



**Advocacy, Research, and Service for Women:  
The Pioneering Origins of the Center for the  
Education of Women  
at the University of Michigan**

**Linda Eisenmann  
University of Massachusetts Boston and  
Visiting Scholar, CEW  
February 2001**

**Center for the Education of Women  
The University of Michigan  
330 E. Liberty St. Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2289  
734/998-7080  
<http://www.umich.edu/~cew>**

As a charter member of the “continuing education for women” movement of the early-1960s, the Center for the Education of Women at the University of Michigan presents a potent example of a program born in a non-feminist era that not only survived but prospered through a later activist period. The center and others like it represent an important stage in the development of gender equity concerns on American college and university campuses. The women’s research centers, women’s studies programs, and commissions on women that developed in the later-1960s and 1970s had different tools at their disposal, yet they could build upon the structural responses to women’s needs created by women’s continuing education programs. This paper traces how one exemplary program, conceived for a particular need in 1962, transitioned to a different era, remaining flexible, creative, and sturdy enough to serve important – yet somewhat different – needs for women nearly forty years later.

Three themes about the continuing education for women movement can be explored through the story of the University of Michigan’s Center for the Education of Women (CEW):

1. Continuing education programs served as early institutional efforts at gender equity on college campuses. Created in the early-1960s, before the rejuvenated women’s movement arrived, continuing education could pave the way for new types of programs. Born in an era that provided little encouragement for women’s professional futures, the centers organized around women’s needs as students, and some remained viable when the women’s movement hit campuses later in the decade.

2. The Michigan Center for the Education of Women provided a stronger model than many contemporary centers for making the transition to a feminist era. Michigan’s CEW developed a more creative approach to its tripartite mission of advocacy, research, and service that allowed it to change over time while remaining true to its original intent. The early and almost unique focus on research allowed CEW to prosper when many others did not.

3. Reclaiming the history of these centers helps revise the historiographic view of the 1950s as a primarily passive time for women, when the primacy of domestic ideology overruled other efforts. Rather than sustaining a notion that this era produced no advances for women’s concerns, the history of the women’s continuing education movement can demonstrate a link in women’s activism from the energetic war years of the 1940s to the activist feminist era of the later-1960s.

### **Women’s Status in the Postwar Era**

This third theme provides a starting point by examining current historiographic presentations of the early postwar years. Crafting an appropriate term for the period between the end of World War II and 1965 is difficult. Thinking of it as “the early Cold War era” is one sensible approach, although historians of women often reject periodizations based on political and military events. Nonetheless, in this case, the aftermath of a world war and its subsequent political and diplomatic challenges affected women directly. In terms of periodization, it is also true that the defining spirit of a decade is not necessarily confined to that ten-year numerical span. Thus, when examined from a feminist perspective, “the 1950s” seem, in fact, to stretch into the early-1960s. Perhaps the 1950s actually ended in 1963 when Betty Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique* appeared, or in 1966 when NOW (the National Organization for Women) was formed. In either case, it seems that the notions of the 1950s carried on after the turn of the new decade.<sup>1</sup>

Conjuring up popular views of the 1950s invariably leads to the stereotypic television-generated images of “Father Knows Best” or “Leave it to Beaver,” where proper middle-class, white mothers stayed home, tended to family needs with perfect but domestically-oriented

competence, and supported the earnest male family breadwinner. Mothers rarely worked outside the home, almost never at professional jobs, and if they had prepared themselves for some career via a college education, they seemed content to let that preparation lie idle while they devoted themselves to family needs. This notion of skills at rest created a depiction of “rusty women” needing reclamation by the early advocates of the movement for women’s continuing education.<sup>2</sup> In a postwar era, the return to normalcy seemed to suggest that the female citizen was most needed in the home.

However, the facts of both female labor force activity and women’s participation in higher education in the 1950s and early-1960s challenge this view of women alienated from both work and study. Although a certain middle-class, often suburban, group of families may have been living this domestic model -- at least for short periods -- this characterization of family life was really more a fiction of what was later called “the media” than it was fact.

In terms of female labor force participation, the large dip that is frequently assumed to have occurred immediately after the war did not, in fact, appear. The actual figures reveal a long-term upward trend from 1900 to the present for women participating in the work force, both in terms of their actual numbers and their percentage of the labor force (see Table 1 and Table 2).

**Table 1: The Female Labor Force, 1890-1950**

---

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Women Employed (in thousands)</u>
	<u>Workers Aged 10 and Over</u>
1890	4,006
1900	5,319
1910	7,445
1920	8,637
1930	10,752
	<u>Workers aged 14 and Over</u>
1930	10,396
1940	13,015
1950	16,552

Source: National Manpower Council, *Womanpower* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), table 9, p. 111. Data is summarized from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Decennial Census Reports. After 1930, the Census shifted its definition of “gainful workers” and changed the age which it measured.

---

Specifically examining the post-war era, historian Alice Kessler-Harris has analyzed the long-term labor market trends for women, finding that women actually worked in greater numbers by 1960 than they had in 1940, countering our notion of so many women leaving jobs to tend to their families. Kessler-Harris explains that by 1950 there was a net female labor force gain of 16% from 1940, notwithstanding the loss of some women who had worked only in response to wartime emergency. In other words, not all the Rosie the Riveters gave up the factory for the home. They may have shifted jobs, but they did not all leave the labor force. Further, the largest increase in participation over this time period occurred among married and older women workers.<sup>3</sup>

**Table 2: Female Labor Force Participation Rates by Marital Status and Race**

---

	<u>1890</u>	<u>1900*</u>	<u>1920</u>	<u>1930</u>	<u>1940</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>
Total	18.9	20.6	23.7	24.8	25.8	29.5	35.1
Married	4.6	5.6	9.0	11.7	13.8	21.6	30.6
Single	40.5	43.5	46.4	50.5	45.5	50.6	47.5
White	16.3	17.9	21.6	23.7	24.5	28.5	34.2
Married	2.5	3.2	6.5	9.8	12.5	20.7	29.8
Single	38.4	41.5	45.0	48.7	45.9	51.8	48.5
Nonwhite	39.7	43.2	43.1	43.3	37.6	37.8	42.7
Married	22.5	26.0	32.5	33.2	27.3	31.8	40.5
Single	59.5	60.5	58.8	52.1	41.9	40.0	39.7

\* 1910 labor force figures are omitted in original; see Chapter 2.

Source: Claudia Goldin, *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), excerpted from table 2.1, p. 17. Original sources are U.S. Bureau of the Census.

---

In higher education, it is true that women's *proportion* of the overall student body dipped in the late-1940s and 1950s, primarily as a result of generous veterans' benefits to returning soldiers. However, women's actual *numbers* attending higher education increased, as they had since 1900. In terms of raw numbers of women who attended college every fall, women's attendance rose every year from 1947 to the 1980s, with the exception of only two years: 1950 and 1951. Even with this brief downturn, the overall trend line over the decades would move steadily upward.<sup>4</sup>

**Table 3 Enrollments in institutions of higher education, 1942-1980**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Enrollment</u>	<u>Undergraduate Enrollments</u>		
		<u>Number of Men Enrolled</u>	<u>Number of Women Enrolled</u>	<u>Women as Percentage of Total Enrolled</u>
1942	1,404,000*	819,000	85,000	41.6
1944	1,155,000*	579,000	576,000	49.8
1945	1,677,000*	928,000	749,000	44.6
1946	2,078,000*	1,418,000	661,000	31.8
1947	2,338,000*	1,659,000	679,000	29.0
1948	2,408,249**	1,712,283	695,966	28.8
1949	2,456,841**	1,728,672	728,169	29.6
1950	2,296,592**	1,569,322	727,270	31.6
1951	2,116,440**	1,398,735	717,705	33.9
1952	2,148,284**	1,387,094	761,190	35.4
1953	2,250,701**	1,432,474	818,227	36.5
1954	2,468,596**	1,575,227	893,369	36.1
1955	2,678,623**	1,747,429	931,194	34.7
1956	2,946,985**	1,927,863	1,019,122	34.5
1957	3,068,417**	2,003,424	1,064,993	34.7
1958	3,258,556**	2,110,426	1,148,130	35.2
1959	3,402,297**	2,173,797	1,228,500	36.1
1960	3,610,007**	2,270,640	1,339,367	37.1
1961	3,891,230**	2,423,987	1,467,243	37.7
1962	4,206,672**	2,603,072	1,603,600	38.1
1963	4,419,000**	2,743,000	1,676,000	37.9
1964	5,280,000*	3,249,000	2,031,000	38.4
1965	5,921,000*	3,630,000	2,291,000	38.6
1970	8,581,000*	5,044,000	3,537,000	41.2
1980	12,097,000*	5,874,000	6,223,000	51.4

Sources: \* National Center for Education Statistics, *120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait* (Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1993).

\*\*U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Digest of Educational Statistics* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963).

Although the story is more complicated when looking at geographic, class, and racial differences (e.g., black women's labor force participation, whether for married or single women, was always higher than white women's), the main point here is the difference between expectation and behavior in the postwar era that often caused women choosing work or education to feel concerned, guilty, or even unpatriotic about their choices.

Historians, too, until quite recently, have made similar assumptions and generalizations about women's behavior in the 1950s and early-1960s. In many ways, the 1950s have been ignored in historical analysis because they seem less interesting and certainly less groundbreaking than the assertive, creative approaches to women's lives during the war, or the feisty challenges of the later-1960s, spurred by the revived women's movement.

Recently, however, a revisionism has begun in the study of the postwar era for women. Joanne Meyerowitz, in a book with the provocative title, *Not June Cleaver*, has presented a number of examples suggesting that women were, in fact, participating in feminist causes or, at the least, had wider expectations for themselves than either historiography or popular memory would suggest. Scholars are finding organizations and places in women's lives where a continuity can be traced between the activism of the 1920s and 1930s and the renewed energy of the 1960s. Such threads appear in places like the labor unions, especially the auto workers; the peace movement; the civil rights movement; and some elements of the women's movement, where the more radical National Woman's Party, which supported the ERA over many decades, clashed with moderate women's organizations like the American Association of University Women, the League of Women Voters, and the Business and Professional Women's Clubs over the best role for women.<sup>5</sup>

However, even with these promising new directions changing the sense of how the 1950s contributed to women's lives, historians have not yet closely examined higher education to see where similar threads of continuity might exist. In the few places that do examine women collegians, scholars tend to cover familiar ground; for example, Lynn White, Jr., president of Mills College for women, whose book *Educating Our Daughters* argued for a shift in collegiate education that would train women for their future role in the home rather than as liberally educated classicists. Or they cite numerous studies like Havemann and West's *They Went to College* which emphasized the number of college women who dropped out before degree completion, usually to marry. The focus is often on the poor fit between the collegiate curriculum and women's lives, with more attention to disruptions than continuities.<sup>6</sup>

### **Beginnings of the Continuing Education for Women Movement**

The larger project of which this study of Michigan's CEW is a part aims to turn the revisionist lens onto higher education, arguing that the continuing education for women movement provides the thread of activism which connects this development for women to the more assertive gender equity programs of the later feminist era. In other words, instead of assuming that the entire focus of women's collegiate or professional education in the 1950s and 1960s was muted by the belief that women were not serious workers or professionals, I suggest that these programs for returning women constitute an important step in changing the structures of higher education to accommodate women's concerns.<sup>7</sup>

The book traces the earliest group of continuing education programs: in addition to Michigan, the centers at the University of Minnesota, Sarah Lawrence College, and Radcliffe College. The latter three were considered the field's prototypes, not only as the first notable programs, but also as a trio funded by the Carnegie Corporation -- a fact which brought them

considerable attention, press, and prestige. Michigan deserves a place within this group as one of the earliest centers (founded in 1964), but also one that added a stronger attention to research as one of the significant missions of the developing programs.<sup>8</sup>

Seen with modern eyes, the “continuing education for women” movement may not immediately convey an exciting image. Currently, this idea can refer to nearly-random collections of courses taken by not-too-serious students who may not even have a degree as their educational goal. Personal fulfillment rather than professional impetus can characterize such programs. But in 1960, the continuing education movement presented challenging ideas to higher education. Certainly, there had long been adult education and extension programming on collegiate campuses. However, these were not organized programs for specific groups of people intent on completing degrees or pursuing professional goals.<sup>9</sup>

The women’s centers organized themselves around the needs of a group of students who faced considerable barriers to re-entry in the academic world. In the late-1950s, schools did not routinely let students study part-time, especially at the graduate level. If they did, such students were rarely eligible for fellowships and scholarships. The occasional woman might be able to win credits for past work, but decisions were usually made on an ad hoc basis. Women who had moved, often to support a husband’s educational or professional needs, found the effort to secure collegiate credit for work done elsewhere particularly difficult. In curricular terms, requirements were seldom waived, forcing some women to re-take physical education or general education courses, a result that further slowed their progress. Generally, the assumption was that, if a woman had fallen off the traditional four-year educational track, her return was not especially welcomed or facilitated. The overall popular opinion of women’s role in the home was so strong that the choice to leave school before degree completion or to stop with only the bachelor’s degree seemed irrevocable.<sup>10</sup>

However, complicating this picture was a concomitant push for solving new labor market shortages by tapping women as the nation’s “underutilized resource.” The term “womanpower” was popularized in a 1957 study by the National Manpower Council which recognized that shortages in many technical areas, as well as teaching and nursing, could well be met by women, especially those close to earning their degrees or just needing some retraining.<sup>11</sup> The 1950s were an economic boom time, requiring both workers and consumers. In addition, the added concern over America’s technological future generated by the Sputnik launch added to the variety of messages women were receiving about how to plan their futures and use their educations.

Within this mix of ideas, the leaders of the continuing education for women movement conceived of programs to bring women back to the academic world and prepare them for new approaches to the workforce. The initial centers each took a slightly different approach to the problem. The University of Minnesota created the first organized program through its Minnesota Plan. In addition to a strong counseling and advising service, Minnesota created a special set of courses designed to ease women back into university life. Focusing primarily on married women and mothers who wanted to resume their educations, the program also targeted current undergraduate students in hopes of averting educational choices that would adversely affect their futures. Sarah Lawrence College, another recognized pioneer, focused even more specifically on bringing women back into degree programs, crafting a parallel curriculum for returning women that, when successfully completed, allowed women to matriculate into the college’s regular B.A. program. Taking advantage of its New York City locale, Sarah Lawrence also tried to reclaim the educational futures of women who had begun work elsewhere but now hoped to complete degrees in their new setting. Radcliffe College approached the issue from a different vantage point. It organized the Radcliffe Institute for Independent Study as a center for women already

holding the Ph.D. or equivalent who wanted to ease themselves back into professional work by spending a year or two on the Harvard/Radcliffe campus pursuing self-designed projects.<sup>12</sup>

Although other programs were scattered around the country, these three centers were the best-known and most-copied due to their exposure as Carnegie Corporation grant recipients. Their arrangement with Carnegie included a responsibility to disseminate information about their work, to offer themselves as models, and to evaluate their work after five years of pilot effort.

The Michigan continuing education center was one program that turned to the three pioneers in considering its own plans. Michigan built on the ideas generated by Minnesota, Sarah Lawrence, and Radcliffe, but it also added some strengths to the visions of the original three. Although each of the others acknowledged the importance of examining the results of their work, Michigan recognized the long-term value of research activity more explicitly. And Michigan, from the beginning, planned its programming around the interactive goals of service, advocacy, and research in ways that sustained its efforts well over time.

### **Origins of the Michigan CEW**

The most striking feature about Michigan's CEW is the potency of the original mission that was created nearly forty years ago, but has continued to support an array of activities and efforts throughout four decades of quite dramatic change for women. Jean Campbell, director of the Center for its first twenty-one years, has said that the center's founding proposal resembled the Constitution in its flexibility, continually allowing change but always within an established, agreed-upon purview. In a 1968 letter explaining the Center's operations, she noted that the founders "had the gift of our forefathers writing the Constitution. The Center basic document is so clear yet so flexible that in four years we have not had an idea that couldn't be carried out under this mandate."<sup>13</sup> The original proposal presented a tripartite mission of service, advocacy, and research on behalf of women, especially those wishing to return to school after an interruption in their education.<sup>14</sup> Service meant direct help to individual women, usually through counseling appointments and other opportunities for information, including conferences. Advocacy constituted an activist set of efforts to improve the situation for women, particularly within the large, decentralized setting at the University of Michigan. Research included both sustained attention to the characteristics of the clientele who used the center, and support for scholarly examinations of the needs of that population, whether conducted by center staff or by outside researchers.

The proposal itself did not outline the three-part mission in exactly this crisp fashion, although all three elements were clearly present. Rather, Jean Campbell notes that she highlighted this particular shape when writing the center's 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary report, reflecting on CEW accomplishments over the years.<sup>15</sup> However, the combination of service, advocacy, and research goals gave CEW its unique place within the larger set of continuing education centers. Further, CEW's explicit attention over time to each of the elements -- especially the research function -- allowed it to prosper and assume new approaches when some of the other early centers waned in influence and strength.

What, then, prompted the creation of this unusual center? The initial proposal was crafted by a single author, but was informed by a great many contributors. At a Founders' Day Luncheon three years after the opening of the Center, Louise Cain -- the original author -- looked around a room full of supporters and acknowledged that, should someone call for all the founders to stand, most of the people in the room would have the right to do so.<sup>16</sup>

Louise Cain, like several other originators of continuing education programs (including Elizabeth Cless at Minnesota) worked at the University Extension division, where she handled some issues relating to women, but also managed course planning and what today would be considered educational marketing. Outside the University, she was an active civic leader, serving as the statewide president of the League of Women Voters (an important connection across the lives of many of the continuing education pioneers, both at Michigan and elsewhere). Cain participated in activities of the local American Association of University Women (AAUW) and the Business and Professional Women's Club (BPW). Further, she was well-known within the university community, as what was then called a "faculty wife."

Today that term feels anachronistic, and even grating to feminist sensibilities. However, it also asserts the importance of recognizing the postwar context, when neither feminist analysis nor language had rarely been applied to women's situation. Within the history of higher education, the role of "faculty wives" holds a respectable and important tradition. Before women were welcomed into faculty ranks, the few women connected to a campus often played a significant role in supporting the female students. For instance, at the turn of the twentieth century, wives of faculty members joined with local advocates and alumnae to raise money, provide housing, advocate for women, and otherwise support women's educational interests on campuses.<sup>17</sup> Similarly, in the 1950s, only a small number of women yet worked on coeducational campuses as faculty, but there were a great many influential, well-educated, and activist women in the community, supporting women's concerns through indirect (and occasionally direct) influence on the university. In the case of Michigan's CEW, three of the women were married to especially influential men. Jean Campbell's husband Angus and Jane Likert's husband Rensis were directors and researchers at the Institute for Social Research and the Survey Research Center, two institutes of national prestige and stature.<sup>18</sup> Louise Cain's husband Stanley was a professor of natural resources who headed that department for a number of years. Clearly, the women who pushed for the creation of the Michigan center knew their way around the university, understood its workings, and knew (both socially and professionally) many of the important people who could effect change.

Louise Cain was the first of this group to give written form to ideas about women's needs that she and her friends had been discussing for several years. Although there is no evidence of formal organization, these friends created informal discussion groups similar to early consciousness-raising sessions where women who shared similarities as mothers of grown or growing children, and who were well-educated and connected to the university, gathered to discuss their own futures and issues of interest to women.

In August 1962, Cain crafted her first idea for a continuing education center, and passed it to Roger Heyns, Michigan's Vice President for Academic Affairs. After leaving Michigan in 1965, Heyns built a distinguished national career, first as chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, and then as president of the American Council on Education. While at Michigan, he became the most active administrative supporter of the continuing education center, and ultimately secured funds to start it. (See Appendix 1 for a Timeline of the founding and early years of CEW.)

As the founders recall, Cain had given Heyns her proposal, but then heard nothing for six months, and she feared it had dropped to the bottom of the pile on his desk. After waiting in vain, she approached Heyns at a party (again demonstrating the influence of the university community) and asked him if he had had an opportunity to review her idea. Once Heyns examined the proposal, he was so impressed that he hired Louise Cain away from Extension as a

Special Assistant to the Vice President.<sup>19</sup> She began that job in February 1963, with the express mandate of giving better form to an actual center, marshaling support around the university (including among the alumnae), and investigating funding possibilities.

After six months in her special assistant role, Cain provided Heyns with an outline of the efforts she had taken toward creating a center. In a four-page memorandum, she listed nineteen different activities she had pursued, from “identifying, collecting, reading, note-taking on a general selection of sociological, psychological, occupational, and educational data on women,” to “gathering data and preliminary analysis of data on older women enrolled in the University of Michigan,” to visits to all the well-known centers around the country, to working with alumnae and civic groups (and the sole female Regent) on plans for a center.<sup>20</sup>

Her efforts proved successful, especially her connections with the alumnae. The Michigan Alumnae Council had already expressed an interest in some type of continuing women’s education, even before Louise Cain submitted her first proposal. At a September 1962 meeting, they had discussed using part of their funds to provide grants for women who wished to retrain themselves for collegiate teaching. On learning of Cain’s work, they immediately invited her to talk with them, created a Continuing Education Committee, and determined to play a “stand-by, supportive role” to her efforts, and to keep alumnae informed of her progress.<sup>21</sup>

As they learned more about the proposed new effort, alumnae increased their involvement. Cain and Alison Myers, the Alumnae Secretary, realized that gathering data on their own graduates would not only enhance alumnae interest in the project, but would also bolster arguments for the center. In September of 1963, Cain worked with the alumnae committee to devise a questionnaire. Introducing the issue of “the discontinuous pattern of a woman’s life,” the survey explained that a new center could focus on “a flexible system for taking refresher courses, finishing a degree in a chosen field, or even embarking on new professional training.” The survey sought specific information on individual women’s academic interests and counseling preferences. Over a two-month period, heads of local clubs distributed the survey along with a helpful protocol designed by the committee. In March of 1965, Alison Myers reported on the results.<sup>22</sup>

Surveys had been sent to 1601 members, with a 35% return rate of 564. Results showed that fully 61% of those responding wanted more education. Of those “extremely eager” to continue, 75% wanted to pursue a degree program (generally the master’s degree), with only 7% seeking a “professional refresher program.” Preferred fields of study ranged rather widely, although nearly 40% of respondents expressed interest in education. One of the more interesting questions asked respondents what they saw as barriers to continuing their education. Fully 10% saw “no barriers” at all, and only 2% felt that their own age presented any difficulty. However, nearly a third (31%) noted that the age of their children constituted a barrier to resuming education, and 21% felt that the hours classes were held would likewise present difficulty.

In her summary of the survey’s findings, Myers pushed for a center which would provide counseling, advice, information, and employment data. She concluded that, “although many women who are eager to continue with their education indicate that family responsibilities would delay their doing so, few appeared to be unhappily frustrated by the need to delay.” She ended with a call for encouraging women in their long-term and short-term plans to resume their education.<sup>23</sup>

The information proved very useful to Cain. She redrafted her proposal twice, adding some of the local data, and by May of 1964, it was ready for action by Vice President Heyns. Cain and Heyns had considered outside funding possibilities, hoping to copy the success of the most notable centers. Not only had the Carnegie Corporation provided funding, but it had also

generated considerable notice for the early centers in the Corporation's annual report, in the *New York Times*, and in other academic and popular sources. In fact, Cain visited Carnegie during her planning period. She recalled during a much later oral history interview, however, that she had not devoted much time trying to raise outside funds, citing only one mild overture to the Kellogg Foundation that did not yield support. Generally, Cain felt that unless the university itself was willing to support the center financially, they would not be able to attract outside funding.<sup>24</sup>

### **Alumnae Contributions**

Here is where the alumnae connection proved vital to the history of the center, and where Michigan alumnae assumed a unique role in the history of early continuing education programs. None of the other pioneer centers had solicited funds from their own alumnae. Besides Carnegie Corporation support, all three pioneers had benefitted from private donors, sometimes supplemented by university funds. At Radcliffe, for example, President Mary Bunting, who led the creation of that center, was prohibited by her trustees from using any general Radcliffe funds for the new idea. Michigan, however, turned to a local tradition of alumnae support.

Women providing funds in order to use university facilities has a long and sometimes unsavory history in higher education. At many institutions, including Harvard, Brown, Johns Hopkins, and Michigan itself, women had been told they might enter particular university programs if they generated their own support. Women's entrance into the Hopkins medical school, for example, was considered only after they provided a generous gift. Women's buildings at many universities around the country had been constructed only after donors offered sufficient funds. At Michigan, women donors had provided money for the Michigan League, a female counterpart to the off-limits male Michigan Union, as well as funds to assure a professorship for a woman. When use of that professorship languished, the alumnae had rejuvenated it as the Alice Freeman Palmer Professorship, in honor of the early Michigan graduate who later became President of Wellesley College and dean of women at University of Chicago. In fact, in 1964, the alumnae were still obligated for annual contributions to the Palmer professorship.<sup>25</sup>

Cain and Heyns, perhaps skeptical of possibilities for other outside support, broached the idea of alumnae funding with the Alumnae Council in March of 1964. Alumnae Council -- the leadership arm of the larger group -- liked the idea but realized the necessity of building support for this new venture before a formal vote on acceptance would occur. A new Continuing Education Committee was created, whose purpose was to spread information about the proposed center, generate support on its behalf, lay groundwork for potential fundraising, and generally assure that the formal request for help, when submitted in September, was acted upon favorably.

Another of the center's "founding mothers" -- often unrecognized in this role -- appeared as chair of the new alumnae Continuing Education Committee. Jean Cobb, a very active alumna, agreed to support the plan, spending enormous amounts of her time over the next three years garnering support for the center, clarifying its mission for skeptical alumnae, shepherding a group of volunteer committee members through the fundraising process, and monitoring (and occasionally agonizing over) the progress of the fundraising goal. Papers detailing Cobb's work as chair of this committee surfaced recently at CEW, and provide a wonderful lens through which to examine the contributions of a non-academic partner in this educational effort.<sup>26</sup>

When the vote came in September of 1964 -- with the center already officially open -- the alumnae agreed to "support the establishment of the University's Center for Continuing Education of Women and contribute a maximum of \$15,000 a year for three years, commencing September 1, 1965, to finance the Center; this amount to be raised from such sources as

contributions from individuals, Alumnae Clubs and money obtained from the Biennial Birthday Greeting.”<sup>27</sup> Their commitment was, in fact, a huge one. They assumed a three-year total obligation of \$45,000 for a new venture that had been in operation less than three weeks.

Two facts helped make their obligation slightly less overwhelming. First, in recognition of the alumnae’s intentions to incur this burden, the university assumed the same level of financial support for the center. Heyns secured from President Harlan Hatcher a commitment of \$15,000 per year for three years from the president’s own discretionary fund. The agreement was that, if all went well, the university would fund the center in this combined way for three years, after which the budget would shift completely to the institution’s general funds. (President Hatcher may be another overlooked party in the center’s history. He was, in fact, a long-time supporter of women’s issues, including during his earlier tenure at Ohio State University and his longstanding membership on the American Council on Education’s Commission on the Education of Women.) The second fact which somewhat mediated the enormity of the alumnae’s commitment was that the university agreed to retire their commitment of support for the Alice Freeman Palmer Professorship. Thus, they had a clean slate to begin fundraising for the new continuing education center.

### **A Trio of Goals: Service, Advocacy, Research**

To what were the alumnae attaching their support? By 1964, after wide consultation across the university and among her women colleagues, Cain had focused her ideas more tightly on “a visible, facilitating center on the campus” which would assist the university in three ways. The 1964 proposal, as accepted by Heyns and the university, outlined how the new center would serve the needs of Michigan’s women:

- A. In the preliminary steps of giving information about university programs and requirements to the adult woman student who wishes to resume her interrupted education; and in advising her in her educational planning in the frame of reference of (1) her continuing home responsibilities and (2) her objectives for which the university program of study will be a preparation.
- B. In working with the administration and faculty to achieve further flexibility in university programs and requirements to take maximum advantage of the resources and needs of this special section of returning students.
- C. In programs to motivate the young woman undergraduate and to assist the young home-bound mother to continue developing their talents and educational training for future productive use.<sup>28</sup>

Section A addressed the center’s service function; Section B outlined the advocacy effort. Section C was not, at this time, the research function, but rather introduced an element that never really prospered within the center’s activities. With its focus on undergraduates, the idea raised in Section C was derived from a complementary effort to help undergraduates avoid the difficulties that older women had encountered. That is, by alerting women while they were still in school to the issues of interrupted education and life cycle needs, Michigan and other centers felt that they could attack the problem before it had a chance to grow. At Minnesota, for example, this focus on undergraduates was especially strong, although the founders subsequently acknowledged that it was the least productive and successful of their efforts. At Michigan, the undergraduate focus seems to have been spurred by Roger Heyns’ connections with Felice Schwartz, the founder of the Catalyst program, who secured Heyns’ cooperation as national

chairman of her subsidiary program Catalyst on Campus. Catalyst on Campus was an effort – part of the nationwide, clearinghouse approach of Catalyst – specifically designed for surveying and informing undergraduate women about their long-term career needs. Although there was initial interest in pairing the Catalyst on Campus effort with CEW, the proposed partnership never really materialized, and the undergraduate focus was one of the lesser elements in CEW’s efforts.<sup>29</sup>

The research element did arise, however, in the descriptive portion of the proposal. In the section outlining the need for service, Cain acknowledged that, in order to provide sound counseling, the center staff would need to know more about employment opportunities, and she proposed a research effort to gather data, especially on the local environment. Further, in her conclusion, when outlining ways in which the Michigan center would differ from others (presumably written with an eye toward potential funders), Cain called for “research studies related to the program, an adjunct needed if we and other institutions of higher education are to evaluate our present patterns of education for women and the experimental projects planned.”<sup>30</sup>

The service element -- best envisioned through the center’s direct counseling to women -- received most of the proposal’s attention. Here Cain provided local data to bolster her case for the need at Michigan. Arguing for the importance of a “visible” place to organize services for women, she noted that in 1962, 1258 women over the age of 30 were already studying at the university, almost 1000 of whom were graduate students and 737 of whom were married. She acknowledged the presence of many “older” women on campus, and noted that “there is no single, existing facility in the University to consider the total situation of this adult woman, for whose needs the University program was not designed.” Cain recognized that some women would want to return to school for sheer “love of learning” or personal enrichment, but explained that the new center was especially focused on women working toward professional involvement, whether in the long or short term.<sup>31</sup>

Turning to the advocacy function, Cain emphasized that, in a large, decentralized institution like Michigan, policies and responses to women’s needs necessarily varied. In a strong statement that became one of the center’s guiding principles over the decades, she explained that CEW would “act as agent and stimulator of adaptations and changes” within the university, but further emphasized that all of this would be done “within the framework of the continuing high standards of the University of Michigan.”<sup>32</sup>

The 1964 proposal reveals several characteristics of CEW’s initial work that differentiated it from others of the era and helped secure its longstanding potency.

First, CEW was strongly focused on helping women who were seeking degrees or, at least, intended to use their education for professional purposes. Other programs, including Minnesota and Sarah Lawrence, rarely differentiated between career-minded women and those still exploring their educational options.

Second, CEW acknowledged the necessity of conducting research on and for this population. The other programs all recognized this need as well, and most of them eventually published studies of their early years. However, those studies tended to be reports to the sponsor which, although extremely valuable for recording the early operations and successes of the centers, nonetheless substantially capped the research efforts of the programs. Individuals at Minnesota pursued a few subsequent studies, and Radcliffe’s Institute for Independent Study made some further attempts to sustain a research staff, but even its director acknowledged that the research effort never blossomed in ways they had hoped.<sup>33</sup> Even though the research function was muted in the original Michigan proposal, it was nonetheless present and gave the center a strong incentive over time to extend itself in this direction.

Third, the CEW proposal was quite activist in its self-identification as an “agent and stimulator” of change. Certainly, the other programs wished to have this effect as well, but Michigan was notably explicit in envisioning its role as changing the university by encouraging more consistent and favorable policies on behalf of older women students. The founders also willingly assumed this role. As Jean Campbell framed it in a much later interview, “we had taken on the responsibility to ‘change the university.’”<sup>34</sup> The center also recognized that this change agency might need a long development period. In a June 1964 letter to alumnae committee chair Jean Cobb, Louise Cain explained that she could divide the coming “women’s enterprise” into two phases. The first would be the “immediate concrete services” of counseling and advising women; the second would be the “expectation and aim” that the center and its work would prompt other changes on behalf of women. Looking for an economic analogy, Cain explained that “the first will be the stock that our joint funds will buy. The second are the dividends – the added benefits – which we look forward to accumulating as a result of our initial investment.”<sup>35</sup>

Finally, the Michigan proposal was well-tailored to its environment, having been considered over a two-year period. Other centers were also *sui generis*, a fact which may have inhibited the growth of the continuing education movement as a whole, but which nonetheless indicates the era’s variety of needs and the lack of prior institutional response.

### **CEW’s Pilot Phase**

The thoughtful nature of the proposal, including its calculated plan to fit into the expectations of its university base, was enhanced by nearly a year’s work by Heyns and Cain with an Executive Advisory Committee composed of the deans of the university’s schools, some faculty members, and a few other key supporters -- another sign of how carefully tailored the new center was to its setting. Committee members raised several issues that were eventually clarified in the final proposal. For example, the committee expressed its clear preference for training women for professional positions, veering away from the personal enrichment or general education approach they saw in some other institutions. Another concern developed over the need for research. Committee members encouraged the center to include a mission element of conducting and sponsoring research, but also indicated some mild concern that it did not resemble the sort of research center -- with faculty affiliates and a research staff -- normally found on a campus like the University of Michigan.<sup>36</sup> This perspective raised a potential dilemma for the center, as it simultaneously encouraged the pursuit of research but reminded the center’s staff not to overestimate its capabilities or its role. In a later reflection on this issue, Jean Campbell explored the difficulty this posed, noting how research on women eventually moved into both women’s studies programs and women’s research institutes. She concluded that, “for very good reasons, we kept it [our research approach] within the kind of definition of the original proposal.... I can see now that we might have played a greater role in the gender research idea.”<sup>37</sup>

A different set of concerns had been anticipated by the alumnae fundraisers who assumed the task of smoothing the way for the proposal. Less concerned with issues of research or university hierarchy, they focused on how their constituents would identify with and understand this new program. In a characteristically lively memorandum to her fundraising committee, Jean Cobb tutored committee members on how to respond to the likely questions that their target audience would raise:

1. Q. As woman's place is properly in the home raising her children, why should we promote a project which will help them leave home? Won't this increase juvenile delinquency?

A. Agreed that woman's place is in the home – as long as her children need her. However, current statistics show that most women have their last child at 26, have a life expectancy of over 70 years and, therefore, have at least 20 years of life to live after their duties as mother and full-time housekeeper have diminished. The Center is designed to help these women make this period of their life useful and satisfying.

2. Q. I'm 109 years old. Why should I contribute to a program which is intended to help women in the 30s to 50's?

A. Ladies of 109 years of age undoubtedly have many daughters, grand-daughters, neices [sic], grand-neices, etc. who would be direct beneficiaries of their contributions to C.E.W.

3. Why do we need a 3-year Pilot Program? Why not start a full fledged Center right now?

A. C.E.W. is a very, very new idea. It has never been tried as a full scale project at an institution as large and complex as U. of M. Like every really new idea, it needs a period of trial, of refinement and reassessment before a concrete program and procedure is developed.

4. Q. The University has a multi-million dollar budget, why can't it finance this 3-year period without money from the alumnae?

A. Despite the size of the University budget, there is never enough for all the wonderful, worthy projects necessary to educational advancement. University money is budgeted to cover EXISTING programs. Other sources must be found to finance new programs. As the Center will benefit women, the University logically turns to its alumnae for help in financing it, as it logically turns to the State Bar of Michigan to finance the Institute of Continuing Legal Education.<sup>38</sup>

Besides sounding eerily like modern fundraising advice, this primer also reveals a concern that not all women would necessarily support the philosophy behind the center, nor would they be immediately receptive to the university's request for financial help.

In fact, the alumnae fundraising effort, while off to a rousing start, faltered somewhat throughout the first year. Perhaps because of an ill-timed solicitation from the university which coincided with one specifically to alumnae, returns from the regular "birthday greeting" were unexpectedly low the first year. Whereas \$13,000 had been raised the previous year, and

\$15,000 was expected for 1964-65 sales of the greeting, the newest greeting produced barely \$5500 in proceeds. Likewise, donations from individual contributors lagged for the first year. The inclusion of CEW as one targeted element in a university-wide \$55 million fundraising campaign – a coup for the center, as the only program focused on women – nevertheless did not produce the anticipated financial support. If anything, placement in the campaign portfolio confused the issue of the alumnae’s freedom to approach any individual donor.<sup>39</sup>

However, Jean Cobb’s determined efforts, along with excellent reports of the center’s initial accomplishments, combined to bring second-year fundraising to a stronger result. As the program became better known, the pace of support quickened, from both individual donors and city-wide alumnae clubs. Whereas the alumnae had regretfully reported falling short of their financial goal for the first year, they were able to recoup the deficit and contribute a total of \$30,000 – their goal – by the conclusion of the second year. Individual donations constituted a large part of this success, and a plaque which still hangs outside the Center’s door was unveiled in September 1967, listing all major contributors (24 individuals, 3 clubs, and 7 honorary gifts), commemorating this unprecedented support of a continuing education center by the institution’s own alumnae.

Operating during its first year with only the \$15,000 from the President, CEW managed an impressive set of accomplishments. Because it kept careful track of its clients, the Center was able to report that it had served 563 women during the first twelve months, with 430 individual counseling appointments. Recognizing the need to enhance their visibility beyond the women they could serve individually, the Center’s leaders mounted a conference/workshop in March of 1965, only seven months after opening their doors. That gathering, “Opportunities for Women Through Education,” attracted women and men from throughout the state, focusing on opportunities in specific employment fields like social work and education. General speakers, including a keynote by Esther Raushenbush, the nationally-prominent founder of the continuing education program and the new president at Sarah Lawrence College, were followed by smaller group work where women were encouraged to raise questions about their own educational and employment needs. Two hundred thirty-eight women attended, along with 38 faculty and staff members. The meeting was so popular that several hundred potential attendees were turned away due to space limitations.<sup>40</sup>

Combining its service and advocacy roles, the center also sponsored a few training courses with departments around the university. A course on preparing to be a “paraprofessional” social worker, sponsored jointly with the School of Social Work and United Community Services of Metropolitan Detroit, served 106 women. Another 53 people completed a course training them as volunteer museum aides. Other advocacy work around the university aimed at a longer-term payoff. This included working with admissions, registrar, and financial aid officers to help individual women and to affect policy decisions. The center was helpful in clarifying the tuition status of wives of male graduate students, in helping returning women arrange undergraduate and graduate credits, and in outlining requirements for re-admission to the university.

Because the center consistently kept data forms on its participants, good information was available on the characteristics of the client base. After the first year, the director summarized the “typical woman” using the Center for the Continuing Education of Women:

37 years old, married, living in the area, with a professional or student husband, two or three children, some college, or more likely than not a bachelor’s degree. She wanted to prepare for employment (approximately 85 percent of the women

gave this as a reason for attending the center); and she needed help in thinking through her job possibilities, in selecting an educational program appropriate to her goals, and in dealing with technical problems of admissions, registration, convenient class scheduling, and financial assistance.<sup>41</sup>

Year two continued these strong trends, with increased counseling appointments, another well-attended conference (“New Patterns of Employment”), more inquiry into sponsoring additional courses, visits by the director to centers around the country, and continuing investigation into local employment opportunities. Year three – the presumed conclusion of the pilot stage of the program – reported that counseling sessions were increasing at the rate of about 30 per month. Advocacy work within the university was resulting in easier relationships with other offices, including more frequent referrals between admissions, financial aid, and the academic departments. The biggest success on the long-term advocacy front was an increasing appreciation for the needs of part-time students. As Director Campbell reported in May of 1967, “There seems to be a gradual shift in attitude concerning financial aid for part time students. It is increasingly recognized that there is a legitimate new need, and that part time schedules do not mean second-class commitments.”<sup>42</sup> Recognizing, however, that the university’s financial aid options were limited, especially for this population of women, the center began a plan to provide its own scholarships, and opened a fund to receive contributions. This effort succeeded over the next three years, and in 1970 (celebrating the centennial of women’s admission to Michigan) the center offered its first scholarship and fellowship funds, an activity still supported by CEW.

Although Campbell had expected a review of the center’s efforts after the initial three-year period, no one in the administration remembered that expectation when the pilot period expired. Roger Heyns had left Michigan for Berkeley, and his successor, Allan Smith, did not seem to doubt the center’s continuing existence. In fact, when Campbell introduced the idea of a review during an Executive Committee meeting, the members interpreted her request as if there were a problem. Realizing immediately that no one remembered the earlier promise, Campbell appropriately took their lack of concern as support for the center’s efforts and accomplishments. She admitted later that she had looked forward to the review in hopes of receiving advice from others about the directions of such a new enterprise, but came to recognize that “nobody knew what we should be doing, and that was just something you get from day to day.”<sup>43</sup>

### **Center Directors Reflect on CEW’s Progress**

Although the focus of this paper is the origins and early years of the Center, it is useful to have the longer-range retrospective analyses that a 40-year history provides. Directors of the center took several opportunities over the years to reflect on its accomplishments, successes, and dilemmas. Louise Cain (who served as director in absentia during the first year but returned from 1969 to 1971 as a program specialist and conference planner) wrote a few letters and reports reflecting on the center.<sup>44</sup> In addition, she, Jean Campbell, and Jane Likert sat for an interview with Ruth Bordin, herself a historian of the university, in 1989 for the center’s 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Jean Campbell, the longest-serving director (1964-1985), produced numerous reports on the center, including a strong 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary analysis, as well as several nationally-distributed articles and speeches that discussed the Michigan center within a wider context of women’s higher education. These reflections are historically useful for their sense of how the participants saw changes in their mission and efforts over time.

Although she had led the effort to create the center, Louise Cain moved to Washington, DC, in the summer before the program opened in 1964 to accompany her husband on sabbatical.

Later, when Stanley Cain assumed a post as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, the Cains decided to remain in Washington for several years. Cain was the center's "director in absentia" for that first year, with Jean Campbell serving as "acting director." Cain remained interested in the center's progress, but was necessarily less active in its actual work. Involved with the center in a less-constant way, Cain had fewer opportunities to observe its complete operations or to comment on its development. However, in a 1967 speech for a Founders' Day Luncheon at the Center, Cain chose as her title and metaphor for the center's growth "Cutting the Pattern." "I see the cloth, the given fabric," she explained, "as ourselves, the women, and cutting the pattern to fit the cloth as indicating the need to find patterns of education and vocation which make the most effective use of the basic material." This idea signified for her the center's efforts to find ways for women students to reinsert themselves into the mainstream. However, Cain noted, "the adjustment can't go one way. In fact, my alternate title, wisely ignored, was 'The Two-Way Stretch.' What both titles imply is flexibility – flexibility of women, of University training programs, of vocations, to break through the whalebone of traditional forms."<sup>45</sup>

Cain concluded with an analysis of the various assets that the three-year-old center might marshal to ensure this flexibility. She recognized the strengths of both the current staff and the new Vice President, Allan Smith. But she also stressed the flexibility of the University of Michigan, noting its long accommodation to part-time graduate work in various fields and its overall climate of supporting women students. Finally, she appreciated the center's location, which fed "directly into the central channel of the University," rather than as a subordinate unit. Its place as an independent unit reporting directly to the Vice President, she claimed, made CEW "the most academic of all the women's centers among the colleges and universities."<sup>46</sup>

Cain returned to this theme of Michigan's flexibility in a 1968/1969 rumination she composed for Dorothy McGuigan as the latter worked on her 1970 history of women at the University of Michigan. Cain noted wryly that many friends had discouraged her initial efforts to establish a center at Ann Arbor: "Louise, are you out of your mind? Women will never get anywhere at Michigan. It's the most unlikely campus setting." She agreed with many aspects of this concern, but noted that, although Michigan is a male-oriented "academic fraternity," it is one that prizes excellence, and "that this large, many-faceted university is a decentralized institution, flexible, able to absorb new mechanisms." Cain explained that, as founders, she and her colleagues had always recognized the importance of trying to affect the mainstream of the institution, "sensitizing the University to the needs of a special student population."<sup>47</sup>

Emphasizing the advocacy element of the original vision, Cain judged the center's early performance:

It was designed as a response to change, to change in women's lives and interests. It in turn has created change. To an outsider these might seem minor. To anyone with experience with the slowness and traditional character of institutions of higher education, they seem more remarkable. To a woman student coming up against hurdles she had no way of jumping, the Center sometimes seemed a miracle-worker.<sup>48</sup>

In her remarks for a ten-year anniversary celebration of the center, Cain said simply: "I want to say at the outset that CEW in 1974 has outstripped every blueprint and dream we had for it at its inception."<sup>49</sup>

During the course of her 21-year directorship, Jean Campbell had more opportunities not only to analyze the work of the center, but also to look back and set its developments into a wider perspective. Pieces that Campbell wrote in the early years of the program outlined two particular concerns that she observed as affecting all such centers of continuing education. The first was a question – to which she returned frequently – about the choice of offering separate programming for returning women students versus integrating them into the university mainstream. As early as 1967, on her return from a national meeting of the Adult Education Association, Campbell noted the “extremes” of opinion about this issue. On the farthest end, advocating separation, she cited Burt Loewenberg of Sarah Lawrence College, who asserted the strength of that institution’s approach to admitting returning women to a special series of seminars. After successful completion of that series (usually two years), the students could matriculate into the regular degree program. Campbell favored the other pole, represented by a program like Minnesota’s which mirrored Michigan’s approach of fostering women’s movement into the regular university curriculum, saying, “We have found that women make a very successful transition with good supportive guidance and a cautious approach.” She added, however, in the first of many such comments, that this “might point up the need for some research.”<sup>50</sup>

The other concern highlighted at this national meeting was whether special consideration should be offered to continuing education students. Some educators worried that special approaches signified not only “coddling,” but also that this treatment threatened “the sanctity of the academic degree” and that “special arrangements equal an inferior performance.”<sup>51</sup>

Campbell rarely raised this issue of continuing education students being seen as inferior in the Michigan setting. Instead, the center tackled the issue indirectly through its programming in service, advocacy, and research. Unlike some other programs which focused on the long-term academic performance of its students, including their graduation rates, Michigan put more energy into helping women find the best path for their re-entry into higher education and launching them with all the support their advocacy could muster. However, Michigan stood out from many other centers by developing an interest in researching the women who used continuing education programs. In the early years, this research effort consisted mostly of studying the backgrounds and intentions of their own clientele, with some attention to the nature of the barriers facing these women. By the late-1970s, however, the center capitalized on its early research interests, building a reputation as a site with an active research component and creative research questions.

By 1973, Campbell was using national opportunities to reflect on the successes of the Michigan center and their potential usefulness to other programs. In a keynote speech to higher education representatives in Maryland, she analyzed the “five ingredients for success” that had supported Michigan’s effort. The first was top-level administrative backing which could be spurred, she argued, by helping administrators realize that their support of women highlighted the institution’s commitment to equal educational opportunity, fostered women’s attachment to the university, generated new sources of income, and encouraged developments in other program areas. This feature, Campbell argued, might be the most important of all, and had clearly given Michigan’s center a strong start. A close second in the ingredients of success was “committed female leadership,” in this case, both the alumnae group and the small band of leaders who gave form to the new center. The third feature was a program well-tailored to the particular university or college setting. Here Campbell was prepared to acknowledge that a program like Sarah Lawrence’s, which highlighted a separate women’s curriculum, would be successful to the extent

that it matched the institutional culture. At Michigan, alternatively, the large, decentralized setting required smaller, simultaneous advances in many places. A fourth feature was demand from an active constituency, which local wives and mothers provided in the early-1960s. Campbell reminded her listeners of the late-1950s zeitgeist, and the appeal of Betty Friedan's ideas in *The Feminine Mystique*. In a provocative image, Campbell called *The Feminine Mystique* "the *Uncle Tom's Cabin* of post-war feminism," recalling the way a single book could capture the imagination of readers who saw truths in its analyses. The fifth and final ingredient was outside funding. Most of the early centers had benefitted from foundation funding, although Michigan was unusual in garnering support from its own alumnae. These five features worked together first to generate support for a center but, ultimately, to sustain its activity within the campus setting.<sup>52</sup>

By 1984, in a twenty-year retrospective on the center's work, Campbell had a different way of explaining its efforts. Now informed by the significant developments of the 1970s women's movement, she explained that the center's history could be told as a story of ongoing attention to the changing meaning of equity. The original impetus for the center, she explained, came from a realization that real equity meant more than mere access: educators needed to create a more flexible environment for women returning to campus. This understanding of equity acknowledged that women merited the same generous treatment afforded to World War II veterans via the G.I. Bill. However, Campbell noted, a recognition of external barriers to women's full participation was fairly new when the Center opened. What was barely understood at that time was how the combination of external and internal barriers might inhibit women's participation. Thus, the counseling services of the center had combined with the research arm to study what women needed and how, in turn, to convert those understandings into institutional change at the university. She noted positively the sense of circularity in the center's activities, or, in the words of a faculty committee commissioned to review the center in 1982: "The Center is an outstanding example of synergy. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts, and we find this to be a compelling case for retaining the whole." By the 1970s, Campbell explained, legal sanctions were added as an alternative means to win gains for women. Ultimately, programs like Affirmative Action Offices and Commissions on the Status of Women supplemented the work of continuing education centers in highlighting and advocating for changes on behalf of women.<sup>53</sup>

Throughout a series of articles and speeches, Campbell analyzed the long-term effects of the women's continuing education movement, frequently relying on the Michigan case for specific details. With a clear eye on successes and failures, she focused on four aspects of the national movement: the level of its research accomplishments, the degree of actual institutional change, the nature of its reform imperative, and its connection to the larger women's movement.

Even with Michigan's comparatively strong focus on research, Campbell acknowledged that research-based understanding of women's continuing education was under-developed: "The variety of continuing education programs for women is evident; research concerning the organization of these programs is not."<sup>54</sup> In 1967, a center in Oakland had, with Kellogg Foundation support, sponsored a conference to discuss research knowledge about these burgeoning programs. There Campbell recognized, with the other attendees, that, even with the programs' growth, "their energy and ingenuity needed a firmer base." After examining what was known about the programs and their clientele, however, she concluded that "there were no new hypotheses; few new directions were noted." She added, however, that "this assemblage of program leaders nevertheless made a significant contribution to assessing the need for basic and comprehensive research about women's position in our society."<sup>55</sup>

In more casual reflections during two oral history interviews, Campbell acknowledged that enhancing the research capacity at the Michigan center was an opportunity she wished they had pursued more forcefully. However, the very primacy given to research at a university like Michigan also worked against a center like CEW becoming a strong research arm. Center staff recognized that research is the currency in an academic setting like Michigan: “You have to have that turn of mind.... It’s just required at this university.”<sup>56</sup> But the extant understanding of a “research center” involved senior faculty, outside funding, and an ongoing investigative agenda. With hindsight, Campbell thought that they might have found more creative ways around the lack of faculty status, but the way was not well-paved early on for such a service-oriented center to make a strong research contribution.

On the issue of the continuing education movement’s ability to provoke long-term institutional change, Campbell was also skeptical, partly because she saw a difference between what advocates for women had hoped to accomplish and what educational administrators had been willing to change. From the perspective of the 1970s, Campbell realized that the equity interest – so important to the female planners – had rarely been the main spur for institutions to add women’s centers. Rather, the economic view which argued that women could fulfill the growing manpower needs of the early-1960s had piggybacked onto equity interests to support women’s continuing education. When Campbell first wrote about these two reasons for supporting women, she found their mutuality helpful. Over time, however, she doubted whether the manpower idea had actually benefitted women:

It was this atmosphere of ‘social need’ that sold our University administrators on a facilitating agency.... Even so, I have always doubted that a Center would have been approved just because women have the right to develop their talents as equal human beings without the impetus of apparent economic necessity.<sup>57</sup>

As the manpower issue receded in the late-1960s and 1970s, new definitions of women’s equity took over, and the centers tried to shift accordingly: “CEW goals have been constant, but their meaning has expanded,” Campbell explained.<sup>58</sup>

Yet, the ultimate goal, particularly at Michigan, had been to effect lasting change in institutional structures and responses, and here Campbell was, if not disheartened, at least discouraged. By 1970, a national survey showed that only 50% of institutions “made any institutional adjustments to fit the special needs” of women, even though most of them allowed women to return to degree programs. Although Campbell appreciated the very real gains she and others had made, she assessed that “the institutional change brought about by these programs, impressive in an absolute sense, has been disappointing.”<sup>59</sup> She cited the findings of researcher Carole Leland, who studied continuing education efforts in the early-1970s: “By no means has the early challenge of the 1960s been fulfilled. Seldom have our colleges shown any more flexibility or enlightenment with regard to women than a host of other societal institutions.”<sup>60</sup> The comparison to other settings might hold the key to women’s actual educational gains, however. As Campbell herself noted in 1982, the rapid changes over the past twenty years highlighted “the difficulties this implies for educators in directing sustained attention to the fundamental nature of these changes and the necessary breadth of institutional response.”<sup>61</sup> In other words, with needs and demands shifting so rapidly, the level of change never seemed sufficient.

Yet the nature of the change that female leaders had sought could also account for some of the difficulties in measuring it. The third element which Campbell examined was what she

called the “adaptive” nature of the movement’s reform efforts. Borrowing an analysis from women’s history about the differences between reform and radical politics, Campbell suggested that continuing education programs are “essentially adaptive, seeking wider opportunities, compensatory support, and greater access to the academic system.” In this way, their “leaders are in the tradition of political and institutional *reform*,” she explained, which might, in the long run “fall short of fundamental social change.”<sup>62</sup> The programs had chosen a “compensatory” approach – which might have been the best avenue open at the time – but even this road had not taken them very far toward real institutional change. “Present programs and services for women are innovative and energetic,” Campbell analyzed, “but in all cases somewhat marginal to the educational power structure.” And further, “insofar as measures are compensatory, they are not central. Insofar as they are not central, they require the constant attention of the compensatory agency to ward off the effects of competing pressures.”<sup>63</sup> Not only had such programs employed a marginal approach, but they had achieved only limited success in that effort.

Some of this harsh assessment may have resulted from comparison with the changing environment of the 1970s and 1980s rather than a recollection of the more realistic opportunities available in the pre-women’s movement early-1960s. In these later articles, a certain defensiveness creeps in when Campbell and others compare their accomplishments to the growing focus on affirmative action, women’s studies, and other demands for more equitable treatment of women. Looking back at the context of the early-1960s, Campbell tried to explain the unwitting connection between the dissatisfactions occurring for hundreds of individual women and the larger social movement of which they were a part:

Large numbers of women who did not necessarily relate their experience to the particulars of the movement apparently did understand a greater cultural and psychological ‘permission’ to think about education and work in combination with decisions about family rather than in stages or not at all.<sup>64</sup>

Only as the movement advanced did women find the language and the framework to place these individual cases into a larger understanding. Yet, as a new feminist consciousness arose around these efforts, the continuing education centers were there to undergird other efforts to change the university.

### **The CEW Legacy and Link to the Future**

Although Jean Campbell and her colleagues had the opportunity to reflect on the women’s continuing education movement with twenty years of hindsight, what do forty years of history, supplemented with advances in feminist analysis, suggest about the long-term accomplishments of this early-1960s effort? Taking this perspective, I am somewhat more positive than Jean Campbell about the movement’s successes in three particular areas.

First, the continuing education movement pioneered by introducing institutional changes that would later become standard operating procedures – or at least expectations – when higher education institutions faced the “new students” of the late-1960s and beyond. Jacquelyn Mattfeld, then associate provost of Brown University, initiated this analysis in her examination of continuing education for women in 1971. Deep in the wake of the student protests of the late-1960s, Mattfeld saw that many of the demands students were making of the university had already been introduced, on a smaller scale, for women returning to the educational arena. She highlighted several changes:

wider acceptance of individualized programs, the abolition of compulsory courses, distribution and major requirements, and fixed residence requirements[;] the validation of credit toward the degree of work satisfactorily completed at other institutions, the introduction of credit for field work, the arts, and life experience[;] the loosening of the four-year-full-time in the ivory-tower-attitudes to permit both acceleration and extension of the degree program to suit [an] individual student's needs. All of these features were established early on as necessary ingredients of continuing education for women programs.<sup>65</sup>

Thirty years later, these types of flexible academic arrangements have assumed even greater importance as institutions have served larger numbers of "under-prepared" students. As the adult student market burgeoned throughout the 1980s and 1990s, and institutions turned increasingly to marketing themselves, a history of managing such accommodations was a helpful element for many. It is true that extension programs and other sorts of adult education also experimented with these flexible arrangements, but the continuing education for women movement constituted a more coherent grouping of programs and clientele which could serve as a pilot for the later introduction of such institutional changes.

Second, the continuing education for women movement set the stage for a much wider array of women's programming that would expand on campuses in the 1970s. Commissions on the Status of Women, which had grown at the statewide level following the 1963 report of the national Presidential Commission on the Status of Women, appeared on college campuses more slowly, eventually serving as clearinghouses and central advocacy points for women's collegiate needs. Women's resource centers assumed responsibility for one set of identified needs, expanding the provision of health, safety, financial, and other services that advocates had highlighted. Affirmative action programs attacked the problem differently, finding ways to support the inclusion of women as students and employees of higher education. Women's research centers and programs of women's studies developed in yet another direction, creating a series of theoretical and analytical frameworks for understanding women's status in the structures and ideologies surrounding them.<sup>66</sup>

Although women's continuing education may not have consciously prompted these efforts, its leaders saw the nascent need for each of these approaches as they tried to serve women returning to the collegiate campus. Their advocacy programs and their calls for research drew attention to these various needs, even if they could not yet sufficiently address them. In addition, some of the leaders of the movement eventually served in roles in these other, newer programs. At Michigan, for example, CEW was involved in the creation of the university's Commission for Women (with a staff member serving as support to the commission), and was supportive in both the university's affirmative action effort and its women's studies program.

However, two factors worked against the smooth movement of continuing education into these newer, more radical programs. There were generational and class differences between the clients and some of the founders of continuing education when compared to the leaders of the new women's efforts. Because continuing education was primarily and initially directed at married women with children who sought to re-enter the academic world, its clients were older and essentially middle-class women who wanted to rejoin the mainstream of higher education. Likewise, the women who pioneered the movement had often understood the issues because of their own similar histories. The leaders recognized that their success rested on being accepted within the mainstream, and they operated through a first-hand understanding of the system. As Jean Campbell explained, "I had been here since 1946 and I knew that you couldn't walk into the

men's Union, and I knew what a male place it is.... So it was with a strong sense of realism that we approached this."<sup>67</sup> Similarly, she recognized the criticism that continuing education was a middle-class-focused movement, but countered that these women's needs "were the original impetus for redesigning traditional institutions for greater flexibility, and they are still valid."<sup>68</sup> Nevertheless, the late-1960s and 1970s were not distinguished by particular patience for middle-class efforts, and the longer-term influence of the continuing education centers may have suffered by such identification.

Third, the reform approach of the women's continuing education movement, although perhaps out of step with the more radical nature of 1960s and 1970s activities, nonetheless sustained a respectable thread of activism that led through the history of women in higher education. There have certainly been periods and moments of radicalism in the history of women's push for collegiate education.<sup>69</sup> However, the movement to open coeducational institutions, to assure women's place in the standard curriculum, and to support women as equal students on collegiate campuses had to be conducted within the mainstream of collegiate life if it were to have any long-term impact. Women's increasing proportion as college students throughout the twentieth century testifies to their steady push for acceptance into the majority of collegiate settings and as increasingly typical collegiate students.

The efforts of the continuing education movement may seem mild in comparison to the radicalism of the 1960s feminist movement, but they were challenging and innovative in the wake of 1950s domestic ideology. Looking back at continuing education through the lens of the activism which exploded barely ten years later misleads us into minimizing or even dismissing the creativity and challenge of the program for its time period. Continuing education for women can be seen as one thread that sustained women's activism from its strengths during World War II into the rejuvenated women's movement of the mid-1960s. In educational settings, continuing education for women constituted a major element of women's activism that appeared in the late-1950s and early-1960s, when women struggled to sustain their place in a fairly hostile environment.

In the end, the movement for continuing education of women constitutes an important step in a two-century-long effort to build gender equity for women on collegiate campuses. Although the language and approach of its late-1950s origins might seem only weakly related to more feminist ideologies, the history of this movement merits a place next to other instances of 1950s and 1960s challenges, thereby contributing to a revision of our understanding of postwar women's activism.

## APPENDIX 1

### TIMELINE OF CEW FOUNDING AND EARLY YEARS

#### 1962

- August Louise Cain submits 'A Memo and Suggestion on the Continuing Education of Women' to Roger Heyns. Memo does not specifically focus on creation of a 'center,' but suggests usefulness of 'an advisory, coordinating office.'
- September Alumnae Council reads memo prepared by Louise Cain, votes to support her idea, and decides to create a committee to work specifically with her to advance the project. Council also entertains idea of using some of its funds to provide grants for women who wish to prepare for college teaching
- December Alison Myers and Marjorie Williams of the Alumnae Council organize a Continuing Education Committee of 18 members to consider the issues of women's educational and vocational needs. They decide to play 'a stand-by, supportive role' to Cain's efforts and to keep alumnae informed of progress on the proposal.

#### 1963

- February 1 Louise Cain becomes Special Assistant to VP Roger Heyns to work on plans for a center.
- April 16 Cain presents information on continuing education to the Alumnae Committee. Notes that she has been gathering research material, visiting other centers, making connections within the University, and gathering statistics about women students at Michigan.
- June 19 Cain submits second draft of proposal for CEW to Heyns. This version is closer to final proposal, with language seeking 'a visible, facilitating center.' Goals are to give information and advise women, work with administration and faculty for further flexibility on campus, and consider cooperating with Catalyst on Campus for work with undergraduates. Expresses some hope for opening center in September of 1963.
- July 13 Louise Cain summarizes her 6 months of work on the issue. She has gathered research data, visited other programs, created her own small advisory committee (of Jean Campbell, Jane Likert, and Marjory Lansing), gathered data on older UM women, talked to Carnegie Foundation about possible funding; visited other programs, served as consultant to Governor's Commission on the Status of Women, and continued working within university to support women's needs.
- September 20 Alumnae Council hears from Cain and Heyns on the CEW project, and agrees to survey its membership about continuing education issues.
- Nov.-Dec. Alumnae Committee on Continuing Education for Women surveys more than 1000 alumnae about their continuing education interests.
- December Executive Advisory Committee formed at the university for proposed center. Members include deans of the colleges and supportive faculty members.

**1964**

- February 3 First meeting of the Advisory Committee on the proposed center. Members discuss hope to secure outside funding, and wonder whether they should try to open the center now, before additional funding is assured. Louise Cain notes the presumed difficulty in getting outside funding for 'an operational service unit alone.' Preference expressed for working with women who have vocational and/or professional aspirations, and for degree seekers.
- March Alison Myers, Alumnae Council Secretary, analyzes results of the alumnae survey. 1601 surveys are mailed; 564 returned. 61% of respondents would like to pursue additional education.
- March 12 At meeting of the Alumnae Committee on Continuing Education, Cain notes it is unlikely that an outside foundation will support the center at this stage. They discuss the possibility of the alumnae adding financial support, for a limited time period.
- April 18 Heyns visits Alumnae Council and further discusses idea of alumnae financial backing. He agrees that, if the alumnae could offer support of \$10-15,000 per year for three years, the university would then assume full responsibility for the new center.
- May 27 Final proposal for CEW is submitted. Emphasizes manpower needs of the country that can be met by women. Stresses that UM needs a single facilitating agency on women's issues. Feels CEW would be unique because of its 'total counseling concept,' which brings together home and vocation as women's dual interests.
- June 12 A new alumnae Continuing Education for Women committee is formed, with goal of fostering support for the request that alumnae help finance the new center for three years. Committee undertakes an 'information program' to answer questions about the project and ensure alumnae councillors' positive vote on the request in September.
- July 13 Heyns formally requests from President Hatcher \$15,000 annually for three years to support CEW. Notes that, if the program has 'demonstrated its usefulness' after three years, the costs will be transferred to the University's General Funds.
- September 1 CEW opens, with office space in the Michigan League.
- September 19 Alumnae Council votes to 'support the establishment of the University's Center for Continuing Education of Women and contribute a maximum of \$15,000 a year for three years, commencing September 1, 1965, to finance the Center; this amount to be raised from such sources as contributions from individuals, Alumnae Clubs and money obtained from the Biennial Birthday Greeting.' The University has also agreed to set aside any remaining alumnae obligations for the Alice Freeman Palmer professorship, a previous funding commitment.
- September 22 First meeting of new Executive Committee of center. Members similar to earlier Advisory Committee.
- November Alumnae Continuing Education Committee strengthens its fundraising efforts under the chairmanship of Jean Cobb. Her memos to members encourage them to emphasize to individual donors the center's *personal* appeal for younger women, *broad* appeal beyond the University of Michigan, and *prestige* appeal for alumnae who wish to see the university as a pacesetter. University includes CEW as a fundraising option in its \$55million development campaign.

**1965**

- March 16 CEW sponsors its first conference, "Opportunities for Women through Education." Although 238 attend, an additional several hundred requests must be denied due to space limitations.
- September Center reports on its first full year of operation. More than 500 women have used Center services; 106 attended a course on social work; considerable progress is made on clarifying and easing regulations around the university.

**1966**

- February Alumnae fundraising lagged behind goal for first year, but picks up in second year. After 17 months, the funding is behind schedule by more than \$8000, but pace of support begins to increase.
- September Fundraising continues to improve. First year raised only \$8500, but \$21,000 in second year.

**1967**

- September Alumnae fundraising is successfully completed. Plaque is installed at Center headquarters in the League recognizing major donors to the original fund drive.

## ENDNOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> This argument about the slippery nature of a decade's emphasis is made by both Eugenia Kaledin, *Mothers and More: American Women in the 1950s* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1984) and Blanche Linden-Ward and Carol Hurd Green, *American Women in the 1960s: Changing the Future* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993).

<sup>2</sup> Virginia L. Senders, a co-founder of the University of Minnesota's continuing education program, invented this metaphor, which was not uniformly appreciated by other movement leaders. See her article, "The Minnesota Plan for Continuing Education: A Progress Report," *Educational Record*, 42 (4), October 1961, 270-278.

<sup>3</sup> Alice Kessler-Harris, *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), especially Chapter 10. See also Claudia Goldin, *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), and National Manpower Council, *Womanpower: A Statement by the National Manpower Council with Chapters by the Council Staff* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957).

<sup>4</sup> For a good discussion of changes in women's percentage of higher education students, see Barbara Miller Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), especially Table 2, and Mabel Newcomer, *A Century of Higher Education for American Women* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1959).

<sup>5</sup> Joanne Meyerowitz, *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994), especially Dorothy Sue Cobble, "Recapturing Working-Class Feminism: Union Women in the Postwar Era," 57-83; Susan M. Hartmann, "Women's Employment and the Domestic Ideal in the Early Cold War Years," 84-102; and Susan Lynn, "Gender and Progressive Politics: A Bridge to Social Activism of the 1960s," 103-127. See also Leila J. Rupp and Verta Taylor, *Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Cynthia Harrison, *On Account of Sex: The Politics of Women's Issues, 1945-1968* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988); Susan Lynn, *Progressive Women in Conservative Times: Racial Justice, Peace, and Feminism, 1945 to the 1960s* (New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1992); and Susan M. Hartmann, *The Other Feminists: Activists in the Liberal Establishment* (New Haven: Yale Press, 1998).

<sup>6</sup> Lynn White, Jr., *Educating Our Daughters: A Challenge to the Colleges* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1950); Ernest Havemann and Patricia Salter West, *They Went to College: The College Graduate in America Today* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1952). For standard discussions of college women in the 1950s, see Solomon, William Henry Chafe, *The Paradox of Change: American Women in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford, 1991) and Paula S. Fass, "The Female Paradox: Higher Education for Women, 1945-63," in *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

- 
- <sup>7</sup> My previous publications and papers on the other centers include Eisenmann, “Weathering ‘A Climate of Unexpectation’: Gender Equity and the Radcliffe Institute, 1960-1995,” *Academe*, July/August, 1995, 21-25; “Befuddling the ‘Feminine Mystique’: Academic Women and the Creation of the Radcliffe Institute, 1950-1965,” *Educational Foundations*, 10 (Summer 1996), 5-26; “‘Our Respectful Way of Working Within the System’: 1950s Origins of Continuing Education for Women at the University of Minnesota and Sarah Lawrence College,” paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 2000.
- <sup>8</sup> Minnesota and Radcliffe opened their programs in 1960, Sarah Lawrence in 1962.
- <sup>9</sup> The best history of the continuing education for women movement is Helen S. Astin, ed., *Some Action of Her Own: The Adult Woman and Higher Education* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1976).
- <sup>10</sup> For a contemporary discussion emphasizing the nature of an “educational track” for women, see Mary I. Bunting, “A Huge Waste: Educated Womanpower,” *The New York Times Magazine*, May 7, 1961.
- <sup>11</sup> National Manpower Council, *Womanpower*.
- <sup>12</sup> These programs were described in a trio of articles published by the American Council on Education. See the October 1961 *Educational Record*, 42 (4), for the following: Esther Raushenbush, “Unfinished Business: Continuing Education for Women,” 261-269; Virginia L. Senders, “The Minnesota Plan for Women’s Continuing Education: A Progress Report,” 270-278; and Mary I. Bunting, “The Radcliffe Institute for Independent Study,” 279-286.
- <sup>13</sup> 13. Jean W. Campbell to Freda H. Goldman, undated [probably 1968], Box 6, Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- <sup>14</sup> The original proposal for the Center was drafted in August 1962 by Louise Cain. In Box 1, “Advisory Committee/Proposal for a Center, 1961, 1963,” Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- <sup>15</sup> Campbell explained her approach to describing the mission in an oral history interview conducted by Linda Eisenmann and Jeanne Miller, October 2, 2000, at the Center for the Education of Women. A transcript of the interview is available at CEW, and will be referred to throughout this paper. Campbell’s discussion of her “shaping” of the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary report is at pages 16-17. The 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary report is also available at CEW; see “The University of Michigan Center for Continuing Education of Women, 1964-1984: A Report.”
- <sup>16</sup> See text of Louise Cain’s remarks, “Cutting the Pattern,” April 26, 1967, available at CEW.
- <sup>17</sup> For examples of such female support, see Lynn D. Gordon, *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), and Polly Welts Kaufman, ed., *The Search for Equity: Women at Brown University, 1891-1991* (Hanover, NH: Brown University Press, 1991).

- 
- <sup>18</sup> The history of the nationally-recognized Institute for Social Research, including the work of the Survey Research Center, which Likert and Campbell pioneered, is detailed in Anne Frantilla, *Social Science in the Public Interest: A Fiftieth-Year History of the Institute for Social Research* (Ann Arbor, MI: Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, 1998).
- <sup>19</sup> The story is commonly told at the Center. Jean Campbell records it in her oral history interview, pp. 1-2.
- <sup>20</sup> Cain, Box 6, "Proposal for CEW," Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- <sup>21</sup> Unprocessed records of the two alumnae Continuing Education Committees are at CEW.
- <sup>22</sup> The September 1963 protocol, the survey, and Alison Myers' March 12, 1964 memo analyzing the results are all available in the unprocessed records of the Alumnae Continuing Education Committee, CEW.
- <sup>23</sup> Alison Myers, Memorandum to Continuing Education for Women Committee, March 12, 1964, in papers of the Continuing Education Committee, CEW.
- <sup>24</sup> The interview in which she discussed her lack of fundraising expertise was conducted by historian Ruth Bordin with Louise Cain, Jean Campbell, and Jane Likert, for CEW's 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 1989. A tape of the interview and notes (although not a formal transcript) are available at CEW.
- <sup>25</sup> For general discussions of women's financial contributions to universities, see Solomon. For discussion specific to Michigan, see Ruth Bordin, *Women at Michigan: The 'Dangerous Experiment,' 1870s to the Present* (Ann Arbor: UM Press, 1999).
- <sup>26</sup> These are the folders of unprocessed papers of the Continuing Education Committee, available at CEW.
- <sup>27</sup> For a record of the vote, see Alumnae Council Meeting Minutes, September 18, 1964, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- <sup>28</sup> Copies of the 1964 proposal are available at CEW. Copies of the final 1964 proposal, as well as the two earlier versions, are available in Box 6, "Proposal for CEW," Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- <sup>29</sup> Little specific information is available about Heyns' involvement with or commitment to Catalyst on Campus. However, it appears that he and Felice Schwartz had some preliminary conversations about making Michigan a pilot site for Catalyst on Campus. (See scattered references in Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan). In the 2000 oral history interview, Jean Campbell speculates that, once Heyns left Michigan, the impetus for the collaboration disappeared (see pp. 10-11). In the unprocessed papers of the alumnae Continuing Education Committee, at CEW, there is an unsigned prototype of a contract between Catalyst on Campus and potential cooperating

---

universities. The contract stresses the university as a site for surveying, research, and some advising work by Catalyst.

<sup>30</sup> See pages 9 and 15 of the 1964 proposal.

<sup>31</sup> 1964 proposal, p. 5.

<sup>32</sup> 1964 proposal, p. 10.

<sup>33</sup> For a discussion the research efforts at the other centers, including an interpretation of Radcliffe's disappointment in this area, see Eisenmann, "Our Respectful Way of Working Within the System," and "Befuddling the Feminine Mystique."

<sup>34</sup> Campbell, oral history interview, p. 14.

<sup>35</sup> Louise Cain to Jean [Mrs. Edward] Cobb, June 1, 1964, unprocessed papers of alumnae Continuing Education Committee, CEW.

<sup>36</sup> See Box 6, Executive Committee Minutes and Correspondence, Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

<sup>37</sup> Campbell, 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary interview, 1989, pp. 3-4 of notes, and see generally pp. 16-19 of the 2000 oral history interview.

<sup>38</sup> Jean Cobb in Minutes of Alumnae Council Committee on Continuing Education of Women, June 12, 1964, in unprocessed papers of the committee, CEW.

<sup>39</sup> See letters and reports of Jean Cobb in the unprocessed papers of the alumnae Continuing Education Committee, CEW.

<sup>40</sup> A summary of the Center's first-year activities can be found in Box 1, Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

<sup>41</sup> Jean Campbell, "Women Drop Back In: Educational Innovations in the 60s," in Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood, eds., *Academic Women on the Move* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973), pp. 104-105.

<sup>42</sup> Campbell, page 3, Report to the Executive Committee, May 16, 1967, Box 6, Executive Committee Minutes and Correspondence, Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

<sup>43</sup> Campbell, 2000 oral history interview, p. 22.

<sup>44</sup> Louise Cain returned to the Center in 1969 for a two-year stint as a program specialist and coordinator for the national research conference in 1970, "Women on Campus: 1970."

<sup>45</sup> Louise Cain, "Cutting the Pattern..." Remarks for Founders' Day Luncheon, Center for the Education of Women, April 26, 1967, pp. 6-7. Speech in unprocessed papers at CEW.

<sup>46</sup> Cain, "Cutting the Pattern," p. 15.

- 
- <sup>47</sup> Louise Cain, undated [1968/1969] letter to Dorothy McGuigan, pp. 1-2, in Folder “Cain, Correspondence, 1968-1970,” Box 1, Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan. Dorothy Gies McGuigan is author of *A Dangerous Experiment: One Hundred Years of Women at the University of Michigan* (Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Education of Women, 1970).
- <sup>48</sup> Cain, [1968/1969] letter to Dorothy McGuigan, p. 1.
- <sup>49</sup> Cain, Folder, “Cain: Miscellaneous, Speeches, Notes,” Box 1, Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- <sup>50</sup> Campbell, letter to Rosalind Loring, October 12, 1967, Folder, “Adult Education Association,” Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- <sup>51</sup> Campbell to Rosalind Loring, October 12, 1967.
- <sup>52</sup> Campbell, “Why Have a Continuing Education Program?”, Keynote Speech for a conference on Continuing Education for Women, Towson State College, Baltimore, Maryland, October 26, 1973, in CEW Library. The discussion of the five ingredients for success is found on pages 3-6, and the quote about *The Feminine Mystique* is on page 6.
- <sup>53</sup> The discussion from the 20-year anniversary report is found in “The University of Michigan, Center for Continuing Education of Women, 1964-1984: A Report,” especially pages 1-3. The quote from the 1982 review committee is from p. ii, Executive Summary, CCEW Review and Evaluation, July 2, 1982, available at CEW. This six-member faculty committee had been assembled to conduct an inquiry into whether CEW’s functions were still needed or whether its responsibilities could be reallocated to other university offices. The review was prompted by a budgetary crisis at the university. The committee’s evaluation was so positive, detailed, and well-supported by external analyses that the challenge to the Center’s existence was eliminated.
- <sup>54</sup> Campbell, “Women Drop Back In,” p. 102.
- <sup>55</sup> Campbell, “Women Drop Back In,” p. 114.
- <sup>56</sup> Campbell, 2000 oral history interview, p. 18.
- <sup>57</sup> Campbell, undated [1974 or 1975] memorandum “To Staff: Re: The Job(s) Ahead,” page 1, in Folder, McGuigan: Intra-Office Correspondence, 1970-78, Box 3, Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- <sup>58</sup> Campbell, January 20, 1975, Report to Vice President Frank Rhodes, page 3, in Folder, McGuigan: Assessment of CEW, 1973-75, Box 3, Center for the Education of Women Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- <sup>59</sup> Campbell, “Women Drop Back In,” p. 114.

- 
- <sup>60</sup> Leland quoted in Campbell, "Women Drop Back In," p. 116.
- <sup>61</sup> Campbell, "The Integration of Service, Advocacy and Research in a University Women's Center," Speech at the International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women, Haifa, Israel, December 26, 1981, pp. 2-3.
- <sup>62</sup> <sup>61</sup>. Campbell, "Women Drop Back In," p. 117.
- <sup>63</sup> Campbell, "Women Drop Back In," p. 118.
- <sup>64</sup> Campbell, "The Integration of Service, Advocacy and Research," p. 5.
- <sup>65</sup> Mattfeld quoted in Campbell, "Women Drop Back In," p. 111. Mattfeld's piece is liberally cited here and in other articles by continuing education pioneers. However, it does not seem to be extant in any of the continuing education archives. Her piece is Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld, "A Decade of Continuing Education – Dead End or Open Door?", unpublished manuscript, Brown University, 1971.
- <sup>66</sup> For a good discussion of these developments, see Mariam K. Chamberlain, ed., *Women in Academe: Progress and Prospects* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988), and Carol S. Pearson, Donna L. Shavlik, and Judith G. Touchton, eds., *Educating the Majority: Women Challenge Tradition in Higher Education* (New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing, 1989). The report of the national commission on women can be found in Margaret Mead and Frances Bagley Kaplan, eds., *American Women: Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women* (New York: Scribner's, 1965).
- <sup>67</sup> Campbell, 2000 oral history interview, p. 26.
- <sup>68</sup> Campbell, "Alternative Patterns for Recurrent Education: The Nontraditional Student in Academe," in W. Todd Furniss and Patricia Albjerg Graham, eds., *Women in Higher Education* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1974), p. 198.