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PROLOGUE: An Overview

The image of America in the world today is one of power and prosperity greater than any the world has ever known, more widely distributed among its citizens than in any previous era or in any other contemporary nation. For almost two centuries America has been a place of opportunity to which throngs migrated to seek a better life for themselves and their posterity. It was a one-way migration. They came and they stayed. The "old country" might evoke nostalgia, but no mass return. Americans might do business around the globe, but this country never became the base of colonization to new lands. This is undoubtedly one of the great phenomena in the history of mankind.

How did this come about? This is the overriding concern of anyone who would understand our time and this country's place in our time. Perhaps it was an accident. There were, certainly, fortuitous events at crucial moments.

We are familiar with various theories of explanations: It was free land. It was democratic government. It was natural resources. It was free enterprise. It was Henry Ford's production-line technique. It was the two mighty moats of the Atlantic and the Pacific, which gave the Monroe Doctrine a chance. It was not killing off the crop of boys once a generation, but letting them live and work and build, letting them compete with ballots more regularly than with bullets, with bargains rather than brigades, with gadgets instead of guns.

Today with new nations struggling to exist in Asia and Africa and with other nations looking for ways by which free people can achieve well being, America's experience is prime data
for them, perhaps the essential alternative to tyranny.

There is much to suggest that one of the basic factors in America's achievement has been her dream of being a land of opportunity. This has meant different things to different people—sometimes an achievement of wealth and power by ruthless exploitation of forest and soil and labor and electorates. Here in Minnesota that too has been part of the story. The beaver were trapped, territory was seized from those in possession, railroad and mining enterprises rolled over the rights of the weaker, forests were felled, land speculation was everywhere.

But there is another part of the story, and Minnesota is a good instance. The richest resources were not in soil—though this section in southern and southwestern Minnesota, which is particularly served by Mankato State College, is called one of the rich farm lands of the entire world. The saying is that there has never been a crop failure, a real failure, though the early grasshopper plagues must have been devastating. Were one to take a boat up the Minnesota River above Mankato he might note high banks of black soil from rim to water's edge. The high-grade iron ore of the Mesabi range in northern Minnesota supplied much of the steel for World War II, and though it is gone, taconite processing has emerged as a replacement. The time is past when Minneapolis was known as "The Mill City." The timber that built most of the houses in the Midwest is cut.

Minnesota's greatest resource, and America's, was her people. Potentially they were no greater than those of any other land, for they came from everywhere. One suspects that those emigrants were not the cream of the crop, the achievers, back home. If they had been, they might not have come.* The stories tell of those with little or almost nothing making the gamble to get something. It is literally true that for many of us a grandfather was one of those who homesteaded with very little but what he and grandmother could carry in a wagon drawn by a team of horses or of

*Another way of reading it: the emigrants were those who were smart enough to see the lack of opportunity at home and who had the gumption to go where the odds were better.
oxen. Rolvaag and others have recorded the sagas of steerage passage and homestead landbreaking.

When you compare this new land a century ago with the new nations now in the middle of the twentieth century aspiring to independence, you note a very important difference: an undercurrent of conviction that opportunity is tied to education. If we have eyes to see it, here is an exciting story.

The very first legislature of the state of Minnesota made provisions for common schools and proposed that three normal schools be established at five-year intervals. The first normal school west of the Mississippi was established at Winona. Then came the Civil War and there was a little delay, but not for long. A second normal school was authorized for Mankato and a third for St. Cloud. Later there were others at Moorhead, Duluth, and Bemidji.

It is hard for us to see what this meant, we who take good schooling as a birthright. What was the basic conviction? Perhaps it was something very simple: that people in a democracy ought to know how to read and write and figure.

That teacher qualifications were very modest is easy to understand. Anybody who knew how to read and write and figure could tell others how to do it. If that seems an incredibly naive assumption today, recall that one of the most spectacularly successful literacy programs in our century was the each-one-teach-one program of Dr. Frank Laubach. Another factor making for the conviction that anybody could teach lies in the obvious fact that beginning students were little children, and any big person could boss little ones. This seems a modest enough foundation on which to build a program of universal education. To change the figure, it was a tiny seed, but there was in it the genetics of something the world was to see for the first time, the gradual emergence of increasingly generous educational opportunity for a whole people.

When the institution which is now Mankato State College was founded a century ago, entrance requirements were based on an average age level not much different from that of entering
freshman today, but with educational attainment assumed to be that of an eighth-grade graduate. For two years—often for much less—students studied subjects they would teach in rural schools and general-education courses similar in some respects to what we have come to call secondary education. The need was for teachers of ungraded and graded elementary schools.

In the next thirty years there came the growth of public high schools to supplement the so-called common schools and largely to supplant private academies. What made taxpayers support a higher type of education than that devoted to basic subjects? It was not primarily an urge for vocational training. That came rather modestly and with Federal prodding much later. It was an urge for development of the person as a person, one able to put his mind and natural aptitudes to any of a whole variety of vocations and professions. The high school seemed a step up the ladder of human opportunity. Whenever one has sore misgivings about the adequacies of school boards, PTA's, and the school electorate generally, he can remember this story.

A person with only two years of normal school beyond the eighth grade was not prepared to teach a high school that had four years beyond the eighth grade. Inevitably the curriculum of the normal school had a five-year program (though fifth-year students had enrolled for a decade). By World War I, the student body were typically high school graduates. In the twenties, the collegiate status of the institution was recognized by a change in name to Mankato State Teachers College and by collegiate accreditation.

By the end of World War II, almost everyone considered a high school education the standard minimum achievement. Soon a third, then a half, and more than half of the June graduates of high school were going on to college. There was a grave shortage of teachers, and enrollment at Mankato rose dramatically. Most of the curriculum was general-education and concentration in fields of specialization—the standard fare of college education for any profession. Many students who had no intention of becoming
teachers came to Mankato; and in the 1950's the institution became a multi-purpose area college, and the name was changed to Mankato State College. This growth in enrollment made possible and mandatory broadened programs of study and a faculty with qualifications of specialized competencies.

The metaphor is that the belief that reading, writing, and arithmetic were things which everyone should know was a fertile seed. Gradually public opinion emerged that schools were resources for many kinds of development, that they were instrumentalities which were best used when they best served to release all kinds of potentialities and help people grow to productive and satisfying maturity. Though it is easy to say familiar phrases like these, we seldom are awed by the fantastic assignment. How does one help a whole roomful of youngsters grow—each into what he can best be? The answer is, quite literally and piously, "God only knows!" But this is the role that the schools are cast in. No wonder child development became a major study for those who took education seriously. No wonder the qualifications for certification rose from a simple test in elementary subjects to a year of special training, then two, and three, and four, then a year beyond high school, then two years of college, then three, and the college degree. And now the person who expects to make a career of teaching thinks of a year beyond college, and salary schedules everywhere include steps for the masters degree, and some go beyond that.

It was inevitable, therefore, that schools like Mankato should be authorized to offer graduate work. By a development parallel to that which changed a teachers college into a multi-purpose area college, the facilities needed for graduate study in the arts and sciences, in business, and in other areas served graduate study leading to a variety of vocations, and state colleges became state universities. In recent sessions of the Minnesota Legislature, bills have been introduced to make Mankato a state university.

This, then, is a brief resume of Mankato's story, of personal interest perhaps to those who chose this campus as their place to work, but far more significant as a representative instance of
America's dream that opportunity means, fundamentally, educational opportunity, an example of how this urge to provide adequate educational opportunity leads to study of all the facets of personality and all the resources of culture.

One does not know for sure that this kind of thing is what has made America strong—but the two things have come together, and this hardly seems a mere coincidence. In the remainder of this century institutions like this, so close in tradition to the very grass roots of America’s dream of educational opportunity, may well become typically the institutions through which the majority of our people will try to realize their best selves.

The account of Mankato State College which follows is not a chronicle of events. It is rather a seeking for understanding of what happened: what led up to, what was part of, what followed, what this part and that meant—for the College and for society. It is thus an essay. The tactic has been to look at the account from different perspectives: the developing program, the enrollment, students, the state governing board, administration and faculty. Inevitably such a procedure means going over the historic events again. But since there are always many facets to each significant happening this may be an aid to understanding. A theme emerges in these first notes—the dream of opportunity through education—and its variations inform both whole and parts.
The original course of study at the Second Normal School was a two-year program. One is inclined to call this a ninth and tenth grade program; but to equate the educational level of the first-year students of a normal school a century ago with ninth graders today, with youngsters in junior high, would not be too helpful. To be sure, the students who enrolled at Second State Normal had usually no particular formal education beyond the eighth grade (or whatever their district school offered), but perhaps half of them had already themselves been school teachers. All of them were at least sixteen years of age. The average age in 1870 was nineteen and a half—most of them first-year students. A substantial percentage of students at the Normal would be in their early twenties. Agewise, then, one would probably have the impression that the students were pretty much what we today call "college age."

What did they study? A course of study outlined by Mr. William F. Phelps, principal of the First State Normal at Winona, had been thoroughly discussed at a national meeting of normal school principals in 1870, and no doubt is representative of what a normal course should be. It consisted of two years of two semesters each year. In general it seems to embrace three kinds of study: (1) review of the subjects taught in the "common schools" (elementary schools, we should say today), (2) academic subjects which were to become a part of the high-school curriculum and were then available in academies, and (3) courses in professional education, including observation and practice teaching. The com-
mon-school subjects—the "common branches" as they were called—included arithmetic, geography, grammar, penmanship, and music. The courses akin to high-school subjects included botany, physiology, geometry, algebra, the English language (perhaps mostly oral and written composition), natural philosophy (physics), United States government, chemistry, and geology. It is interesting that there is as much science and mathematics and so little of social studies and the humanities. Admission was on the basis of examination in reading, writing, spelling, geography, arithmetic (through interest), and grammar.

One of the problems, obviously, was relating the institutions to two kinds of needs: the need of the elementary teacher for mastery of the subjects to be taught in rural and city elementary schools on the one hand, and the quite natural and worthy desire, on the other hand, to have normal work something in advance of a mere review of the subjects to be taught.

Mr. John D. Ford, President of the State Normal Board, in his annual report for 1864 had emphasized these two curricular objectives:

First, A careful and exhaustive review of all those branches required to be taught in the common schools.
Second, The study of those higher departments of knowledge best calculated to discipline and expand . . . [the student's] powers and afford him an insight into the human mind, and the subtle forces which make up the human being.

In addition were what we today call the experiences of professional education.

The sciences, algebra, and geometry answered the need for more advanced work; but since they would not be taught to elementary students, they opened the door to the charge that they were not practical. Of course the professional courses answered both needs—for something beyond the common school curriculum but yet something which would help the student develop into a good teacher.

And here fall the seeds of an issue which was to flourish through the decades to follow. What is the province of the nor-
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mal school, of teacher education? One answer frequently heard was that it was a professional school—like the school of law or the college of medicine. As such its curriculum should consist of purely professional courses. It was no more reasonable to ask the normal school to teach academic subjects than to ask a medical faculty to offer courses in English composition or music appreciation.

But somehow or other, apt as the analogy seems, this point of view never really prevailed—then or now. That a person with subject-matter competency went to a normal school, a teachers college, a department or school of education for “methods courses” has been a persistent image, but one which neither the educator nor the students generally have found a very satisfactory concept of what good teacher preparation should be.

In the beginning probably most normal-school advocates must have thought of something like this as an ideal. But it was an unattainable ideal. In the new state, schools had been opened and teachers found where they could be. How amazing that in 1870 with almost no state or private facilities for the preparation of teachers in Minnesota, there were hired 3,775 teachers in 2,625 school districts! Not only were there no facilities for teacher education for more than nine out of every ten teachers, but there was almost no provision for guidance and supervision of the “teacher” who was hired. Examination and certification were yet entirely on a local basis—with of course no agreed-upon standards. Supervision at the state level had been an adjunct of other duties of the Secretary of State—who was then also ex officio secretary of the State Normal School Board and Chancellor of the University of Minnesota.

Of course such schools (two-thirds of them in log cabins!) turned out uneven graduates. Those who applied at the normals would probably be the successful and/or the ambitious, but a substantial number would have to be relegated to “preparatory classes” for at least part of their initial work.

That this was so is more indicative of the situation in higher
education generally than a comment on the normal schools as such. Many of the A & M colleges before the growth of the high schools admitted students just out of the common schools. Iowa State College at Ames had opened a decade before Mankato. Students accepted for admission were to be fourteen years of age, able to read and write English with ease, and should know the fundamentals of arithmetic. At the University of Wisconsin in the 1850’s only about ten percent of the students were enrolled in college-level courses. President Folwell was faced with the same situation at the University of Minnesota.

The story was the same in professional schools. In 1896, President Eliot of Harvard pointed out that only thirty years earlier there “were no requirements for admission to medical schools. To secure admission a young man had nothing to do but to register his name and pay a fee . . . . The total period of required school attendance for the degree of Doctor of Medicine did not exceed, in the best schools, three winter terms of four months each, and there were schools accounted respectable which had even a shorter total period than this.” In professional schools of law, standards of admission were, naturally, similar—a good common school education. One might even bypass the professional school entirely. The Honorable Daniel Buck of Mankato, who was so instrumental in securing the location of the Normal at Mankato, had a distinguished legal career in Minnesota. He was elected to the Legislature in 1863, the State Senate in 1873. He served as a judge of the Supreme Court of Minnesota from 1893 to 1899. His historian says, “He was well educated in the common schools of his locality [Boonville, N. Y.], where he studied law and was admitted to the bar.”

There are two ways of looking at this state of affairs. One is to deplore it. That has been common enough. But there is another way to see the matter: despite a minority to the contrary, American educational institutions have consistently built on what they had, not wrung their hands and wailed that things were not different. Admission standards were upgraded consistently, but
students with promising potential were conditionally admitted and coached some way or another. Brubacher and Ruby in their *Higher Education in Transition* (1958) report that as late as 1907 over half of the freshmen matriculating at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia failed to meet entrance requirements and were admitted conditionally. A decade later the United States Commissioner of Education reported three hundred and fifty institutions with preparatory departments. In the 1920's President Coffman of the University of Minnesota argued against pressures to limit enrollment. "Rather," the Centennial historian reports his point of view, "money must be found to expand services. The point was not to preserve numbers but to 'salvage abilities.'" From the bottom to the top of the American educational scheme evidence is abundant that American initiative was willing to pitch in and get rolling with the material at hand. The result is an educational situation which can compare in kind on any level or in virtually any segmentation with achievement anywhere or any time—and one which has elicited more support for the idea of progress through education than anything else in man's experience. The simple explanation seems to be the true one: human beings with all of our strategies tap only a small fraction of their potential. Anything which provides a culture in which that potential can grow is elemental realism, fundamental wisdom.

So the occasionally touted idea of a normal school's confining its efforts purely to professional instruction was unrealistic. This was so in the beginning, and the history since then seems to indicate clearly that for reasons not then spelled out the concept of good teacher education would move in other directions.

It is probably not the province of this review of an institution's development to attempt too much in the way of defining the role of professional education in America, but on the other hand we should not be reporting the story correctly if we did not read it with awareness of some of the professional issues involved.

What makes a good teacher? That was the original question
and the one we still face. In the beginning, the answer the curriculum devisers came up with included what we later have come to call general education or liberal education. They were not always sure about this. There were charges that the normal teachers should tend to their own knitting. Many administrators of normal schools thought that to justify their existence they must see their own unique function and make it known. The normal school had its own work to do. It was not the same as that of the high school or the academy, who were therefore less qualified to prepare teachers for the common schools than the normals. It was not the same as the work of the colleges or universities or other professional schools. But while this was a good line to justify development and appropriations, the actual course of events was toward including in the curriculum not only work in the special considerations and problems of teaching but also the courses being offered in high school, and later those being taught in college. From a distance we can perhaps see the significance of this much better than had we been involved in appearing before appropriation committees. And that meaning is pretty close to the meaning of America! Essentially it is that people think of this as a land of opportunity, and the most universal symbol of opportunity to advance in life has been, now for many decades, educational opportunity.

We are not at all precise in our thinking when we say things like this. Maybe it is more a feeling than a reasoned argument. We work hard on curriculums that are “functional.” We have given great attention to evaluation by all kind of means, from building personnel files filled with discursive notes to precise testing. But in the large the appetite to go a little farther, to get a little more education, has thrived on what it has fed upon—one can almost say “on anything it has fed upon”! And we probably are wrong if we say this derisively. It is pretty good science to assume that every effect has had an adequate cause. If the schools have engendered a conviction that a person should get as much education as he possibly can, there must be in the curriculum
adequate causes for the "holding power" of the schools.

As far as teacher education is concerned, the conviction early appeared and continued to develop that the responsibilities of a teacher and his opportunities for service called not only for technical competencies in conducting discrete learning situations, but also for powers of a vaster range: wisdom, imagination, judgment, sensitivity, courage, kindness, integrity, scholarship, understanding of one's self and of society, possession of our rich heritage. Some of these qualities sound very much like the classical virtues. Together they sound very much like what we have called the marks of an educated man. They sound like the goals of a liberal education.

Thus what in the early stages may be viewed as a choice between "method courses" and the "academic subjects" opens easily enough to a vista of what education is and what kinds of teachers are needed to help all the sons and daughters of all the people realize their potentials as human beings. What an awesome responsibility for a teacher! It is no wonder we shrink from it and stake claims to circumscribed objectives for particular technical competencies. But the great tide of the century is a mightier idea. It explains the growth of common schools, of high schools, the drive for a college education, the need for graduate study and advanced degrees. Man is a creature whose potential in the general run of mankind has scarcely been touched and whose cooperative efforts of research and social effort almost daily obsolete past achievement. Education remains the name for the means society experiments with to release more of that potential. Just as each new achievement in research opens doors to unexpected relationships, so each step up the ladder of educational opportunity for the members of society raises the sight to possibility likewise unanticipated, to an untravell'd world whose margin fades
For ever and ever when I move.

The normal school by simply raising the problem of what a good school is and what good teachers are started the chain of reaction, primed an appetite for getting ahead by means of educa-
tional opportunity—which in a century would make it a com-
monplace conviction that a high-school dropout was a personal
and social risk. For all their faith in education, the first "Pruden-
tial Committee" of the Second Normal School or Principal Gage
or the "Assistants" he hired could scarcely have dreamed that Min-
nesotans would become so sold on education.

One of the rather exciting aspects of the early normal-school
movement was the insistence on a model school. Theory and prac-
tice were to be wed. The aspirant to teachership was to learn by
doing (in the phrase which was to come on much later—a couple
of generations later). Here was a theoretical activity tied to an ex-
perimental activity. Every beginning teacher suffers through the
discovery that there is a mighty gap between an ideal of what one
would like to do and the disheartening reality of what one ac-
complishes.

It is not clear that the mid-nineteenth century educators
thought exactly in these terms. The elementary school where stu-
dents did their "practice teaching" was formally designated a
"model" school, informally referred to as a "practice school." We
cringe a little at the word model. What penury of understanding
of the intricacies of human growth and development could lead
to the fatuous assertion that one's own performance was what
every teacher should wish to do, should strive to emulate! And the
term practice too was a term coming from rather thick-skinned in-
sensitivity. Inevitably parents would want something better for
their children than to have them serve as guinea pigs for inex-
perienced teachers to practice on. A later day would therefore bor-
row a term from the sciences and refer to the school as a labora-
tory school or it might be simply a campus school. The student
would not do "practice teaching," but simply "student teaching."

But mixed as the situation was with overconfidence that one
knew the answers, "the correct way of teaching," that the hungry
sheep need only come to be fed, the mere presence of a situation
where talk led to trial and back again to talk about the trial was
a built-in corrective to pomposities, an inevitable ovary of new possibilities.

The name *normal school* itself may reflect that same over-confidence that the term *model school* does. In fact, the terms may be identical. A *norm*, as the current *Collegiate Dictionary* notes, may mean simply “average”—something which is typical of a group. In this sense the Normal School would tend to present what the ordinary teacher-to-be could expect to duplicate in his own schoolhouse. But there was an earlier meaning which did not suggest the ordinary, the average, the run-of-the-mill at all. The word derives from the Latin *norma*, meaning a “rule” or a “carpenter’s square.” Here the concern was for an exact standard, a precise instrument of measurement—in short, the ideal, the model, the perfect. One would infer that something near the latter meaning gave the word to the French *ecole normale* and to those who picked it up from those schools as the name for the new teacher-training institutions in this country.

If one side of the early normal-school idea was confidence that with a teacher using “normal methods” a school district could get twice the learning in half the time, the false pride was certain to generate detractors—and it happened so. The early 1870's were years when the official reports of principals, Board presidents, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and even the Governor in his annual message to the Legislature might allude to the criticisms of the normal schools. The one at Mankato was mentioned in particular.

These were lean years for the new agricultural economy, and hard times affected enrollments and allocations. Taxes were burdensome, and the normal schools had to be financed from taxes. The common-school fund had income from land grants. There were generous land grants to the University. But almost every nickel used in the establishment and operation of the normal schools was derived from taxes or from a very meager income from fees and rentals. Where tuition was free to all students who
"signed the pledge" to teach two years after graduation, the mon­eys earned on campus were small enough.

Nor is it surprising that where miracles were promised in teacher preparation, what actually came out of the normal schools were schoolmarms and schoolmasters of modest attainment. Only a fraction of those who took some work at the normal stayed to graduate. Moreover, the overwhelming preponderance of teachers holding jobs in Minnesota were persons without any "higher" education at all. That they should have felt their status jeopardized was all too human, and that they should have struck back at the exalted pretensions of those who had "gone to the Normal" was inevitable. Inevitable, too, was the fact that (education being the most complicated of all professions) the new teachers would furnish plenty of targets for critics to shoot at.

Yet the idea of a normal school was able to cope with the adversities because it had such a fundamental soundness: good schools must have good teachers.

Within a few years the principals were recommending to the Board an additional year of work. The two-year program seemed reasonably satisfactory for the teacher, but schools need supervisors, and supervisors need some educational qualifications beyond those of the ones supervised. A third year of work was recommended for this additional work, for an "advanced" course, as it was to be called. It would be of special value for teachers and principals of graded schools and of high schools, for superintendents of school systems, for county superintendents, for, in fact, persons who would themselves become members of a normal school faculty. Again it is interesting to consider what studies seem suitable for such an advanced course. Additional work in the "art of teaching" was an obvious inclusion, but the other proposals were higher mathematics, physics, chemistry, geology, astronomy, and the "abstract sciences."

What is education, or what is an education? One can scarcely avoid drawing the conclusion that in most societies the image of
what an educated person should be is basically determined by the subjects which a person considered educated had studied when he was in school. When colleges required Latin for admission, courses in Latin were the mark of a real education. However, the predominance of science and mathematics in the proposal for the third year at the normals hardly reflects the college curriculum of a century ago—which was still oriented toward the classical languages and the humanities. The absolute domination of Latin and Greek in the college curriculum was modified in 1839 at Harvard when the faculty permitted students to substitute science, modern languages, and history for the required Latin and Greek. But almost a decade after Phelps proposed the “Advanced” course loaded with science and math, the University of Minnesota faculty was in a ferment over the same issue. “The Bourbons,” as President Folwell labeled them, wanted “to establish the point that institutions of higher learning existed to teach Latin and Greek . . . .” The University faculty at that time apparently had one teacher who handled both chemistry and physics but three and a half positions for Latin and Greek.

One of the lessons one quickly learns in reading reports and minutes of the normal schools is that a recommendation for a course of action does not effect the desired change, that there is normally a lag between the proposal and the authorization. As all students of political science have pointed out, this is inherent in the democratic system. If an idea is meritorious it will probably sooner or later command a majority of the votes necessary to its adoption. Usually competition and precedent are powerful factors in securing that support. The history of the Second State Normal School through its three changes in names (actually four, if one counts the dropping of “Second” as one) and its successive redefinitions of function illustrates in reiterated detail this process. The fact that such delay is inherent in the democratic administration is no palliative to the ardent advocates of getting on with the job, but a kind of justification can be argued for democracy’s wasteful and procrastinating muddling through. If democracy
ideally is anything, it is government by consensus—not fiat. When consensus is quickly won, the issue may be trivial or not understood, or the consensus may be simply concealed fiat—as when a political party dominates the branches of government. But the hope of democracy—both democracy's hope and the ultimate justifications of democracy—is that in the long run, slow as it is, democracy is a faster way to progress, a sounder way as well. Coercion is seldom a short cut: the edifice it rears crumbles as swiftly as the power structure that raised it, or it survives only because the fiat was supported by education, the basis of consensus.

In the same year, 1870, that Principal Phelps was proposing a third year for an advanced course which included higher mathematics, a petition by the citizens of Mankato that classics and higher mathematics be taught was denied by the Board for the reason that the Board did not deem these subjects within the scope of normal school training. The juxtaposition of these two requests is prophetic of much of the history to come.

In 1874, (that is, four years later) the principals of the normals were asked to recommend a uniform course of study for the three schools. Besides the work taught in elementary schools and courses in professional education (Art of Teaching, Methods of Teaching, practice in the Model School), the proposal they made included rhetoric and composition, algebra, natural philosophy, U.S. history, botany, plane geometry, physiology, and "mental philosophy." These were for the first two years. Advanced studies were to be pursued when practicable: bookkeeping, Minnesota geology, astronomy, and chemistry. One notes that no third-year program is actually drawn up as an "Advanced Course," but the door is opened. Some courses will be offered beyond the regular two-year program. This, too, is prophetic; normally a salient is successful before the whole front advances. Put the other way (from the Board's point of view): a few balloons were loosed before a major commitment was attempted.

In December of 1877, the Board approved an elementary
course of two years and an advanced course of three years, including Latin.

The new course of study appeared in the catalogue for 1877-1878, which published the statistics for 1877. The two-year course no longer led to a diploma, merely to a certificate of scholarship. The catalogue stated that those who graduated from the three-year course would qualify to teach in grammar and high schools. Second-year students would now be called “juniors” and third-year students would be called “seniors.” Two years of Latin are offered, including some Caesar, Cicero, and Virgil. In the faculty listing, the principal at Mankato, the Reverend D. C. John, M.A., is listed as the teacher of “school economy” and the Latin language. All of the subjects proposed by Principal Phelps in 1870 are included. In addition are Latin, bookkeeping, history of civil government, trigonometry, zoology, astronomy, general history, history of the English language, and the history of education. The citizens’ committee from Mankato that wanted mathematics and the classics must have been pleased at how things came around—in time, that is.

By the following year, the “offerings” had been sorted out and new terminology adopted for various programs. It must have been all very clear to those actually working in the schools at the time, but from the distance of several generations, today’s reader of these catalogues is bewildered. One catalogue states that the “E” Class has been discontinued. This means that students who did not meet entrance requirements could no longer enroll in review courses to prepare themselves for official entrance. Students enrolled in 1877-1878 were listed in four groups: Class A, Class B, Class C, and Class D—apparently corresponding to the four semesters of the two-year programming. Those in their fourth semester would be in Class A. But a year later Class C apparently refers to a whole year of work—the first year of a three-year program. The second-year courses were divided into two programs, one called the “English” course and the other called the “Ad-
vanced Course." It thus appears that students who planned to stay only two years entered the C Class their first year and in the second year were in the English B Class. There is no English A group as yet. The three-year course is called the Advanced Course: the B Class the second year of the program and the A Class the third year. The principal distinction of the Advanced Course beyond the fact that it was a three-year program is that students took two years of Latin.

An interesting addendum to this terminology confusion was the note in the catalogue that experience had proved that in Minnesota at the time there were many persons failing to pass the entrance exams who simply had no opportunity to make better preparation, and so they were once again to be conditionally admitted; but this time not to an E Class but to a Preparatory Class.

By the catalogue of 1880-1881, the term Advanced Class had been dropped; it is simply called the Latin Course. But advanced was too good a word to drop, and it reappears in the catalogue of 1881-1882. Now there are a three-year program called the Elementary Course* and a new four-year course called the Advanced Course. The first year is the same for both programs, and there is little difference in the second year; but in the third and fourth years of the Advanced Course students were to take Latin.

This situation—a four-year program including Latin, and a three-year program without Latin—continued until the fall of 1884, when an alternate one-year Professional Course was announced. This was to take care of students who had taken academic courses elsewhere—presumably in high schools or academies, possibly a few in colleges—students who were transferring to the Normal for work in professional education. It is thus a parallel to the MAT program of the mid 1960’s, a master of arts in teaching for students coming to Mankato State College with a bachelor’s degree but without work in professional education.

The appearance of this provision for high school graduates

*Elementary does not here refer to grades one through six or eight as in later terminology. Both Elementary and Advanced courses were preparation for teaching in what we call elementary schools.
is itself evidence of the growth in popularity of high schools. When the "common schools" were the practical limit of public education in the state, the Normal had started there. As the level of public education rose, the offerings of the teacher-education institution recognized each advance, and curriculums were built on the preparation level of the students enrolling.

The catalogue of 1886-1887 notes that the Preparatory Department has once again been abolished. The vacillation in this matter reflects two-way pulls: to take care of potential students coming from rural and other areas without high school facilities and to avoid competing with high schools that were functioning. There is some discrepancy in various records as to when preparatory departments were entirely dropped from Minnesota normals, but the late 80's would be about it.

The high school was rapidly assuming its place as a basic element of public education in America. The number of high schools in the country almost doubled between 1880 and 1890 and substantially more than doubled again between 1890 and 1900 (and it would continue this doubling decade by decade until the 1930's).

The public high school idea was about a half century old at the founding of Mankato Normal, but the boom did not come until after the Civil War. That it met a felt need is evidenced by the way the idea caught on. In 1872 the Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for the year 1870 lists twenty-two schools in Minnesota as institutions of secondary education. The name high school does not appear. A majority are affiliated with churches, particularly the Roman Catholic. A few list no denominational affiliation. Practically all appear to be private academies. They range in enrollment from sixteen, in the Select School at Mankato, to 1048 in the German Catholic School at St. Paul. The total enrollment for the twenty-two academies is about three thousand, but most schools had only a few dozen students. The figures of the Report may be optimistic, may include more than the strictly secondary pupils. In 1874 the report of the State Su-
perintendent of Public Instruction lists these enrollments for the various types of educational institutions in Minnesota:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common schools</td>
<td>128,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal schools</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academies</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private schools</td>
<td>2,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133,822</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1890, the *Biennial Report* of the Superintendent of Public Instruction lists sixty-four "state" high schools, classified as first, second, and third class. In Minnesota, as throughout much of the country, people seemed convinced that a democracy could not consistently limit its leadership to a class which could afford to pay for its own education, and therefore the high school took its place in public education. Within a generation after the founding of the Mankato Normal, two-thirds of all students in secondary education were enrolled in public high schools.

Both the academies and their successors, the public high schools, sent their students out to become teachers—just as the liberal arts colleges were to do. In Minnesota the normal departments of high schools supplied a substantial percentage of the teaching force. In fact one of the arguments for high schools stated by the Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1875 was that with four-to-six weeks normal courses (subsidized by the State), high schools could supply many teachers for rural schools. This matter of teacher-supply for rural schools was a vacuum which normals never did fill. Students with normal training could usually go to better jobs in town and in graded schools. The peak in the teacher-training departments in high schools came before World War I, but a report in 1924 indicates that over half of the rural teachers in Minnesota came from this source.

Governor Davis in 1875 had asked the Legislature to establish preparatory schools in various cities, the curriculum to be set by the University and the salary of the "preceptor" in each school
to be paid by the State. "The University," he said, "should begin where the highest grade of the common school leaves off." At that time, he pointed out, there were no preparatory schools in the state. "The State," he argued "which can afford both a university and a system of common schools ought to connect them and make one harmonious scheme of our educational interests." Such a scheme of preparatory schools would make the University "not only the rich man's privilege, but also the poor man's available right."

It is clear that Governor Davis was thinking of high schools as preparatory schools for institutions of higher education. But there were others who saw a different role for the public high school. In his next annual report, David Burt, Superintendent of Public Instruction, objected to the proposal for the University to dominate the high school curriculum. The high school should exist, he wrote, "not so much to fill the University, as to furnish the sons and daughters of their patrons what they want, and what parents are willing to pay for as the final schooling of their children." The high school is seen as "the coming glory of popular education . . . the advantages of superior education are brought within the reach of all classes."

Here again we note how educational institutions are most likely to develop in a democracy: they survive and prosper as they meet the needs of the people. Theorists might argue for logical partitioning of responsibility, but both in public schools directly controlled by the state and local governments and in private academies and colleges, it was not the founders who determined the services the institutions were to perform but the constituents. It has been so for a century: there is little likelihood that the same forces will not continue to determine how the resources of any school or any campus are to be used.

That the emergence of a four-year public school beyond the previous eight grades is a major factor in determining the level of work and the nature of the curriculum at the normal schools would seem beyond dispute. But of course it was disputed—
another virtual certainty of democratic debate. That will show up a little further down the road.

The overview of curriculum development at Mankato reveals that the most striking changes are adaptation to the level of preparation of entering students. This is seeing curriculum in relation to the educational level adopted. There are other ways, however, of studying curriculum development. One of basic interest and importance is the content of the curriculum—the books that were studied as texts, the changes in philosophy and point of view, the techniques of teacher education. The present review includes too little of this story. It is a study in itself—at least as interesting as the broader outline sketched here. There was, however, one phase of the preparation of teachers for the "common schools" which should be mentioned, for this was an extension of the school years in the other direction—the kindergarten.

A kindergarten department was established in 1894, and thereby hangs a tale. About this time the president of the Normal School Board was much concerned over the quality of instruction in the schools. Each year a committee of Board members visited each of the campuses and gave students who were candidates for graduation oral and written examinations. The Board had passed a motion in 1893 "that schools shall graduate only those approved by the examining committee . . . ." The first young lady to prepare for kindergarten teaching at Mankato spent the year in subjects special to kindergarten work, and when the examining committee appeared in the spring, she did well in her field. However, the committee felt that in addition she should take all the tests that others preparing to teach in elementary schools took, and the girl refused. She said she had been informed that it was the kindergarten she was preparing for—not the regular grades. She had not reviewed those other subjects for a long time, and she knew she would do badly. The case was carried to the Board.

The important aspect of the matter is that the Board concluded that kindergarten work should be in addition to the preparation of elementary teachers. The teacher should be fully aware
of the elementary school’s work and problems so that she could 
better prepare her students for what they would be encountering. 
To this day this philosophy of kindergarten preparation has con­
tinued at Mankato.

Admission to the Normal had been generally by examination 
or a second-class teacher’s certificate. There had also been provision 
for advanced standing either on the basis of examination or cer­
tificate or diploma from approved schools. The announcements 
for the fall of 1888 stated that the "certificate of the State High 
School Board will also be received in lieu of examination in the 
subjects covered." Here in 1888 high school certification in cer­
tain subjects is mentioned as the last of several alternative means 
of admission. A generation later it will be the standard form of 
admission, virtually the sine qua non— and two generations later 
it will be considered by many an open-door policy inimical to aca­
demic standards.

The three-year Elementary Course and the four-year Ad­
vanced Course continued until the fall of 1895 when a fifth year 
was added to the Advanced Course. For the first time, too, the 
Advanced Course might be either a five-year English course or a 
five-year Latin course. The catalogue the year before had noted the 
growth of the school (as it had done every year since the coming 
of President Searing), but it reported that “this increased atten­
dance has been almost exclusively in the upper classes.” (Some­thing over a half century later, in the 1950’s enrollment figures for 
Mankato State College would reflect a similar phenomenon—with 
the difference that the “upper classes” would then refer to college 
juniors and seniors and graduate students.)

The 1895 program not only included five-year courses but 
also three courses for the high school graduate: a one-year Kindergarten, a one-year Elementary, and a two-year Advanced. It 
would appear that the latter envisioned study on the level of the 
sixth year above the common schools. The two-year junior-col-
A Collegiate Program

Looking back at what was happening in the high schools, one wonders where the teachers came from. Good schools need good teachers—so the formula ran. This argument had created the normal schools. Good high schools also needed good teachers. Naturally it would seem that the institutions created to prepare teachers would have developed programs for the preparation of high school teachers. It worked out that way in some other states, but the story in Minnesota was a little different.

Such a development would have caused the normals to become four-year colleges. Such a development was related to the vested interests of the already established collegiate institutions, the University and the private colleges.

The normal schools in Minnesota became state teachers colleges by legislative act in 1921, but this change came a quarter of a century after the concept of teacher education on an exclusively collegiate level began to be discussed. In 1896 the Minnesota Superintendent of Public Instruction, W. W. Pendergast, in his annual report tossed the first straw into the wind: “By recent action of the Massachusetts State Board of Education none but graduates of high schools having a full four years’ range of high school subjects, shall be admitted to any normal school in the commonwealth.” He continued: “We are not yet ready to take so long a step in advance. But every move we make shall be in that direction.”

By 1890 a state normal in Michigan had a six-year course to prepare high school teachers. In 1902, Ohio established normal schools at liberal arts colleges in Athens and Oxford. In 1907, the Illinois legislature authorized four normals in that state to confer degrees. Iowa took the same step in 1910, but backed away again two years later. In 1908 the presidents of the normal schools in
Wisconsin recommended to the regents that they become four-year degree-granting colleges, something which did not come about until 1925. The normals schools in Missouri were granting baccalaureate degrees in the first decade of the twentieth century.

In his annual report in 1911, President G. E. Maxwell of Winona cited a list of states whose normals were already operating as four-year degree-granting colleges: Cedar Falls, Iowa, four Illinois normals, Ypsilanti in Michigan, Terre Haute in Indiana, the Missouri normals, Peru in Nebraska, Greeley in Colorado, and Emporia in Kansas.

It was in the air. The previous spring (1910) when Winona was celebrating its Semicentennial, the presidents of the normal schools had brought before the Board two recommendations. The first was for a diploma program representing three years beyond high school, six years of work if the student had no high school preparation. The second was for a four-year post-high-school program (seven years if the student had no high school work) leading to a degree in education. The presidents proposed that this extension of offering be made only if the Legislature made additional appropriations to cover the added expense. The Board decided to study the presidents' recommendations and confer with state high school and University authorities "with a view of reaching a harmonious basis for any change or enlargement in the instruction to be given in the normal schools . . . ."

Evidently the first serious action to secure authorization of degree programs came in 1911. In the report of the State Normal School Board covering the period ending July 3, 1912, the president of the Board, Mr. Ell Torrance, wrote a revealing account of what had happened and the road block encountered:

At the last session of the legislature a bill was introduced, which had the approval of this board, aiming to extend the present normal school course by two years [that is, a total of four years beyond high school], thus making it possible to give the normal students a more thorough and complete training and to train principals for graded schools, teachers for the training departments in high schools, and make the normal schools more effective agencies in the leadership and direction of public school work.
The act failed to pass largely because of the fear that it would make possible, in time, the conversion of the several normal schools into normal colleges. At its meeting in August of the present year [1912], the Normal Board and the presidents after a full discussion of this subject, decided to renew the request. In this connection a conference was held between the Normal Board and the presidents, with representatives of the state university, the private colleges, the members of the high school board and its inspectors.* The conference developed a very friendly spirit and cooperative interest on the part of the educational institutions of the state and resulted in the Normal Board, upon recommendation of the normal school presidents, postponing for the present further activity in the effort to secure a law necessary to make the proposed extended course of study attractive to students desiring to obtain the degree of Bachelor of Education.

What took place at this meeting may be inferred. This was very likely the famous agreement that the normals would train teachers for the elementary grades and leave the preparation of high school teachers to the University and the private colleges. In his next report, President of the Board Torrance seemed to be making this point when he wrote this declaration of normal school policy: "The primary purpose and fundamental aim of these schools is and has been the training of teachers for the elementary schools of the state." He went on to repeat the account of the get-together which had taken place two years earlier—in almost the same words he had used before. There was no question: he wanted it in the record!

Earlier, in the same report in which President Maxwell of Winona had reviewed the list of other normal schools then granting four-year degrees, the Winona president had put into his report this statement:

There is no ambition on the part of the Minnesota normal schools to direct their efforts toward the preparation of high school teachers. The elementary school alone with increased salaries, with demands for better prepared teachers in all grades, teachers in departmental work, and trained specialists and supervisors, sufficiently justifies the enlarged facilities . . . . The normal school should regard these problems of elementary education as directly and quite exclusively its own . . . .

The first sentence of the catalogue for 1914-1915 (with announcements for the next year) echoed what Torrance had put

*In the later report, Torrance stated that this meeting was held in November of 1913. This can hardly be, for the previous account was apparently already in print long before that.
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into his annual report a few months earlier: "'The school is maintained by the state for the purpose of training teachers for the elementary schools.'" This sentence continued to be the opening catalogue statement without alteration for the next two years. It was dropped in the 1917-1918 catalogue.

There were a number of factors which tended to delay the Minnesota normals' becoming four-year institutions preparing teachers for both elementary and high schools. No doubt the private colleges and the University did not encourage such a move. Then there were political factors. Through the years the normal schools have had somewhat fewer of their graduates sitting on legislative committees than enrollment figures alone might suggest. Elementary teaching led in most instances to domestic housekeeping, seldom to legislative. As the teaching staff for elementary schools became preponderantly female, the practice of a man's teaching a country school for a few terms before he went into business or on to professional school declined. Hence the normals had no strong party of graduates in the legislature, and bills must command attention on their sheer merits, on the contributions which would be made to education in Minnesota. That under the circumstances the graph of development shows a steady succession of rising to new levels of responsibility is indication of the fundamental nature of the business teachers are conducting. A third significant affective factor, as was noted earlier, was that alone among the public institutions of education (excepting special services to those with particular handicaps) the normals derived virtually all of their support from taxes. Any expansion of the function of the normals would meet with the objection that the taxes would be higher. Again, that a century of these schools is a constant story of upgrading is eloquent testimony that better teachers for better schools was an idea taxpayers and legislators supported; that they regularly turned for the implementation of this idea to the state teacher-education institutions is persuasive evidence that normal school and teachers college graduates produced in the communities they served the desire for more school-
ing and better schools.

One further point should be mentioned, probably the crucial one at this juncture. It appears from the record that having a definite section of the teacher-training field reserved as their special province appealed to the normal school administrators. The market for elementary teachers was the big one in teacher education, and it could absorb all the graduates the normal schools could possibly produce. With the disruptions attendant to World War I, the teacher shortage grew acute, and salaries rose. Moreover, that war was long before the day of WAC’s and WAVE’s; and enrollments in normal schools were less affected by military enlistments and drafts than colleges having a larger percentage of men students. Also, apparently the shortage of teachers did not for some time affect the high schools. In 1918, C. G. Schulz, Superintendent of the State Department of Education, could say that the College of Education of the University of Minnesota and the private colleges were handling the preparation of high school teachers “in an efficient manner.” By November of 1920, the new State Board of Education was reporting on the “Teacher Problem” in Minnesota: three hundred short that year and eighteen hundred unprepared for the positions they were holding. Yet the Board could add that “with few exceptions, the high school departments were supplied with teachers who meet the standards of qualification.”

From the standpoints of both prudent legislatures and prudent normal school administrators there was a good case for the normals to stick to their last. Here was a field with a good demand and minimal competition. If high schools could be supplied with teachers by institutions not on the public payroll, why make a change?

These were arguments of expediency. The issue was larger, and the wave of the future rolled on. The ultimate issue was of course the question, “What kind of education makes the best high school teacher?” There was quite general agreement that a college degree was very desirable—and normal schools were late entrants
in fully collegiate programs. There was the usual hassle about professional education vs. subject-matter competency. It will probably never be settled on a theoretical level. What did happen was that the conviction prevailed that studying the job of teaching was as relevant for the high school teacher as for the elementary. Thus when normal schools became fully collegiate in their programs and when certification of high school teachers required professional education, the teachers colleges easily and naturally became teacher-preparation agencies for all the public schools of the state.

The famous “meeting” and the printed pronouncements of the “General Aims of Normal Schools” were given publicity because there had been a history. At the turn of the century the Board had approved the offering of “post-graduate” work in courses needed for high school certification—provided each class had twelve or more students. Although a full program of work for teaching in high schools was far in the future, steps in that direction continued to be made. After 1916 only high school graduates were admitted at Mankato. The 1917-1918 catalogue announced a program for junior-high teachers: three years beyond high school. There were also similar programs for supervisors of music and for teachers of home economics. These special fields and the junior high school were bridges. Apparently the Board was not ready or the times were not ready for the normals to cross these bridges, for the programs were modified the next year and disappeared the following year.

In 1921 the Legislature approved the idea which had been rejected ten years before. All of the state normal schools in Minnesota became state teachers colleges and were authorized “to award appropriate degrees to persons who complete the prescribed four-year curriculum.”

A milestone had been passed, but unostentatiously. The degree was not prescribed, nor the curriculum. The Legislature simply authorized the schools to develop as four-year teachers colleges. The Board was thus given a vote of full confidence.
Theirs was the responsibility of supervising this development.

There was no four-year program at Mankato in 1921 although legally the institution was a four-year college. There was a three-year course for teaching in the junior high school. The catalogue announcement for the fall of 1922 did present a four-year program for elementary administrators and junior high school teachers. However, a year later, the fall of 1923, all mention of programs beyond two years was dropped. This catalogue was compiled in the year the main building of the College was burned to the ground, and space had to be found wherever it could be found. The time was hardly propitious for frontal advance in curriculum. The fire, however, could have been only a temporary delay. Actually years rolled by with no extension of the standard two-year curriculum. It was not until the announcements for the fall of 1928 that mention was again made in the catalogue of a program beyond the junior-college level:

The fields of work in elementary education for which the teachers' colleges are to furnish advanced preparation have now been determined by the State Teachers College Board. In the four-year course the colleges will train:

1. Teachers or principals in elementary schools of either the six-year or the eight-year type.
2. Teachers or principals in junior high schools.
3. Teachers in high school teacher training departments.
4. Supervisors of elementary schools.
5. Teachers of physical education.
6. Teachers of general industrial training.
7. Teachers of music and art.

Holders of this diploma will not be certified as general high school teachers.

The announcement went on to say that the programs for these areas were being developed, but only the general outline of the four-year programs was presented.*

Events of the kind that are being traced in this review usually cast long shadows before them. Although there was a considerable gap between the legislative authorization of a four-year program for Mankato and the full implementation of such a curriculum,

*On May 5, 1925 President Cooper presented to the Board as the recommendation of the presidents a "Temporary Four Year Curriculum." This was approved and no doubt was used by students, but it was never officially published in the catalogue of Mankato State Teachers College.
students kept taking courses beyond the junior-college level. They had been doing this for years, and all through the twenties the "Register of Students" in the annual catalogues listed not only "juniors" and "seniors" (we should call them freshmen and sophomores), but also "Third Year Students." While the catalogues did not list three-year and four-year programs, there were courses which could be used as "electives" or for "Advanced Credits." In the school year of 1927-1928, fifty-eight persons were in this group.

In the fall of 1928, the four-year curriculum was again described as "in active preparation, but . . . not ready for publication at this time." But now the Register of Students called (for the first time) the third-year students "juniors." There were seventy-eight juniors, and, also for the first time, five "seniors."

The catalogue announcement for the fall of 1930 finally presented a "Four-Year Degree Curriculum." The year before there had been one hundred thirty third-year students, and the first bachelor's degree had been awarded in 1927. The four-year curriculum climaxd the leadership of President Cooper, who retired from the presidency in the spring of 1930. A year before, the catalogue had described the scope of the work of the College as two-year programs in elementary, junior high school, and certain special teaching fields, but in 1930 the curriculums are for "the different departments and fields of the public schools."

This new program offered majors in nine academic areas, in addition to professional education: English, social studies, science, mathematics, foreign languages (French, Latin, German), industrial arts, physical education, music, and fine arts.

Thus in the fall of 1930, Mankato State Teachers College at last had a degree program for both elementary and secondary teaching. It was almost twenty years after the presidents and the Board had proposed a four-year curriculum and had been turned down because it might lead to changing the normals into colleges. It was almost a decade since the right to grant degrees had received legislative authorization.
A recital of chronology, one feels, gives only limited awareness of reasons for the way things work out. In this situation, no doubt the final approval mainly reflected the need for high school teachers. High school enrollments had increased regularly, and the 1920's showed the fastest rate of growth in high school enrollment the country had ever known.

What were the other factors? Were they in the faculty and administration, in the official board, in the State Department of Education, in the educational climate of the state? One suspects that the answer is yes to all of these. Minnesota was not a leader in the growing role of the teachers colleges in American education, but it was a part of it. The forces that demanded more of the state teachers colleges in other states eventually produced similar effects in Minnesota. One of the interesting stories in American public education would be an account of the frontier line: what states took the initiative occasionally, or consistently, or rarely, or never? Which states developed and supported only those programs for which there was ample precedent? And what were the affective factors—personalities, economics, population? That is a story beyond the province of this account, but one continually has the feeling that the Mankato story is mostly what it was because America was what it was, that we pick up one stick from a bundle—the fasces, as it were, e pluribus unum. Actually, the other way around, too: each one emerging as the many made it possible.

Behind the catalogue announcement of 1930 that the teachers colleges of Minnesota would prepare teachers for both elementary and high schools were events that show up in the Minutes of the Presidents and the Board. In 1925, the program of advancing a year at a time was abandoned. The three-year course was abandoned because the demand for teachers was for those with either a two-year or a four-year preparation. The Board in May of that year authorized a four-year course in elementary education, but as stated above, it never did get into the Mankato catalogue. In March of 1928 the Board approved a resolution that the function of teachers colleges in Minnesota was "the training of teachers for
the public schools of the state." The original language of the law back in 1858 had been that the normal schools were "established to educate and prepare teachers for the common schools of this State." Thus in 1928 the Board was proclaiming that by then the "common schools" of Minnesota were the public schools. Such an interpretation would naturally include high schools. In that March meeting, the Board did not specifically act on this premise and included in the fields of teaching at the teachers colleges only elementary, junior high, and three special fields—physical education, industrial arts, and music.

But the point had been made, and in September of the same year James M. McConnell, State Commissioner of Education and ex officio secretary of the Board, raised the question of extending the work of the four-year course to include the training of high school teachers. The matter was discussed at length, and at the next meeting, in December of 1928, the Board specifically authorized the several colleges to offer four-year courses of study for the training of both elementary and high school teachers. The following spring, in May 1929, a full four-year curriculum for both elementary and high school teaching was adopted. This was too late, no doubt, for the catalogue announcements that year, but as told above it appeared in the announcements for 1930.

The thirty-five year transition from school to college is itself a commentary on education in a democracy. There was first the vision the leaders had. There was the looking at what other states were doing. There was balancing the claims of competitors and the attempt to work out a compromise which could keep everybody happy. There was the simple, clear, terse authorization of 1921 that freed the colleges for a quarter century of change and did not restrict them to contemporary terminology. There was responsibility on the part of lay citizens serving on the Board. There was the careful building of academic standards and accreditations by the colleges. But perhaps above all there was a commonwealth of people who wanted educational opportunity for their children.
and who were determined to use the resources of the State to achieve that end.

When Frank D. McElroy came as president in the fall of 1930, people were still saying that prosperity was just around the corner. The years that lay ahead, however, as we know now, were going to be rough ones: the depression of the 1930's and the war years. When the war was over, President McElroy's administration was also over. One could hardly avoid the conclusion that all of those years were abnormal in our economy, years in many respects of hanging on, carrying on, doing the best one could with what one had. When goods were to be had, money wasn't. When income rose, production was for free-world survival.

That was not the whole picture. People who could not get jobs might go to college or go back to college—especially to a state supported college where costs were low. The institutions which depended on private philanthropy were hardest hit; the depression years there were times of low salaries or delayed payments or, sometimes, contracts which could not be met at all.

It was a mixed picture. In the 1930's there was in the United States an actual drop of about ten percent in total enrollment in elementary schools (despite the theme song of Eddie Cantor that since "tomatoes are cheaper, potatoes are cheaper, now's the time to fall in love!"); but there was at the same time a fifty percent increase in high school enrollment, and the number of high school graduates doubled. In the previous decade, the 1920's, college graduates had more than doubled in number. The state teachers colleges of Minnesota, despite the 1921 authorization, had almost no participation in the college boom of the twenties. In the 1930's college enrollments despite the depression rose another fifty percent. Mankato State Teachers College did participate in this development. In 1930, there were ten students who graduated with a four-year degree. For the sixteen years from 1930 through 1945, there were graduated with the bachelor's degree an average of about sixty-two students each year. Total enrollment of the Col-
college during the regular year (September to June) was usually in the six or seven hundreds. Twice it was higher (1907 in 1939 and 865 in 1940), and four years it was fewer than six hundred. In the summers, teachers returned to upgrade their certificates, and they added substantially to the total annual enrollments—which were usually about a thousand, but over fifteen hundred in 1939. Approximately two thirds of the students were enrolled as freshmen and sophomores.

The two-year diploma qualified students for certification to teach in elementary schools. A plateau of teacher preparation had been reached here, and upgrading would wait until after the war. With this situation, unless a college moved strongly into the field of preparing high school teachers, a plateau in the whole program was predictable.

Entrance requirements remained the same. The basic curriculum options remained the same. The departments of instruction were regrouped into five divisions, and Spanish and physics were added. Handwriting was in 1945 no longer an area of instruction. In the catalogue for 1930-1931 one hundred thirty-five courses were described. Sixteen years later there were twice that number.

A sampling of course titles in a department is suggestive of what was being taught. In 1931 there were twenty-one English courses: two in composition, one in public speaking, six in literature, and twelve in materials and methods of teaching the language arts on the various levels from the kindergarten through high school. A decade and a half later the English department listed thirty courses (four courses in the teaching of reading had become the province of Education). Of these thirty, six were in public speaking and seven in teaching various branches and levels of the language arts. Another way of seeing this would be to note that composition courses increased from two to five, literature from six to twelve, speech from one to six, and methods were partially re-located in Education.

In 1931, there were seven courses in Mathematics: one in
trigonometry, one in college algebra, and five in the teaching of mathematics. In 1945, there were two courses in the teaching of mathematics and eight in the subject-matter of mathematics—through integral calculus.

If these samplings are representative, it would appear that under President McElroy course offerings in the various departments were substantially increased, particularly in the academic areas. The number of courses listed in Education increased about fifty percent, but as indicated above, this included some departmental reshuffling.

With the number of different courses in high schools exceeding those in elementary schools and with the need for courses sufficient to permit specialization by each student in a major and two minor areas of concentration, such expansion of academic offering was demanded.

Here again one notes how one side of the institution's development is tied to other developments. Prospective high school teachers would not select a state teachers college until a four-year program for them was announced. But courses could not be offered until there were students to fill the classes. In a state college new appropriations for faculty are hard to get until present classes are overflowing. It is somewhat like a mountain climber ascending a narrow chimney. He puts his feet on one side, his back on the other. Scootching up his feet he gets that side a bit higher. Twisting his shoulder blades, he inches up his backside. And he pushes hard to maintain friction all the time because he's a goner if he slips! So in across-the-board curriculum expansion.

One of the affective factors in the course offering expansion of the McElroy era was the upgrading of the faculty. In 1931 about one in seven had doctorates. When the war began, almost one in three had this advanced degree. Apparently about forty percent of the faculty did not have a graduate degree in the early thirties. In 1941, before the depletion for war work, almost ninety percent had a master's or a doctor's degree. People with this kind of specialized training are the explanation or the con-
comitant of the increased specialization in course offering.

Closely allied to the upgrading of course offering and faculty qualification was the push for accreditation. In the 1920’s the Minnesota teachers colleges had been classed as Class A schools by the American Associataion of Teachers Colleges, but this did not automatically secure for the graduates entry into graduate schools without penalty of probationary status and an extension of the time necessary to complete a degree. The 1940-1941 catalogue is the first to announce that the College had also become accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. A subsequent catalogue points out that “this latter membership enables graduates to enter graduate schools of various universities and to be certified to teach in any states recognizing this Association.”

Parallel with this shaping up of the academic status of the institution were other developments which would have conditioned approval by the North Central Association: the organization of the College to achieve the objectives it had set for itself.

In the announcement for 1931, the purpose of preparing teachers for the public schools of Minnesota was declared to be “a single purpose, professional in nature, to which the College will give all its resources.” This is an echo of the mid-nineteenth century case for normal schools; they were specialists in professional education for teaching. That this is exactly what was intended is born out further on in the same announcement:

The institution is dominated by a belief that teaching is a profession of high rank, equal to any in professional service and opportunities for advancement.

These statements were reprinted in catalogues for several years. They sound defensive, if not defiant. They appear to be expression of a felt need to justify the institution by what was peculiar to it in higher education. This explains the high percentage of courses in “materials and methods of teaching” this subject or that.

The reader will recall that the issue was much the same in
the beginning. Since then the teacher-preparation curriculum had grown from one or two years to six or eight. The difference was almost entirely in the academic background thought desirable for the teacher: four years in high school, plus about half to three-fourths of his college work.

In the catalogue announcement for the fall of 1938, there was a new emphasis on liberal studies:

To the young men and women of Minnesota who are high school graduates, the Mankato State Teachers College offers an opportunity for a liberal and a professional education.

While the Mankato State Teachers College is a professional school, dedicated to the education of young people for the teaching profession, it is more than that. In order to do that, it must first of all give students a liberal education and make them strong personalities; then it must give them the professional knowledge and skill needed for superior teaching.

The syntax and idiom might be a little rough here, but a point is being made. The statement continued:

This is accomplished by dividing the four-year course so that the first two years are purely academic and the last two years are both academic and professional. The junior college work is given over to the development of a general background of information prerequisite to a study of the field in which the professional work is done. In the second two years the mastery of the field of concentration or special interest is gained, along with the study of the professional courses and the practice with the children in the laboratory and cooperating schools.

We should notice that the program of the College is here described as a four-year program. No mention of the two-year diploma for elementary teachers is made in this description of the function and philosophy of the College. Seventeen pages later the "Two-year Diploma Course" is explained. About seventy percent of the graduates were still two-year graduates.

During the twenties and early thirties, one frequently encounters in reports and College publications the statement that there had been considerable concern that the College in becoming a four-year institution would abandon its two-year program. Officials repeatedly assured the public that there was no such intention. It was thus sixteen years after the name change before the College seemed to be deliberately cultivating an image of an
institute which was primarily a four-year college. From this point on, significant curriculum developments will all be in the direction of programs leading to a baccalaureate or a graduate degree—or to retraining or short-course updating of previous graduates.*

A State College

The strengthening of course offerings in academic departments was necessary if the teachers colleges were to prepare high school teachers, but the same subjects which provided the general educational background of the teacher frequently worked just as well as preprofessional studies for other professions. The logical next step in the evolution of the institution was to make these resources available to all the citizens of the state whether they were planning to become teachers or not.

From the beginning the function of the school had been teacher education. No doubt only a fraction of the students who attended the normal or the teachers college made life-long careers of teaching. That teaching was something a girl did a few years before she married was the standard image. In the beginning, educators felt that such a short teaching career limited the amount of time one could afford to devote to special training to a year or two. This naturally was an obstacle to curriculum expansion, so reasonable that quite likely the one-and two-year normal would have remained permanently had not the very existence of public education whetted the taste for more and higher schooling. There must be studies around showing that the children of school teachers were conditioned to keep on with school, to graduate from high school, to enroll in college in numbers greater than the average of the population. A little schooling creates a faith that more would open more doors of opportunity. The school teachers may drop out of teaching permanently or only for a while, but the

*After Mankato became a multi-purpose state college, a variety of technical programs began to emerge, the length of the program designed to meet the needs of the special group served.
next generation will be school minded, college minded.

With men the situation was only different in degree. Keeping school was an interim experience for many men. Here too no doubt the men became parents of children conditioned to think in terms of professional careers which would require college and professional preparation. It seems likely that only a few men left teaching to enter careers where formal education was not considered a vocational or professional asset, and this too would condition the children of the father to aim at specialized and professional careers. That many would enter business was, as it turned out, not necessarily a lessening of interest in better schools. If they prospered they could afford to support better schools, and the evidence is clear that they have done so.

Moreover, one of the most consistently attractive appeals of higher education has been the correlation between educational achievement and personal income. Many studies through the years have pointed this out. The income of the college graduate is likely to run about double that of the high school graduate, almost three times that of the person whose education stopped with what used to be called the "common schools."

It has always been debated whether this reflects the value of the educational experience or whether it simply indicates that persons with more aptitude continued longer with their education. The latter alternative would seem likely on the face of the matter: successful people can afford to give children more schooling; the better stock probably produces offspring with superior aptitude; children who succeed continue. All such factors would argue that were schools nothing but screening facilities, their graduates would likely make fine records.

Yet this really does not seem to be the whole story. The income comparison cited above was made by the National Bureau of Economic Research in 1965. A not dissimilar situation was reported in 1900. In "a biographical dictionary of living Americans who had achieved more than ordinary success in some calling," persons with a college degree apparently had about six times
the likelihood of being listed as the general population. Moreover, those who had made outstanding academic records had almost three times the chance of listing as the average college graduate.

When these two reports, separated by two-thirds of a century, are coupled with one more, the case for education itself as the effective factor is strengthened. Although the number of students enrolled in college rose dramatically, the ratio of high school seniors entering college remained fairly constant. It seems reasonably clear, therefore, that although a much larger percentage of the people were continuing with education, the probabilities of advantage for the educated were just as striking in the 1960's as they were at the beginning of the century.

When, therefore, the teachers colleges expanded course offerings and upgraded faculty qualifications to offer majors and minors in the various fields, there was already a demand for the use of the college facilities by persons who did not intend to teach.

Throughout all the history of the normal school, students who enrolled would be granted free tuition if they promised to teach at least two years after graduation. But even in the beginning there were some who did not "take the pledge." By the middle of the twentieth century, a very large percentage of entering freshmen—one check indicated sixty-five percent—were undecided about a choice of vocation. Since by that time the first two years of college work were largely in general education, a student could enroll at Mankato and find himself as he explored the courses offered by the different departments.

This condition had two effects. Many students who had no intention of teaching came to Mankato for a year or two of college work and terminated or transferred to other institutions for advanced work. On the other hand it was commonplace for many of these persons to decide to become teachers. The result was increased recruitment for the teaching profession at the same time that teachers colleges were being transformed into "state colleges"—that is, into multi-purpose area colleges.
The logic of the situation was such that this development was general. Brickman and Lehre in their history of higher education state that within twenty years after the normal schools became teachers colleges, they began transforming themselves into general state colleges or universities granting liberal arts degrees. The change-of-name-to-teachers-colleges phase peaked in the 1920's. In California the state normal schools became teachers colleges in 1921—the same year as the change came to Minnesota—and in 1935 the teachers colleges of California became state colleges. Bowling Green and Kent in Ohio became state colleges in 1929.

The overall picture of the move from teachers-college to state-college status emerges from the examination of a directory like the ninth edition of *American Colleges and Universities* (1964), published by the American Council on Education. It appears that in this evolution a very few, perhaps three, teachers colleges made the transition before 1930, a half dozen in the 1930's, a score in the 1940's, a few more than that in the 1950's, others in the early 1960's. By the middle of the 1960's, there were in the United States fewer than a dozen and a half state teachers colleges or state colleges of education that had not become state colleges or state universities.

At Mankato the name was changed to Mankato State College in 1957.

The years following World War II have seen large increases in college enrollments. They were touched off by the so-called GI Bill, which subsidized education for persons with service in the Armed Forces. The crest of this boom came in 1949, when almost two and a half million students enrolled in institutions of higher education. The Korean conflict augmented the decline, 1951 being nationally the lowest year in college enrollments since 1946. Then with a new GI Bill, enrollments rose once more. Between 1946 and 1964 enrollment in higher education rose from about two million to almost five—an increase of approximately one
hundred fifty percent.

In the 1920's, it will be recalled, the teachers colleges of Minnesota were not ready to participate in the growth of college enrollment except on a junior-college level in programs of education for elementary teaching—with the exception of a few courses for a few students who wanted work beyond their diploma requirements.

In the 1930's, a new image of the service the College could perform for the State emerged, but about the time faculty and course offerings had been readied for greater breadth and depth of curriculum, the war intruded with its imperatives and priorities. Immediately following the close of hostilities, however, a new role for Mankato rapidly evolved. Although the location of the College at Mankato in the center of the southern part of the state (an agricultural and trade area which year after year had known strong economic stability) seemed the favored one for a state college, the history of the institution had not shown that this potential had been either realized or achieved. In the beginning, the elder sister at Winona took the lead. Later the school at St. Cloud became the largest of the normals.

There would have been substantial growth of any good collegiate institution, and the forte of the state teachers colleges was especially conducive to this. Teacher shortages developed just as they had after World War I, and as soon as the crop of "war babies" began to reach school age, the shortages became critical. But the expansion at Mankato was way beyond statistical probabilities. As was noted above, nationwide the growth to the mid-sixties was about one and a half times the immediate post-war figure. The Mankato catalogue for 1946-1947 reported that during the previous year there were a few more than one thousand different individuals enrolled at the College in the year ending with the Spring Quarter of 1946, almost exactly the same number as the year previously. The catalogue for 1966-1968, twenty years later reported that for the year of June 1964 through the Spring Quarter of 1965 there were 13,378 different students en-
rolled either on a full-time or a part-time basis. It included students enrolled for classes during the day and those offered in the evening or on Saturday. It included those enrolled on campus and those in courses taught by faculty members in a score or more of communities in the area. It included some students who received part of their instruction by television. And of course it included students who enrolled in one or both of the two summer sessions. There was a time when full-time fall quarter or fall semester enrollment gave a reasonably true measure of the number of students enrolled in a college and therefore of the educational service the institution was performing. The fact that the thirteen thousand figure for the 1964-1965 school year embraces the categories just enumerated is itself illustrative of the growing complexity of the College's response to the educational needs of its constituency during the presidency of Dr. C. L. Crawford.

This complex of services is the key to understanding what occurred at Mankato in the two post-war decades. For most of its history, the institution had conceived of itself and been thought of as a single-purpose institution. As we noted early in this account, almost from the very beginning the concept of a school solely devoted to the "how" of teaching proved to be wrong headed. Each step up the ladder of higher education involved educational experiences common not only to teachers but to the whole concept of an educated person. That such facilities should be available for all who could benefit by them made good sense. It made possible better teacher education—faculty, library, laboratories, course offerings, and other educational facilities of the College. It attracted to the teaching profession many students who became interested in teaching after they were on campus. And it served many who exploited the opportunities available for a wide variety of educational objectives other than teaching.

Thus most gradually and naturally and inevitably Mankato became a multi-purpose college. More students than ever before elected to become teachers, and the College became in several areas the principal resource of the State for the preparation of teachers.
And in addition, new programs emerged, each an attempt to do a job which needed to be done. This appears to be its permanent role. The situation is not dissimilar in a way to the experience of a scholar making a study of a problem which interests him: each new fact he encounters opens up new relationships, further aspects that need attention. He can never know when he begins what opinions he will hold a year from then, the new questions that will need answering. All he can be sure of is that if he is smart enough, if he is alert enough, there will be new insight, new jobs to do.

The change of name from teachers college to state college, like changes that had preceded it, was a process stretching over many years. In 1938, the presidents of the Minnesota teachers colleges recommended to the Board that a study be made of the merits of the teachers colleges' becoming state colleges—especially on the junior-college level. They noted that this was a trend in some states. The occasion of the recommendation was a study they were making of the curriculum and its relation to the role the colleges were to occupy. There was agreement that colleges should be organized on two levels, the first two years to be "broad, cultural and liberal." Such subjects would provide the foundation for the professional education of teachers on the senior-college level, but they could just as easily in many instances serve as pre-professional preparation in other professional fields. At the same meeting, it is interesting to observe, they also agreed that curriculum planning should be "in anticipation of requirements of five years of college for high school teachers" and with the "possibility of graduate work in the future."

The sequel comes eight years later. World War II has intervened. The GI Bill has been passed, and thousands of veterans were anxious to take advantage of it. Some of them wanted to be teachers, but of course their needs were various. Soon colleges were swamped with applications.

At the Board meeting in August 1946 a proposal was made by the University of Minnesota to approve "joint registration" by
students at the teachers college and the University. Depending on his program, the student could take a year or two at a teachers college and transfer to the University for his advanced work, with the assurance that all of his course work would count. The Board approved.

At the same meeting, a large delegation from Duluth presented the acute need "for opportunities for higher education on the college level" in the northern part of the state. Representatives of other sections of the State reported a similar situation in their areas. The Board authorized the granting of the B.A. degree by all six teachers colleges.* By so doing the door was opened to the institutions' functioning as state colleges.

Far from this marking a retreat from the role of preparing teachers, the evidence indicated that the change would not only broaden the base of teacher recruitment but would increase substantially the number of students who would prepare for teaching. One study reported to the Board indicated that for every two students who came to a teachers college and later changed their vocational objective to something other than teaching, there were fifty students who came as freshman with something else in mind and later changed to teaching.

Consistent with this situation and with the action the Board had taken approving the offering of the B.A. degree, a bill was introduced in the 1947 Legislature to change the names of the teachers colleges to state colleges, but it did not get out of committee, and the Board concluded that it should wait a while.

In August of 1948 the Board passed a resolution recommending the change of name. Almost immediately there arose opposition from the Minnesota Education Association, on the grounds that such a change would be interpreted as a reflection on the teaching profession. The Board invited representatives of groups to appear, and it apparently was not difficult to allay the uneasiness. It would have been surprising had it been more than

*The Bachelor of Science degree was traditionally the degree awarded to graduates prepared for teacher certification. Thus, the Bachelor of Arts degree entered the curriculum as a catch-all degree for all other programs.
a matter of "communication," for the essentials of the situation had been inherent in almost everything that had taken place in teacher education from its beginning in the state: a teacher needs to be well educated; so do members of other professions; much of this overlaps; efficiency dictates making maximum use of state resources.

Again in 1949 a bill to change the name failed to get out of committee in either house. In 1950, the Board, apparently to lay a foundation of data for anticipated development, seriously considered an extensive study of the role of teachers colleges in Minnesota, but for budgetary reasons it had to be dropped.

Seven years later the College became Mankato State College. The Board minutes for late 1956 and for 1957 reflect no special attention to this matter. The minutes of February 7, 1957 include a report on matters affecting the teachers colleges which were then being considered by the Legislature, but there is no reference to "state colleges." On February 25 the minutes report a meeting of "the State Teachers College Board"; on May 13 the minutes report a meeting of "the State College Board." This is the only recognition there that the change had been made.

Here once more Minnesota was neither the first nor the last to make the move. When opinion had been created for the change, the change came about with little fuss or feathers. The change in name was recognition of a change which in fact already existed.

The Graduate Program

The 1938 resolution of the teachers colleges' presidents referred to above looked not only to broadening the area of service on the undergraduate level but also to extending the program beyond four years. Actually in a way this latter change was formalized before the former. Four years before Mankato became a state college, the institution was authorized to grant a master's degree in teacher education. This was in 1953. A decade later, in 1963, Mankato State College was authorized to confer a Master of Arts
degree in programs other than teacher education, and in the Legislature a bill was introduced to make the institution a state university.

Essentially, the rationale for the move to graduate study was the same that had provided the foundation for previous development. First, there was a substantial demand for graduate study for teachers. Salary schedules in public schools were now geared to the teacher's level of preparation, with increments for the fifth year, a master's degree, and in some instances a doctorate. Faculty and facilities in the teachers colleges were available for such study. As soon as authorization was effected, teachers came to upgrade their academic status.

Perhaps the earliest official notice of interest in developing a graduate program in the teachers colleges of Minnesota may be found in the Minutes of a meeting of the presidents in January of 1936. President Selke of St. Cloud reported that twelve to sixteen teachers colleges in the country were then doing graduate work leading to the master's degree, but only one, Greeley, Colorado, was awarding the Ph.D. He thought that in a few years the Minnesota colleges should be ready to do graduate work. Two years later, as noted above, the idea was incorporated in the presidents' resolution concerning factors which should guide curriculum development—the resolution in which they recommended state college status.

In 1945 a bill was introduced in the Legislature but failed to pass. It was opposed by the University—as so often had happened before. In 1948 an agreement was worked out with the University to reserve for that institution certain areas of graduate work in Education, and a new bill was introduced in the 1949 Legislature. But legislative approval for the "five-year curriculum in teacher education" did not come until four years later, 1953. St. Cloud State Teachers College was all ready to go, and on May 11, 1953 the Board approved their proposal. In August, the authorization was extended to all of the teachers colleges. The original proposal was for a Master of Science in Education degree,
as the original proposal for the baccalaureate degree was for a Bachelor of Science in Education degree (officially changed in 1939 to a Bachelor of Science degree). But the Board Minutes for May 10, 1954 in approving the diploma for the degree refers simply to a "Master of Science Degree."

Thus in terminology the old ambivalent attitude is echoed once more: teacher education to be justified by a special professional degree and discipline—like law or medicine—or a teacher-education program which will find its home comfortably in the graduate school, using as its symbol of achievement the standard academic degree. In every instance for a century of development the beginning has been in the direction of the first alternative, the ultimate commitment to the latter.

The decade between the authorization of the Master of Science degree and the Master of Arts degree was one of adaptation to the new responsibility and the new opportunity. At Mankato there was caution in moving into graduate work, an evident reluctance to offer graduate experiences which did not provide the level of study the faculty had experienced in their own schooling. There was no shortage of such standards for comparison, for the teachers at Mankato had come from institutions of higher education all over the United States and even from foreign universities. From first-hand experience—both as students and as professors—they knew what graduate study is: the kinds of problems being investigated, the literatures of the various fields, the facilities needed. The fact that Mankato had expanded so rapidly after World War II meant that most members of the faculty were new to the College and brought with them fresh knowledge and fresh enthusiasm. They requisitioned for the library the works they had found useful in their own work, and they carried their enthusiasm to their students. Normally as a college grows, the per capita circulation of the library falls off, but at Mankato although student enrollment each year surpassed the previous year by margins that exceeded forecasts and amazed the people of the state, library circulation figures rose at even a higher rate. The explanation may
have been this influx of faculty, many of them still engaged in completing their advanced degree. In 1962 a survey of the faculty revealed that they represented degrees from 169 colleges and universities, but the encounter with educational ideas was even wider, for most had had years of teaching experience in other institutions before coming to Mankato.

The reticence of the College toward anything which might be construed as soft standards is illustrated by the requirement that no one was to be admitted to the Graduate Faculty unless he had an earned doctorate, a standard more rigid than almost any of the schools from which the faculty had themselves received their degrees. This was not done from a naive faith in the reliability of any degree as a means of distinguishing the great teacher and scholar from others. It was simply a means of setting up a hurdle that on the whole—at least in the initial years—would tend to insure that those who taught graduate courses had adequate familiarity with graduate study and research.

It was not anticipated that graduate courses would immediately draw large enrollments. One result was that course-offering enrichment began on the level of courses designed for both advanced undergraduates and graduate students, with provisions for special problems for the latter. This proved both a wise and a happy development. The whole College was affected. The range of courses available for majors attracted to the various departments students with interest and competency. The enlargement of faculty permitted employment of persons with special competencies. Such professors could challenge students and interest them to explore levels of study seldom entered in a program less differentiated in courses, faculty, and students. Large colleges and universities have their own problems, but in this respect they have advantages which only in segments can be matched by the small school. With the great growth at Mankato, students found themselves competing with peer groups of special preparation and special ability. This normally leads to segmentation, but it also leads to the excitement of finding others for whom the same kinds
of things are important. Perhaps there are few better ways of phrasing what it is that makes the good life.

A quick overview of what this course enrichment during the Crawford administration amounted to may be had by checking the catalogue of 1946-1947 with that for 1966-1968. The course offerings in 1946 were listed under eighteen departments. Two decades later there appear to be some thirty-four departmental areas. In the earlier catalogue, 214 courses are described; in the latter, 1513. By the school year of 1966-1967 almost six hundred courses were offered for graduate credit. In 1946, there were sixty members of the faculty; in the fall of 1966 approximately five hundred.

One of the interesting results of this situation was the increased percentage of the College's activity on the level of senior-college and graduate study. For the school year beginning in June of 1944, approximately two-thirds of the students were freshmen and sophomores. The freshman class was more than four times as large as the senior class. Although this reflected the high percentage of students preparing to be elementary teachers—who could still be certified after two years of college work—it nevertheless was not atypical of the general college situation across the country, where a dropout rate between the first and second year might run around forty percent, with decreased but still high rates of dropout for the succeeding years. Through the early years of the 1950's, however, the level of service the College performed changed markedly. By 1956 the senior class was larger than the freshman. In fact ever since the initiation of the graduate program in 1953, lowerclassmen have been a minority on campus. Thus a sizeable majority of students were coming to Mankato for advanced undergraduate and graduate work. Enrollment of the graduate students in 1953 was a little over a hundred; it is currently running well over two thousand—twice the size of the entire study body just after the war.

As usual, the fact that the institution was entering a new
role was conditioned by off-campus factors as well as those which were taking place on campus.

It will be recalled that preceding World War I (in 1915) the certification of elementary teachers was raised to two years of college work. In the half century from its founding, the concept of what was the minimum requirement of preparation for teaching little children had risen from a vague stamp of approval by some local school board or county superintendent to six years of study, presumably four of these in high school and two in college. This was a level not even imagined when the State set itself to the job. But that two-year diploma proved to be a plateau extremely difficult to surpass. When the teachers colleges were authorized to set up four-year programs leading to degrees, there was no similar raising of the requirements for teaching in the elementary schools of the state. Eventually a distinction appeared at commencements. The four-year graduates were awarded a degree, the two-year graduates a diploma. The four-year graduates were in caps and gowns of academic black, the two-year girls in gowns of blue. Well after World War II, although the black gowns sat down front, they were outnumbered by the pretty blue gowns in the seats behind them.

The change in elementary certification did not come until 1954, and then a phasing-out operation was spread over several years, gradually moving to the degree requirement. This part of the story is a chapter (or book) itself and can only be alluded to here. Two factors, however, may be mentioned. One was the growing conviction that the teacher who works with a student's mind and personality has as subtle and significant problems working with the child as he does working with the adolescent or the adult. No job was "more important" than the others. As a matter of fact, as has always been recognized, as the twig is bent so doth the tree incline: a bad start in life can make all the difference. This obviously means that society needs the very best teachers it can get for its children, that elementary teachers need the best of qualifications.
A second factor is a conclusion inferred from the first. If the teacher's job is as critical on the elementary level as it is on the secondary, then the pay should be the same. So when school boards began to adopt pay schedules, the tendency rapidly developed to put them not on the grade level to which a teacher was assigned, but on the qualifications and performance of the teacher. Thus a teacher only qualified for the higher schedule if she had a bachelor's degree. The result was that the 1950's saw great interest by elementary teachers in returning to college—in the summers or for evening classes—to upgrade their certificates.

There is more than this to the matter. One very significant aspect of the story of upgrading college programs and teacher preparation is the story of the consolidation of school districts. It was both effect and cause, tied in many ways to the story with which this book is concerned. But the temptation to untangle those ligatures will be resisted here.

Another significant part of the story of Mankato during these years is the off-campus program developed to meet the needs for inservice education of teachers. Here is an instance of the ambiguity of events. One of the reasons for the long delay in raising certification requirements beyond the two-year level was the teacher shortage. (When there had been a surplus in the depression years, that hardly seemed the time to require unemployed teachers to spend money for more college education.) After World War II, the teaching profession had to compete with the attractions of other kinds of employment. As population boomed shortly after the soldiers returned, schools were flooded with students. The State Department of Education had to give special permission to persons with inadequate education to take on assignments temporarily until they could get enough work for full certification. Many of these on temporary permits were married women returning to the profession after having reared a family. The job of providing them with the courses they needed was lightly referred to as "re-treading."

One of the strategies was offering classes on Monday eve-
nings, sometimes on Saturdays. This rapidly became a standard part of the work of the College, at Mankato as elsewhere. Good roads and cars make it possible for students at considerable distance to combine education and employment. One anticipates no diminution of this exploitation of opportunity for educational advance. In more urban communities, the situation is no doubt much more striking than at Mankato. There is still an occasional dragging out of the dusty epithet of "suitcase students"—but the parking problem on every college campus is eloquent if frustrating testimony that we are a nation on wheels and have no thought of anything else.

In addition to evening classes on campus, the College began sending teachers off campus to teach groups (frequently organized by a county superintendent) in various communities of southern or southwestern Minnesota. The first such classes were held in 1943, nine of them, with a total enrollment of 321 students. The next year there were nine more—with a third more students. Within a few years, there were off-campus classes taught in from twenty to thirty different communities. Since courses would be offered each quarter and more than one course could be offered at a single center, the number of classes was impressive: ninety-three in 1953-1954, one hundred four in 1964-1965. Annual enrollment in off-campus work reached over two thousand. The preponderance of enrollment in these courses has always been undergraduate work, but since 1958, when it was concluded that some work carrying graduate credit was feasible, this also has been part of the program. The Office of Field Services reports that from 1943 through the spring of 1966, there was an enrollment of over thirty-two thousand in off-campus classes.

While the teacher shortage gave birth to this program, the success of this approach was such that it provided an important service in effecting the acceptance of a degree requirement for elementary teaching. Teachers got a taste of college classes—sometimes after years of being out of school and out of teaching. They liked what they got. Since only a limited amount of off-campus
work counted toward a degree, they came on campus for more work. Completing a bachelor's degree, many set sights for a graduate degree.

One other effect of the off-campus courses is hard to treat with any exactness. It may be that the influx of freshmen was not unrelated to these courses for adults. Year after year people in the communities of southern Minnesota had contact with the College, with their courses, their requirements, their faculty. What the State of Minnesota was making available to its citizens at Mankato was known by first-hand experience—and the word got around, in the family, among friends of the family. If Mom had a Catalogue, the high school daughter or son would check it too.

At any rate, the times correspond: off-campus classes and huge enrollment increases. Here once more is an example of one of the best vindications of the educational programs. People like education when they get it, and they want more. It is encouraging to think that this not only suggests something about education but also something about people.

Doctoral Programs and University Status

As earlier in the century there developed a pattern of normal schools' becoming teachers colleges, of teachers colleges' becoming multi-purpose state colleges—first on an undergraduate level and then with limited graduate programs—so in the 1960's institutions of this type began to assume the role of universities with graduate programs leading to doctoral degrees and with a variety of professional schools. This is not surprising, for there are a number of precedents and affective factors.

The precedents are of two kinds: on the one hand, the century of evolutionary development from the single-purpose normal school to the multi-purpose area college; and on the other, the precedent of the A & M colleges. The first of these has been detailed throughout this account; the second deserves a few words of explanation.
The name state college through most of the first half of the twentieth century was typically applied to colleges of the type promoted by the land-grant Morrill Act of 1862 and its successors. They might be called colleges of agriculture and mechanics, or agriculture and engineering, or agriculture and applied sciences, or in some instances, polytechnic institutes. Popularly they were referred to as the Ag School or, in deprecation, Silo Tech. Their story is a brilliant one. Amazingly in the early years they seemed to have little going for them except, paradoxically, legislative support. There were often virtually no faculty, no curriculum, almost no students. From the humblest of educational beginnings, they have advanced to great distinction. Dedicated to serving a broad constituency of the state, they rose with the achievements in agriculture, science, and technology which have made America pre-eminent in these fields. One recent commentator observes that "the majority of recent winners of Nobel prizes received their training in such institutions." Large proportions of Federal research grants are allocated to them.

Some of the original land-grant colleges were state universities, as was true in Minnesota. From the turn of the century onward, those which were founded as "state colleges" began to change their name to universities. In 1865, Maine established a State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. The first instruction was in 1868, the same year classes opened at the Second Normal School in Mankato. In 1897, the A & M college in Maine became the University of Maine. Kentucky's situation was parallel; the name change came in 1908. There were a pair of such changes in each of the first four decades of the century, and then in the 1950's and the 1960's the movement became general. By the mid 1960's virtually all of the land-grant colleges except those established as separate institutions for negroes had become state universities.

The affective factors in the move toward university status are many, but they have a central explanation. Primary, it would appear, is the complexity of our society, the complexity of its re-
quirements for the people who will work in it. Moreover, com-
plex is succeeding complex, the new setup making obsolete the old,
with amazing rapidity. The business or industry which does not
plan ahead for this is doomed; the individual who doesn't do
likewise may be left behind. Education produces this situation,
and it is the chief resource for exploiting it. We need not be sur-
prised that college enrollments continue to zoom and that the
projections of enrollments envision no discernible ceiling. In fact,
it is very likely that in our century education may become
typically a part of life through all one's years: youth, maturity,
and retirement. Already estimates of the number of people par-
ticipating in adult education run from seventeen to fifty million.

The result of man's making a complex world is that he
thereby creates a need for educational systems that are multi-func-
tional. Hugh S. Brown and Lewis B. Mayhew in their American
Higher Education (1965) draw this conclusion from a study of
the trends in higher education: "Single-purpose institutions—such
as liberal arts colleges, the teachers college, or the technical insti-
tutes—are rapidly becoming things of the past."

Bowling Green in Ohio was chartered in 1910. In 1929 it
became Bowling Green State College, and in 1935, Bowling Green
State University. Kent made the same changes in the same years.
But generally the state colleges founded as teacher-education insti-
tutions began to be officially designated universities in the late
1950's and in the 1960's. Such changes have taken place in Ari-
zona, California, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, New Mexico,
New York, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin—as well as in Ohio.
In terms of the number of students enrolled, Mankato State Col-
lege in the 1960's was attempting to meet the diverse educational
needs of as large and varied groups as all but the very largest of
these schools. In fact, of the two hundred or so state colleges in
the country, Mankato ranked in enrollment in the top ten per
cent. Such a complex of student needs pointed to the urgency for
reexamination of the nature of the institution required to meet
those needs.
The interest in designating Mankato as a second state university for Minnesota thus was a natural culmination of forces and developments widespread in the nation and flowering in this state from the same seed and social requirements as elsewhere. Once again as throughout this account, the story of Mankato is not so much the history of a single institution as an illustration of America’s basic educational drives.

A bill was introduced in 1963 Legislature to make Mankato the University of Southern Minnesota. This would have given to the new university its own board, and while it would not have the fiscal autonomy constitutionally guaranteed to the University of Minnesota, it was thought that there was uniqueness in the spectacular growth at Mankato which could be best recognized and utilized by a separate board.

For a century The University in this state has meant one institution. There was not even a state college until the 1950’s, for agriculture, engineering, and technology were a part of the University. That there should be a second university naturally suggested the first as a basis of comparison. What was this upstart school doing which only a short while ago had been mainly devoted to junior college teaching, to preparing girls for elementary teaching? Did it have libraries with millions of volumes, or research contracts of millions of dollars, or professional schools of medicine, law, and the rest? There was little interest in making comparisons to the green and growing years of the University in the late teens and the twenties. The movement for university status for Mankato was a legislative one. By-passing the State College Board, it received no encouragement there—or from the other state colleges.

In the 1965 Legislature a new bill was introduced. This time the Board reviewed the proposal and endorsed it. There was considerable legislative support in both the House and Senate, but Governor Karl Rolvaag made his position quite clear that he was opposed to university status for Mankato “at this time.” Senator Val Imm, from Mankato, Chairman of the Finance Committee
of the Senate and joint sponsor of the bill in the Senate, felt that it could get through the Senate, but it was less successful in the House, and again failed to reach the floor of either house.

The opposition to the proposal seemed to be centered in the Twin Cities. The Governor not only spoke against the proposal but used his power of appointment to secure a State College Board which reversed the earlier endorsement. President Meredith Wilson of the University appeared at a Senate hearing and expressed his hope that, with the limited financial resources available for higher education in Minnesota, the splendid achievements at the University would not be jeopardized by embarking on costly projects which must compete for the funds available for appropriation. The Minneapolis Tribune took a dim view of the whole idea.

Almost no attempts were made to relate what was taking place in southern Minnesota to the whole surge of America's desire for educational opportunity, to see the present moment in the perspective of a state's hunger for and determination to get all that education could provide for its citizens. There was little attempt to see the local situation in terms of the changes which were taking place across the land. As a result, for two sessions of the Legislature, opponents of the bills were successful in labeling the proposals the ambitions and presumptions of local interests.

Of course there is something healthy about seeing each step of the evolution of an educational institution in isolation from similar movements in other states. It forces one to make the individual case for the change. It brings up the problems which will be involved in the change. It necessitates institutional study, re-examination of the needs of the constituency. That the state colleges of Minnesota have a brilliant future as multi-purpose area institutions of higher education, no one is likely to deny. Quite possibly in the remaining third of the twentieth century the majority of citizens of the United States will earn their college degrees, graduate and undergraduate, in such institutions. The odds seem overwhelming that many of them will be known as universities. It hardly seems likely that a century-old trend toward
more diversified and qualitatively superior opportunities for higher education will be halted or reversed. It will be recalled that there was resistance to normal schools' being authorized to prepare students for high school teaching. There was resistance to their operating as fully collegiate degree-granting institutions. There was resistance to their offering graduate work. In each instance time was on the side of the greater role of service.

In 1967, the pattern of change so frequently observed in this review once again emerged. The climate had shifted a bit, and the strategy. Other Minnesota state colleges, particularly St. Cloud, were growing fast and speculating about what this would mean in institutional objectives and organization. Minnesota had become the only state left in the area which tried to get along with one state university. A new president had come to Mankato, Dr. James F. Nickerson, a doctoral graduate of the University of Minnesota who had many friends there. He immediately began to build bridges of communication. Area legislators dropped the push for immediate university status and concentrated on authorization of the State College Board to approve graduate study beyond the master's degree: When in the Board's opinion any particular program in any specific college was qualified to offer such work. Specifically, they emphasized sixth-year programs in Education, where a substantial base in need and qualifications was difficult to question. This time at legislative hearings representatives of the University appeared to endorse the proposal. At the sessions end, it was clear that the years ahead for Mankato would include graduate study beyond the master's degree. The Board was authorized to establish sixth-year programs. Studies concerning doctoral openings were to be reported to the next legislature. During the last year of the first century of the institution's history, active progress has been made along these lines. Programs of study beyond the master's degree are being developed, approved, and implemented. The change in name to university, one may speculate, will follow the precedent of the change to state-college status and be a recognition of an accomplished fact.
ENROLLMENT

In our day there are numerous ways of tabulating enrollment at colleges and universities. One of the most common is full-time fall-quarter enrollment. This has obvious advantage, for quite generally the institution will be operating under maximum load at this time. But as a measure of the service the institution renders its constituency it rests on an older image of "going to college." As was indicated earlier, American society in the mid-twentieth century is finding many strategies for making available educational opportunities. In a large urban university, a high percentage of the enrollees may be people who come in for late afternoon or evening classes. The land-grant colleges showed the vitality of adapting instruction to the needs of the people by extension programs, short courses, institutes, and other variants from traditional schedules.

Although normal schools originally thought of themselves as rigidly single-purpose institutions, from the very beginning their work was closely tied to the concept of in-service education of teachers. A report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for 1867 indicates that the average school year in Minnesota was less than four months. Typically, the teacher tried to reconcile the desire for education with opportunities for employment. Only a small fraction of the students completed the whole program by unbroken enrollment.

In attempting to find a basis for comparison of enrollment from the beginning of Mankato Normal up to the middle of the 1960's one probably must conclude that the most satisfactory is the enrollment figures published annually in the catalogues. Ap-
parently from the beginning this was a tabulation of the students enrolled during the year rather than the number enrolled in any particular term. In the biennial report of President Cooper to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the years 1900-1901, there was a table of attendance at Mankato from 1868 through the school year of 1901-1902. These figures are used for these years. For the years since then, the figures are taken from those published in the annual catalogues. A check of President Cooper's tabulation against the catalogues for those years indicates that these were the sources he employed.

Table 1 presents the figures of enrollment and Figure 1 is a graph which enables one to translate these figures into an image for ready perception of increases, decreases, and long-time relationships. The startling zoom since the end of World War II is a dominant first impression, but more detailed scrutiny (see Figure 2 and Figure 3) suggests many correlations to the development of the institution.

The first substantial dip in attendance comes during the years when the Reverend D. C. John, A. M., was principal. From this distance, it is precarious to pronounce on the explanation, but there are several parts of the record that illuminate.

The first principal of the Second State Normal School at Mankato was George M. Gage—whose memory has been recently honored by the naming after him of the new high-rise housing unit on the Upper Campus of Mankato State College. He was at Mankato for four years and left to become superintendent of the St. Paul public schools. A year later he was appointed to the State Normal Board and was soon chosen as its president. He appears to have been an educator who held the respect of the persons concerned with public schools at the time. Official reports generally indicate considerable enthusiasm for the role of normal schools in Minnesota. The 1870 report of Horace B. Wilson, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, was one of pride and confidence: "Minnesota, a State of but twelve years of age may challenge any of her sisters of the Union to show greater improvement
### Table 1
Enrollment: 1868-1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Enrollment</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Enrollment</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1868-1869</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1901-1902</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1934-1935</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869-1870</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1902-1903</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1935-1936</td>
<td>1,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1871</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1903-1904</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>1936-1937</td>
<td>1,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1872</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1904-1905</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1937-1938</td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-1873</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1905-1906</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1938-1939</td>
<td>1,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-1874</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1906-1907</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1939-1940</td>
<td>1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874-1875</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1907-1908</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1940-1941</td>
<td>1,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875-1876</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1908-1909</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1941-1942</td>
<td>1,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1877</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1909-1910</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1942-1943</td>
<td>1,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877-1878</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1910-1911</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1943-1944</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-1879</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1911-1912</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>1944-1945</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879-1880</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1912-1913</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1945-1946</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-1881</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1913-1914</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1946-1947</td>
<td>1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1882</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1914-1915</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1947-1948</td>
<td>1,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883-1884</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1916-1917</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>1949-1950</td>
<td>2,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884-1885</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1917-1918</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1950-1951</td>
<td>2,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-1886</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1918-1919</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>1951-1952</td>
<td>2,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1887</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1919-1920</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>1952-1953</td>
<td>3,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887-1888</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1920-1921</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1953-1954</td>
<td>3,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888-1889</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>1921-1922</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1954-1955</td>
<td>4,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-1890</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1922-1923</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1955-1956</td>
<td>4,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-1891</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1923-1924</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>1956-1957</td>
<td>5,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1892</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1924-1925</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>1957-1958</td>
<td>5,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-1893</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1925-1926</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>1958-1959</td>
<td>6,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-1894</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1926-1927</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1959-1960</td>
<td>7,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894-1895</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1927-1928</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1960-1961</td>
<td>7,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-1898</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>1930-1931</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1963-1964</td>
<td>11,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898-1899</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>1931-1932</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1964-1965</td>
<td>13,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1900</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1932-1933</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1965-1966</td>
<td>14,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1901</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1933-1934</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>1966-1967</td>
<td>14,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>16,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: For 1868-1901, Report of the President, State Normal School at Mankato, to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, for the school years of 1900-1901 and 1901-1902. For 1902-1967, the annual catalogues of the institution.
Administrations
George M. Gage, 1868-1872
Julia A. Sears, 1872-1873
D. C. John, 1873-1880
Edward Searing, 1880-1898
Charles H. Cooper, 1899-1930
Frank D. McElroy, 1930-1946
C. L. Crawford, 1946-1965
Melvin G. Scarlett, 1965-1966
James F. Nickerson, 1966-

Figure 1. Annual Enrollment: 1868-1968
in educational advancement during the same period of time.” A little later he added: “There will soon be no need for employing any other than well-trained teachers. Our high, graded, and training schools, and more than all, our numerous Teachers Institutes and excellent Normal Schools and State University will supply the growing demand for qualified teachers.” Speaking of the Second Normal School at Mankato, he wrote: “Already, she is kindling a light in the west.”

Mr. Gage resigned in 1872, and his chief assistant, Miss Julia A. Sears, was appointed principal as his successor. She seems to have had a good year, but there was some feeling in the Board that the position should be held by a man. At the July meeting in 1873, the Reverend D. C. John was elected as principal, and Miss Sears offered her old position as assistant. She was not happy about the matter, wrote a letter to Mr. Gage by then president of the Board that she was not intending to return. Interpreting this to mean that she rejected the offer, the position was offered to another candidate—by the Resident Director under instruction from Gage. Offers got crossed up in the mails (or otherwise). Miss Sears decided to come after all. There was a good deal of confusion, but the sum of it was that in September both candidates showed up, each claiming to have been officially appointed. It makes quite a story, and one can follow the details for several months in Board minutes.

The teaching position was finally given to the other party, a Mr. C. W. G. Hyde, and Miss Sears was left without a job, a thousand miles from home. The mixup would not be worthy of our special notice were it not related to other things. It throws light on the difficulty the Board had in keeping in close touch with the various campuses, the necessity of delegating authority to the Resident Director, and the misunderstandings always incipient where authority is divided.

Of more significance, however, was the effect on the Mankato school. Miss Sears apparently was well liked at the Normal and in the community. She had made a trip from New England in
Figure 2. Profile of Enrollment — 1868-1920

Figure 3. Profile of Enrollment — 1900-1946
answer to a telegram saying, “Come,” and she was not only out of a job but out of pocket. On campus and in the community there was instant indignation. A petition of remonstrance was signed by more than sixty prominent townsfolk (Mankatoans today will recognize names like Meagher, Buck, Brewster, Pfau, Brett, Clark, and Shawbut). Students who had known Miss Sears the previous year went on strike and refused to attend classes. The new administration was confronted with a show-down crisis.

The chief virtue of the new principal was firmness. Students were given a deadline to get back on the job. Those who did not, about three dozen, were expelled. They were through. Finally, in a way, the year got under way.

The Reverend Mr. John was not pleased by the students who remained, and he persuaded the graduating class that they were too poorly prepared to be graduated, that they should stay on for another term. “Nearly all of our students,” he wrote, “come to us poorly prepared . . . . Not one-tenth of them remain long enough to complete the course, and a majority scarcely half that time.” In the catalogues he compiled each year he included a section entitled “Who Should Become Teachers?” Here he specified twelve qualities which were essential to those expecting to become successful teachers: “. . . any one who does not possess them will waste time, and sacrifice a useful life in some other sphere, in order to become a poor teacher.” Among the essential qualities were magnetism, dignity and force of character, celerity in movement and thought, accuracy in knowledge, skill in explanation and illustration, and “power to control others (natural leadership).” It must have been a rather awesome list as read by girls taught in district schools by teachers with no special training at all—as would necessarily have been true of the overwhelming majority of potential students.

A page on the history of the Normal in the catalogue for 1877-1878 included the following paragraph:

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

At the end of Mr. John's administration enrollment slipped to the lowest point it ever reached or was to reach. These were the darkest years. But the state became more prosperous and the population rose. As the normal schools raised standards of admission and extended the number of years necessary for graduation, enrollments quickly picked up. Four additional years of work were "added" between 1877 and 1895. Table 2 gives the detail of this development. The data in the table is taken from enrollments as published in annual catalogues. As explained in the chapter on Curriculum, the classification by years in the normals had its special terminology (A Class, Advanced Class, Advanced Class for high school graduates, etc.), and this makes it difficult to arrange the enrollment reports in one consistent consecutive pattern. Dr. Otto Welton Snarr attempted to do so for his doctoral dissertation at the University of Chicago, and although there are problems in the interpretation of detail, the general graph is both essentially accurate and very useful as a means of visualizing the upgrading of the Normal's level of instruction. The discrepancies between totals here and those in Table I usually represent unclassified "Specials" and in a few instances summer enrollments not broken down to classes in the catalogue tabulations.

TABLE 2
Enrollment By Grades, 1877-1878 Through 1922-1923

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>1st Yr.</th>
<th>2nd Yr.</th>
<th>3rd Yr.</th>
<th>4th Yr.</th>
<th>5th Yr.</th>
<th>6th Yr.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1877-1878</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-1879</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879-1880</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-1881</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1882</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882-1883</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883-1884</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884-1885</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-1886</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year</td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
<td>2nd Yr.</td>
<td>3rd Yr.</td>
<td>4th Yr.</td>
<td>5th Yr.</td>
<td>6th Yr.</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1887</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887-1888</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888-1889</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-1890</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-1891</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1892</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-1893</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-1894</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894-1895</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-1896</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1897</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-1898</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898-1899</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1900</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1901</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1902</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902-1903</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903-1904</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904-1905</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-1906</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1907</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907-1908</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908-1909</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-1910</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-1911</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-1912</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912-1913</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913-1914</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-1915</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-1916</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-1917</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-1918</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-1919</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-1920</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1921</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-1922</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-1923</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Otto Welton Snarr, *The Education of Teachers in the Middle States*, Chicago (1945), p. 182. Data secured from annual catalogues.

Dr. Snarr’s enrollment figures include students on a sub-college-freshmen level after high school graduation had become an admission requirement in 1916. An exception had been made for elementary students enrolled only in summer sessions. This category continued to be listed in annual enrollment reports until 1948, usually with only ten or a dozen students. Actually they were “special” students, and after that date were included in that category.
A part of the explanation of the added years was the increase in the number of public high schools in Minnesota, but enrollment in the beginning classes remains fairly constant until these classes are dropped in the years between 1912 and 1918. A glance at the graph enrollment (Figure 3) shows that there was a drop in enrollment during these years, with 1918 as the lowest. These were the years of World War I, and as soon as the Armistice was signed enrollment losses were erased. Within a few years the student body had doubled.

There is more to this part of the story, but perhaps one should pause for a few moments to note an earlier little Jungfrau on the enrollment graph (Figure 2), in the years of 1897-1899.

What happened then forms a commentary on several aspects of running an institution like this one. Enrollment in the Normal Department in the 1890's was between three and four hundred students. In 1897, it jumped to 677, and in 1898 it went over eight hundred! Then the next year it dropped back to the former four hundred. The fact that the peak came at the end of the Searing administration and the drop at the beginning of the Cooper administration naturally made for administrative uneasiness.

This enrollment boomlet correlates precisely with a two-year experiment in what was called “Continuous Session.” The year was divided into four equal quarters beginning in January, April, July and October—with a special six weeks summer session for those whose teaching assignment would keep them from using the full Summer Quarter. Summer vacation was provided in a six-weeks period prior to July first. The doors of additional opportunities were thrown open, and students came in unprecedented numbers.

The catch was that a twelve months program was more costly than a nine, and after two years the Legislature was unwilling to make the additional appropriations. The Continuous Session was discontinued.

President Cooper also noted another affective factor; the discontinuance of the three-year elementary course. This chiefly af-
fected students planning to teach in rural schools and made it necessary for them to take a five-year course to get a diploma. As the institution raised its standards and levels of study, the problem of providing teachers for rural schools developed into a perennial one. With normal graduates constituting only a fraction of the teaching force of the state, their special preparation usually opened favorable teaching opportunities. The ultimate resolution was two generations away—consolidation. In the meantime a number of strategies appear as short-course palliatives for the rural-teacher-shortage headache.

The graph of attendance rises sharply again in 1903 and continues to make an interesting skyline profile of the massif until the time of World War II. It appears to be no coincidence that summer schools were begun again in 1903 and became a standard feature of the annual program thereafter.

The radical concept of Continuous Session with four symmetrical terms, including one starting the first of October, is not heard of again. But the essential feature, summer opportunity for teachers with jobs during the regular school year, was salvaged and made standard. The sequence illustrated, thus, was innovation, reversal, and revised approach. It has reappeared regularly.

The table of levels of instruction indicates that by the teens the school was rapidly dropping from its own program of instruction the years of basic education now felt to be necessary foundation for the professional training of teachers. The high schools of the state apparently were serving this function adequately. President Cooper's concern for the plight of the rural teacher, it appears, did not eventuate in perpetuating what was by then a sort of substandard program. It thus proved feasible both to raise the standards of admission (by four years!) and within a very few years to enlarge the student body to over four times what it had been at the beginning of President Cooper's administration.

The severe teacher shortage after World War I correlates with the enrollment boom of the twenties. But then there came decline. In 1921 the normal schools of Minnesota became officially teach-
ers colleges, authorized to grant a four-year degree. But nine years went by before the Board and faculty formally published a four-year program of studies, and in these years which saw across the country a sharp rise in college attendance (1920: 582,000; 1930: 1,053,000), the profile at Mankato is drab.

Three explanations suggest themselves. The first is that the legislative authorization to provide upper-class programs was not in fact followed by appropriate curriculum changes. The second explanation also explains the first: there was little felt need for the extra two years. The story has already been given in detail in another chapter. From the late teens through the twenties, thirties, and forties, certification of elementary teachers remained essentially at the level of two years of college work. There were plenty of jobs for girls with a two-year elementary diploma—and not much incentive to take more work.

At first the new teachers colleges envisioned a step-by-step, a year-at-a-time approach: a third year requirement for graduation to begin with, later a fourth. But this did not work out, for a three-year diploma had no particular significance on the academic scene; the market was for two-year or four year graduates. Thus it was that the catalogues in the twenties, after the abortive announcement of a three-year program, withdrew that and only murmured cautiously and vaguely about "advanced work."

The third explanation of the situation in the twenties was that the College still operated as a single-purpose institution: the preparation of elementary teachers. The pressures and compromises of the Great Agreement of 1912 in which the Board and the administrators of the normal schools formally and publicly renounced any concern for the preparation of high school teachers and avowed as their sole excuse for being the preparation of elementary teachers now bore its fruit. It was only at the end of the twenties that the Board was able to announce that the time had then arrived in which the original legislative authorization, the preparing of teachers for the common schools of the State, now included both elementary and high schools.
This claim was allowed, and President McElroy saw it as his assignment to move the College into a full four-year program of college studies for both elementary and secondary teachers. The years of his administration, 1930 to 1946, were years of the Depression and the War. That the enrichment of course offering and upgrading of faculty proved attractive to persons of southern Minnesota is clear from the graph of enrollment (Figure 3). The high point as one would expect was 1939, a year in which more than fifteen hundred students enrolled for courses. Then came the drop correlating with the War, with little changes in 1943, 1944, and 1945—about a thousand students each year, with as usual, substantially fewer on campus in any single term.

In a single year after the War, the first year of the Crawford administration, 1946-1947, enrollment rose above all previous highs, and for two decades with only a few moments of breath catching the population explosion on the Mankato campus continued. These were years of the GI Bill, the new image of full education as the expectation of increasingly more families, of the population explosions in the elementary and high schools, of Sputnik and the frenzy of effort to keep Russia from getting ahead of the United States. These were years of huge budgets for research and the resulting explosion of knowledge, of the technological change in business and industry which made the unskilled worker often a social and economic liability.

But the rate of enrollment growth at Mankato during the administration of President C. L. Crawford (1946-1965) exceeded dramatically that of all other colleges in the area. One of the reports of the College (School Progress XL:4, May 1959) contained a graph comparing the growth at Mankato to other institutions. It is reproduced as Figure 4. These figures were for the Fall Quarter, and since summer sessions were also attracting many students, using annual enrollment figures might have proved even more dramatic. The graph carried enrollment through 1958. Table 1 and Figure 1 show that this was less than half way up the steep ascent of the last two decades.
RAPID GROWTH

Enrollment increases at Mankato compared to those in the State and in the entire country.

Fall Quarter 1947: 100
Sources: Enrollment Reports For Upper Midwest Association of Collegiate Registrars and annual enrollment reports in Higher Education.

It would be foolish to try to pinpoint the explanation of this phenomenon. The major part of the story is related in the previous chapter. No doubt personalities were causative factors, and this account has paid much too little tribute to the biographical. Primary too was the development of the College as a many sided school, with a wide variety of services available to a wide variety of needs and interests. But mainly, to this observer, the explanation would seem to be that here in southern Minnesota there was a potential which had never been realized. There were doors to be opened and crowds eager to enter. What was done was to open doors of educational opportunity.

Now at the beginning of the second century of this College, one speculates on what lies ahead. It is unpredictable, as the past has been, but no doubt a century hence another recorder will find it easy to discover patterns and correlations. Things we don’t anticipate will occur, and some we predict will be scrubbed. At this date, nevertheless, it seems highly probably that forces now operat-
ing will continue their pressure in the decades ahead. An increasing percentage of college educated people will have attended institutions supported from public revenues. As junior colleges increase, more students having proved themselves there will go on for further years of advanced or specialized study at state colleges or universities. This has already happened at Mankato: freshman and sophomores have been a minority since 1953. What it means to be an educated person may actually be abandoned as a meaningful concept, for the past participle *educated* seems to imply something capable of attainment. That one can go somewhere and be processed in a way designed to last a lifetime may be a manner of speaking or thinking which evokes only nostalgia for an earlier day—like Bacon’s taking all knowledge as his province. It is more likely that the colleges and universities will make themselves available to the solving of all kinds of problems of training, investigation, and appraisal at almost every stage of a person’s career.
WHAT kind of people enrolled for work at Mankato during the past century?

There is no way to get precise answers to such a query, but there are a number of strategies which reveal different aspects of the matter.

In the broadest terms, it seems right to conclude that they were the ones who made us. We are their children and grandchildren and great grandchildren. For some of us now studying or teaching at Mankato State College or pursuing our careers as graduates or former students of the institution, this is biologically true; but a case can be made that in many ways what we are and do and have has grown from the kind of people who came here to study—on the thesis, of course, that what happened here was representative. This is truism well worn in oratorical perorations, but one worth scrutiny.

To test the matter personally, the professional, commercial, and civic leaders of today have only to recall their own family histories and note how many had a grandmother who was a school teacher, a grandfather or uncle or great uncle who taught school, perhaps for a few terms before he entered a theological seminary, or a professional school, or a business.

The conviction that education is the most generally available door to self-realization, to advancement in life, to better standards of living, to a better society can only have had its genesis in educational experiences that proved rewarding, that aroused expectations that if a little was good, more would be better. There is really no other way to explain the routine extension of the
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curriculum, the establishment of high schools, the evolution of the single-purpose normal schools into multi-purpose collegiate and graduate schools, the rise in teacher-certification standards, the shift to graded schools and then to consolidated, the extension of the ordinary educational expectation of a boy or girl in Minnesota from a few four-months terms in a district school to the completion of high school and then to continuing either at college or in some post-high-school vocational program.

This is the pragmatic approach to the matter. Aside from all attempts to formulate technical specs of description, the overwhelming fact which shouts at us is the vitality of the whole enterprise. The idea was viable. It is scarcely discerning to assume that it would have been so were not the human stuff responsive. If the seed of the matter was the dream of educational opportunity, the soil in which it germinated, flourished, and bore fruit was the people who presided and the pupils who came.

When one is thinking in these large social perspectives, one cannot ascribe the cause of the hunger for education to any single institution or type of institution. Apparently all educational media—the common schools (even with nine-tenths of their teachers having no special preparation for teaching), the academies, the high schools, the private and parochial schools, the colleges, the University, the teachers institutes, the extension courses, the technical and vocational schools, the press, the libraries, the lyceums and concert series, the pulpits, too—all engendered this image of opportunity through education. And yet the role of the normal schools and their successors is an especially relevant one, for it has spanned the whole spectrum—and made it possible. There would have been no higher education if there were no foundation—as President Folwell discovered when he tried to build a university and had to begin with a preparatory school. The tree of education grows from its roots. No institution was closer to the "root of the matter" than the normal school. The case for education had to be made there. It could have been lost. It could have been made on other terms. But it was made in terms so
seminal that a whole civilization arose, such a one as the world had never seen, one called to world leadership in our time, one founded on a concept of discovering ways to unleash human potential and therefore on a principle which any peer or successor must necessarily emulate.

So those early students found something, and they must have been something! It may very well be that what they found was simply engagement. Ah yes, in the romantic sense too. Since many of them were nubile, the fact that they were educated a bit above the run no doubt made them plusses on the marriage mart (and that, too, was eugenically significant). But aside from the fact that exposure to additional education affected the kind of mate one was likely to plight one’s troth with, the significant engagement was with ideas and attitudes and values and ways of thinking. There are many names for it: culture, improving one’s mind, peeping over the rim of the parochial. Looking at this story ought, it would seem, to make one chary about minimum essentials, core curriculums, requirements in general education, "constants," and the like—except as the very search for the essential, the core of the matter, the common elements of educational experience, is itself engagement, and therefore revealing and refining. It would seem not unreasonable to assume that whatever they learned about mental arithmetic and map drawing and physiology and vocal music and English and Latin grammar was medial, that the finding of matters to be examined and the habits of challenge, inquiry, reflection, and experimentation carried over and made their schoolrooms and homes and families different. If this be so, everything fits, for there is no summit to enterprise of this sort: each prominence mounted reveals itself to be but a foothill with peaks and ranges beyond.

So much for what they found—and what they must have been for the seed to germinate and fructify. We do know a few things of lesser significance about what they were.

In the nineteenth century, most students of normal schools were certified and experienced teachers before they matriculated.
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This is an ironic comment on the standards of certification, but there is a bit more to it. Unless we accept the heresy that only that is educative which follows the prescribed syllabus, we cannot overlook the vehicles of educational development which preceded patterns to which we are now accustomed. The teacher if he or she have any fitness for the thing at all is also a learner. Annually last year's graduates return announcing the same discovery: "You never really learn anything until you have to teach it!" or, "I learned more this year than in any other!"

Until 1899 more than half of entering students at Mankato were teachers, and through most of the early years about seventy per cent of them were. Usually it had been only for a single year, but students were not uncommon who had taught from two to five or six years. Moreover, as has been pointed out, the typical student combined teaching and going to school. In 1880 the Board received a report that a large number of students at Winona taught summer schools to get money to attend classes in the winter. This situation would have been paralleled at Mankato. The successful experiment named "Continuous Session" (which doubled enrollments in 1897 and 1898) was designed to provide maximum flexibility in scheduling. A student could begin any quarter, and whether he taught a winter term or a summer term or a longer period, he would be able to find a six-weeks period or a twelve-weeks period or even a couple of quarters which would dovetail with his teaching duties.

All of which means that theory in the Normal classroom came more relevantly to students who had themselves encountered the situation to which the lesson referred, to students who a few weeks later would have a chance once again to compare their own teaching practices with the ideas they had encountered at Mankato.

As one would expect, then, the student body as far as chronological age and general maturity were concerned in no way paralleled the typical person today with only an elementary education of six or eight years. A study of normal schools in Minnesota and a number of other states of the upper Midwest indicated
that the average normal school student was from twenty to twenty-three years old.

As one would expect also, these students came from homes of the area. The attraction of southern Minnesota to settlers was land, and as homesteads were taken up, supporting villages of businesses and various special services arose. The largest occupational category of the parents of students was, therefore, farming.* The business and professional population contributed a share somewhat larger no doubt than their percentage of the total population: one report suggests something like fourteen percent.

Official reports tally the national origin of students and their families. Again, predictably, the students came from parents whose "old country" was in central or northern Europe.

Since Minnesota was a new state when normals got under way, at first many students had been born outside the state—from the states mostly to the east of Minnesota. This was a phenomenon of the wave of the frontier, a wave which in general was from east to west rather than from south to north. There is significance here which this account cannot explore, but it would be interesting to do so. For instance, the whole phenomenon of the normal school idea came from New England. Or again, one recalls how much more fertile soil the idea of public education—the whole sweep of it—proved in the states carved out of the Northwest Territory than in some other areas.

All this gives but dim outlines of the actual human beings involved. We need novelists to give us an image we can visualize—as does Per Hansa in Giants of the Earth or a Hoosier schoolmaster. And we need biographers who can demonstrate the thesis of Carlyle and Emerson that all history consists of the biographies of great men. This account is written from almost the opposite point of view: that Mankato was and is a part of something going on wonderfully over much of the country. But no matter how much we celebrate the hour and the moment, the context of

*This appears to be still true, in the 1960's.
the thing, the times must have their man. There is always the person. There is always the individual who receives and responds and in turn influences others to do the same. Let us hope that others will tell the story so that we can see it in the round. This is the stuff of literature waiting for the shaping imagination.

For many decades now, the public institutions of higher education in Minnesota have all opened their doors to high school graduates. They have felt themselves obligated to serve as broad a spectrum of the citizenry as possible. This has not meant that any high school graduate was qualified to enter any program. Professional schools that in their early years had admitted anyone who enrolled and paid the tuition now may require for admission not only a high school diploma and a college degree but also special undergraduate curriculums and a very high level of academic achievement. Thus the concept of higher education as a function of the state reveals drives (or pulls) in two directions: on the one hand, the necessity of discovering ways of meeting the educational needs of many people; on the other, the upgrading of requirements for admission to particular programs. How they move toward these two goals differs among the institutions.

At the University of Minnesota there has been a variety of approaches: among them the General College begun in the early years of the Depression, an elaborate program of extension courses and institutes, a Center for Continuation Study, and a TV College. In all of the state institutions of higher education, the concept of "general education" has much concerned the faculties in the middle third of this century. Junior college programs leading to a terminal degree have been studied by all and adopted in several situations.

Concomitant with concern for a variety of general and special educational needs and opportunities has been a cumulative upgrading of standards to be met for particular programs. For instance, in order for a student at Mankato to be recommended for teacher certification, he must on graduation have a grade-point-average of 2.0 overall and in his special field a grade-point-average of 2.5.
The 2.0 grade-point-average equals a "C" average. This insistence on performance is a part of the screening process. Unless a student maintains a "C" average, his academic record is considered unsatisfactory. This pressures one who has slipped in some area, for he must secure high grades in other areas to bring up his average. With the recent reorganization of the structure of Mankato State College into Schools and Divisions, an additional hurdle was established: a 2.0 grade-point-average required for admission to the School or Division—usually in the sophomore year. For graduate work, the student is required to maintain a "B" average.

Recently the State College Board has approved proposals for raising entrance requirements for the state colleges. One may rather safely predict that the policies which develop in the years ahead will be those which best recognize the opportunities for serving many needs and at the same time respond to the increasing pressures of the times for upgrading qualification of graduates. Many factors are involved in the quality of work a student does. Prescribed hurdles like those mentioned are the simplest to understand and administer and therefore the easiest to use for purposes of comparison. They are extremely useful, for in general the more steps up the ladder of academic achievement a person takes the better the odds are that throughout his career he will be productive. But the very variety of opportunities available also sets up situations in which the student competes with select peer groups and must make his mark when compared with a few who have been winnowed from the many. Students get sorted out within a college, and programs designed to capitalize on that fact may approach excellence in a way different from that of the school which emphasizes anterior selection and either subordinates specialization (as in a liberal arts program) or confines attention to a single discipline (as in a professional school).

For more recent years a certain amount of objective data is available concerning the academic potential of students who enrolled at Mankato. There is an easy way for an institution to rate high in this respect: screen out all who have not already proved
that they will be likely to succeed no matter what kind of instruction they receive. The odds, thus, are very high that a student who has maintained a high grade average in high school through the whole spread of teachers and courses he has taken knows how to get good grades and will be able to continue to do so. A physician who treated only patients who had passed their physicals with flying colors would have a high rate of “cures”—or at least a low incidence of incurables.

Since before World War I high school graduation has been the principal admission requirement for Minnesota’s normals, teachers colleges, and state colleges. Non-residents meet somewhat higher admission requirements, and within the last few years some restrictions are being placed on students whose high school record is not promising. But in general for the past half century the door to educational opportunity at Mankato has been open.

The fact that students came to a teachers college in order to prepare themselves for an academic vocation appears, however, to have operated as automatic self-screening. The nature of the job envisioned had an appeal to students who liked school and wanted to become a part of the learning-teaching situation as a career. Conversely, it would exert less attraction for the low achievers. In addition, while the entrance door was open, the exit was also. If the student had the desire, he was not denied the opportunity to try. If he produced, fine; if not, he could try something else. The standards of retention mentioned above appear to have been similar to those elsewhere.

Keeping these factors in mind, one finds the record very interesting—for the College, of course, but also for the whole idea of opportunity through education.

In the 1930’s the College reported for several years the academic status of entering students as indicated by their rank in their high school graduating class. Early in the decade two-thirds of the freshmen had come from the top half of their high school classes. By 1937, over three-fourths had graduated in the top half.
almost a quarter in the top ten per cent of their high school class. The people who were planning to become teachers would thus appear to be quite a choice segment of the youth of the generation.

That this was generally true of teachers colleges across the country may be doubted. One check would seem to indicate otherwise. After World War II for a number of years, entering freshmen at Mankato took a standardized English test. There were norms for comparison of scores made by Mankato students with those of students from other schools with similar histories and function. Usually the median score at Mankato was at the point which would have put the student in the top one-third nationally; in 1963 it was over the seventy-second percentile mark. Usually, twenty per cent of Mankato freshmen ranked in the top one-tenth nationally, almost twenty-four per cent in 1961. We should note that the '50's and the '60's were the years when enrollments were doubling and redoubling. The absence of a marked trend one way or another is significant; in fact the English scores at Mankato were a little higher in the latter years. The quantity-quality dilemma—so commonly proclaimed when numbers go up—is not documented by these findings.

In January of 1966, the Research Service of the Student Personnel Counseling Center at the College compiled a summary analysis of research and reports concerning the students at the College. One part of this study reports the comparison of the ACT scores made by entering freshmen at Mankato with those seeking admission elsewhere. This ACT entrance examination was administered to 150,000 students in 329 colleges and universities, largely state institutions in the Midwest. In all four areas—English, mathematics, social sciences, and natural sciences—and in the composite (total) score, the medians for Mankato students were at or above the medians of all participants. In percentile ranking, a student in the top half of his class at Mankato would have been in the top one-third of the entire group.

It would thus appear that measured by academic tests the students enrolling at Mankato compared not unfavorably with
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others. Both in the middle 1960's when more than ten thousand students were enrolling each year and in the 1930's when there were perhaps a tenth of that number, the student body at Mankato was composed of what appears to be much the same quality of students: a good cross section of the college bound, with a substantial skew of the curve to the right.

The explanation of this phenomenon could be the most significant aspect of the whole century of the institution's history. As a college grows it attracts more students probably because it offers opportunities attractive to more persons. As the teachers colleges became multi-purpose colleges, persons who before would have completed their schooling with high school or gone elsewhere discovered in their part of the state challenge and opportunity to continue their education. The potential for human development, it seems clear, is vaster than we have been able to realize, and the state that acts to develop and release this potential will not confine its efforts to inherited patterns either in the nature of the institutions or in the educational experiences provided. If the lesson of a century is anything at all, it seems to be that an educational institution which serves important needs of the people will find the work fruitful past imagining.
ONE OF the interesting aspects of the history of the College is the government of the institution. Seventeenth century England and its rebel colonies of the later years of the eighteenth century built a case for civil authority resting on the consent of the governed. This meant that regulations would be passed by a legislature elected by the governed. The executive was charged with administering the laws the legislature passed—these and no others!

This concept was of course written into the Constitution of the United States, and when the various states developed their instruments of government the idea of government by consent was basic. This is essentially what we mean by democracy.

The idea works also for a county or city government—in fact, for any group which is united for a purpose and either as a whole or by delegation draws up the rules by which it operates.

When the executive branch of the government is charged with the administration of the laws the legislature has enacted, it is constantly faced with problems of interpreting those laws. These interpretations become a new body of second-level law, subject of course to judicial review in case of question of illegality, but practically becoming rules of procedure governing the bureau of government concerned. The employees, thus, are in their employment not in a democratic relation with their employer (that is, government by consent), but in a contractual relation. Except in so far as they are citizens of the state and thus able to influence legislation, their employer-employee relationship is much like that of one working for a private employer.
In such a contractual relationship the employer sets up conditions under which he would like to employ another. The employee accepts them or rejects them. He may from time to time negotiate a new contract or, being unable to do so, terminate the arrangement. Whether the employer is a private individual, a corporation, or a unit of government, the idea of government by rules of the governed’s making no longer fits the situation. That it does not do so is generally recognized, and almost as generally it has lead to uneasiness. Why should a people who have de-throned monarchs submit to subserviency in their daily employment? An ingenious people naturally have tried different strategies for bringing employment and citizenship closer together in ideology. At one extreme might be communism (with a lower-case c), but this has had little attraction in this country for many reasons—and has the same problems of bureaucracy as any other government. Various kinds of cooperatives have been and are being used. Businesses and industries owned and managed by the people who work there appear occasionally. The labor movement has used organization as a device for negotiating regulations to which the “governed” would be willing to consent.

A state college created by a democracy is politically quite a different thing from an association of scholars who unite to conduct an educational program, who themselves finance the operation, and who make their own rules. Such an idea did develop in the medieval university, but it is almost completely abandoned in modern times—simply because higher education is normally not a money-making venture; in fact, it needs vast subsidy. Although it is obvious that a college financed and governed by the state is not a parallel to the political setup envisioned by Locke and Jefferson, the scholar is nonetheless restive as a hired hand and through the years has moved to define the special status of the academic community. The doctrine of academic freedom, for instance, while it has its justification in the idea of knowledge itself, yet in this context has come to represent an important strategy for preserving the “rights of the governed.” Another
closely related concept is that of "professionalism"—as in medicine or law.

To be sure, a contract has a certain element of "consent of the governed" in it (a presumed "social contract" was the original rationale of political rights in seventeenth-century thought), and theoretically resignation is the same crude solution to intolerable conditions as giving up one's citizenship would be in the political realm. Emigration is a sorry last resort; our ancestors left their homes for something better.

The right of tenure is a strategy for the protection of the "governed" in the academic world, but it is only a right to continue, not to "elect the legislature." Actually although tenure rights play a part in the academic pressure for autonomy, the basic justification derives from the nature of the pursuit of knowledge rather than from the rights-of-the-governed political theory: the proven scholar must be free to teach and investigate without the pressures of dismissal threats.

What has actually worked out in the government of the state colleges is an elaborate balancing of the two concepts of relationship: the political consent-of-the-governed democratic concept and the contractual. It is hard to decide where the balance lies or where it will lie in the future. Bureaus of government are expanding at such fantastic rates that already wits are projecting the curve to predict the date when we shall all be working for the government. And government as employer has shown itself more reluctant even than the private employer to allow the employees to make their own rules. In fact, the right of governmental employees to protest is much more circumscribed than the rights which government insists must be granted those who work for non-governmental employees.

On the other hand, the history of the College affords a number of instances of the desirability or necessity of delegating decision to persons closest to the situation and best qualified to understand what is involved.

There is another way of saying all this: the experience of
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this institution reveals a tension between centralization and de-
centralization of decision. The framework of Minnesota govern-
ment and the devotion to democracy pull both ways.

The legal basis for the school Minnesota established at Man-
kato goes back to 1858, the year the Territory became the State. On August second of that year the first Legislature approved a bill authorizing the establishment of three normals:

LXXIX. Section 1. There shall be established within five years after the passage of this Act, an institution to educate and prepare teachers for teaching in the Common Schools of the State, to be called a State Normal School. There shall be established within ten years after the passage of this Act, a second State Normal School, and within fifteen years a third; provided, there shall be no obligation to establish the first Normal School until the sum of five thousand dollars is donated to the State in money and lands, or in money alone, for the erection of the necessary buildings, and for the support of the professors or teachers in such institutions, but when such sum is donated for such purpose a like sum of five thousand dollars shall be and hereby is appropriated by the Legislature, and shall be, on the order of the proper officers, paid out of any moneys in the treasury not otherwise appropriated by law for the use and benefit of such institution.

Section 2 contained similar provisions for a second normal; Section 3, for a third. The first became the school at Winona; the second, that at Mankato; and the third, that at St. Cloud.

The State Normal Board of Instruction was to be appointed by the Governor within thirty days after the passage of this Act. There were to be six members, one from each of the judicial districts. After 1860 the Board was to be elected by the Legislature, and vacancies were to be filled by the Legislature. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction was to be ex officio a member of the Normal Board and its secretary.

To the Board was delegated the responsibility of locating where the normals would be—within the conditions prescribed by the Act, including the "healthfulness and beauty of situation . . . accessibility and general convenience . . . the wants of the common schools, and the wishes of donors who may make munificent donations, conditioned upon a particular location."
The Board was placed squarely in charge of the schools. They were to have control of the erection of buildings, to appoint the faculty, to prescribe the course of study and the prerequisites for admission, and to make "all needful rules for the government of said schools."

For a single Board to exercise such a mandate presented problems. Since directors would come from all six judicial districts of the state, the situation was inevitably one of remote control. Just getting about the state was a consideration. These were years of converting wagon trails into roads, of shifting the movement of supplies from river routes to land. There were no railroads in Minnesota before the Civil War, but there was much interest, and by 1865 about two hundred miles of track had been laid. Road building was pushed, and the early pages of the Laws of the State contain many pages of legislation relating to roads. Yet getting in a car and driving from one of the state colleges to St. Paul in an hour or two was a century off. Locating the three normals at Winona, Mankato, and St. Cloud was itself vivid testimony of this transportation factor, for these were river towns, two of them on the Mississippi—as was the Capital—and Mankato on the other main artery of river transportation (since the early trappers arrived more than a century and a half earlier), the Minnesota.

The Act of 1858 took this situation into account. For day-to-day supervision of the school, the Board was authorized to appoint a "Prudential Committee" of three persons, one of whom should be a member of the Board. Moreover it was provided that the member of the Board in any normal district and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction would be "special visitors" of the normal school. Either they or those they appointed were to visit and examine the school at least two days in each session.

The Civil War interrupted the program of establishing the three normal schools. Winona got under way, but the five-year intervals for establishing each of the other two was postponed five years in 1860, and also again in 1865. That would have made the earliest date for the school at Mankato 1870, but by 1866
the situation had eased enough to go ahead once more.

In Chapter 37, Section 2 of the General Statutes, 1866, Mankato was specified as the site of the second normal:

> There shall be established at Mankato, in this state, an institution to educate and prepare teachers for teaching in the common schools of this state, called the second state normal school.

Section 4 provided that whenever Mankato raised five thousand dollars the State would match it, "but no part of such named sum shall be drawn or paid out of the treasury until after the first of April, 1867."

Section 5 made similar provision for St. Cloud.

Section 6 set up a three-year deadline for Mankato to meet the conditions.

The report of the State Normal School Board to the Governor for the year ending December 1, 1869, reviews this legislation:

> Second State Normal School, Mankato, located by an Act of the Legislature, passed February 1866, organized and opened for students, October 7, 1868, in rooms temporarily furnished for the purpose, George M. Gage, Principal.

The minutes of the Board for January 1, 1868 record a resolution that the Second State Normal School at Mankato be organized.

On July 16, 1868 the Board met at Mankato, appointed a Prudential Committee and authorized them to get the Mankato school in operation.

On August 4, 1868 the Board met at St. Cloud. George M. Gage of Maine was elected Principal of Second State Normal School—at a salary of $2000.

On September 5, 1868 Mr. Gage distributed a circular announcing that the Normal at Mankato would open October sixth. One day late, it opened on October seventh with twenty-seven pupils.

With minor modifications the basic arrangements for the operation of the normals continued for many decades. In addition to the Director, a treasurer for each of the normals was designated.
Thus there was the Board to make decisions on general matters of policy, one member of which came from Mankato—in 1868, Mr. Daniel Buck (later Judge Daniel Buck; he had been very active in securing the location of the school at Mankato; the first dormitory, Daniel Buck Hall, opened in 1913, was to be named for him). In addition, for local matters, there was the treasurer (for Mankato in 1868, Mr. John N. Hall). Finally there was the Prudential Committee for Mankato, with Mr. Buck as chairman. The other members of the first Prudential Committee were Mr. James Brown and Mr. J. B. Murphy—neither a member of the Board.

The office of "Treasurer, Mankato" drops from the record after 1872. This was also the last year for the Prudential Committee. In 1876, each of the representatives from the three communities at which normals were located was designated "Resident Director." The title does not again appear in the catalogue listings of Board membership until the 1880-1881 announcements. But then it continues until the 1894-1895 catalogue, when the designation became "Treasurer." In the catalogue for 1899-1900, the term "Resident Director" was revived. In 1920 the title was dropped, but the assignment continued. It was not until 1963 that the Legislature dropped the requirement that there should be one director in each county in which a state college is located. By this time other important changes had taken place.

It would be expected that in a hundred years personality conflicts would arise within the Board, the presidents, the faculties, the students, the constituencies of the schools and colleges. They did, of course, though one suspects that relatively few appear in the official records. The year 1873 was not good—in almost any way one could think of. The state was hit by recession. The Sears mixup at Mankato earlier referred to had alienated students and townfolk. Enrollments were falling in both Normal Department and the Model School. The new building at Mankato was showing up poor construction and was already in bad repair. The public image of the normal school was probably close to an all-time
low. One outspoken and energetic normal school president apparently stepped on too many toes, and a resolution to fire him lost on a tie vote. Delegation of authority to local committees in contractual and financial matters encounters risks, and there is indication that the situation at Mankato became unsavory. Principal John must have had a talent for gaucherie. His annual report includes a tribute to his new Resident Director, a fellow clergyman, the Reverend G. W. T. Wright, D.D., "whose wise and economical management has brought order out of chaos and placed the school on a sound financial basis." While one rejoices that Dr. Wright arrived on the scene in the nick of time, one's imagination speculates on the antecedent financial chaos implied. The dropping of the Prudential Committee was at this time—no doubt a significant coincidence.

Personnel problems show up only occasionally throughout the years. A teacher may protest an administrative ruling and appeal to the Board. A president may be waited upon by a special subcommittee of the Board to hear charges and present his answers. But the vast preponderance of personnel matters are routine: the institution makes recommendations within policy lines established by the Board; the Board approves or modifies. A substantial part of the records of Board action is devoted to passing on matters of employment. What this means in terms of overall policy is that by and large the Board has thought of itself as delegating to qualified persons responsibility for making decisions, and that the Board's proper function was to be available to establish guidelines as need for such arose.

In actuality it never worked out quite so neatly. The original authorization of the Board put them in charge of the normal schools. They were charged not only with making all "needful rules for said schools," but with regular visitation and inspection on campus to see that what was intended actually took place and worked out. Periodically new courses of study were presented to the Board by the presidents, but regularly the Board of Visitors (as it was called in the 1880's) or its predecessors or successors,
checked up. In the 1890’s the Board was taking quite seriously and literally its duty of inspection. Not only did the official visitors visit the campus and classrooms, inspecting the grounds, equipment, and records, but they also decided to find out for themselves precisely how much students were learning. Constructing their own tests, they required each candidate for graduation to take a three-hour written and oral examination. Grading the papers, they were not particularly happy with the results: the Committee (May 12, 1894) complained that students lacked “a thorough acquaintance with . . . the common branches.” In the spring of 1895 several Board meetings were devoted largely to the examinations and the handling of appeals when certain candidates for graduation were scratched from the list. There were problems. Some students were ill when the examiners arrived. Some were off campus doing student teaching. Making the rounds was an onerous assignment for the committee members—to say nothing of returning for make-ups!

By the spring of 1897, the assignment was delegated to a single director, with expenses of the visitations to be paid by the several schools. Included in his report was this concern about the entire process:

It was found at the outset that no inspector or outside committee whatsoever, could, by cursory and necessarily superficial examination of one day or even three days, be as competent judges of the fitness or unfitness of these candidates for graduation as their instructors who have been with them, testing them, and trying them by all the most approved standards for months and years, and whose mental conceptions of their standing must be far more clear and conclusive than any hasty judgment recorded in arbitrary figures obtained upon a test of a few hours duration. If this be not the case then it is a fair presumption that the faculties need looking after not less than the products of their work.

One sees in this episode not only how a Board was interpreting its stewardship responsibility, but the larger matter of educational goals and the evaluation of achievement. At the initiation of the normal-school idea, curriculum makers were confronted with pressures to make normal work a mastering of subjects taught in elementary schools: learn it and learn ’em! As curriculums were
adapted to new concepts of what schools should be trying to do and the qualifications necessary for teaching such schools, the lay Board members increasingly relied on techniques other than personal examination of candidates to determine fitness for graduation. In the 1950's the idea of comprehensive examination of all seniors was again seriously considered for a few months, but was allowed to expire. Yet the responsibility of the Board for the quality of instruction is built in. The whole system hangs on it. The temptation to seek an objective yardstick of measurement is perennial. In the 1890's the approach was direct: test the students. In more recent years, it shifted to merit raises for the faculty. It remains a thorny concern of all devoted to excellence.

A school must have a place to be. There must be a building to begin with—classrooms, an assembly room, an office for the principal. This was almost the first responsibility of the Board: they could not go ahead at all unless Mankato raised $5000 for this purpose to match the similar amount the Legislature authorized. A normal school building was occupied in 1870. Almost immediately cracks and leaks began to appear. In a few years the principal was complaining that some of the rooms could not be heated warm enough to use in winter. In 1879 the roof blew off in a windstorm. In 1893 two three-story wings were added, and the president could point with pride: "The school edifice as now enlarged is one of the most spacious, convenient and imposing in the country. It has a frontage of 272 feet ..." But by the turn of the century its heating system seemed archaic: twenty-two furnaces! And a new system was installed. In 1907 a $15,000 library was added, with a large fireplace and a beamed ceiling.

In 1922, on a Sunday morning, February fifth, fire destroyed the building which had been The Normal for this part of Minnesota during half a century. Plans were immediately made to take care of students in temporary quarters; enrollments actually increased sixty per cent over the previous spring. A new building was erected on the same spot, and it served as the principal instructional unit until the big surge after World War II.
There were other housing needs. In 1881 the Normal was authorized to lease a suitable building for a girls' dormitory, but it was not until 1911 that an appropriation of $105,000 was made for women's residence—occupied as Daniel Buck Hall in 1913. Cooper Hall was occupied the same year as the new main building, 1924.

In 1909, the new Model School Building was completed—the south wing of the present Administrative Building, and now the oldest building on campus. In 1939 the Health and Physical Education Building was finished: three main gyms, several smaller ones, an indoor track, an archery range, a warming room for ice skaters in the winter, classrooms, offices, and the quarters of the student health center.

Such was the building story through the first eighty years of the school's history. Since then it has been different.

Students came, and they came, and they came. Facilities never could catch up with enrollments. Faculty officed five or six to a room. Classrooms were scheduled tight from morning till late afternoon—and on Monday evenings and less frequently on Saturdays. One year classes were held in the education units of churches near the campus. For a while serious consideration was given to buying the Ben Pay Hotel downtown and using it for a dormitory. A men's residence hall, Searing, was occupied in 1952, a classroom building for the sciences and the arts the same year. A half block of houses across Fifth Street from the Administration Building were condemned by the State, and in 1958 the library was moved to a new home there.

But this was an expensive way to get land, and with no ceiling on enrollment in sight, the authorities reluctantly decided that a second campus was the only feasible solution. The Science and Arts Quadrangle was completed in 1960, but other than that all new building has been on the Highland Campus since 1958.

The Valley Campus through much of the school's history was only a few acres in extent. Presently it totals thirty acres. At the Highland Campus are 295 acres. About two dozen buildings
or interconnected units of buildings have sprung up on Highland Campus since 1959, including two thirteen-story towers that dominate the skyline and look out over the Minnesota Valley and cities of Mankato and North Mankato. The new Education-English building (now Armstrong Hall) was planned to take care of one hundred per cent increases in classroom and office-space needs. A year after it was occupied in 1964, it was crowded.

In some ways it would seem that the Legislature assigned the government of the state normals, teachers colleges, or state colleges to the Board. But to the Board members it must have been very clear that their areas of discretion were subject to severe limitations. The primary limitation was money. Back in the early seventies, a disgruntled legislature refused to make necessary appropriations, and the normals had to postpone payment of bills (including faculty salaries) until a new appeal could be made after the first of January to another legislature. The Board here was successful in handling the emergency without obligating the State beyond appropriations—by sheer morale it would seem, a notable achievement. And this, it will be recalled, was at a time when the normalschool image was not bright. But always a prime consideration in Board action is the financial one, and here they must ask and justify their asking and make do with the inevitable compromises that emerge.

In a well-run state government, not only must a department depend upon appropriations made by the legislature, but its use of the funds must be adequately audited. This means that the Board of the state colleges is not only controlled by what the legislature appropriates but also by the controls that are set up to supervise the expenditure of those funds.

For about two-thirds of the history of this College, these limitations on the power of the Board to govern the various schools was a Minnesota matter. Moneys came from Minnesota taxes, and supervision was chiefly through the executive branch of the State's government. To be sure there were other than fi-
nancial and therefore other than governmental restrictions on the Board's autonomy. Decisions at the normals and teachers colleges had to be made in relation to others in public and private education—principally in the state, but elsewhere as well. It is clear from the record that the move to offer a four-year degree, the move to educate teachers for high schools, and the move to become multi-purpose institutions were only possible when they no longer met strong resistance from others in education. Particular programs added to curriculums came in answer to needs of the constituency. Accreditation was by regional and national agencies. The notion of autonomy has almost no ultimate validity: there are always pressures—of groups, of the times, of developments. Even a dictator rules by sufferance. A bureau of a democratic government is by very definition but a means by which the people get work done, hopefully their work. The etymology of bureau is interesting: the desk on which one writes, in this instance, hopefully, on which Demos writes.

Thus in the academic world when one looks for the ruler, he finds decisions behind decisions and deciders behind deciders—all literally without end. The vote in the legislative committee or in the general session reflects conditioning factors—as do the ballots that put the legislator there to vote.

Such a philosophic view of the matter is simple to formulate but at any particular moment anyone working in the system may be acquiescent, cynical, frustrated, or defiant. As the institutions the State Teachers College Board or the State College Board governed became more complex, the opportunities for friction at points of decision multiplied.

During the 1930's money became available from Federal funds for assisting students by jobs. During World War II first a Civilian Pilot Training Program and then a unit of the Navy V-5 Program were assigned to Mankato, and the faculty found themselves teaching courses not of their own devising. Later there was the GI Bill and a variety of services to veterans. These were only the beginnings of the marriage of work done on campus and fund-
ing from the Federal treasury. In the 1950's and 1960's the term Federal grant emerged as a standard part of academic vocabulary. By the mid-1960's it was clear to all that higher education in America would be in the future a joint achievement of the traditional budgetary resources and the go-aheads which come from Washington.

These contracts with Federal agencies confronted the Board with problems in addition to the accustomed one of what could be done within the limits of the biennial appropriations. Not infrequently legal problems were involved, or matching money would be required. The Board found itself in big business requiring detailed and continued auditing and supervision. Another development of the 1950's dramatized this trend in another way. With students jamming all of the campuses of the state, huge sums of money were required for expansion of the physical plant. One partial approach to easing the pressure on the state treasury was the proposal to amortize the construction of new housing units through student dormitory fees. Since this involved the issuance of bonds to be liquidated over a number of years, the Board was forced to set up machinery which would provide the guarantees of supervision and control which would make such bonds marketable.

A central office thus became imperative. And the office must be staffed and administered. This meant a professional administrative unit other than those on the individual campuses. What should this administrator be called, and what would be his relation to the administrations of the colleges? Would he be a kind of super-president of all the colleges—like the chancellor of a university?

The moderation and caution that one perceives throughout the century appear again in this situation. There was some urging to clothe the office with firm control and leave no doubt who was in charge. But the Board felt its way along carefully, reflecting once again awareness of dual pulls and dual virtues: of centralization and decentralization, of uniformity and diversity, of "doing the job" and encouraging initiative.
Remote control has a bad sound—no doubt because experience has so often shown the fatuity of separating the act of decision from the facts on which a decision should be made. While a considerable amount of this evil is inescapable under any system of government, it becomes peculiarly onerous when decisions are made on matters of detail. James Gray in his centennial history of the University of Minnesota has an amusing account of the struggle there during the first quarter of this century between the administration of the University and the state supervisors of purchases. He cites instances of rejections of University requisitions, sometimes petty in amount, but which frustrated and incensed the faculty. Finally in the 1920’s the issue was tested in court and the authority of the Regents to complete control of funds appropriated to the University was established as a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the State.

The normal schools, the teachers colleges, and the state colleges suffered under exactly parallel frustrations, but there was no constitutional guarantee here to give them the same right the University enjoyed. As one reads the minutes of the Normal School Board and the Teachers College Board, one finds in general a minimum of rebellion as long as the institutions remained relatively small. (An exception would be in the early 1900’s when the issue was actually taken to court.) But there is a rising crescendo of indignation in the last quarter century. Every president can cite lists of annoyances and handicaps to the work of the colleges due to “some clerk” in the Department of Administration who has run a blue pencil though an item in requisition.

The legal background stretches over at least three-quarters of a century. The Legislature of 1901 set up a Board of Control to which was delegated “full authority in all financial matters of the state university, the state normal schools,” and certain other state institutions. Both the Normal Board and the Board of Regents made such strenuous objections that in 1905 the Legislature modified the powers of the Board of Control and released both the university and the normal schools from its jurisdiction.
In 1925, a Commission of Administration and Finance was created by the Legislature and empowered to approve (or disapprove) the requests for expenditure of all state departments. This was the statute successfully challenged on constitutional grounds by the Board of Regents.

Under the Reorganization Law of 1939, a Department of Administration was established. The Commissioner of Administration was empowered "to purchase, rent, or otherwise provide" all supplies and equipment for state institutions. The University of Minnesota was specifically excluded from this jurisdiction, the state teachers colleges specifically included. This discrimination among state institutions of higher education has no logic other than that of the historic processes which have produced it. That it has affected not only the operation but also the status and prestige of the state colleges is apparent to all familiar with the climate of thought and opinion in the state.

Fiscal control of funds appropriated to the colleges thus became a serious issue in the minds of faculty, administration, and Board. At this writing it is unresolved, but one senses that some way will be found by which the financial responsibility which the Legislature must require can be joined to the realistic facts of a viable academic community. The wisdom and responsibility of the Regents in their use of appropriated funds to build a great university would seem an impressive precedent and a guide to the solution.

The major achievement of the Board was the relating of programs of education offered in the normal schools, the teachers colleges, and the state colleges to what the people wanted and what they were willing to pay for. That story is the great story of this institution, as it is (for what it illustrates) the great story of America. It is unmatched in history or in any other country. A century ago America was a land of opportunity to people of many lands. Free land was an almost incredible attraction. But the shift from the attraction of what one can get to the hope of what one can become is a high-level social development. The principal chap-
ter of this book is devoted to this account; and though we do not repeat or recap it here in this contemplation of the role played by the governing board in the history of the College, we must pay tribute to an achievement made possible by the vision, resourcefulness, tact, judgment, patience, and tenacity of the many citizens who served in legislatures, on legislative committees, in the administration of the State government—but especially to those whose special charge this was: the members of the Board. There is little enough of the sounding of trumpets—and plenty of heckling. But stand off and see what has happened to a people between the 1860's and the 1960's. Relate it to how the people prepared themselves to handle increasingly complicated and responsible social roles in our world. One can little doubt that what has happened here through the creation of expanding horizons of educational opportunity deserves accolades far more tumultuous than those to the triumphal processions of conquerors.
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

THE story of the faculty is different from the rest of this record. Officially it is lost—for the most part. To be sure we can find the names, and that has been done. An appendix includes an alphabetic listing of the administration and faculty as their names appear in the catalogues or other official reports. A limited amount of biographical data is available for the principals and presidents. Moreover their names and acts appear regularly in preserved reports and minutes. But although it is no doubt true that the service performed by those who were teachers at this institution is by all odds the greatest fact in its history, it is not a story we can tell. With enough perseverance and ingenuity no doubt a number of anecdotes concerning personalities on the faculties could be uncovered—especially were one to discover accounts of the goings on at retirement dinners. The student newspapers, year books, and the like would yield their bits. Bibliographies of publication could be assembled, particularly for the later years.

But fundamentally throughout its history the faculty has been a teaching faculty. Their work has been in the classroom and working with groups of students—in curricular, extra-curricular, and co-curricular activities. There were innumerable committees. They studied the needs of their students, of the school, and of their own welfare. They proposed curriculums, revised them, replaced them. They assembled data and made representations to the administration and to the Board. They prepared lessons for their daily classes and corrected tons of student papers. They spoke at teachers institutes (at one time teachers institutes during the late spring months were a regular part of the faculty teaching assign-
They attended MEA and NEA, held offices, presided at sectional and state meetings, regularly participated in their programs. They served on state committees charged with concern for the various aspects of teacher education in Minnesota. They brought back to Mankato the thinking and experience of national groups. In the city of Mankato they were active in church and civic enterprise. As the College grew in size and complexity, persons of competence in a wide range of scholarly and scientific fields made up the faculty; and interests, memberships, and work in academic societies spread across the land and beyond.

In the summers, on sabbaticals, on leave of absence they returned to graduate study to upgrade their professional competencies and to secure tenure, promotion, and pay raises. For many the Mankato assignment was a stepping stone to more lucrative positions elsewhere. For decades Board minutes record the plaints of presidents that their faculties were being attracted to better jobs at other schools. One senses at each of these occasions that the situation is crucial, an emergency. But it is one which perennially recurred. The Board used the same data and testimony in presenting and justifying their budgets to the legislature.

One area of information concerning faculty and administration is quite fully documented: salaries. Since annual appointments were made by the Board, salaries appear in the minutes. We know, for instance, that the first principal of the Second State Normal School, George M. Gage, was paid $2000 each of the four years he was in Mankato. Leaving for the superintendency of the St. Paul schools, he presumably would get more there (he was offered $2500 to stay at the Normal). In 1880, the highest salary paid a public school superintendent in Minnesota was $2850, paid in Minneapolis. One doubts that the State Capital would be far behind.

Faculty salaries when the Normal opened must have seemed quite attractive. In 1870 they ranged from $600 to $850. In that year the Superintendent of Public Education, Mr. H. B. Wilson, reported that the average monthly salary for public school teach-
ers in Minnesota was $37.14 for men, $23.36 for women.

One naturally wants to relate these salaries to cost of living. For years the catalogue at Mankato announced to students that "the prevailing price of board and room in families is three dollars a week." It would thus appear that a school teacher who received less than twenty-four dollars a month for teaching might have to spend half of that amount for a place to stay and something to eat. The official report for 1870 does not indicate how general was the practice of providing board and room at various homes in the district—the "boarding around" we've heard stories about. In the "winter term" about half of the teachers of Minnesota schools would be men. In the "summer term" there would be five times as many schoolmarms as schoolmasters.

By 1880, men in Blue Earth County averaged $31.25 and women $25.28—including board. There was an average of 6.4 months of school each year—and this was high. The state average was 4.6 months of school each year. Other counties make interesting comparisons: Nicollet 3, LeSueur 5, Brown 5.3, Faribault 5.6, Hennepin 6.3, Ramsey 6, Martin 4, Pipestone 2, and Big Stone 2. A principal in a graded school system received from $1000 to $1700 (Minneapolis). The range for superintendents was $1200 (Mankato and Rochester) to $2850 (Minneapolis). There were sixty-three districts in the state with two or more teachers. The teacher in a graded school taught (on the average) fifty-four pupils.

Thus in 1880 the average annual income for a woman teaching in Blue Earth County would be a little more than $160, for men perhaps much less if they taught only in the winter. It is not difficult to see why study at the Normal was not, typically, an unbroken pursuit of a curriculum, straight through from matriculation to graduation.

In 1880, salaries paid the faculty at Mankato ranged from $500 to $1200, a scale that should have been attractive to persons who began their teaching careers in public-school teaching. It is therefore interesting to read that in the May meeting of the Board,
the principal at Winona reported that in recruiting new faculty he could not meet the competition of high schools on salaries. It was a lament to be heard often again.

When Mr. Gage resigned in the spring of 1871 to become superintendent at St. Paul, the salary of the normal-school principals had just been raised $500. It is not clear what Miss Sears received the year she was principal, but her successor, the Reverend Mr. John, came at $2500 in 1873. Considering the financial recession in the state and county that year, this is interesting. But the figure did not last, and fell back to $2000 in 1875. That was the salary when Mr. Searing took the job in 1880. It was once again $2500 in 1885, where it stayed through the Searing presidency. President Cooper received $3000 in 1900, $3500 in 1906. Salaries took a substantial boost after the first World War, and by the mid-1920's the president was receiving $5500, the figure at which President McElroy came.

Faculty salaries ranged from $600 to $850 in 1870, from $450 to $800 in 1871. By the next year one teacher was receiving $1200. By 1889, the top job paid $1800. With a change in personnel, it dropped to $1400 in '92, then rose to $1575 in '94, $1600 in '95, and back again to $1800 in '96. By 1902, the position of superintendent of the Model School paid $2000. With the teacher shortage after the War, the limit on faculty salary rose to $3600 in 1926, to $4000 in 1930, and to $4000 plus about six hundred more for summer in 1938. A new member of the faculty in the late 1930's probably received about $2000 for the regular year, possibly another two or three hundred for summer school teaching.

Something about upgrading the professional qualifications of the faculty has been mentioned in the chapter relating the curricular changes in the College. It is difficult to know what happened in the first thirty years. Mr. John printed his A.M. in the catalogue; and Mr. Searing did also the first year of his presidency, but after that academic degrees are omitted from the catalogue listings of his faculty. Under President Cooper, the practice of list-
ing degrees was begun again, and it is evident that the omission under the Searing administration does not mean the absence of degrees—but some intention not to consider it worth noting.

As the teachers colleges developed programs leading to a four-year degree, the faculty became more interested in the conventional scale of college faculty promotion known as academic ranking. There was, however, some reluctance where seniority had been achieved on bases other than those likely to count for rating on a particular academic rank. Adjustments were made, and a fairly conventional grouping pattern was eventually achieved, perhaps reaching its hey-dey of importance in the 1950's. In the sixties the competition for faculty among institutions of higher education became strenuous, and at some schools rank was a card to be played in the bidding. Many held out, but a good degree could be a means to fast promotion, even the bypassing of a rank, by a little moving—or even within an institution—at a speed that left others who had trod the long road a bit dizzy, or resentful.

About the same time that the teachers colleges began to move toward academic ranking—the late 1930's—the faculties of the colleges began to feel that faculty interests would be better served if they could speak with one voice, and an Inter-Faculty Organization was achieved. The faculty associations in the different teachers colleges and state colleges and the IFO with its executive council called the Inter-Faculty Policies Committee have remained important vehicles for faculty influence from that time. With representatives sitting in on the Board meetings and with the right to communicate the sense of the faculty represented, the IFO and the IFPC constitute an effective instrument for consideration of problems of faculty welfare and for presenting points of view and supporting information to the local administrations, to the state administration, and to legislative committees.

In the later 1950's a move appeared to work out in greater detail means of faculty participation in the decisions and administration of the whole work of the College. Constitutions were formulated and adopted. While the chief administrative officer
of the College still has the responsibility for what happens, especially when things get out of line, in practice most decisions are worked out in close consultation with faculty representation. While the Board still is responsible to the Governor and the Legislature in all matters, in practice most of the work on policy has been done before it receives their consideration, and normally Board decisions decide. One sore spot remains: the financial control exercised by the Department of Administration. This was challenged over sixty years ago—even taken to court—but it has been lived with (sometimes tolerantly, sometimes bitterly) ever since.

Probably no one believes that the tensions between consent-of-the-governed and bureaucratic line authority and responsibility have found a resolution here, either theoretical or practical. As institutions become large and complicated, the techniques of achieving consent take priority over objective or subjective evaluation. One may confidently expect that in the next century campus politics will become a way of life for the academically energetic and ambitious. It is simple enough to view such an eventuality ruefully; yet the history of the past century of the institution, the state, and the country should make one cautious about derisive dismissal of the strategies which enlist concern of the many. Government by committee lends itself to caricature, but a society which draws on its human resources is the healthy one, the productive one, ultimately the greatest one. What one sees in a society of scholars and scientists involved in teaching and learning is an on-going experimental approach to the problem which Plato explored in the Republic: How a society can best use its human resources. The answer of Locke and Jefferson was not the same as Plato’s. This implementation of the Declaration of Independence in the daily lives of governmental employees is a problem as yet hardly formulated clearly. But a community of ten to twenty thousand students and a faculty of five hundred to fifteen hundred teachers subsidized in salary and facilities by the state, by Federal grants, by foundation grants (and the future only knows
what other sources of sustenance!)—such an academic community will be an exciting laboratory for the discovery of ways by which human talent may be discovered and encouraged to find fulfillment.
EPILOGUE

THERE are no beginnings and no endings. What we see as islands are but slight elevations protruding above the fluid film of the globe’s surface. The shoreline may be charted, but it changes with the tide. An elevation of the sea by a few feet or a shrinking of the oceans would make our continents and the civilizations they bear something quite different.

The role of the teacher is almost as protean as the shapes of that fabled one who gave us the word. It stretches across the gradations of dignity from the menial to the revered. Edwin Grant Dexter quoted this little vignette from colonial America, the words of a Reverend George Ross:

There are some private schools within my reputed districts which are put very often into the hands of those who are brought into the country and sold for servants. Some schoolmasters are hired by the year by a knot of families who, in their turn, entertain him monthly, and the poor man lives in their houses like one that begged an alms, more like a person in credit and authority. When a ship arrives in the river it is a common expression with those who stand in need of an instructor for their children, let us go and buy a schoolmaster. The truth is, the office and character of such a person is generally very mean and contemptible here, and it cannot be other ways ’til the public take the Education of Children into their mature consideration.

Dexter also cites a statement made in 1678 by Jonathan Boucher, rector at Annapolis:

... not a ship arrives with either redemptioners or convicts, in which schoolmasters are not regularly advertised for sale, as weavers, tailors, or other trade, with little other difference that I can hear of except perhaps that the former do not usually fetch so good a price as the latter.

At the other extreme is the use of teacher as the epithet of highest veneration. No other term was adequate for Confucius. The work of the teacher is illumination, and Buddha is Sanskrit
for "enlightened." The Hebrew word rabbi, teacher, was one of Jesus' contemporaries applied to him. But more important was the kind of imagery one finds in the Fourth Gospel: the Light of the World. Always and everywhere the light-darkness antithesis is a device one seize for the contrast between the way up and the way down. It is Plato's Allegory of the Cave—which after more than sixty generations remains one of the most acute delineations of the nature of educational emergence—of moving out of the cave and its shadows into clear sunlight and comprehension.

That there should be this range of attitude toward the teacher and his work is no accident. Its basis is biology. A little child is less than a man. A leader of little children, thus, must be in status inferior to a leader of adults. Moreover, the child is ignorant, inexperienced. He can be manipulated or coerced by some one older and bigger. At the minimum, the teacher tends school, like a babysitter—and with not much more demanding qualifications.

But on the other hand, the child is the perfect image of growth, of becoming, of looking forward to something better next year. And this is what each man who lives in hope wants for himself, for his own, for his society. He wants to find his way out of darkness with its fumbling and bruised shins. He wants to get where he can see things as they are.

We return, thus, at last, to our original thesis: the educational system America has built and is abuilding arises out of a deep conviction that the most available door to opportunity is education. Whenever that note is struck it sets up answering vibrations.

It would have been pleasant in this account to record samples of the oratory of the frontier. Here one sees why those early legislators regarded it as axiomatic that a people must prepare themselves for self-government. About the time the Territory of Minnesota was being established, Horace Mann was preaching this gospel:
I believe Normal Schools to be a new instrumentality in the advancement of the race. I believe that, without them, Free Schools themselves would be shorn of their strength and their healing power, and would at length become mere charity schools, and thus die out in fact and form. Neither the art of printing, nor the trial by jury, nor a free press, nor free suffrage, can long exist, to any beneficial and salutary purpose, without schools for the training of teachers: for, if the character and qualifications of teachers be allowed to degenerate, the Free Schools will become pauper schools, and the pauper schools will produce pauper souls, and the free press will become a false and licentious press, and ignorant voters will become venal voters, and through the medium and guise of republican forms, an oligarchy of profligate and flagitious men will govern this land: nay, the universal diffusion and ultimate triumphs of all-glorious Christianity itself must await the time when knowledge shall be diffused among men through the instrumentality of good schools. Coiled up in this institution, as in a spring, there is a vigor whose uncoiling may wheel the spheres.

Well, we could hardly have put it stronger! This free-wheeling style is not exactly to our taste: neither that austere restraint of the documentation, nor that rhetoric which shows our penchant for understatement carefully shielded by irony and ambiguity. But our faith in what Mann was proclaiming has never been so strong. The proof is pragmatic.

The role of the teacher was the fundamental concern of the normals and the teachers colleges—both in how to teach the students who came to their classes and in how, at one remove, to influence the kind of teaching that was to be done in the schoolrooms of the state. Back in 1848 when Thomas Mann caught a glimpse of that vigor coiled up in the very idea of educational opportunity, he was no doubt thinking of teachers of graded and ungraded district schools. But enthusiasm starts ablaze at the mighty potential of the human mind and spirit, if it can find expression. The role of all teachers from those in charge of infants to the direction of graduate studies and research is the single search for finding ways to help people realize their potential. Reading and writing and arithmetic are means to that end, but so also are research projects in nucleic acids and seminars in Camus or a pilgrimage to Picasso in Antibes.

It is no accident that the highest earned degree an educational institution in America can confer enshrines this image of the
teacher. The doctor is a teacher—so in the Latin. And, beauti-
fully, he is also a learner, one with the love of becoming aware—
so in the Greek. A teacher of the love of knowing!

A century of the enterprise at Mankato is now accomplished. What was before stretches back through mankind's history as far as we can trace, as far as we can conjecture. What accompanied it and made it possible and drew upon it was the latent and active instinct that draws man toward light and self-fulfillment. Given man, the century which lies ahead gives no promise of lesser seeking. With data outdated even during the launching from the pad, the voracious appetite for what and how and why and so what will not be appeased. No doubt the curriculum will list courses in interstellear navigation and programming genetic variations. One wonders if any substitute will be devised for grading weekly themes. Will the teacher become not a loner but a supervising engineer with electronic diagnosis, prescription, and prognosis?

A century ago—even half of that, or a quarter—higher edu-
cation was a kind of finishing school for an elite. A college boy was of a predictable age and social milieu. The graduate school and the GI Bill changed all that. The professors went back for degrees. Where young folk had been expelled if they married before graduation, the campus now teems with parents. Learning has become a job for which a lifetime is much too short. It has to be a continuous and cooperative effort. It pays off in new products, in lengthened longevity predictions, in the kinds of issues a society prepares itself to confront.

So far the pattern of education in the public mind is a simple continuum: grade school, high school, college, graduate or professional school. How much of this will be the viable framework three generations from now?

The past is always prologue. If the informing spirit that has shaped Mankato State College and what enterprises like this represent in the American scheme of things prevails, the next hundred years should be worth looking at!
APPENDIX A: The Board

An alphabetical listing of Board members with the term of board membership.

ANDERSON, ARNOLD C. Montevideo. 1967--
ANDREWS, GENERAL C. C. St. Cloud. 1868-1869.
ANKENY, A. T. Minneapolis. 1898-1902, President.
AUSTIN, GEORGE W. Mankato. 1872-1874. Treasurer 1872.
BANCHELDER, SAMUEL. Albert Lea. 1872-1873.
BARNES, NATHAN F. St. Cloud. 1869-1870.
BARR, GEORGE T. Mankato. 1883-1885. Resident Director.
BJORKLUND, MRS. CARL. Hopkins. 1953-1957.
BLODGETT, H. F. Anoka. 1868-1870.
BROOKS, REV. JABEZ. Red Wing. 1868-1870.
BROWN, JAMES. Mankato. 1871-1872.
BUCK, DANIEL. Mankato. 1868-1870. 1872-1873.
BUCK, H. L. Winona. 1904-1908. Resident Director.
BURT, DAVID. St. Paul. 1875-1881. Secretary.
CAMPBELL, MARVIN. Crookston. 1965-.
CHELSEY, FRANK G. Red Wing. 1965-.
COMSTOCK, GEORGE M. Moorhead. 1943-1952.
CROMB, JNO. Crookston. 1890-1894.
DEVANEY, JOHN P. Minneapolis. 1931-1933.
DONOHUE, HOWARD. St. Cloud. 1937-1938.
DOSLAND, C. G. Moorhead. 1913-1914. Resident Director.
DUNLAP, ROBERT. Rochester. 1967-.
ENGSTROM, A. E. Cannon Falls. 1892-1896.
GAGE, GEORGE M. St. Paul. 1873-1874. President.
GALE, S. C. Minneapolis. 1876-1882.
GARLOCK, DEWITT H. Bemidji. 1931-1939.
GISLASON, SIDNEY P. New Ulm. 1967-.
GOSSLEE, G. L. Moorhead. 1931-1943.
GREER, A. J. Lake City. 1888-1892.
GRINDELAND, ANDREW. Warren. 1894-1898.
HAGEN, O. J. Moorhead. 1922-1931.
HALL, JOHN N. Mankato. 1868-1872. Treasurer.
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HAMLIN, W. S. St. James. 1898-1906.


HIRSCHBOECK, F. J. Duluth. 1941-1945.


HOLES, WILBUR W. St. Cloud. 1948-1957.


HUNTOON, L. A. Moorhead. 1910-1913,


JACOBSON, TOLLEF. Alexandria. 1910-1914.


JOHNSON, MRS. VIENA P. Duluth. 1937-1941.

JONES, EDWIN J. Morris. 1896-1899, 1900-1902.


KURTZ, THOS. C. Moorhead. 1935-1937.

LAMPERE, GEORGE N. Moorhead. 1926-1928.

LEE, WILLIAM E. Prairie Grove, Long Prairie. 1888-1894.

LEWIS, J. H. St. Paul. 1898-1900, Secretary.


LYCAN, WILBUR. Bemidji. 1939-1942.

MALONE, ELMER I. Minneapolis. 1967.

MATHIE, KARL. St. Cloud. 1907-1910, Director.


McCLEARN, HUGH J. Duluth. 1933-1935.


MORRISON, JAMES M. St. Paul. 1918-1933, Secretary.

McCRACKEN, JAMES M. St. Paul. 1918-1933, Secretary.


MITCHELL, HENRY Z. Bemidji. 1929-1931.

MITCHELL, WILLIAM B. St. Cloud. 1877-1901, Resident Director 1880-1894. 1899-1901, Treasurer 1894-1899.


NEVIES, BLAKE. Winona. 1941-1946.

NILES, SANFORD. Rochester. 1873-1886.

NORBY, J. C. Ada. 1898-1902.


OLSEN, JOHN W. St. Paul. 1900-1908.


PITCHER, O. O. Mankato. 1876-1881, Resident Director 1876-1877, 1880-1881.


RAY, J. H. Mankato. 1881-1883, Resident Director.


REECE, BEVINGTON A. 1920-1923, Executive Director 1920-1923.


SCHWAB, CARL D. St. Cloud. 1922-1925.

SCHWEICKHARD, DEAN M. St. Paul. 1943-1962, Secretary.

SCHUMACHER, R. H. Bemidji 1925-1929.

SCHWEICKHARD, DEAN M. St. Paul. 1943-1962, Secretary.


SIBLEY, H. H. St. Paul. 1874-1876, President.

SIMPSON, THOMAS. Winona. 1868-1884.

THE BOARD


NEVIES, BLAKE. Winona. 1941-1946.

NILES, SANFORD. Rochester. 1873-1886.

NORBY, J. C. Ada. 1898-1902.


OLSEN, JOHN W. St. Paul. 1900-1908.


PARKER, REV. H. I. Austin. 1868-1872.

PATTERSON, WILLIAM N. Northfield. 1886-1898, President 1887-1898.


PHILLIPS, E. M. St. Paul. 1933-1934, Secretary.

PITCHER, O. O. Mankato. 1876-1881, Resident Director 1876-1877, 1880-1881.

POPOVICH, PETER S. St. Paul. 1868-1898, President 1887-1898.


PORTER, L. C. Winona. 1868-1873, Treasurer.


RAY, J. H. Mankato. 1881-1883, Resident Director.


REECE, BEVINGTON A. 1920-1923, Executive Director 1920-1923.

ROCKWELL, JOHN GUNDERSEN. St. Paul. 1934-1941, Secretary.


SAFFORD, ORREN E. Minneapolis. 1923-1931.

SAUER, REV. ALFRED W. Winona. 1937-1941.

SCHULZ, C. G. St. Paul. 1908-1918, Secretary.

SCHUMACHER, R. H. Bemidji 1925-1929.

SCHWEICKHARD, DEAN M. St. Paul. 1943-1962, Secretary.


SIBLEY, H. H. St. Paul. 1874-1876, President.

SIMPSON, THOMAS. Winona. 1868-1884, President 1868-1870, 1876-1882, Resident Director 1876-1877, 1880-1884.
SMITH, CLARENCE R. Bemidji. 1942-1946.
SOMSEN, STEPHEN H. Winona. 1908-1933, Resident Director, President 1930-1933.
STRONG, HARRY C. Duluth. 1920-1924.
THAYER, SAMUEL R. Minneapolis. 1870-1873.
THOMSON, J. CAMERON. Minneapolis. 1965-1966, Vice President.
TIFFT, M. C. Long Prairie. 1906-1907.
TOMPKINS, ISAAC N. Mankato. 1921-1933.
TORRANCE, ELL. Minneapolis. 1902-1920, President 1907-1920.
WARD, G. B. Alexandria. 1894-1898.
WASHBURN, J. L. Duluth. 1902-1920, Resident Director.
WELTER, LESLIE. Moorhead. 1914-1922, Resident Director.
WHITE, ARTHUR P. Bemidji. 1914-1925, Resident Director.
WHITNEY, J. C. Minneapolis. 1882-1886.
WILSON, HORACE B. St. Paul, Red Wing. 1870-1875, 1882-1890, Secretary 1870-1875, President 1882-1887.
WISE, JOHN C. Mankato. 1904-1921, Resident Director.
WRIGHT, REV. G. W. T. Mankato, Owatonna, Rochester, Lake City. 1874-1882.
An alphabetical listing of administrative officers and faculty, with the principal field of instruction, departmental or divisional chairmanship or other administrative position, and the years of faculty membership.

ABBOTT, PHYLLIS R. History. 1965--
ACQUARD, RICHARD H. Mathematics. 1962--
ADAMS, JAMES L. Mathematics. 1966--
ADAMS, NORMAN O. English. 1958--
ADAMS, REGINA. Dormitories and Cafeteria. 1932-1934.
AHLVERS, ELIZABETH R. Education. 1964--
AIRD, C. CLIFTON. Handwriting, Geography. 1926-1955.
ALDERS, C. DEAN. Mathematics. 1956--
ALLEN, CYRIL. History, Chairman. 1950--
ALLER, WAYNE K. Psychology. 1967--
ALM, KENT G. Education, Vice President for Academic Affairs. 1967--
AMANN, PATRICIA. Health and Physical Education. 1965--
AMANN, PATRICIA J. See Palm, Patricia J. Anderson.
ANDREWS, CALISTA. Gymnastics, Mathematics. 1869-1873.
ANDREWS, ISABELLA M. Latin 1891-1895.
ANNIS, ELEANOR A. Art. 1950--
ANNIS, RICHARD H. Education. 1965--
ANTHONY, FOIS ANN. Education. 1963-1964.
APITZ, DARELL F. Geography, Social Studies. 1958--
ARCH, MARIE. Home Economics. 1929-1930.
ARMSTRONG, GRACE. Associate Director of Professional Education. 1927-1963.
ARNOTT, JAMES S. Library. 1967--
ARTIS, WILLIAM E. Art 1966--
AYERS, GEORGE E. Education. 1966--
BABB, GEORGINA. English. 1950-1951.
BAIN, MARTHA. Home Economics. 1912-1928.
BALCZIAK, LOUIS W. Science, Education, Chemistry. 1950--
BALLINGER, BILLY G. Education. 1960-1964.
BARATY, EDWARD. Languages. 1948-1951.
BARBER, EDDICE. English. 1956-1965, 1966--
BARNES, DONALD. Education. 1952-1955.
BARR, MARGARET T. Kindergarten. 1894-1898.
BARRETT, ROBERT A. Political Science, Chairman. 1963--
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BARSAN, VASILE C. Foreign Languages. 1965--
BARTLETT, ROBERT H. Educational Psychology. 1967--
BAUERDES, ADA MABEL. Primary Department. 1900-1902.
BAUMGARDNER, NINA E. Primary Grades. 1927-1931.
BAUMGART, NORBERT K. Dean of Students. 1963--
BAYLESS, J. LESLIE. Business Administration, Chairman. 1962--
BAYLESS, JUNE. Education. 1962--
BEADLE, LAURENA A. Education. 1966--
BEALE, HARRIET M. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature. 1915-1941.
BECKER, ROBERT H. Chemistry. 1956--
BECKER, WAYNE A. Biology. 1965--
BECKMAN, VERNON E. Speech and Theatre Arts, Chairman. 1949--
BECHDOLT, A. F. Science. 1880-1885.
BECKERONI, L. CHARLES. Education. 1963--
BENDER, MARY. Music. 1959--
BEVIN, EUGENE R. Education. 1964--
BIEDE, FRED C. Speech. 1964--
BIEDELL, S. LILIAN. Primary Grades. 1902-1907.
BLANCHARD, MAUDE. Education. 1941-1959.
BLEWETT, MARGARET. Physical Education. 1921-1923.
BLUM, ALVA G. Education. 1967--
BLUM, KAREN F. Library. 1967--
BOCK, FRED C. Speech. 1964--
BOCK, KARIN L. English, Speech. 1965--
BOESE, DONALD L. History. 1962--
BOETTCHER, ROBERT J. Biology. 1965--
BOWDEN, JOSEPHINE H. English. 1911-1927.
BOYCE, HELEN E. School Nurse. 1928-1938.
BOYD, MADELYNE B. Education. 1964--
BOYNE, EDWIN M. Education, Director of Student Teaching. Dean of the School of Graduate Studies. 1951-1956.
BREDLEY, PHILLY. Library. 1930-1933.
Berg, James K. Music. 1964--
BERGE, DAVID J. Physical Education. 1965--
BERGERSON, SHIRLEY ANN. Physical Education. 1963-1964.
BERRY, RUDOLPH C. Accounting. 1966--
BEG, WILLIAM M. Education. 1934-1947.
BIEDELL, DANIEL J. Geography. 1966--
BIEWEN, EUGENE R. Education. 1967--
BIGELOW, CECIL C. Business. 1953--
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

BROCK, GEORGENE ANN. Physical Education. 1964--

BROMELY, FLORA JANE. Education. 1953-1955.

BROOKS, FOWLER D. Director of Elementary School. 1916-1920.

BROOKSHIER, RUTH L. Primary Grades. 1928-1930.

BROSE, DONALD E. Physical Education. 1965--

BROUGHTEN, GENE B. Music, Education. 1963--

BROUSE, HELEN T. Primary Grades. 1921-1927.

BROWN, ARLINE MARTIN. Business. 1957-1964, 1965--

BROWN; CLARA M. Sewing. 1914-1915.

BROWN, CONNIE STANTON. Physical Education. 1949-1950.

BROWN, KENNETH GEORGE. Education. 1952--

BROWN, ROBERT R. Physics. 1966--


BROWN, WILLIAM J. Industrial Arts. 1964-__

BRUCE, MARIE A. Associate Dean of Students. 1956--


BRUNSVOID, PERLEY O. Education. 1967--


BUCHANAN, DONALD W. Physical Education. 1955--


BUCK, BENJAMIN A. Assistant Dean of the School of Education. 1956--

BUCK, MARGARET C. Health and Physical Education. 1953--


BURBANK, REX JAMES. English. 1957-1959.


BURNS, BERT E. Geography, Chairman. 1950--

BURT, C. VINCENT. Director of Professional Education. 1944-1945.

BURT, DONALD C. English. 1965--

BURTON, DANIEL F. Biology. 1948--

BURTON, VERONA DEVINE. Biology. 1948--


BUSKRD, HAROLD W. Education. 1940-1946.

BUTZER, JOHN. Director of College Health Service. 1966--

CALLAGHAN, HELEN. Library. 1914-1917.


CALVIN, MARGARET JEAN. English. 1906-1908.

CAMPBELL, HELEN M. Primary Grades. 1927-1928.

CANSLER, G. M. Education, Psychology. 1953--

CARKOSKI, CHESTER A. Assistant Dean of Students. 1960--


CARLSON, MARJORIE J. Biology. 1967--


CARNEY, CORA A. N. Music, Primary Department. 1893-1902.

CARNEY, MARY E. Education. 1963-1964.

CARSON, ANDREW. Penmanship, Bookkeeping. 1880-1881.

CARTER, JAMES. History, Physical Education. 1936-1939.

CASE, GERTRUDE. Music. 1914-1915.


CASEY, EVELYN BRANDT. Nursing, Home Economics. 1958--

CASEY, PAUL F. Business. 1958--


CHAPMAN, MARGARET F. Junior High School. 1924-1925.

CHELBURG, DALE A. Biology. 1961--

CHELL, ELSIE. Education. 1949-1952.

CHERNIS, LILLIAN. Intermediate Grades. 1929-1930.

CHEYNEY, ELIZA A. Primary Department. 1881-1886.

CHEYNEY, MARGARETTA. Grammar Department. 1884-1888.


CHIN, FRANK T. Library. 1967--

CHIN, YEN-YEN. Library. 1968--

CHINBURG, JANET J. Library. 1967--

CHINBURG, WAYNE O. Education. 1967--

CHOE, HYUNG TAE. Biology. 1963--


CHRISTIAN, VIRGINIA B. Mathematics. 1965--


CHURCH, MARY ALICE. English, History. 1906-1909.

CISMOISKI, IRENE Education. 1950-1953.


CLARK, ANGE G. See Nelson, Anne Clark
CLARK, GRACE B. Grammar Department. 1897-1901.

CLARK, JAMES R. Chairman of the Division of Health and Physical Education. 1939-1949.

CLARK, MARY LOUISE. Sewing. 1905-1915.


CLAYTON, ROBERT. Chairman of the Division of Health and Physical Education. 1939-1949.


CLEVENGER, RALPH A. Education. 1957-1960.


COAT, DAVID ORLAND. English. 1905-1909.


COCA, DAVID ORLAND. English. 1905-1909.

COCHRAN, ETHEL M. Director of Halls and Cafeteria. 1926-1944.


COLE, EMILY E. Grammar Department. 1887-1890.

COLE, MALCOLM B. Physics. 1949-1951.


COLLINS, EMMA H. Assistant. 1886-1890.

COLLINS, MARTHA V. Kindergarten. 1898-1934.

COLVER, MARY CLARA. Arithmetic. 1893-1894.

COLYER, REBECCA F. Grammar. 1904-1906.


CONSTANCE, MARGARET. Reading. Speech. 1919-1926.

CONSTANTZ, QUINN. Chairman of the Division of Health and Physical Education. 1949-1952.


COOK, RUTH CATHLYN. Education. 1938-1939.


COOPER, BERNICE. Physical Education. 1942-1944.

COOPER, CHARLES H. President. 1899-1930.


COOPER, HELEN. French. English. 1930-1944.

COOPER, MARGARET. Primary Grades. 1921-1926.


ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY


COVETT, S. JOHN. Education. 1953-1954.


COX, ULYSSES O. Biology. 1891-1905.


CRABTREE, EUNICE K. English. 1923-1924.

CRARY, EVELYN M. Education. 1945-1949.

CRAWFORD, C. L. President. 1946-1965.

CROMWELL, ALICE H. Geography, Grammar. 1877-1879.


CROPPER, MARY BESS. Business. 1950-1951.


CRYAN, MARY ELIZABETH. Reading. Speech. 1926-1927.


CUSHING, HENRY P. Science. 1885-1891.


DARLING, DONALD F. Education. 1965-1966.

DARLING, GERTRUDE. English. 1893-1899.

DARRAH, ESTELLE M. Intermediate Department. 1897-1898.

DAVIDIAN, ELIZABETH V. See Johnson, Elizabeth Davidian.


DAVIS, ELLEN C. Mathematics. 1902-1914.


DAYTON, MABEL A. Mathematics. 1920-1921.


DENNIS, EMMA LOU. Industrial Education. 1944-1945.


ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

DEPUTY, MANFRED W. Director of Practice School. 1911-1916.
DEFTER, HOWARD M. English. 1967--
DEVANEY, ETHEL ANNE. Office Manager, Accountant. 1925-1957.
DEVINE, VERONA, See Burton, Verona Devine.
DICKMAN, URVIN F. Student Teaching. 1966--
DRICKER, JAMES M. Education. 1953-1954.
ERICKSON, DENNIS S. Accounting. 1967--
ERICKSON, RALPH J. Education. 1956-1962.
ERIE, DENNIS O. Health and Physical Education. 1966--
ERIKSON, GLENN T. Education. Science. 1959--
ESGATE, WALLACE G. Foreign Languages. 1967--
ETHERIDGE, AMANDA. Physical Education. 1948-1952.
EVANS, EDWARDS S., Jr. Education. 1967--
FAWCELL, LOIS M. Library. 1924-1928.
FELLOWS, ARNOLD L. English. 1963--
FENTON, FRANCES. Grammar, Rhetoric. 1903-1904.
FERGUSON, GEORGE A. Principal of Model School. 1869-1871.
FIELD, GEORGIA LOUISE. English, Dean of Women. 1914-1918.

EEN, ANDREW R. Principal of Campus School, Associate Director of Professional Education, Registrar, Director of Admissions. 1958--
EHRIE, MARY C. English. 1924-1926.
EIDE, RICHARD B. English. 1935-1941.
EKE, ALAN B. Industrial Arts. 1963--
ELLIS, MATTIE COOK. History, Dean of Women. 1921-1924.
ELLISON, BESS. Nursing, Chairman. 1958--
ENGELSEN, LILLY A. Primary Grades. 1920-1921.
ENGH, HELMER A. Biology. 1966--
EPPEL, DAMIS L. Library. 1952-1962.
EPPEL, EDWARD. Music. 1941--
EROYSEN, JAMES M. Education. 1953-1954.
ERICKSON, RALPH J. Education. 1956-1962.
ERIE, DENNIS O. Health and Physical Education. 1966--
ERIKSON, GLENN T. Education. Science. 1959--
ESGATE, WALLACE G. Foreign Languages. 1967--
ETHERIDGE, AMANDA. Physical Education. 1948-1952.
EVANS, EDWARDS S., Jr. Education. 1967--
FADNER, WILLARD L. Physics. 1964--
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

GATES, M. CATHERINE WILDER. Educational Psychology. 1966--

GAVIN, GORDON O. Industrial Arts. 1967--

GEBEIT, ROBERT E. Chemistry. 1966--


GILDEMEISTER, EARL L. Computer Services. Mathematics. 1965--

GILES, RUTH L. Music. 1965--

GILES, THOMAS L. Music. 1965--


GILSRUD, RONALD D. Business. 1965--


GIRARD, HELEN. Art. 1965--

GIRARD, WILLIAM W. Geography. 1964--

GLICK, FORREST I. Physics. 1964--

GLOTZBACH, AGNES C. Library. 1898-1908.


GOFF, JAMES F. Geography. 1964--

GOODENOW, JEAN. Business. 1950--


GORMAN, RUSSELL D. Health and Physical Education, Chairman of Men's Department. 1966--

GOSS, ALICE D. Dean of Women. 1918-1921.

GOWER, RONALD A. English. 1965--

GRAHAM, GORDON L. Health and Physical Education. 1964--

GRAHAM, ROBERT L. Chemistry. Chairman. 1963--


GRANT, EVA AGNES. Lower Grades. 1916-1919.


GREEN, AGNES. Intermediate Department. 1880-1881.

GREEN, CHARITY N. Grammar Department. 1882-1884.

GREEN, ETTA COULTER. Home Economics. 1914-1922.

GREEN, GEORGE E. Political Science. 1967--


GREGORY, ISOBEL C. See Walling. Isobel Gregory.


GRIFFIN, MARY E. English. Latin. 1888-1890.

GRIFFIN, MARY USHER. Music. Reading. 1890-1895.

ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

GROve, Arthur M. Geography, Head. 1951--
GRUmeiEr, Ernest Winston. Chemistry. 1958--
GUernsey, Minna R. Grammar Department. 1895-1897.
Gugisberg, Mercedes. Physical Education, Chairman of the Division of Health and Physical Education. 1937-1945.
HABIN, Natalie. Literature. 1924-1926.
HANCOCK, John A. Psychology. Education. 1901-1933.
Hankerson, Robert G. College Physician. 1967--
HARTZLER, H. Harold. Physics. Mathematics. 1958-
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

HODAPP, MARJORIE L. Physical Education. 1965--
HODON, JOHN R. Education. 1964--
HOGAN, JOE. Education. 1964--
HOLMEMS, KARL. English, Speech. 1927-1929.
HOLMES, LAWRENCE R. English. 1965--
HOLMES, LAURIE. Education. 1962-1963.
HOLM, W. ARTHUR. Business. 1886-1887.
HOLM, W. ADDA. Intermediate Department. 1882-1884.
HOLT, JESSE. Music. 1892-1898.
HOLT, M. ADDA. Intermediate Department. 1882-1884.
HOMER, ADA. Education. 1950-1955.
HOPKINS, LAYNE V. Mathematics. 1966--
HOSLER, MARTHA K. Business. 1967--
HOUGLUM, ARVID J. Director of Student Health Service. 1965-1966.
HOPKINS, LAYNE V. Mathematics. 1966--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
HOPKINS, MARIAH. English. 1964--
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

JOHNSON, J. BUFORD. Political Science. 1967--

JOHNSON, JOHN A. Director of Placement and Field Service. Director of Professional Education, Dean of the School of Education. 1948--

JOHNSON, L. BERNIECE. Education. 1951-1953.

JOHNSON, MARIETTE LOUISE PIERCE. Primary Department. 1896-1900.

JOHNSON, RAYMOND LLOYD. Education. 1957--

JOHNSON, ROBERT DARWIN. Physical Education. 1967--


JOHNSON, W. WAYNON. Biology. 1967--

KAHRS, MARY V., Chairman of the Department of Elementary Education. 1960--

KAIHER, LIN A. Intermediate Department. 1886-1887.

KEIGHT, MARK M. Biology, Chairman of the Division of Science and Mathematics. 1933-1945.


KELSON, JOHN H. English. 1967--

KELSON, SARA ANN. English. 1968--


KEOGH, MARVIN J. Education. 1965--

KEOGH, PATRICIA M. Physical Education. 1967--


KESSEL, ABBAS. Political Science. 1966--

KETCHUM, ANGELINE H. Model School. 1879-1880.

KIECKER, THOMAS B. Industrial Arts. 1958--

KING, E. GEORGIA. English. 1965--

KING, EVERETT C. Business. 1965--

KING, KENT H. Education, Psychology. 1956--


KIRCHEN, CALVIN J. Physics, Mathematics. 1942-1943.

KISCH, RICHARD J. Campus School. 1966--

KITTLESON, CARL J. Music. 1958--


KLINE, GERALDINE B. Education. 1963--

KLINE, LINUS W. Psychology, Pedagogy. 1899-1901.

KLOCKE, RONALD A. Sociology. 1966--

KROSSNER, LILIAN C. Grammar Department. 1901-1907.

KNIGHT, RICHARD J. Speech. 1966--

KNIGHT, KAREN JANE. Campus School. 1966--

KNIGHTS, GERTRUDE C. Primary Department. 1894-1895.


KNOWLTON, MARGUERITE. English. 1903-1906.


KOehler, CHARLES F. History, Psychology. 1892-1902.

KOehler, IRIS B. Assistant Registrar, Business. 1954-1956.


KOPEL, BERNICE H. Home Economics. 1961--


KEEFE, MARGARET. Library. 1936-1937.

KEIRNAN, LINA. Intermediate Department. 1886-1887.

KEITH, MARK M. Biology, Chairman of the Division of Science and Mathematics. 1933-1945.
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

LEWIS, UCAL STEVENS. Dean of Women. English, 1929-1930.

LIEN, RONALD L. Education. 1962--

LINDBERG, ARTHUR CLIFFORD. Mathematics. 1958--

LINDGREN, BRUCE F. Biology. 1965--

LINDSAY, D. BRUCE. Education. 1965--

LINDSAY, AUDRY HILL. Biology. 1954--1964.


LINDSLEY, PEARL MAY. Library. 1896-1897.

LINNELL, ADELAIDE. Music, Education. 1919-1956.

LINNETT, LAWRENCE M. Psychology. 1965--


LITCHFIELD, ELLA G. English. 1938-1940.

LOFY, CARL A. Education. 1968--

LOKENSWARD, HJALMAR O. English. 1949--


LOKENSWARD, RUDOLPH L. Mathematics. 1934-1935.


LONGWELL, PATRICIA A. Foreign Languages. 1965--

LOWE, FRANCES E. Junior High School. 1923-1924.

LOWE, JOE. Education. 1951-1955.


LOY, JEAN E. See Swanson, Jean E. Loy.

LUCCOCK, NATALIE. Kindergarten. 1914-1918.

LUCHT, WILLIAM E. English. 1948-1951.

LUDEMAN, DORIS F. Education. 1965--

LUDEMAN, VERNON L. Education. 1964--

LUND, ARNOLD J. Biology. 1964--

LUNDIN, GARY A. Audiovisual. 1967--

LUNDQUIST, L. H. Social Studies. 1940-1941.

LURTH, RICHARD D. Education. 1964--

LYON, W. F. Penmanship, Bookkeeping. 1870-1873.

MAKESTAD, LOREN M. English. 1955--

MABRY, WINIFRED. Primary Grades. 1926-1934.

MACIAS, ROMETO. Physical Education. 1950--

MACKENZIE, HARRIET. English Grammar. 1908-1911.

MarRAE, DONALD A. Business. 1954--

MAGER, CLARA M. College High School. 1927-1935.


MALEY, WINNIFRED E. Junior High School. 1926-1930.

MALZAHN, ELNA. Library. 1913-1914.
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

MANDERFIELD, JOSEPHINE I. Primary Grades. 1920-1923.

MATTHEES, FLORENCE C. Mathematics, Education. 1964--

MATTING, DONALD A. Art. 1954--

MATTISON, BRUCE D. Education. 1959-1965.

MATTISSON, KENNETH D. Education. 1959--

MATUSKA, ROBERT J. Director of Student Financial Aids. 1965--

MAU, AVIS O. Education. 1952-1957.


MAUSEL, PAUL W. Geography. 1877-1878.

MECKENBERG, E. L. Assistant. 1868-1869.


MECK, WILLIAM B. Business. 1881-1892.

McCarthy, IRENE C. Manager, Dormitories and Cafeteria. 1933-1934.

McCARTHY, JEAN J. Health and Physical Education. 1962--

McCARTHY, MARGARET. Grammar. 1963--

McCARTHY, RUBY. Library. 1949-1950.

McCARTHY, ISMAEL KHIN. Sociology. 1951.

Mccarthy, ROBERT. Education. 1948-1959.

McGOWAN, HELEN M. Penmanship, Arithmetic. 1877-1878.

McKINNEY, ELLIE. Library. 1960--

McKINLEY, ELLIE. Library. 1960--


McLAUGHLIN, BETTY J. History. 1948-1951.

McMAHON, EDWARD R. Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. 1967--

McMULLIN, MICHAEL J. Sociology. 1965--

MEISEL, BURTON E. Speech. 1958--

MEISEL, PAT W. Speech. 1963--


MERRILL, BLANCHE Y. Dean of Women. 1941-1942.

METT, MARGARET A. English. 1966--

MIFF, ALICE M. Jr. Economics. 1964--

MIEER, ALLEN J. Business. 1966--


MEYER, ROY W. English. 1957--

MEYER, RUTH A. English. 1966--


MEYERING, HARRY R. Director of Professional Education and the Laboratory Schools. Director of Special Education. 1948-1966.

MEYERSON, PETER G. Sociology. 1967--


MICKELSEN, LEONHARD P. Business. 1964--

MICKELSON, IRENE L. Education. 1965-1966.

MILLAR, ALLEN R. Education. 1956-1962.

MILLAR, EDITH. Education. 1956-1960.

MILLER, ADELAIDE H. Physical Education. 1923-1927.

MILLER, BRUCE EDWARD. English. 1961-1962.

MILLER, CARL E. Physics. 1967--

MILLER, CLARA MAY. Nursing, Chairman. 1954-1957.


MILLER, DENNIS D. Education. 1955-1962.


MILLER, LINA. Intermediate Grades. 1915-1943.


MILNOR, FRANCES L. English. 1897-1898.

MINSNAR, JOYCE. Music. 1931-1932.

MITCHELL, RICHARD R. Student Teaching. 1966--

MJOLSNESS, JOSEPH M. Registrar, Education, Psychology, Acting Chairman. 1962--

MJOLSNESS, PEARL M. Education. 1966--


MOEN, CARLTON. Admissions. 1965--

MOFFATT, JOHN. Speech. 1966--


MOIR, THOMAS L. History. 1959--

MOLT, DONALD. Biology. 1966--


MONTGOMERY, E. L. Assistant. 1868-1869.


MOORE, ROY B. Chairman of the Division of Health and Physical Education. 1952--


MORAVEK, MARJORY. Home Economics. 1957--
MORDUE, DALE L. Physics. 1965--
MORRIS, ALBERT B. History, Registrar. 1919-1956.
MORRIS, EVELYN B. Education. Research Assistant. 1941-1942.
MORRIS, GRETCHEN S. Business, Assistant to the President. 1942--
MORRIS, WILLIAM. Health and Physical Education. 1956--
MORSE, OLIVE. Languages. 1946-1947.
MOTT, ELEANOR. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature. 1926-1949.
MOURDUE, DALE L. Physics. 1965--
MORRIS, ALBERT B. History, Registrar. 1919-1956.
MORRIS, EVELYN B. Education. Research Assistant. 1941-1942.
MORGAN, WILLIAM. Health and Physical Education. 1956--
MORSE, OLIVE. Languages. 1946-1947.
MOTT, ELEANOR. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature. 1926-1949.
MOURDUE, DALE L. Physics. 1965--
MORRIS, ALBERT B. History, Registrar. 1919-1956.
MORRIS, EVELYN B. Education. Research Assistant. 1941-1942.
MORGAN, WILLIAM. Health and Physical Education. 1956--
MORSE, OLIVE. Languages. 1946-1947.
MOTT, ELEANOR. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature. 1926-1949.
MOURDUE, DALE L. Physics. 1965--
MORRIS, ALBERT B. History, Registrar. 1919-1956.
MORRIS, EVELYN B. Education. Research Assistant. 1941-1942.
MORGAN, WILLIAM. Health and Physical Education. 1956--
MORSE, OLIVE. Languages. 1946-1947.
MOTT, ELEANOR. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature. 1926-1949.
MOURDUE, DALE L. Physics. 1965--
MORRIS, ALBERT B. History, Registrar. 1919-1956.
MORRIS, EVELYN B. Education. Research Assistant. 1941-1942.
MORGAN, WILLIAM. Health and Physical Education. 1956--
MORSE, OLIVE. Languages. 1946-1947.
MOTT, ELEANOR. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature. 1926-1949.
MOURDUE, DALE L. Physics. 1965--
MORRIS, ALBERT B. History, Registrar. 1919-1956.
MORRIS, EVELYN B. Education. Research Assistant. 1941-1942.
MORGAN, WILLIAM. Health and Physical Education. 1956--
MORSE, OLIVE. Languages. 1946-1947.
MOTT, ELEANOR. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature. 1926-1949.
MOURDUE, DALE L. Physics. 1965--
MORRIS, ALBERT B. History, Registrar. 1919-1956.
MORRIS, EVELYN B. Education. Research Assistant. 1941-1942.
MORGAN, WILLIAM. Health and Physical Education. 1956--
MORSE, OLIVE. Languages. 1946-1947.
MOTT, ELEANOR. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature. 1926-1949.
MOURDUE, DALE L. Physics. 1965--
MORRIS, ALBERT B. History, Registrar. 1919-1956.
MORRIS, EVELYN B. Education. Research Assistant. 1941-1942.
MORGAN, WILLIAM. Health and Physical Education. 1956--
MORSE, OLIVE. Languages. 1946-1947.
MOTT, ELEANOR. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature. 1926-1949.
MOURDUE, DALE L. Physics. 1965--
MORRIS, ALBERT B. History, Registrar. 1919-1956.
MORRIS, EVELYN B. Education. Research Assistant. 1941-1942.
MORGAN, WILLIAM. Health and Physical Education. 1956--
MORSE, OLIVE. Languages. 1946-1947.
MOTT, ELEANOR. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature. 1926-1949.
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY


ORSBORN, HARRY J. Geography, Mathematics. 1897-1899.

OSBORN, ELEANOR. Intermediate Department. 1910-1912, 1917-1921.

OSBORN, MARY L. Kindergarten. 1894-1895.

OSBORN, HARRY J. Geography, Mathematics. 1897-1899.

OSBORN, ELEANOR. Intermediate Department. 1910-1912, 1917-1921.

OSBORN, MARY L. Kindergarten. 1894-1895.

O'SHEA, HARRIET F. E. Primary Department. 1894-1895.

O'SHEA, M. V. Psychology, Director of the Practice School. 1892-1895.

OSLYN, NANCY M. Music. 1968-.


OTIS, JOHN W. English. 1963--.

OTIS, MAXINE K. English. 1964--.

OTTO, JAMES ROBERT. Health and Physical Education. 1953--.

OWEN, HERBERT E. Music, Chairman. 1952--.


PAGEL, DORIS B. Library Science. 1959-.

PAHL, THOMAS L. Political Science. 1966-.

PALMER, BETTY A. Art. 1967--.

PALMER, GAIL. Education. 1955--.


PARKER, ACHSA S. History, English. 1889-1903.

PARRISH, RODNEY L. English, Journalism. 1963-.


PETERS, ARNOLD C. Industrial Arts. 1953--.

PETERS, DWAIN F. Education. Director of Institutional Research. 1964--.

PETERSON, E. DALE. Business, Economics, Chairman. 1959--.

PETERSON, MORRIS P. Informational Services. 1967--.

PETERS, RICHARD B. Business. 1966--.

PETTERSON, GUSTAV S. Sociology, Counselor of Foreign Students, Economics, Director of Radio Programs, Chairman of the Division of Social Studies. 1913-1957.

PHELPS, ETHELWYNN. Domestic Art. 1916-1918.

PHELPS, BETTY JUNE. Business. 1959-.


PHILLIPS, H. M. Mathematics. 1873-1904.


PIETAN, NORMAN E. Art. 1965--.


POULSEN, HAROLD W. Health and Physical Education. 1962--.

POULSEN, BRUCE C. Student Teaching. 1966--.


PAYNE, WILLIAM A. English. 1948-1951.

PECKER, EDITH G. P. Physical Culture. 1904-1905.


PENDERGAST, HELEN ANN. Physical Education. 1927-1930.

PENDERGAST, SOPHIE M. English, History. 1895-1896, 1897-1900.


PENNINGTON, VICTORIA. Education. 1949-1951.

PEREZ-MEDINA, ANTONIA. Foreign Languages. 1964-1965.

PERISHO, CLARENCE R. Chemistry. 1954--.

PERISHO, MARGARET. Mathematics. 1957-1960. 1962--.

PERRIN, HOMER E. Arithmetic, Bookkeeping, Penmanship. 1885-1890.

PERRINE, ROSE. C. Education. 1944-1945.


PETERS, CHARLES A. Health and Physical Education. 1963--.

PETERS, DWAIN F. Education. Director of Institutional Research. 1964--.

PETERSON, DONALD L. Business. 1967--.

PETERSON, E. DALE. Business, Economics, Chairman. 1959--.

PETERSON, MORRIS P. Informational Services. 1967--.

PETERS, RICHARD B. Business. 1966--.

PETERSON, GUSTAV S. Sociology, Counselor of Foreign Students, Economics, Director of Radio Programs, Chairman of the Division of Social Studies. 1913-1957.

PHELPS, ETHELWYNN. Domestic Art. 1916-1918.


PHILLIPS, BETTY JUNE. Business. 1959-.


PHILLIPS, H. M. Mathematics. 1873-1904.


PIETAN, NORMAN E. Art. 1965--.


PITCHER, GRACE. Music. 1880-1882.


POLK, JULIA M. Junior High School. 1920-1922.

POMANTIER, PAUL C. Education. 1941-1942.

PONTINE, KENNETH W. Physics. 1965--.

POOLE, RONALD D. Speech. 1965--.


POWROWSKI, DAVID J. English. 1965--.

POSEY, CHESSLEY JUSTIN. Physical Science. 1905-1911.

POSTEUCA, VAŞILE. Foreign Languages. 1966-1967.
POULIOT, CATHERINE. Halls and Cafeteria. 1934-1948.
POWERS, TINA M. Primary Department. 1903-1904.
PUDDER, E. MARIE. History, Geography. 1921-1923.
PRESTON, WILLIAM M. Political Science. 1954-1959.
RASMUSSEN, MARION F. English. 1948-1949.
SACKETT, ELLA C. Intermediate Department. 1890-1893.
SADLER, SAMUEL G. Education. 1950-1951.
SAFE, VIRGINIA LAMBERG. Education. 1932-1947.
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY
ROBB, GEORGE P. Education. 1957-1967.
ROBBINS, ALICE V. Mathematics. 1894-1937.
ROBBINS, CAROLYN M. Model School. 1888-1919.
ROBERTS, JANE ANN. Health and Physical Education. 1956-
ROBERTS, PHYLLIS J. Library. 1963-1964, 1965-
ROBINSON, DONALD D. Health and Physical Education. 1963-
ROBLE, DORA. Junior High School. 1918-1920.
RODGERS, J. ALVIN. Library. 1965-
RODGERS, STANLEY E., Jr. Physics. 1959-
ROMERO, DOROTHY E. Education. 1939-1942.
ROWE, AGNES F. Latin. 1897-1898.
ROWE, STUART H. Director of Practice School. 1895-1898.
ROWLAND, MARY S. Assistant. 1871-1872.
ROYAL, DONALD C. Psychology, Chairman. 1966-
RUBLE, BRUCE E. Accounting. 1968-
RUDELL, RUDLOFF, LEON M. Political Science. 1966-
RUNDALLS, JAMES J. Education. 1960-1963.
RUSS, LYNETTE Y. Education. 1962-1964, 1965-
SMITH, HERBERT A. Education. 1949-1957.
SMITH, MARION. Assistant to Director of Training. 1934-1935.
SNARR, EDNA COSTO. English. 1928-1930.
SNARR, OTTO WELTON. Director of Professional Education. 1920-1941.
SNIDER, ROBERT. Education. 1950-1951.
SOFTLEY, JAMES. Education. 1948-1949.
SOLTOW, MARY. Writing. 1916-1926.
STOCKLEY, DARWIN R. Library, Physiology. 1888-1892.
STOCKLEY, DARWIN R. Library, Physiology. 1888-1892.
STREET, CLAUDE W. Acting Director of Training School. 1928-1930.
SWAN, DEFRANSA HALL. Geography. 1873-1913.
SWEETLAND, MINNIE I. See Parry, Minnie Sweetland.

ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

SWENSON, ANNA. Mathematics, Education. 1937-1940.
SWENSON, R. VICTOR. Campus School. 1966-1968.
TAGGART, MARY C. Physical Education. 1948-1949.
TAYLOR, MARION ZEAL. Education. 1949-1952.
TEFFT, VIRGINIA. Health and Physical Education. 1952-1955.
TIEDE, ALFRED. Industrial Arts, Chairman of the Division of Fine and Applied Arts. 1934-1944.
THIELEN, THOMAS B. Assistant Dean of Students. 1966-1968.
THOMAS, MORGAN I. Dean of the School of Business. 1953-1955.
THOMAS, RUTH BROWN. Education. 1959-1960.
THOMPSON, JAMES S. Physical Education. 1946-1947.
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

TITE, CAROL. Education. 1964-1965.
TOMASHOFF, WALTER R. Health and Physical Education. 1963--
TORGerson, FRANCES L. Mathematics. 1965--
TOWNSEND, CARRIE P. Assistant. 1872-1873.
TRAFTON, GILBERT H. Biology, Chairman of the Division of Science and Mathematics. 1911-1943.
TRAFTON, RUTH M. Halls and Cafeteria. 1952-1956.
TRICKOVICH, RICHARD. Foreign Languages. 1967--
TRROUBLY, THEONILLA. Library. 1961--
TURNER, FLOSS ANN. Intermediate Grades. 1921-1925.
TUTTLE, MARGARET E. Physical Education. 1919-1920.
ULRICH, CARL J. Biology. 1897-1900.
UTOFT, CAROL MEYERS. English. 1961-
VANCE, JULIA. Cooking. 1912-1914.
VANDERHOEF, MINNA L. Physical Education. 1935-1937.
VAN EATON, ANSON. Political Science. 1942-1943.
VAN SICKLE, HOWARD M. Music. 1948--
VERHAGE, WILLIAM. Political Science. 1934-1942.
VINTON, BLANCE. Library. 1917-1920.
VOSBECK, PHILLIS D. Education. 1963-1964.
WADE, R. EUGENE. Music. 1968--

WALDORF, PAUL D. Foreign Languages. Chairman. 1947--
WALKER, NELLIE L. Primary Grades. 1921-1926.
WALLING, ISOBEL GREGORY. Kindergarten. 1935-1937.
WAMPLER, LETTA M. Household Arts. 1934-1935.
WARD, BLAINE E. Education. 1965--
WARNER, BRUCE P. Counseling, Psychology. 1964--
WATERMAN, CHARLES K. English. 1966--
WATT, MARY. Physical Education. 1950-1953.
WEBER, BERTON C. Chemistry. 1964--
WEBER, CYNTHIA A. Chemistry. 1967--
WEBLEMOE, JOHANNA. School Nurse, Health Education. 1938-1964, 1967--
WEIGEL, S. M. Music. 1870-1873.
WEINMANN, REGINA. Dormitories and Cafeteria. 1934-1935.
WEIR, CLARA. Arithmetic. 1890-1893.
WELCH, ALLEN H. History. 1966--
WELLBORN, DOROTHY J. English. 1965--
WELLS, ARNOLD R. Economics. 1966--
WELTY, DAN M. Business. 1963--
WENDLANDT, WILLIAM E. Music. 1968--
WENNER, JAMES F. Business. 1964--
WESSON, KATHARINE. Library. 1927-1930.
WIECKING, ANNIE V. Model School. 1869-1872.
WIECKING, ANNA M. Education. Principal of College Elementary School. 1917-1956.
WIECKING, EMMA. Library, Head. 1922-1959.
WIENS, BEN J. Education. 1945-1948.
ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

WRIGHT, EMILY. English, Geography. 1873-1875.

WRIGHT, ROBERT C. English, Chairman. 1948-

WYCKOFF, JUANITA C. Home Economics. 1959-

WYNDELE, WAUNDA-MAE. Nursing. 1965-


YEO, EMMA. Junior High School. 1922-1932.

YODER, PETER, A. Physical Science. 1897-1898.

YORK, WILMA. Nursing. 1967-

YOU, MAN H. Economics. 1966-

YOUEL, BURNETTA. Instructional Materials Library. 1954-

YOUEL, DONALD B. English, Chairman of the Division of Language and Literature, Director of Library Services, Director of College Publications. 1946-

YOUNG, DONALD D. Education. 1961-1962.


YOUNG, GARY A. Bookstore Director. 1967-

YOUNG, JANETTE MAYER. Physical Education. 1944-1946.


YOUNG, LORRAINE E. Previewer, Veterans Guidance Center. 1945-1946.

YOUNG, LOY WAYNE. Health and Physical Education. 1956-


YOUNG, ROGER G. Education. 1963-


ZAMBONI, MARY JEAN. Education. 1967-

ZEBARTH, ORVILLE V. Chemistry. 1964-

ZEBARTH, ORVILLE V. Chemistry. 1964-

ZERVAH, JAMES A. Chemistry. 1964-

ZIMMER, MARGARET E. Home Economics. 1967-

ZIMMERMAN, NIEL T. Political Science. 1967-

ZIMMERMAN, ROGER M. Education. 1963-

ZUBRATZ, RICHARD D. Mathematics. 1964-1966-

ZUCKERMAN, JEROME S. English. 1964-

ZWICKEY, FRANKLIN J. Student Union. 1967--