

2008-7

The Coming of Women to St. Edward's University

Dr. Kathleen M. Wilburn

Associate Professor

St. Edward's University

## The Coming of Women to St. Edward's University

### The Forces of Change

To understand the saga of Maryhill College of St. Edward's University in Austin, Texas, it is necessary to understand the three forces of the 1960s that converged to make a perfect storm that cut short the implementation of the co-ordinate model at this Holy Cross' liberal arts college. First, the landscape of higher education was changing as colleges and universities grew to accommodate the post-war generation baby boomers who were ready for college. In addition to being larger than previous cohorts, they represented more diversity than those cohorts. Their attitudes toward education and society differed from those of past generations. They had time to become political activists; their peers were drafted to fight in Viet Nam and their response was protest. They marched and sang, "Where Have All the Flowers Gone?"

Second, the role of the liberal arts college was under siege, as was the private, religious college. All institutions of higher education heeded the call for a greater emphasis on science and technology, spurred on by President Kennedy's goal to put a man on the moon and return him to earth. As federal funding for such programs increased, the Danforth Commission looked into the separation of church and state in colleges sponsored by religious organizations.

Third, by mid-century, many women's religious orders had identified their charisms with education and had spent their own resources to become the best-educated teachers in both K-12 and university systems. Then the Second Vatican Council declared that lay people could also be called to holiness; laywomen could follow Christ as lay teachers who married and had families. Women in the baby boomer generation saw doors opening to higher education and to professions such as teaching and nursing opening other than those into religious congregations.

### Decisions for the Brothers of Holy Cross

As early as 1962, the Brothers of Holy Cross were considering the value of having women on the St. Edward's University campus, or at least near the campus. In an interview in 2006, Dr. Raymond Fleck, who became president of the university in 1957, said that his predecessor, Brother Elmo Bransby, who had been head of Brothers' House of Studies at Notre Dame before coming to St. Edward's University, had started a lay advisory board five years prior in 1952. In 1956 Brother Bransby announced that St. Edward's University would go coeducational, but many on campus objected. There was no further discussion because the next

year, Brother Bransby, originally from Pennsylvania, was asked to move back east and join the newly formed Eastern Province of the Congregation of Holy Cross.

As president, Dr. Fleck, who had come to St. Edward's University in 1954 to teach chemistry, did not support a coeducational institution. Instead, he had a dream to create a co-ordinate college for women that would co-exist with St. Edward's University, perhaps even with a different name for the men's college so that both could be part of St. Edward's University. The idea of women on campus received mixed reviews from faculty and students. In October 1962, the school newspaper, *The Hilltopper*, asked, "If it were possible for St. Ed's to be a coeducational institution, what would be your attitude toward the change?" Even those in favor of it differed in their opinions about whether the university should be coeducational or should support a co-ordinate system.

Brother Romard Barthel, professor of physics, commented that, "to have adequate facilities for women requires a great deal of money. I personally don't see any necessity for it. I'm not against having girls around. I think it would be better instead of having a coeducational institution, if we had a girls' college connected with the university. I believe if we had a girls school right across the road it would a great boon to us." Brother Cornelius Corcoran, professor of business administration, expressed the same issues of expense and said he would much rather spend the money increasing facilities for the boys, although he said the only real difference would be setting up secretarial and home economics courses for the girls. Brother Dunstan Bowles, associate professor of English, said

Behind every successful man, there is a woman. Maybe we would have more successful men if there a few women on campus. There is also a matter of masculine pride, which is involved. Appearances have been known to pick up, studies have been known to pick up, and men have been known to develop socially when they find themselves competing with each other for the notice of the fairer sex. I think the good which could accrue to the many would exceed the defeat of the squashy, romantic juveniles who would probably melt like butter in a hot sun under the fluttering eye lashed smile of some equally squashy, romantic gal. This last type never graduates anyway.

Brother Joseph Cain, Dean of Men and professor of biology supported the idea of a co-ordinate collage because he believed that the psychological and social development of students would be better served, although he added, "Segregated classrooms seem to be fashionable, but when you consider which ones should be segregated, you have a real problem. I don't think my courses would be altered by the presence of women in the classroom."

### The Research

Despite the concerns, Dr. Fleck had a dream, and he would not be dissuaded. On July 20, 1964, Dr. Fleck wrote letters to college presidents with co-ordinate and coeducational schools, including presidents of Sophie-Newcomb, Radcliffe, and MacMurray:

St. Edward's is still holding the fort for "men only." However, starting in September, we will be undergoing the Southern Association Self-Study, and at that time, we will give serious consideration to the possibility of going coeducational. Since many of your experiences in the process of going coeducational would undoubtedly be experienced by ourselves, I would appreciate any information and evaluation that you could give us. For example, are men and women admitted on an equal basis to all academic programs, or are some restricted to men and some to women? I presume that all of the academic affairs are still carried out under the leadership of one academic dean responsible to the President. To what extent are separate facilities provided or planned for the men and women? Are there separate dining facilities, gymnasium, student union, etc? What is your organizational arrangement for the administration of the student personnel program? Is there a dean of women? If so, is she responsible to the dean of men or the director of student personnel?

Supported by Dr. Fleck, Brother Joseph Cain, as a member of the first class of the American Council in Education Administration Interns Program, went to Tulane to spend the 1964-65 year at Tulane studying the administration of co-ordinate colleges Sophie Newcomb and Tulane. In an interview in 2007, Dr. Fleck said that he remembered that many at Tulane told Brother Cain: "Why would you want to create a co-ordinate college today? It has too many layers, too many headaches with two administrations." By this time, a co-ordinate school was the only option for Dr. Fleck, although he admitted the successful co-ordinate colleges had been in existence for a long time. (personal communication, March 8, 2007)

### The Proposal

In September 1964, Dr. Fleck floated a proposal titled "A Program for the Education of Women at St. Edward's University." He stressed the need in the Austin Diocese that included 26 counties with a Catholic population in excess of 125,000 for expanding access to a Catholic higher education, especially for women. The proposal described how the co-ordinate system was different from an educational system that was exclusively male or female and thus did not allow for full development of personalities, but was also different from a coeducational system that assumed only minor differences in the psychology and hence educational requirements of men and women.

A Co-ordinate System of education rejects this assumption and maintains that there are specific functions, needs, rights, and obligations that are exclusively within the province

of men and women. The Co-ordinate System of higher education is designed to emphasize those elements of difference and community in the academic, social, religious, and physical programs, and is reflected in the provisions for physical plant, staff, and organizational and administrative structure.

Dr. Fleck outlined a student personnel program for the women's college, administered by the Dean of Women that would be distinct from the men's program. The women would have residence, dining and recreational facilities separate from the men; a guidance and counseling program distinct from the men; separate physical and activities programs, including a small gym, athletic field, and intramural program; and some portions of the religious activities program, including retreats and special devotions, would be separate from the men.

He proposed a cluster of residence halls with a large lounge that could accommodate social activities with men, and with dining facilities so that the women would have their morning and evening meals "family style." The noon meal would be available at the University Dining Hall with the men, cafeteria style. The proposal assumed that in the freshman year, all or practically all of the women's classes would be taught separately from the men, and explained the needs for new facilities and academic programs, such as new programs for elementary education and nursing, and additional courses in languages such as a major in French, plus majors in drama, painting, and music.

The number of women to be accommodated would be approximately two-thirds the capacity of the men students. Our present master plan provides facilities for at least 650 boarding laymen. The new master plan coming out of the self-study will probably raise this number significantly (perhaps to 1200). Thus, initial planning for the women's college should provide for a minimum of 400 women boarders, and adequate space for expansion to 800.

In fact, the new master plan proposed a new library, a field house and convocation center, a church, an instructional center with classrooms, laboratories, computer center, studio for closed circuit TV, and a language lab, and a student union with a bookstore, snack bar, and recreational areas. All new buildings were to be fully air-conditioned.

Dr. Fleck proposed that a community of Sisters would staff the women's college. Laywomen could supplement the Sisters, depending on the course needs. The staff was to include a director, a director of admissions, a dean of women, residence hall counselors, a director of physical education and qualified women teachers who would be part of the regular university faculty and thus meet the requirements of professional competence of St. Edward's University.



A community of Sisters with a Sister-formation program in some other city could establish a Scholasticate for their Sisters where they could complete their last two years of college, and would have a residence in Austin where their Sisters could live while pursuing graduate degrees at the University of Texas.

#### Concerns

While the proposal was still in draft form, Dr. Fleck sent it to Brother Cornelius Corcoran, CSC, for his recommendations. Brother Corcoran, CSC, was skeptical. His skepticism was about the financial and other practical requirements that had to be addressed in order to implement the proposal. In a letter dated July 26, 1964, he told Dr. Fleck:

I agree that women of student age are desirable to complete the social structure of St. Edward's University, and that we should make an investigation into the possibility of incorporating them. Since, however, their presence is not absolutely essential, whether we should have them depends on the price—financial and otherwise.

The ideal solution would seem to be an entirely separate girl's college, but I agree this is practically impossible. I believe we could struggle along with the status quo, but our situation would be definitely improved by a women's college of St. Edward's University. Characteristic of such a women's college and distinguishing it from a true coed school would be the fact that whenever possible the girls should have their classes separately, and likewise the boys—thereby taking advantage of the differences in material and techniques desirable in educating girls.

At this time it seems to me that only an approval-to-investigate is practical—and this approval-to-investigate would certainly be forthcoming. There are too many unknowns to make a definitive decision at this time: the financial requirement, the market for such a school, the availability of a Sisters' community, adequacy of available locations. Once specific item: I think that the planned women's campus would surely require a classroom building.

Brother Andrew Angermeier, CSC, Chair of the Humanities Department, responded to the proposal in a letter in August 1964. He felt that the way to grow was to develop academically as an outstanding men's college.

Though there seems to be little advantage, in my view, of adding girls to the educational program, I can see advantages in a more normal daily life on campus with their presence. Whether the addition of girls would give St. Ed's a better size, more rapid growth, and development into a better educational program is debatable, as far as I can see. I believe St. Edward's University could and would grow rapidly enough to consolidate properly educational gains. There are many areas of the college that need to be encouraged and enhanced. This gets more difficult as size increases, so it is important to lay foundations for the best quality while growth is taking place. To wait for improvement until the school is better established is dangerous because it is difficult to deal with a pattern that has been once established, not to say entrenched.

I believe all our important problems are academic. I even think other, non-academic problems have a way of being solved, eventually; and if the academic is kept

of men and women. The Co-ordinate System of higher education is designed to emphasize those elements of difference and community in the academic, social, religious, and physical programs, and is reflected in the provisions for physical plant, staff, and organizational and administrative structure.

Dr. Fleck outlined a student personnel program for the women's college, administered by the Dean of Women that would be distinct from the men's program. The women would have residence, dining and recreational facilities separate from the men; a guidance and counseling program distinct from the men; separate physical and activities programs, including a small gym, athletic field, and intramural program; and some portions of the religious activities program, including retreats and special devotions, would be separate from the men.

He proposed a cluster of residence halls with a large lounge that could accommodate social activities with men, and with dining facilities so that the women would have their morning and evening meals "family style." The noon meal would be available at the University Dining Hall with the men, cafeteria style. The proposal assumed that in the freshman year, all or practically all of the women's classes would be taught separately from the men, and explained the needs for new facilities and academic programs, such as new programs for elementary education and nursing, and additional courses in languages such as a major in French, plus majors in drama, painting, and music.

The number of women to be accommodated would be approximately two-thirds the capacity of the men students. Our present master plan provides facilities for at least 650 boarding laymen. The new master plan coming out of the self-study will probably raise this number significantly (perhaps to 1200). Thus, initial planning for the women's college should provide for a minimum of 400 women boarders, and adequate space for expansion to 800.

In fact, the new master plan proposed a new library, a field house and convocation center, a church, an instructional center with classrooms, laboratories, computer center, studio for closed circuit TV, and a language lab, and a student union with a bookstore, snack bar, and recreational areas. All new buildings were to be fully air-conditioned.

Dr. Fleck proposed that a community of Sisters would staff the women's college. Laywomen could supplement the Sisters, depending on the course needs. The staff was to include a director, a director of admissions, a dean of women, residence hall counselors, a director of physical education and qualified women teachers who would be part of the regular university faculty and thus meet the requirements of professional competence of St. Edward's University.

A community of Sisters with a Sister-formation program in some other city could establish a Scholasticate for their Sisters where they could complete their last two years of college, and would have a residence in Austin where their Sisters could live while pursuing graduate degrees at the University of Texas.

#### Concerns

While the proposal was still in draft form, Dr. Fleck sent it to Brother Cornelius Corcoran, CSC, for his recommendations. Brother Corcoran, CSC, was skeptical. His skepticism was about the financial and other practical requirements that had to be addressed in order to implement the proposal. In a letter dated July 26, 1964, he told Dr. Fleck:

I agree that women of student age are desirable to complete the social structure of St. Edward's University, and that we should make an investigation into the possibility of incorporating them. Since, however, their presence is not absolutely essential, whether we should have them depends on the price—financial and otherwise.

The ideal solution would seem to be an entirely separate girl's college, but I agree this is practically impossible. I believe we could struggle along with the status quo, but our situation would be definitely improved by a women's college of St. Edward's University. Characteristic of such a women's college and distinguishing it from a true coed school would be the fact that whenever possible the girls should have their classes separately, and likewise the boys—thereby taking advantage of the differences in material and techniques desirable in educating girls.

At this time it seems to me that only an approval-to-investigate is practical—and this approval-to-investigate would certainly be forthcoming. There are too many unknowns to make a definitive decision at this time: the financial requirement, the market for such a school, the availability of a Sisters' community, adequacy of available locations. Once specific item: I think that the planned women's campus would surely require a classroom building.

Brother Andrew Angermeier, CSC, Chair of the Humanities Department, responded to the proposal in a letter in August 1964. He felt that the way to grow was to develop academically as an outstanding men's college.

Though there seems to be little advantage, in my view, of adding girls to the educational program, I can see advantages in a more normal daily life on campus with their presence. Whether the addition of girls would give St. Ed's a better size, more rapid growth, and development into a better educational program is debatable, as far as I can see. I believe St. Edward's University could and would grow rapidly enough to consolidate properly educational gains. There are many areas of the college that need to be encouraged and enhanced. This gets more difficult as size increases, so it is important to lay foundations for the best quality while growth is taking place. To wait for improvement until the school is better established is dangerous because it is difficult to deal with a pattern that has been once established, not to say entrenched.

I believe all our important problems are academic. I even think other, non-academic problems have a way of being solved, eventually; and if the academic is kept



first, and given every priority, other problems are soluble, and if not, are not as deleterious to our main purpose. Some disagree, I know.

I believe we ought not to go further ahead without considering many of the points Mrs. Ryan brings up in her book on these problems and their implications because its timeliness coincides with our councilor changes of direction for the entire church. In my opinion, our development should be in the Church-wide context. Two separate or semi schools can help each other; they can also hold each other back. In our high school co-institutional experience, we seemed to arrive at this conclusion, in one area: where the Brothers were in the school first, or arrived simultaneously, things were smoother (at least from our standpoint), whereas the opposite situation fomented problems. . . .

In our area, we have several girls' schools, with St. Mary's now a coed school. I'm sure we attract some students because we are not coed. I am sure growth in quality is more important than growth in size. Where the two are used in combination, they can both be attained with the proper care and effort, but it seems easier and surer to enlarge from a soundly based academic excellence than from a more fluid and expanding position. So that a well-established program, solidly and widely recognized by the discerning public as quality education, is a very good position to venture into a new program. . . .

The problem of financial resources, while important, may not be the most central consideration. Simplicity of operation, in whatever sphere, seems to be desirable. New educational admixture is fresh and even exciting, and can give a new impetus to all concerned, it is true. But to add an institution alongside an already established one, where the alternative is an enlarged one without the additional top heaviness, is, in my opinion, unnecessarily cumbersome. . . .

Much, of course, would depend on who accepts, what their resources, mainly people, are, and other such factors, their reputation, successes, etc. Overall, the plan does not appear as appealing as simple coeducation under the present situation, though this too, seems to hold no great promise, in my vision of the future. In general I am for changes. I am not convinced this is a hopeful one.

#### The Approval

On August 8, 1964, Brother John Baptist Titzer, CSC, Provincial of the Brothers of Holy Cross, wrote that the provincial Council would go along with either a co-ordinate or a coeducational school.

Most council members felt that a modified plan might eventually end in coed, as at other colleges, either for economic reasons or because separation was in fact not currently desirable. That women need a separate college on a male campus would not appear totally logical. In all honesty, the vast majority of classes in general, and even specialized education would be taught the same for women as for men—languages, math, chemistry, art appreciation, history, philosophy, etc., etc. . . . Undoubtedly, there are certain classes and full majors that would appeal mostly or totally to women. In the usual college coed setup, these are simply added to the curriculum. . . . Class procedure and scholarship may be better where both are not in the same class: competition in class seems to hurt the girls, make the boys nervous. (At Portland U. the girls seem to carry off the prizes—girls not out to get a husband, though this may be partly explained by the fact that top male

students matriculate at Reed and name colleges). . . . Council members do not approve of a distinct college for women, with its own accrediting and stuck off in a corner of the campus. Getting accrediting would cost a lot of time, grief, and money. One thought that a special name was not desirable; the others would go along with a division name (like \_\_\_\_\_ College for Women); one thought we might as well change the name of St. Edward's for the male students too.

#### The Reality

It appears that most faculty and students did not really understand the enormous change that would be required for a co-ordinate college. It was not like having two gender separate high schools that shared athletics and social activities. The tenor of the discussions seemed to focus on how the male students at St. Edward's University would be affected, not the female students who joined them. The reality is that the Brothers of Holy Cross could probably not have handled a coeducational institution at the time. Parents sending their daughters to a Catholic college still expected rules and regulations that would protect their daughters. Having an order of Sisters who had experience running a women's college made sense since the Sisters would be the ones to maintain the order. Dr. Raymond Fleck said in 2007:

The large number of Religious on the faculty and staff at that time made the Catholic identity of St. Ed's obvious, and many of the students came from Catholic high schools. The religious character of the school, in the ecumenical era unleashed by Vatican II earlier in the decade, made the institution attractive to many parents whether or not they were Catholic. For the parents of female high school graduates, I think the religious character of St. Ed's/Maryhill was more important than whether we had a co-ordinate or a coeducational arrangement. (personal communication)

#### Preparations

By October 30, 1964, the Local and Provincial Councils of the Brothers of Holy Cross and the Board of Lay Trustees had approved the creation of a co-ordinate women's college, with fall 1968 being the target date for the new women's college to open. The Moody Foundation announced that it would give \$100,000 toward the new classroom building to be ready by then; it would house classrooms, introductory science laboratories, computer center, language laboratory, a 200-seat lecture room with a small stage, and faculty offices.

Dr. Fleck, was quoted in the Austin Statesman of Oct. 19, 1964, as foreseeing 200 women enrolled in three years at which time he expected the male student population to be 900. The projected plan was for an enrollment of 2,500 students, about one-third women, and fifteen million dollars in construction by 1976. The enrollment of St. Edward's University had doubled from 1959-1964; he expected that enrollment would double again in the next five years.

### The Co-ordinate Model

The co-ordinate model had worked well for Sophie Newcomb and for Radcliffe, but it is important to note that both women's colleges had long histories. Sophie Newcomb College was founded in 1886 as part of Tulane University and was the first women's co-ordinate college in the U. S. It merged with Tulane in 2005, after Hurricane Katrina, to become Newcomb-Tulane College, home of undergraduate education at Tulane University. (Newcomb-Tulane College, 2006) The Sophie Newcomb Memorial College Institute exists today to enhance women's education at Tulane.

Radcliffe College was founded as a co-ordinate college in 1879 and was called the Harvard Annex; Harvard professors taught women in the Annex. It was chartered as Radcliffe in 1894. During WWI, women were invited on the Harvard campus to fill up the seats in classes left vacant because male students were at war. In 1963, the Radcliffe Graduate School closed when Harvard's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences was opened to women; in 1970, Radcliffe and Harvard had the first joint graduation ceremony. In 1977, Harvard and Radcliffe signed a governing agreement for the partnership, and finally in 1999, the two officially merged, establishing the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard. (Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University, 2006) [Dr. Drew Faust, was the dean of the Radcliffe Institute before becoming the first female president of Harvard University in 2007.]

In fact, there were women's colleges that were inviting men's colleges as co-ordinate. Sarah Boyden (1959) traces the history of women and higher education from the days in which women were screened from view in males' classrooms to the day that land-grant colleges in the mid-west began admitting women. She cites the example of MacMurray College in Jacksonville, Illinois, founded in 1846, that established MacMurray College for Men on its campus in 1957 in order to stop the transfers of students after their sophomore years. By the third year, there were 255 enrolled in the men's college and 500 in the women's college, and women were returning to finish their degrees. There was much debate by 1960 about whether separate classes for men and women were valuable or whether the college should be coeducational. The college president was quoted as saying that he felt that mixed classes in the early years inhibited learning processes because women and men approach classroom problems differently. One junior girl added "Another aspect to be considered is cheating. Girls have a definite honor code against it—boys

don't" (Franey, 1960). This same debate was to be fought about Maryhill and Holy Cross years later.

### The Search Begins

Dr. Fleck understood that he would need an order of religious women who had experience administering and teaching in higher education to assist in his endeavor. In a September 6, 1964, in a letter to Brother Titzer, South-West Provincial, Dr. Fleck presented possible Communities of Women Religious who were "substantially committed to work in the field of higher education and conduct good colleges; that they are already working in this area of the country but do not have a college in the Texas area; that they have a substantial number of Sisters."

"We walk by faith and not by sight"

Even without a commitment from any order of Sisters, Dr. Fleck convinced the Board to have faith that God would provide an order of Sisters. It announced in October 1964 that there would be a co-ordinate women's college at St. Edward's University. The first residence hall was planned to accommodate 150 students.

On October 22, 1964 the Lone Star Register, Official Newspaper of the Diocese of Austin, reported that "St. Edward's Plans College for Women: After reviewing the growth of St. Edward's University in the past seven years—during which the enrollment has doubled and several new buildings have been added to the plant, Dr. Fleck announced that the Moody Foundation would give \$100,000 toward the next building phase at the Hilltop school."

The Austin Statesman announced in October 1964 that "St. Edward's University will become a coeducational institution within three years, bringing some 200 girls to the previously all-male university. . . . Current ideas are for an order of nuns to administer the girl's adjunct. The women's college will be established in an educational pattern fashioned after the Sophie Newcomb and Tulane University plan." The Austin Statesman did not understand the difference between a coed model and a co-ordinate model; it is unlikely that many in the state of Texas understood it either since there were no co-ordinate schools in the Southwest.

By February 23, 1965, even Dr. Fleck was concerned about the fact that no order of Sisters was coming forward. One by one, the Mothers Superiors, had written letters saying that they were having difficulty staffing their existing schools, and could not contemplate taking on a



new one. Dr. Fleck wrote to Brothers Mang and Woelfel: "The strongest community that still seems to be a 'live' possibility are the IHMs in Monroe, Michigan."

#### Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (IHM)

The Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (IHM) said that they might be interested, but they had many questions that needed answers, such as whether there was a need for a women's college in Austin, what the projected enrollment was, and what number of sisters would be needed. On January 25, 1965, Superior General Mother Anna Marie, IHM, wrote to Dr. Fleck:

Naturally we are interested in such a venture, but as you are perhaps aware, there would be many aspects that need further elaboration. We are honest when we say that we would not feel capable of staffing such a project on a large scale. . . . Is the staffing to be the concern of a single community or is there any thought of several communities cooperating in the composition of the faculty?

The IHMs had a superior reputation for education at all levels. They knew how to run an academically rigorous college designed to develop women leaders. What they may not have known was how a co-ordinate college for women would differ from a college for women, or just how much Dr. Fleck and the others did not understand about their concept of educating women.

#### Marygrove College for Women

The Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary was founded in the United States in 1845 by Reverend Louis Florent Gillet, CSSR, and Teresa Maxis Duchemin, as a teaching order. Thus they had maintained their founding charism, and the process of aligning their current purpose with their founding charism was not the destructive process it was for other orders of women religious. In 1846, they opened St. Mary Academy in Monroe, Michigan, which offered "a course of study that included French and English grammar, arithmetic, mythology, bookkeeping, needlework, beadwork, tapestry, worsted flowers, and music" (Marygrove <http://www.marygrove.edu/about/history.asp>). By 1905, the Academy was offering college level courses, so the IHMs established St. Mary College. In 1910, the State Department of Education of Michigan approved the college to grant degrees, and in 1914, authorized it to grant teaching certificates. By the 1920s, the school was outgrowing its facilities. In 1927 Marygrove College was moved to Detroit when the IHMs purchased an 80-acre wooded track of land in northwest Detroit.

The Marygrove Idea, as this philosophy came to be known to generations of alumnae, encouraged Marygrove women to develop personal power in themselves, to be driving

forces in their chosen fields, to act consciously on their own values, and to be proficient in the seven liberal arts: the art of behavior before God, the art of behavior within society among persons, the art of expression, the art of reasoning, the art of historical realization, the art of leisure, and the art of making a living. The test of a college, Dr. Derry, the first president believed, was what its graduates were and could do. The curriculum emphasized speaking and writing skills, critical thinking, and collaborative and interdisciplinary learning. . . . Marygrove students moved through a course of study that included a freshman orientation, a sophomore open-forum, and junior-senior seminars. These classes required students to thoroughly research and write a paper, then present it orally, discuss it, and defend it in the company of students and faculty from several disciplines. So that Marygrove women would move naturally into what Sister Honora Kack, IHM, dean of Marygrove from 1930-1937 and president from 1937-1961, thought of as "the normal work-life of the world," she inaugurated an academic requirement of "professional contacts." Each department required its students to attend a certain number of professional meetings related to the major field each semester. The tradition of professional contacts is still in place in several of Marygrove's academic departments.

#### A New Presence at St. Edward's University

Although the IHMs did not want a college in Austin, Texas, that had to secure its own accreditation, it is clear that they did expect the co-ordinate college to be "a distinct college for women," as Marygrove was. A letter from Superior General Mother Anna Marie, IHM, to Dr. Raymond Fleck restated her understanding from the proposal that separate classes would be maintained for freshman and sophomore courses as much as possible; teachers could be Sisters, Brothers, Priests, or laymen. "In the third and fourth years, Sisters might be employed in teaching classes for which they are especially trained." It also specified that the sisters would have representation on planning boards and in administration that the Sisters would select a name for the college, and that St. Edward's University Corporation would hire any lay teachers required to implement the program. She invited Brother Raymond to visit the Motherhouse in Monroe, Michigan.

On May 26, 1965, Brother Raymond responded, "Your summary of points describing the arrangements between the Sisters and St. Edward's University is generally what we had in mind. There are a few points that I would like to clarify. For example, we would expect to build a Convent for the Sisters when the size of the women's college and the number of Sisters on the staff warrants such a building. It is understood, though, that St. Edward's would be responsible for supplying suitable residence facilities for the Sisters from the beginning. We would expect to have the first few Sisters live in the women's residence hall."

Dr. Fleck also said the name of the women's college must be mutually agreed on by the Sisters and the St. Edward's University Corporation, especially if a benefactor might wish to endow the college in return for naming it. He also made a change from the former list; he said that the salary for each sister would be \$2,000 a year plus room, board, insurance, and utilities. The distribution of the \$2,000 would be left to the Motherhouse.

In an e-mail on December 5, 2006, Sister Marie Andre Walsh reflected: The Co-ordinate College was the brainchild of Brother Raymond Fleck, CSC. When he was exploring ways to develop St. Edward's, he decided that the co-ordinate route would be effective. There were a number of instances in the U.S. at the time. He was a very authoritative person, really did not consult his colleagues about the concept. [In an interview in March 2007, Dr. Fleck agreed with this assessment.] As far as I can recall, Brother Woelfel, who was the academic dean at the time and who left the following year, did go along with the idea. Some of the lay faculty, men whom we referred to as the "old Boys Club" . . . were very opposed to the idea. They did not want change of any kind. The Brothers were more accepting although two of them left in protest. . . . After two years Brother Raymond Fleck left. On the whole, however, the Holy Cross Brothers began to realize that if the IHM Sisters had not arrived, the University would have gone down the drain and they said this openly to us. And they were the most accepting of us. Dr. Henry Altmiller, then a teaching Brother and professor of chemistry who later became academic vice-president and then executive vice-president of St. Edward's University, agreed with the assessment. (personal communication, January 21, 2007)

#### The Announcement

On July 2, 1965, Dr. Fleck, president of St. Edward's, and Mother Anna Marie, IHM, superior general of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, announced that women would be admitted to a co-ordinate college at St. Edward's University in the fall of 1966. Sister Ann Virginia Bowling was chosen to be the Executive Director of the Women's College. The Lone Star Register reported on August 5, 1965 that:

Announcements that the co-ordinate college for women will be opened the fall of 1966 were made jointly by Dr. Fleck president of St. Edward's, and Mother Anna Marie, IHM, superior general of the Sisters whose motherhouse is in Monroe, Michigan.

The IHMs now conduct Marygrove College in Detroit. The name of the co-ordinate college to be opened in Austin will be determined later. Marygrove College is for women only and has an enrollment of 1,450. The college at St. Edward's will be the first Texas venture of the IHMs, who have schools in eight other states besides missions in Puerto Rico and Brazil. Maryhill received its name in October.

It is clear that Dr. Fleck had a dream, but he had difficulty transforming that dream into reality. The details of exactly how the two co-ordinate schools would operate separately and together were never clearly established; assumptions were made about a structure and

management evolving, but in the everyday work of administering and teaching, no one gave substance to the evolution. In the 1991 interview, Sister Ann Virginia Bowling said that when she was told in November 1965 by her mother superior that she would go to Austin, Texas, to establish a co-ordinate college at St. Edward's University, she did not have a title or job description. When she arrived in January 1966 in Austin, she had no office and no living quarters. They found a space for her to work in the barracks; she shared the space with five men. She recalled that there was one other woman on campus, a music teacher named Miss. Grissom.

#### Co-ordinate vs. Coed

Although Dr. Fleck had carried out due diligence in requesting information from various college administrators, and had sent Mrs. Warren out for visits, the issue of how Maryhill would fit with St. Edward's University in terms of administration and student population would continue to be a major concern for its four year existence.

Brother Woelfel wrote on October 8, 1967, that

Aside from the theoretical reasons for the co-ordinate system (and agreeing that a distinctive program will have to be developed), there are two very practical reasons why the procedure followed was correct:

1. It is very unlikely that the Brothers themselves would have accepted the coed idea, if their reaction to such a proposal in the past prevailed. As it turned out, there was practically no opposition to the co-ordinate concept, i.e., to the education of women under some system other than coed . . . a fact which still astounds me.
2. The I.H.M. Sisters said that they would not have been interested at all in coming to St. Edward's on a purely coed basis. Assuming that the presence of a strong, teaching community of Sisters was needed (and it probably was) to make the idea of women-on-campus go, then coed was not the answer.

#### The Identity of Maryhill

It is clear that, for the IHMs, even if the structure and organization of the co-ordinate college concept was not yet established, they believed that the identity would come from their own values and experience in education. In both her speech at the inauguration of Maryhill College and at the opening of Alice K. East Hall, Sister Ann Virginia Bowling painted a picture of a Catholic college for women run by the IHMs that would share activities with the men who would be attending a Catholic college for men. The identity of Maryhill was an issue from its birth. At the Inaugural Dinner for Maryhill College on October 16, 1966, Sister Ann Virginia Bowling, IHM, said

A co-ordinate college, by its very nature, must develop its own identity within the context of a University community. However, it would be premature and unfair, at this time, to ask us to delineate clearly or to define too rigorously the special identity of Maryhill



College. The infant has a beautiful and distinctive name; it has a beautiful home (which it will soon outgrow), but it is still an infant. In my opinion, the most important influence that will come to bear in shaping the identity of Maryhill College in the years ahead must be in the distinctive spirit and proven tradition of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. The influence of this spirit and tradition should also spark a renewal of the older programs of St. Edward's University.

I propose that we build into the administrative structure of the two colleges (Holy Cross and Maryhill) the means by which we can realize to the fullest the potential of the co-ordinate system.

One of the clearest expressions of the co-ordinate concept and one which helps me to define my own vision of the structures needed at Maryhill College to make it function at its best is that contained in a recently published brochure from Lindenwood College announcing the fact that they are opening a co-ordinate college for men on the campus of the 142-year-old college for women (in 1969).

#### Separation and Inclusion

It is probable that this separation envisioned by both Dr. Fleck, and Sister Ann Virginia Bowling, IHM, was not grounded in what men and women were looking for in the college experience in the late 1960s. The women students had their own structure within Maryhill. There was a Maryhill Activities Council of Maryhill College, and an Executive Council with an elected president, vice-president, secretary and treasurer plus council members who were the presidents and representatives for each class, plus one representative of Austin students. There was also Standing Committee Chairmen for Academic, Student Life, and Financial Committees. Maryhill was represented on St. Edward's University Boards and Councils such as the Board of Trustees, the Student Life Committee, the Academic Council of Maryhill College, the Administrative Council, the Faculty Collegium, the Maryhill Hearing Board, the Council on Student Life, the Committee on Student Publications, and the University Council.

However, representation and belonging are two different things. It appears that the men and St. Edward's University were in charge of programs and activities. One part of the identity issue was that the women's college was Maryhill College of St. Edward's University and the men's college was still St. Edward's University. As such, the women of Maryhill perceived that they were subordinate not co-ordinate. The residence halls had their own chapels and recreation rooms. They ate in the same dining hall, although in the 1991 interview, the IHMs recall that the dining hall delivered a continental breakfast to East Hall because it was so far from the dining hall which was next to the men's dorms, and studied in the same library. Mostly, however, the interactions that would allow the two sexes to learn about each other were limited the first two years. It must have seemed like what Brother Barthel had described in 1962: a separate women's

college across the road. The women of Maryhill were in charge of the activities sponsored by Maryhill, but not a part of those sponsored by St. Edward's University.

In the 1991 interview, Sister Ann Virginia Bowling commented that the goal of the women's co-ordinate college was only to bring women to St. Edward's University. She believed that most of the Brothers of Holy Cross perceived the co-ordinate college as only adding women's dorms to the campus and the organizations that all college dormitories had. Otherwise, they really thought of the system as coeducational, since there were not enough girls to have separate classes for them and there was not a separate classroom building for the women's college, even though there was a separate administrative staff.

Dr. Penny Griffith, née Garland, who graduated in 1970, does not remember much conflict or separation:

Many of our students went over to UT to join protests re: Viet Nam and our very good friend had a patch on his head in our wedding pictures from being hit with a billy club by a policeman at a protest. I don't remember any protests on our campus, but everyone discussed what was happening and we had friends going over there. Like I said, I was the first woman editor of the yearbook, so I felt that students were given responsibility. We never thought about being represented on faculty committees that I can remember. We never even felt separate. In fact, my degree says St. Edward's University. They combined early on. We had dorm councils that were for the women, but as far as the University itself, it was all one. Maybe the first year women experienced something different, but I was a second year woman, and by then things seemed to have meshed. I don't know if there were struggles at the administration level, but I never knew about them. The older nuns were strict. I cherish my years at St. Ed's, and my dream is to return there in some capacity.

In the end, Maryhill College became a catalyst that created the future St. Edward's University rather than the co-ordinate college it was created to be. Once the catalyst had transformed the university, it was no longer possible to return to the original elements. Without it, St. Edward's University may have disappeared as well, a private, Catholic, liberal arts university that failed.

## References

- Austin American-Statesman*. Retrieved 2006 from St. Edward's University Archives.
- Bowling, Ann Virginia, IHM, files. Retrieved 2006 from St. Edward's University Archives.
- Boyden, S. (1959, September 20). Just call her Betty Co-Ord. *Chicago Sun-Times*.
- Briggs, K. (2006). *Double crossed: Uncovering the Catholic Church's betrayal of American nuns*. New York: Doubleday.
- Dunn, W. (1986). *Saint Edward's University: A centennial history*. Austin: Saint Edward's University Press.
- Fialka, J. (2003). *Sisters: Catholic nuns and the making of America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Fleck, R. (1964). *A program for the education of women at St. Edward's University*. Austin: St. Edward's University.
- Franey, J. (1960, January 21). Students split on keeping girls in separate classes. *Champaign News-Gazette*, p. 4.
- IHM history files. Retrieved 2006 from St. Edward's University Archives.
- Marygrove College. *History of Marygrove*. Retrieved 2006 from <http://www.marygrove.edu/about/history.asp>
- Pattillo, M., & Mackenzie, D. (1966). *Church-sponsored higher education in the United States: Report of the Danforth Commission*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- President Edgar Roy files. Retrieved 2006 from St. Edward's University Archives.
- President Raymond Fleck files. Retrieved 2006 from St. Edward's University Archives.
- Quiñones, L. & Turner, M. (1992). *The transformation of American Catholic sisters*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study (2006). *Significant dates in Radcliffe's history*. Retrieved November 3, 2006, from <http://www.radcliffe.edu/about/363.aspx>
- Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (Interviewees). (1991, June 22). *Reminiscences of the 5 pioneer IHM Sisters on the opening of Maryhill College at St. Edward's University* [Audio tape of interview by Dr. Richard Hughes]. Austin, TX: St. Edward's University.

- Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Monroe, Michigan. (1997). *Building sisterhood: A feminist history of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, (1968) *Chronicles, 1964–1968*. Retrieved 2006 from St. Edward's University Archives.
- Newcomb College Institute. *History of Newcomb College*. (2006). Retrieved April 2, 2008, from [http://newcomb.tulane.edu/article/history-of-newcomb-college?department\\_id=newcomb-college-institute-about-us](http://newcomb.tulane.edu/article/history-of-newcomb-college?department_id=newcomb-college-institute-about-us)
- St. Edward's University. *1966–67 General Bulletin*. Retrieved 2006 from St. Edward's University Archives.
- St. Edward's University. *The Hilltopper*, 1963–1972. Retrieved 2006 from St. Edward's University Archives.
- St. Edward's University. *The Tower*, 1963–1972. Retrieved 2006 from St. Edward's University Archives.
- Tulane University. (2006). *Welcome*. Retrieved November 3, 2006, from <http://college.tulane.edu/index.htm>
- Wittberg, P. (1991). *Creating a future for religious life: A sociological perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.