2009)

Organization

In the 1990’s, state government officials demonstrated “increased interest
in the performance and adaptability of their higher education systems”
(Richardson, 1999, p. vii). Economic, political and demographic changes on a
level not seen since the chaotic 1960’s caused states to look at a variety of
restructuring options that ranged from creating new governing or coordinating
boards to eliminating them (Richardson, 1999, p. vii). Primarily as a cost saving
measure, the Minnesota Legislature merged three higher education systems in
1995. The three systems, Minnesota State Universities (the original seven Normal
Schools), the Minnesota Community College System and the Minnesota technical
Colleges all combined to form Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
(MNSCU, 2009).

Richardson, et. al suggest that the performance of higher education
systems is influenced by political environments, system design, and leadership.
*Designing State Higher Education Systems for a New Century* (Richardson,
1999) defines three different approaches to consolidating systems of higher
education: consolidated governing boards, coordinating boards, and planning
agencies. The MNSCU system is a consolidated governing board that has legal
and management control responsibilities for all institutions within the system. In
2009 the MNSCU System has 25 two-year colleges (community and technical
colleges combined) and seven state universities. The system is the largest provider
of higher education in the state and serves about 250,000 students in credit-bearing courses annually (MNSCU, 2009).

Although MNSCU allows its institutions autonomy to create independent identity, the fact that MSU, Mankato is part of the state system impacts the way it operates.

**Academic capitalism**

The impacts of academic capitalism came late to MSU, Mankato. As primarily an undergraduate institution, research and the acquisition of grant monies did not become a priority until very recently. Today only about 10% of the University’s total budget comes from federal or corporate grants. Examples of academic capitalism are more evident when one considers public/private partnerships and development efforts. Students pay $1.50 for a bottle of soda on campus that only costs $.98 in a convenience store because of a contract with Pepsi Co. that helped to fund construction of the Taylor Center, a building named after a local business man who donated funds toward the construction of that facility as well. Increased costs of goods and services on campus have the same impact as higher tuition and fees and increase the overall idea of higher education as a business mode.

**Cost**

The State University system is the best value in Minnesota for higher education. While it does cost more to attend MSU than any of the 22 community colleges in the state, tuition is below the national average for state universities,
and quality is perceived to be high. The University has a 79% retention rate from year 1 to year 2, and graduation rates after 5 years are in the 60% range.

**Services provided**

The university provides a range of services for the community, ranging from the Mankato Drug Court, which gives youthful offenders a second chance, to the windmill farm that is testing the idea of wind power on generation on a local-user level. Minnesota State University, Mankato interacts with its community by providing space for high school football competitions, Fourth of July fireworks and special events of all kinds.

**Summary**

This quarter of the century saw the transformation of a state college to a regional, multipurpose university. It was necessary to revise the old academic organization into more appropriate and equal sized units that bore the title of colleges. Most programs grew and many changed to conform to the changes in society and the marketplace. Engineering became a major part of the total curriculum. Perhaps, the most significant changes of all were the development of programs that reflected an attitude of fairness and equality to the minorities and to women. (Faust, 1993, p. 31).

Looking to the future, the MNSCU system Strategic Plan 2006 -2010 *Designing the Future* presents four strategic directions to guide the member institutions: 1) Increase access and opportunity, 2) Promote and measure high-quality learning programs and services, 3) Provide programs and services integral to state and
regional economic needs, and 4) Innovate to meet current and future educational needs efficiently. Throughout the plan there are constant reminders to MNSCU institutions that they have an obligation to the public they serve. The goals associated with Strategic Direction 3 are particularly relevant:

**Goal 3.1** As a major partner in educating Minnesota’s workforce, participate in identifying and meeting regional and statewide economic development priorities.

**Goal 3.2** Support regional vitality by contributing artistic, cultural and civic assets that attract employees and other residents seeking a high quality of life.

**Goal 3.3** Develop each institution’s capacity to be engaged in and add value to its region. (MNSCU, 2006-2010)

MSU Mankato shows its response to the Strategic Directions in numerous ways, from the developing Mankato Drug Court program that provides an alternative for first time offenders to the new windmill farm being developed by MSU faculty to demonstrate the options for small scale generation of electricity for rural communities. How MSU promotes the ways it benefits the public it serves will in a large part determine how well it serves its public and maintains loyalty and support from the state, region and local community.

*Wrapping it up*

The decision to include this decade was based on the premise that the effects of state funding reductions, neoliberalism, the accountability movement, and academic capitalism should be evident by the year 2000. While there are
plenty of examples of service to the public they serve on the part of both MSU, Mankato and the University of Minnesota, there also seems to be a lessening of public support for higher education in the state of Minnesota in the current decade. The reasons for this are unclear but seem to be related to the ever increasing costs of higher education, concern from business and industry leaders about the lack of preparation of college graduates for the workplace, and a lack of public understanding about the services provided by higher education in Minnesota. The belief that a college degree is an essential credential for socio-economic success in life remains firm, but the public value of that credential seems to be diminished. There also seems to be an uncertainty that it is a societal obligation to provide affordable access to higher education for every individual. As a result there appears to be growing doubt about the true value of a higher education to society.
Concluding Thoughts and Recommendations

The questions that Stone and DeNevi asked in the preface to their book, *Portraits of the American University 1890-1910* are still valid today. We still need perspective and we still need a closer look at the origins and history of higher education. Through the history of Higher Education, we can begin to understand how it evolved into the variety of institutions it is today, and perhaps influence the future direction of Higher Education.

What should be the relationship between a university and the society it serves? How should it be governed, organized and financed? What physical facilities are needed, where, and for whose use? Who should be admitted, what shall they be taught, where, when, how and by whom? With what freedom shall ideas be dealt with, and whose ideas? What voice shall the faculty have? What experiences outside the classroom and off campus shall be included as a legitimate part of a college education? What scheme of rewards and sanctions shall prevail for students and faculty and by whom shall they be administered?

These are crucial issues in higher education today. They are universals. They are persistent. They began with the founding of American colleges and universities and their answers have been sought since. Some answers have been
found and some traditions established – the same traditions that are seriously in question today. We need perspective, a closer look at origins and history. (Stone & DeNevi, 1971, p. ix)

A good deal of modern writing and thinking about higher education today revolves around the first question posed above: what should be the relationship between a university and the society it serves? That question is a matter of perspective and may never truly be settled. The question I attempted to answer was what the relationship was like between institutions of higher learning in the United States and the public they served throughout history. To do this, I looked at two distinct institutions in the state of Minnesota at four points in time. Both the University of Minnesota and Minnesota State University, Mankato have rich and well documented histories, making data collection relatively easy.

The idea that institutions of higher education have an historical and ongoing obligation to the public that they serve has received a good deal of attention in modern writings about higher education. Specifics about the nature of the obligation and the corresponding responsibilities of society to colleges and universities often have not been clearly articulated in the higher education history. The objective of this paper was to look at the relationship between higher education and society, and how that relationship changed over time.

My initial research design included in-depth research of four universities at four distinct periods in their history. In the interest of time and thoroughness, that design was reduced to two institutions of higher education in the state of Minnesota. I asked three questions:
1. Can evidence of a social compact between higher education and society be found at specific points in time and as a result of pivotal events in the history of higher education at the universities included in this study?

2. How has the compact changed over time and how does each of the institutions reflect the changes?

3. How has the evolution of the social compact affected the support that these institutions receive from society?

This study traced the growth and development of two universities from their inception to modern times in order to study the idea of a social contract between higher education and the public it serves over a lengthy time period.

Evidence

I believe that evidence of a compact exists for most of the history of higher education in the United States. It existed minimally as an atmosphere of respect and trust, and was demonstrated by the responsibility that civic leaders felt toward the institutions, and in the responsibility that educational leaders demonstrated toward the public they served. In each of the four eras studied, the founding of each institution, 1900-1910, 1960-1970 and 2000-2010, there is some evidence that service to the public was at least part of the universities’ missions. However, the rhetoric seems to change over time. Prior to the 1960’s the conversation appears to be centered around the idea that individuals who participate in higher education are a benefit to society. After that time the conversations focus more on individual success, and that successful individuals
help to keep our economy strong. Early examples of the relationship between higher education and the public it serves are more about general contributions to society – the role that faculty from the University of Minnesota played in mapping the geography of the state, or the fact that students who graduated from the Mankato Normal School brought educational opportunities to children in small towns across the state. Later examples of service are equally evident, but seem to be overshadowed by news of successful Alumni, or partnerships with business and industry.

In a speech titled *The Changing Relationship between Higher Education and the States*, Larry Faulkner (2005) says:

The Second World War modified the social contract and sowed the seeds for its eventual failure. The urgency and technological nature of the war created a need for tremendous expansion of the national research capacity, which was already rooted in universities. The wartime laboratories were forerunners of university research centers. In the ensuing decades, federal research dollars would vastly transform the purpose and ambition of various schools and colleges within the American university. Those dollars would broaden, and sometimes redefine, the job descriptions of the faculty, especially in the sciences and engineering. Research would become a much larger part of institutional mission in the latter part of the 20th century, and it would become linked in the public mind with national and local economic viability. (p. 1)
Change

The compact changed over time, as the needs and desires of society changed and as the two institutions sought to meet those changing needs. The Morrill Act added useful research as a part of the role of higher education, and World War II pushed that public agenda. The University of Minnesota stepped up its research agenda in response to World War II and today is one of the nation’s premier research institutions. Both universities grew in size and offerings as a result of the Veteran’s Readjustment Act and the idea that higher education promoted social mobility. As the students became more diverse, the institutions responded by providing a wide array of services to ensure student success. Clark Kerr wrote that the goal of Higher Education was redefined “to serve less the perpetuation of an elite class and more the creation of a relatively classless society, with the doors of opportunity open to all through education” (Kerr, 1963, p. 43).

Support

Faulkner and several other higher education leaders assert that the compact is broken and some of the evidence supports this assertion. The two universities that I studied have expanded their mission to meet the desires of society, especially to meet desires of access and opportunity for all students. The combinations of exceedingly broad missions, along with the concepts of competition and ranking, have superseded the ideals of higher education as service to society. Support for Higher Education is on a downward track in Minnesota and across the country, both in terms of resources and public trust. A
partial explanation can be found in the writings of Hoffstadter and Hardy from 1952:

By and large, American education has reflected American society, and almost every singular and striking merit that it possesses is likely to have its corresponding deficiency. In promoting social mobility, offering a wide variety of services, and educating exceptionally large numbers, colleges and universities have fallen into many practices that can be questioned. It is hard to conduct a system of mass higher education – and that is what we have – without losing something qualitatively. It is hard to serve the community in a great variety of ways without losses to intellectualism. It has proved hard to serve science and technology in a practical society without some cost to intellectual and spiritual values. It has been hard to serve the American community loyally and effectively without succumbing to some of the failings of that community. (Hoffstadter & Hardy, 1952, p. 102)

As I studied the two universities in each era, several themes began to emerge. The role of the curriculum and how it both influences public perception of the value of an institution and how it influences student decision making about choice of institution. The cost of higher education has been a consistent concern throughout history. Cost balanced against perceived value has long been an element in defining the relationship. The evolving social role of colleges and
universities are perceived differently by various segments of society, and that
diversity of opinion impacts the idea of the social compact. Public relations
makes a difference in perceived value of institutions of higher education, and
paying attention to community engagement enhances public perception of the
institution. Finally, academic leaders who champion the ideals of learning and the
creation of new knowledge as valuable in their own right, rather than as a means
to economic growth, are vital to the future of higher education.

Curriculum

Today, one of the primary reasons that students choose a college or
university is because of the degrees offered and the career options that might
ensue. In 1869 and in 1900, students chose to attend the University of Minnesota
because they wanted to complete their education. Throughout the history of
higher education in the United States, scholars have debated the five major
perspectives of curricular design: traditional, experiential, structure-of-the-
disciplines, behavioral, and cognitive. As the debate went on, the public seems to
have lost something…-a common understanding about what values a university
education can have beyond employment goals, and more importantly, that all
college and university degrees are not the same. Calls for accountability and
standards are partially the result of a lack of understanding about what colleges
and universities teach, and how students learn. The Minnesota State Legislature
is beginning to look at its colleges and universities and will need to make the
decisions about program overlap and the roles of each of its institutions. As
James Ratcliff said, “No one curriculum and no one institution can be entirely responsive to the vast array of new constituents” (1992, p. 17).

Cost

In a *USA Today* article, Sandra Block expresses a concern about higher education. She says; “At a time when even entry-level jobs often require a bachelor’s degree, hardly anyone disputes the importance of a college education. Even so, many parents and students struggle to understand why college costs so much” (2007). This quote emphasizes the idea that people are familiar enough with higher education to know that it’s important, but not familiar enough with it to understand its costs. To the average citizen, an undergraduate degree is a ticket to a good job and a good life. The research and service that are part of the cost of education are often not understood or appreciated. Other areas that impact the cost of higher education are the co-curricular or academic support services provided on campus. While these things make a campus more attractive, they often increase cost to students and tax payers.

The value that society places on higher education has not waivered much in the past hundred years. People still value higher education, but for different reasons than in the past. Historically, the role of higher education was more aligned with the provision of leaders for communities, religious organizations and our country. Today, a college degree is about future job opportunities for the student. This shift from higher education as a public good to higher education as a private good, seems to have had an impact upon state and federal funding for higher education. One of the ways we define the relationship between higher
education and the public it serves is through the provision of resources, another is trust.

**Social Role**

A major shift that occurred in the relationship between higher education and society involves the idea of access and equity. Over the years higher education has become an equalizing factor in society, a way for citizens to climb the socio economic ladder. However, there are still barriers to access that impact students before they get to college. Conflicting ideas about these barriers (K-12 preparation, cultural, attitudinal, and financial) impact public perception and trust in our system of higher education. Some employers express lack of trust in the college graduate’s preparation for the work place, and some members of society express lack of trust in higher education’s ability to make a difference in their futures. In a report titled *Squeeze Play: How Parents and the Public Look at Higher Education Today* (2007), John Immerwahr and Jean Johnson talk about the pressures that higher education is facing from a new generation of students seeking access to higher education at the same time that public funding for colleges and universities is declining. One of the ten findings in their report exemplifies the changing role of higher education today; they say, “When it comes to public attitudes on higher education, ‘the bloom is off the rose’” (p. 22). Although the public has a fairly positive attitude about higher education, people are more critical than in years past. Indicators mentioned in the report include: colleges operating like businesses, the idea held by many Americans that waste and mismanagement are increasing the cost of higher education, and blaming
colleges and universities for high dropout rates (Immerwahr & Johnson, p. 22). Both this report and my historical observations provide indications that the social climate for higher education has changed and that has impacted the balance of the relationship between higher education and the public it serves. In the future, at least in Minnesota, it will be important for colleges and universities to pay attention to public perceptions, be accountable for how public funds are spent, and to reinforce the public value of institutions of higher education to the state.

**Intellectual and public leadership**

In the earliest years of higher education in Minnesota, college and university leaders were recognized and respected as intellectual leaders for the state. From the University of Minnesota, Presidents Folwell and Northrop served the state in a variety of ways. The worked to develop a state-wide high school system, supported the efforts of the state’s historical society, and lobbied for the construction of libraries. Educational leaders from the Mankato Normal School were also involved in these efforts, helping state-wide education grow from the one room school house to a progression of educational opportunities from grade school to high school and college. These early intellectual leaders knew each other and worked with state government officials for the betterment of the state; they were publicly known and respected.

The idea of intellectual leadership has changed over the 150 years of this study and has changed the nature of the relationship between the public and higher education. Presidents and university leaders are no longer viewed as necessary to the growth of society; they run the university and stay apart from
community and statewide affairs. In order to rebalance the social compact between higher education and society, I believe that it will be important for the next generation of higher education leaders to champion the ideals of learning and knowledge creation as essential elements of social well being and growth.

Finally

The social compact between higher education and society is a shared reality, constructed and reconstructed each time that expectations of either party change – it is a social construct. As such, it is always changing and reforming as colleges and universities balance demands from the public and services they provide. The nature of the compact has changed as the nature of Higher Education has changed.

There is much to be learned by studying the compact or relationship between Higher Education and the public it serves. Additional research into the history of the compact, and how the relationship between higher education and the public it serves has changed, will help in designing the future. The balance between needs and services provided should be examined on college campuses throughout the country. This research can help all of higher education to provide better service to the public and receive stronger support from the public in the future… strengthening the compact will enhance higher education in our country.
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