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The College of New Rochelle Community records with sorrow the death of Sister Dorothy Ann Kelly, OSU, Provincial Superior of the Eastern Province of the Ursulines and 11th President of the College (1972-1997). In an association of more than 60 years, she placed her considerable talents at the service of this College Community, and thousands have been touched by her wisdom, caring and goodness. She brought her bright, inquiring mind to the College first as gifted student and then as much sought after faculty member, Dean, and President. She lovingly took this College to new heights. American higher education and the American Church are the beneficiaries of this multi-talented, highly competent leader, who, above all, gifted us with the witness of the woman of faith. We mourn her loss and celebrate her extraordinary life.
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A Champion for Thy People

Students of American literature will recognize one of Nathaniel Hawthorne’s short stories, “The Gray Champion.”

Set in early New England, in circumstances of great challenge and adversity, the townspeople cried, “O Lord of hosts, provide a Champion for thy people ...” which served as the herald’s cry to introduce a remarkable personage who would lead the town through the challenge and adversity.

Of course, Hawthorne’s message is not simply about a pre-Revolutionary War town in New England. It is about the theme of convergence, that Divine Providence will always provide the match of leadership, the champion for the particular, historical moment.

Happily such has been the case for this College over its 105-year history. Providence raises up champions. Providence provides the convergence, the congruence of gifts and talents and skills to a particular historical moment. Profoundly grateful to a loving Providence, we remember an especially dazzling match of gifts and historical moment for The College of New Rochelle in the person of Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly, OSU, whose association with the College covered more than half of its history.

She brought her bright, inquiring mind to the College first as gifted student and then as much sought after faculty member. She came as a day student from the Bronx and not many years later returned as an Ursuline and member of the History Department. Except for brief breaks for graduate studies and as a second grade teacher of one very lucky class in St. Philip Neri Parish on the Grand Concourse, she remained at CNR for almost 45 years, as faculty member, Dean, Acting President, President for 25 years, and Chancellor. She earned the bachelor’s degree from CNR in
1951, the master’s in American Church History from The Catholic University of America in 1958, and the Ph.D. in American Intellectual History from Notre Dame University in 1970.

In short order, so obviously committed to an understanding of administration and leadership as service and ministry, she lovingly took the College into the modern age, extending the heritage and legacy of Mother Irene Gill, the Ursulines, and generations of their co-workers into the national arena. She faithfully protected the mission of the College while propelling it forward with the extraordinary expansion of its scope and influence. Her special vision took the institution from “the College” to four schools: Arts and Sciences, the Graduate School, the School of New Resources, and the School of Nursing, and changed dramatically the College’s geography from Westchester County alone to Westchester and six branch campuses in New York City to serve new generations.

Her sense of service became legendary in the many concentric circles that surrounded the College. Hers was a richness of interests that she found so stimulating, locally, nationally, and internationally. She so effectively worked the political scene to shape good public policy in support of access to higher education. A formidable presence on hospital, community service, school, and university Boards of Trustees, she fostered connections among these individuals and communities to bring forth remarkable, previously untired results. Her work on interreligious conversation, accreditation, women’s colleges, and peace in Ireland demonstrably moved these causes forward. As a member of the American delegation to the Fourth UN Conference on Women in Beijing, as a consultant to the Holy Father and the Congregation for Catholic Education on the formulation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, and as a delegate to a series of General Chapters of the Ursulines in Rome, Sr. Dorothy Ann’s influence was widespread. Six of her colleague presidents tipped their academic caps to her in the conferral of honorary degrees; she took her rightful place in the Westchester Woman’s Hall of Fame, and in 1997, as a permanent and ongoing commemoration of her twenty-five years as President, the Sister Dorothy Ann Kelly, OSU, Woman of Conscience Award was established. The award “recognizes and celebrates the moral leadership of women who by acts of conscience have elevated humanity.”

In the College, in the community around us, in American higher education and in the American Church, we find in the life of Sr. Dorothy Ann a remarkable witness, the witness of the multi-talented, highly competent leader, the interested, engaged partner in so many parts of the community and in so many lives. In Sr. Dorothy Ann we have, above all, the witness of the woman of faith.

It is the element of faith which made sense of the selflessness, the seemingly endless yeses to all kinds of requests, the punishing schedule. It is the element of faith which explains the boundless energy and enthusiasm, the deep interest in each individual whether the First Lady of the United States, the Cardinals of the Catholic University Board, the legislators of New York, Nobel laureates, the faculty and the students of New Rochelle or Brooklyn or the DC-37 Campus, the patients of Sound Shore Hospital Medical Center, or the hungry and homeless of New Rochelle and Westchester.

Here was the heart of her remarkable story. A young girl, vital and vibrant in every possible way, answers a call and continues to answer the call over a lifetime, and answers it not once, but every single day: “Here I am Lord, I’ve come to do your will.”

And in that faithfulness is mirrored God’s faithfulness. This College, and thousands of us so far, are touched by the story, by the woman, Dorothy Ann Kelly. For more than 60 years, here was a love affair with the College. Hers was an unreserved love and we simply bow our heads and say: Isn’t God good to have sent us a champion!

Stephen J. Sweeny, Ph.D.
President, The College of New Rochelle
In Her Own Words: The Legacy of Sister Dorothy Ann Kelly

By Dr. James T. Schleifer
Professor Emeritus of History and former Dean of Gill Library, The College of New Rochelle
In 2000, when she was Chancellor of The College of New Rochelle, I had three interviews with Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly as part of my research for the history of the College I have been writing. What follows are excerpts from those previously unpublished interviews, interspersed with my short comments. In these conversations you can actually hear Sr. Dorothy Ann talking. You can recognize her patterns of speech, her choice of words, her habit of self-deprecation, and her sense of balance and moderation in whatever she said (and did). These are her words and her perspective, and it allows us to examine, to reflect upon, and to understand her legacy in a very unique way.

As a Student. Sr. Dorothy Ann was a member of the Class of 1951 and very much a student leader during her years at CNR. The faculty, both Ursuline and lay, recognized her academic and leadership potential very quickly. In her student years, we can already see her willingness to take responsibility and to tackle problems and her eagerness to move into new situations and new settings. She saw those experiences as opportunities to learn new things and to influence events. Those around her seemed especially to sense her reliability when she decided to undertake a task. In her answers, note also the emerging influence of the Ursulines and Sr. Dorothy Ann's growing appreciation of what women's education was all about.
JS: I want to have you say something about your years here as a student. I know a little bit about your years as a student. It seems as though you took a leadership role quite early.

DAK: My own background [was] a working class family coming from the Bronx. [I was] someone who could not have gone to college, if I hadn’t had a scholarship. The truth of the matter is that my father would have sent me to Hunter [College]. Hunter was free, a nickel subway ride, and my father thought it was Catholic, because there were so many Catholic girls who went down.

When I came to The College of New Rochelle in September of 1946 [sic: 1947], I had never even visited the College. I had no sense of the place except on paper. I had been offered a scholarship, and my father and I decided that this was the place to come. I took the bus up, got off the bus, and for the next four years, I walked up or down Pintard [Avenue]. I came from a very small parish high school, a co-ed high school. [She had graduated as an honor student.] I knew everybody, and everybody knew me. When I would get elected to be a class officer, it was almost always vice president, because the boy would be the president. I was always the one to be vice president, do things responsible, all that sort of thing.

So I leave that situation and come up to what for me then was a big world. I was happy enough freshman year just to make my way through academically and to discover that I was well prepared for college. This was not going to be a failure; I could really do this; it took hard work; it took all this energy.

And then, by the end of freshman year, I found myself much more involved, either by virtue of volunteering or getting elected. And then, as a result of being elected, being responsible for doing this, that, or the other thing.

One of the vehicles for leadership training was what we called in those days Sodality. It was an organization which was very active in parishes, in Catholic colleges. It was a national, an international organization, and it was both religious formation and also some sense of obligation to parishes and so on. I had been in Sodality in high school, and I thought it was just the natural thing to do Sodality in college.... [One of my good friends] said you don’t have to do that; that’s the Ursulines, and if you go you will get more involved, and there will be more things they want you to do. I said I will stick with it a while longer.

I was already fascinated by people like Mother Thérèse Charles [faculty moderator of Sodality], who referred to us always as women, young women. No one had ever called me a woman before, and she had a sense of our possible roles as college women in anything you want, parish organization, the bigger world. I found it all very fascinating. Obviously, this is one way people get marked off as having potential for leadership. So Sodality was one of those ways; getting elected to student government was another; and then getting very interested in things like the National Student Association [NSA] and particularly the National Federation of Catholic College Students [NFCCS].

For NSA, I remember going to regional meetings down at Columbia and NYU. ... I would be asked, among a group of people, would you go to a meeting in New York City, and I would. I was comfortable going into NYC and interested. As a result of going to some regional meetings, both of NSA and...
more of NFCCS, I came to realize that it was very hard to have any influence in those meetings if you did not know parliamentary procedure. I... remember coming back saying that and having a couple of the nuns say: that's what you need to learn; and then it was like magic. As long as you were willing to put your hand up and say I have a point of order, you got recognized. So it was a gradual inclusion, if you want, of some of my natural aspirations and of opportunities that were here [at the College]. ... I had a priest for political science and Latin American history who took me to a meeting of the National Democratic Committee in NYC, as a student. I had not much of a clue about what was going on, but he had enough of a sense that I probably would be interested in that kind of thing; and I learned a lot as a result of it.

So my years here, I found it very easy to move into those kinds of things. I was willing to do it; I made the time to do it; I thought these were important things, as well as getting your assignments done. My father thought it was good. When I would go home and talk about doing this, he thought that's exactly what you should be doing, making your way, make a name for yourself, all of that. ... [At the College] there was always an effort made, I think, to spot people who were, as students, potential leaders or already leaders, and then to move them into opportunities.

**Becoming an Ursuline and Doing Graduate Study.** After graduating from CNR, Sr. Dorothy Ann taught very briefly in a high school, and then, in January 1952, entered the Ursuline Order, taking her first vows in July 1954. In the mid-1950s, she began work on a master's degree, receiving an M.A. in American Church History from The Catholic University of America in July 1958; at CUA one of her mentors was the eminent church historian, John Tracy Ellis.

**As a Faculty Member and Young Ursuline.** Sr. Dorothy Ann returned to the College in 1957 to teach American history. Her leadership potential had already been noticed by Mother Mary Peter Carthy (later known as Sr. Margaret Carthy), who had become President of the College, also in 1957. As a young Ursuline, Sr. Dorothy Ann benefited from the strong Ursuline tradition of consciously preparing the next generation of leaders. She was able to work closely with Mother Mary Peter and shared her openness to change and her willingness to adapt to the times. Like the then President, she wanted "to move in a more contemporary direction."

**JS: I would like to talk to you about the period in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the leadership of Mother Mary Peter Carthy, and what your perspective is on that, although you were early in your career at that point. What was happening at the College in the late 1950s when you returned as a member of the faculty?**

**DAK:** I came back to teach at the College in 1957 and that was the year Mother Mary Peter Carthy was made President. It was a year when several so-called "young Ursulines" were brought directly onto the faculty from their master's work. ... it was unusual for the College to do that.

**JS: Why did that happen?**

**DAK:** My understanding, at the time, was that it was a deliberate effort to bring younger Ursulines sooner onto the faculty for working with students, influencing students. The usual feeling was that people a little closer to the student age and experience might be more attractive to them and engage [them] more in conversations, leading in some cases to vocations [as Ursulines], but if not, [they might] just simply [have] the ability to relate to them.

I came back into a situation in which there was evidently an effort being made to bring people like myself into a prominent role in the College with students. I was not only assigned to teach in the History Department, which was my discipline, but also was sent out to live with students and given assignments ... of extracurricular work. You were made moderator of this or that, as well as [assigned to] teach a full load, do more. Nobody thought twice about it, but you realize afterwards, I certainly did, that we did three or four jobs, which were later made full-time jobs in the College, and rightly so. [We were assigned] all of the club moderatorships, or [made] class moderator. That was a very important assignment, because of the influence you had with the students in shaping their extracurricular program, as a class. ... Those positions of influence (continued on page 8)
were all assigned to the younger ones of us, so that I would find myself meeting with Margaret Carthy, as President, with the other three class advisors, and sometimes with [others].

**JS:** When Sr. Margaret Carthy was President, there seems to have been the question of changes at the College, particularly in relation to student life.

**DAK:** There was a sense, as I got it in those years, that there were directions that Margaret Carthy wanted to take with the College that would be resisted. I didn’t know who was resisting them. … There was never anything between us, between me and Margaret, on any issue that I can remember coming up that was at all difficult for me to say okay.

Again, my recollection is these were the days when, prior to say 1962 or 1963, we were still saying students must wear stockings to class; you had to wear gloves and hat into town. We had a dress code; you dressed for dinner. The students were beginning to say this is archaic; this is like a convent; and those of us living with them were hearing them say this and hearing them describe things at home, which were changing. Going back into the late 1940s and 1950s, most of us experienced this at home, the same kind of regulations, hours about coming in, when you went out, telling your parents where you were going. Those were all things that we had to do at home. Beginning with the late 1950s and early 1960s, the students were beginning to talk differently, experience different things at home, not yet in high schools. They were now rebelling; they got out of high school and said, we do not have to do that, it is “high schoolish.”

I do think Margaret was much more inclined to move on those things. … I would say, yes, that I am sure about Margaret’s willingness to listen to some of us; and that was, I think, the whole point of bringing such an influx of younger people into the College and, for that matter, making Margaret president. … Margaret was always looking to the younger ones of us for input. I think that relationship encouraged her manner of dealing with us, because … I didn’t feel that I had any information or experience to counter anything she wanted to do. She listened to me when I would say it’s really hard to get the students to do this or do that, because they are not experiencing that any more; they are talking about this with other students in residential situations, and they claim obviously things are moving and changing. …

[Those Ursulines] who were supportive of the direction Margaret was moving in wanted the College to move in a more contemporary direction and offer some leadership to the [other] Catholic women’s colleges in doing this. That was the spirit in which the younger Ursulines were brought in, the spirit in which Margaret was made President. Clearly it was for her, I think, the agenda that she wanted to advance.

**Toward a Ph.D.** Sr. Margaret Carthy stepped down as President in 1961. Sr. Dorothy Ann continued to teach in the History Department until 1963, when she left the College to pursue doctoral work. For two years, she studied at the University of Notre Dame, eventually receiving her Ph.D. in American Intellectual History in 1970. After returning to CNR in 1965, she worked on her dissertation (on Walter Lippmann) and taught part-time.

**As Dean.** In 1967 Sr. Dorothy Ann became Academic Dean. [The author of this article, whose doctoral field was American intellectual history, was hired to replace her in the History Department in 1969.] The themes of her leadership as Dean emerge clearly from her answers to my questions. She soon recognized the twin problems for the College (at that time simply the School of Arts and Sciences) of declining enrollment and weak finances. And she moved quickly to meet those challenges, with pragmatic measures, in matters both big and small. She was not afraid to exercise leadership. She also sought ways to adapt the essential mission of the College—greater educational access to those underserved, especially young women—to new times. She was already deeply committed both to women’s education and to racial and economic justice. And to accomplish what needed to be done, she was willing “to step out of the usual pattern.” Among the results notably were the establishment in 1968 of the Graduate Program...
JS: Do you think that the slowness of adapting to changes in student attitude, student lifestyle, is one of the reasons, perhaps a major reason, for what occurred by the mid-1960s, which is a downturn in applications and admissions? Do you think the College was lagging behind what the students wanted, even Catholic women who would be coming to the College?

DAK: I think it had to be a factor. How big a factor I don’t know. I was there by that time. I was very much in the forefront of what was going on by 1967, when I became Dean. I think the enrollment picture or the application pool picture is so much more complicated than that. If we had been on the cutting edge of making these changes, I think we would have lost many students, at least from the parental point of view. …

[Students also] wanted more freedom in the curriculum. We made a series of changes, as you know, in the late 1960s and through the 1970s. Many of those were dictated by what we understood students were looking for by way of choices, by way of freedom. I can remember, somewhere in that early part of my tenure as Dean, actually putting faculty names next to courses on the schedule when it would come out in the spring. Now, that was a “no, no.” Well, it started to sound like something you had a right to know. You did not want professor so and so, and you were willing to take that course at 5 instead of 3. Today that sounds like a minor civil right, to know what professors you are going to have. But it was things of that sort, where, if it was easy enough to do, and if I could do it as Dean, without consulting the curriculum committee and so on, I just did it.

When, as Dean, I said the students could wear pants to class, I had a visit from the faculty women right after that saying: well, does that mean we can too? I hadn’t even thought about it. I said that there was no reason why you can’t either, and I would hope that it would not be jeans, and I remember saying pantsuits.

When, as Dean, I said the students could wear pants to class, I had a visit from the faculty women right after that saying: well, does that mean we can too? I hadn’t even thought about it. I said that there was no reason why you can’t either, and I would hope that it would not be jeans, and I remember saying pantsuits. [Readers will remember that, especially after Sr. Dorothy Ann stepped down as Chancellor, she almost invariably wore pantsuits herself.]

But those were both the most serious and most inconsequential things that students were looking for; and as a matter of fact, the world was moving very rapidly in that direction. Back to your question, did it influence the downturn in enrollment in the 1960s? I think the whole image and the reality of what it meant to go to a Catholic, women’s college in the mid-1960s and moving to the late 1960s did militate against us, once you had the admissibility of these very same young women into co-ed, Catholic institutions.

I became Dean without having understood, or faced, or believed the information coming out of Albany in 1967, that the enrollment crunch was real. This was amazing to me; this is how little as a faculty member I knew. From the standpoint of Albany, … we were all headed for trouble in terms of undergraduate enrollment. Maybe because it was all so new; and I am inclined to believe numbers coming with some authority behind them; and I could see what we were experiencing. So now I believed it wasn’t just us, although being all women and Catholic and small and poor, in terms of scholarships for students, all of that was a factor in it. It seemed to me that, if we were going to meet the enrollment challenge (without meeting it we were not going to survive, because there was no endowment and there was no way to make it up any other way), then we were going to have to figure out some way to attract more students. The first objective would be [to have] more of our usual Arts and Sciences young women. That seemed like a no-win. And Albany was telling us that the population was shrinking. The men’s colleges in the area were going co-ed. … So one of the obvious solutions would be a gender change and go co-ed. We did not want to do that. We had a faculty committee; they did not want to do it, and I did not want to do it. I figured there has got to be another way to do this, because it seemed to be that that would be too high a price to pay.

(continued on page 10)
**JS:** Is this related to the Ursuline idea of educating women?  
**DAK:** Yes, and the more I began to philosophize about that, the more I came to agree with the idea that women were short-changed in the co-ed situation, more so in some situations than in others, and certain types of women more so than others. While it was possible to preserve places where women could choose to go, and we could really, genuinely deliver women-oriented education, we should try to do that. And since that’s what we [the Ursulines] were good at for 400 years, and that’s what we were known for doing, it seemed to me that we were not going to have a great advantage going out into that competitive world as another co-ed school/small co-ed college. … None of that seemed attractive to me, some of it for practical reasons, and some of it for philosophy of education.

But the clear picture was that we were not going to survive. I did all sorts of little figures for myself, figuring out how long it was going to take for us to go by the wayside. I concentrated on student body; and one of the things that seemed evident to me that first summer that I went in [as Dean], in 1967, was that we could have a summer program, if we were doing graduate courses. Mother Justin McKiernan, Chair of the Art Department, … came to me, wanting to do a master’s in art education. … It seemed to me like an excellent idea, particularly since she had lists of people who wanted to come. So graduate education, partly because [an official in the State Education Department] from Albany convinced me that we had the faculty, and we had the reputation in the area for training art teachers. Almost [all the art teachers] in the public school system were our undergraduates at that point. He persuaded me; we were doing him a favor, and we were doing ourselves a favor.

The graduate program was partly something I got convinced of, because one of our faculty members was convinced it was worthwhile and necessary, and a real contribution to the local educational community. It was also a practical step; it cost us just about nothing to do those first few courses in [what became] the Graduate School. And we learned as we moved along. The additional input, of course, was the education students, because Catherine Haage [head of the Education Program] was fast on Sr. Justin’s trail, saying to me: there’s no reason in the world why we can’t do a master’s in education.

So there was a response from a philosophical point of view at the graduate level, but it also saved us in the late 1960s; it absolutely did. Then … a belief that we, the College, should be educating young women of color, and we weren’t going to do it if we just sat around waiting for them to come. The Kerner Report [Report of the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders, by the Kerner Commission, 1968] convinced me that … people had to step out of the usual pattern if we were going to make a difference. So that all began to move along a certain pattern, in partial answer to the enrollment question and in partial answer to an educational mission that I really felt strongly that the College had in this area.

**JS:** When I first spoke with you, setting up the first interview, you also mentioned that at that point in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Kerner Report was almost as important to you as the Bible in terms of inspiration. I would like to have you say a bit more about the arrival in 1968 of the first group of African-American students at the School of Arts & Sciences. [The College] obviously had African-American students, women of color, before that, but not many, one or two, and most of them were resident students.

**DAK:** There was a resident student in my class, so you are talking about 1951. … It really was a great change in the appearance of the campus when the six young women came from New Rochelle High School. They came as freshmen in 1968, and five of the six graduated on time in 1972; the other one graduated in 1973. That wasn’t easy on them or us, but we managed it. As will often happen, the numbers were easier to get the second and third year. We doubled it the second year, and by the third year it almost took care of itself. By the third year, I was able to put it into the Admissions Office.

**JS:** Was it originally the Community Leadership Program?  
**DAK:** That’s what we called it.
J S: It was set up by the College; it was not State.

DAK: No. What happened … was that we were negotiating with the State at the time. … The State of New York was trying to encourage minority students to come into [SUNY and] CUNY from the high schools. … The private sector was agitating to get some funding behind our efforts with minority students. That became known as the Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP); and we merged the two. In other words, for what we called the Community Leadership Program then, the funding, for most, if not all of those students, came through HEOP.

J S: CLP as an initiative predated the State program. You implied in our first interview that it was very difficult going; why so? What was difficult, the reception the students got, or the difference in community culture? What was the problem?

DAK: …Yes, it certainly was a culture problem. What it was not from the beginning was a problem of [the students’] ambition and their family’s willingness to sacrifice their earnings. … I remember a mother coming to me and saying: “Susie Q” is pregnant; and then saying: can she stay in school? I said she can, as long as her health is not in jeopardy. The mother said: I will take care of the child; I want her to stay in school; can she stay in school? There is no reason why she can’t. That was part of the culture. Not that you shouldn’t get pregnant, not that we should abort the child; never any question of that. We will take care of it, and she will get her education, and we will break this cycle.

J S: In the early years there was a strong family commitment to the idea.

DAK: Absolutely.

J S: How did this prepare the way for New Resources? Simply that it was the same mission: to get women of color at the College?

DAK: Probably it was seeing the mission of The College of New Rochelle as offering educational opportunity to those

*The above timeline reflects just a small number of the many honors bestowed on Sr. Dorothy Ann and the numerous boards and committees she served during her lifetime.
who weren’t being well served. I thought of myself as a student here, as someone who could not have gone to college, if I hadn’t had a scholarship. … My sense of what The College of New Rochelle did for me was to give me the opportunity that I never otherwise would have had with this kind of education. I thought we should continue to do that. And when I looked around for the first generation of immigrants, they weren’t Irish and Italian any more; they were, from everything I could see and certainly from the Kerner Report, the young minority women. It seemed to me that we needed to reach out to them.

My sense of what The College of New Rochelle did for me was to give me the opportunity that I never otherwise would have had with this kind of education. I thought we should continue to do that. And when I looked around for the first generation of immigrants, they weren’t Irish and Italian any more; they were, from everything I could see and certainly from the Kerner Report, the young minority women.

As President. Here perhaps we find the core of Sr. Dorothy Ann’s legacy. She became President of The College of New Rochelle in 1972, after serving briefly as Acting President. As President, she led the transformation of the College from one School to four and from one campus to seven. This in turn meant the restructuring of the entire administration of the College. Yet the radical change of developing a Graduate School, a School of New Resources, and a School of Nursing to join the original School of Arts & Sciences, and of spreading out from a single campus in New Rochelle to several campuses in communities throughout the New York metropolitan area, was done with the mission of the College firmly in view. Committed as she was to the survival of the institution, because it still had important work to do among women, minorities, and the underserved, Sr. Dorothy Ann looked for creative and innovative ways to adapt the College to a new era. She remained open to change, a hallmark of her broader contribution over the years, as young Ursuline, Dean, and President.

For 25 years as President, she provided the essential leadership and energy for the difficult task of re-creating The College of New Rochelle. Sr. Dorothy Ann’s replies as she was interviewed make it clear that she grasped the enormity of the challenges she, personally, and the College were facing. But as President, she was willing to make the hard decisions and remained undaunted, always ready to do what was necessary and to try something different. In the end she moved herself and the College ahead in new and unanticipated directions. She found ways as an Ursuline leader to “enhance the mission, move it along, not do it exactly the same way, but move it along.”

As President, Sr. Dorothy Ann led numerous commencement ceremonies; above she congratulates the graduating class in 1976; poses with honorees (from left) New York Governor Malcolm Wilson, Dr. Frances P. Connor, and Judge John Sirica, and Chair of the CNR Board Sidney Mudd in 1974; and welcomes Commencement speaker and honorary degree recipient Elie Weisel to the Castle in 1986.

JS: How would you define your own leadership and influence as President? In a sense, talk about your own perceptions of your legacy.
DAK: Legacy is a strong word. I think whatever I would think, or anyone else would think in that matter, is the legacy of the years from 1972 to 1997. Part of my achievement in the first year was just surviving personally; the institution too for that matter. Within those first two or three years, I was getting some sense of what the possibilities were for us as an institution and for me as a person.

I came into the presidency in June of 1972 [after serving as Acting President in 1970-1971]. When Dr. Joseph McMurray left, the Trustees turned to me. I had been Dean before he came in [as President] and for his first two years in office. And they asked me if I would become President. I was reluctant in some ways; on the other hand, I also saw that we could not, as an institution, have another presidential search. We had had our very first presidential search in 1969-1970, and it had been a very difficult search. The thought of sending everybody back into another search did not appeal to me. From my years as Dean, … I had a good sense of what needed to be done. So I said to Sid Mudd [Sidney Mudd, Chair of the Board of Trustees] that, if he could get the Council of the Faculty to agree, then I would take a two-year contract and finish out Dr. McMurray’s four years. In addition, I would not be a candidate for the job, but a search committee would be developed toward (continued on page 14)
In Her Own Words
(continued from page 13)

the end of those two years. In the meantime, I would have a free hand to do what needed to be done. Sid agreed, and the faculty agreed. We had an inauguration in October. Sid insisted that we make it a rather formal two years.

Those were the circumstances under which I came in. We were showing deficits; we did not have enough endowment to cover the deficit; and we were having a hard time on enrollment, partially because of the number of schools around going co-ed. Also, it was a difficult period to recruit for Catholic, single-sex schools. … Survival for the first year or so was getting some sense of whether or not I could engineer the changes – the economies, in particular – that needed to be done without a revolt on my hands. …

Various things … were getting done that first year. By the end of the first year, I reminded Sid that he was supposed to set up a search committee. Very early in fall 1973, he came to me and said that there was a search committee. … Shortly, the search committee decided that they would ask me, in spite of the understanding in the beginning that I was not going to be a candidate. That was probably the bigger moment of truth. I had done it for two years, and I had some sense of what else needed to be done. This was also now going to be taking [the task] on, in full knowledge of what was involved; whereas, the other had been a stopgap. I thought long and hard and decided that it was probably the right thing to do. The faculty, I felt, understood the devil they knew was better than the devil they didn't know; and there were still hard decisions ahead. I could probably do more to move us along, since I could figure out what to do better than somebody new from the outside, coming in and having that learning period.

Already on the agenda [was] a program for adult women. Tom Taaffe, Jim Middleton [Thomas Taaffe and Dr. James Middleton, members of the faculty], and I started to put our heads together and try to figure out a way to do a program to reach a new market, although I don't think we used that word at the time. One of the things I felt we needed to push was this new market as far as we could. So we came to a conclusion about a program for adult women, separate from the regular Arts and Sciences. The traditional Arts and Sciences student was not happy when I brought the older women into the classroom. In the two years we were doing that program, we had about 125 women. Then New Resources came along, and many of those women, not all of them, transferred into New Resources, very much encouraged by me to do so. … Anybody who came to us, any adult women, who came after the fall of 1972 or spring of 1973 were really counseled into New Resources, because I did not want to continue the practice of putting them into the Arts and Sciences classes, unless they wanted to do it. …

You talk about legacy, when I say survival. One of the things we did was to make [budget] cuts; the other thing was to introduce a whole new program. … When Tom Taaffe, Jim Middleton, and I began talking, [I felt] that we were not going to succeed unless we did something different and that we had to have something to offer that was going to sound a little bit non-traditional. We began to talk, and the more we talked, the more Tom came up with these ideas about students as partners in the program, the whole Montessori philosophy, but with adult language. … Tom Taaffe brought experiential learning and all of that language into our little circle. [And] we were able to fashion it into an experimental program for the adult learner. Come back to college; you are ready to come back;
don't be afraid about coming back, because you have all of these gifts and talents, even if you never went to college; discover yourself. That's what made the difference. First of all, it gave me confidence that we were doing something different and educationally sound. …

What started out as financial exigency, and I would be the first one to admit it was, [meant] we needed to do something; we needed to find another market, New Resources as it evolved. … We really wanted, and I had a strong sense, and [Tom and Jim] did too, of not selling out the legacy of 50 years of our reputation. It had to have an educational relevance for us, part of the mission; there had to be some sense of respectability and academic credibility to this. The fact that the concentration was going to be on women was also very congenial; and the thought we would be able to help minority women or poor women was a big factor for me. What started out basically as a need to get a new market was always part of an effort on my part to keep us true to an educational reputation and an educational future.

New Resources succeeded beyond any expectation. The original thought was that it would be women, but we would not make that a strict rule, and we would not exclude men. … We did not make a great fuss about it being only women, although our expectation was that only women would come, partly because of our reputation as a women's college. We began [New Resources] as all women in reality. When we did the advertising, we just said adults coming back to school. The other stipulation that had great impact eventually was that, from the start, I thought we ought to have some scholarship money available. Therefore, the only people coming into the program would not be the Westchester housewife who could afford to come to college and who hadn't gone at the normal, regular time. While we were aiming principally for that market, I did think it was important that we would be able to have a more diverse population.

Then the Union, District Council 37, contacted us in the summer of 1972, and that started us in a whole direction that I had certainly not anticipated, mainly off campus, because one of the things Victor Gotbaum [head of the Union] wanted was (continued on page 16)
that we do the program in New York City at Union headquarters. Some of this was a willingness to say, all right, we can try that. Maybe the fact that I was familiar enough with the City and the Union and a name like Victor Gotbaum, that probably made it easier. … There were so many [union members] who wanted to come to college and were qualified from the Union point of view. … Some of their members had tried going to City University, right across the park from them, [but] because they were not treated as important people and weren’t given any kind of consideration, they really had not gone in any great numbers, nor had they stayed very long. … We signed a three-year contract [with the Union], and we have renewed that contract every three years since 1972.

Qualms came later when I thought more about what we had started and what the logic was of doing a program down at Union headquarters, which at that point was on Broadway. Some of the Union members lived in Co-op City, so they began agitating about why can't we do the program in Co-op City. … We opened in Co-op City in 1973, the next fall.

My big qualm about trying to set up this adult program [New Resources] was that we had very little room for mistake. If we put $15,000 into it, which is what the Trustees said I could spend that spring, and did not get any return, we were going to be in worse trouble that we were already in. I did not want to see it fail. …

It was never risky once we went public with it. We never had enough people on the phone to keep up with the people who called to find out about the program. I kept adding people to the phone bank to answer the phones; it was more than we could handle. Then hiring faculty; and then the Union came along; getting a director for this campus and the director for the Union campus were problems; and the problems were legion when it came time to fit the expectations of the programs, from an administrative point of view, into the regular routine. But success was on our doorstep right from the beginning, if you count that in terms of numbers.

JS: The other question about New Resources and its beginning, and what it has become, is the issue of minority enrollment. It may very well have started out with the idea of adults, of people who didn’t complete a degree or who never started a degree; that is certainly a very traditional role for women’s colleges. … But the other obviously increasingly important part of New Resources is minority enrollment and reaching out to minority communities in the City. One of my questions about that is whether you, as President, you, as religious, had a specific commitment at some point. Was there a conscious and specific commitment on your part?

DAK: Yes, that was [what I meant when] I insisted that we have some financial aid so that we could get the … Black woman from Yonkers, and Yonkers would have been the symbol of that, of those who would not even have thought about coming unless there was some financial help. Right from the beginning, I was very conscious of [making] the program appeal to, or at least open to the possibility for the minority woman. That was a very conscious effort. … [After opening in Co-op City] we followed the
My big qualm about trying to set up this adult program [New Resources] was that we had very little room for mistake. If we put $15,000 into it, which is what the Trustees said I could spend that spring, and did not get any return, we were going to be in worse trouble that we were already in. I did not want to see it fail.

same kind of call into the South Bronx, near Lincoln Hospital. … Once we went into the South Bronx, the minority population began to outnumber any other group. The South Bronx and probably Brooklyn … pushed in the same direction of minorities. That set the profile of New Resources. …

JS: When did it become known as the School of New Resources?

DAK: We called it the Experimental College for six or eight months. Tom Taaffe and I were sitting next to each other one day at a meeting, and I had said to him that we have to find something else to call this Experimental College. Now that I have to go to Albany [to discuss the new program], I really need a name for this. I had CNR on my notebook, and Tom said: what about the College of New Resources? That wasn’t bad. Subsequently, a week or two later, I said I think we should not say College; it might get us in trouble, because we are not forming a rival college to The College of New Rochelle. So, School. It started out as a play on CNR. New Resources. That sounded to me like an inspiration, and I thought it was terrific. Students were a new resource to us, and we were a new resource in their life. That part just jelled right away. I went to Albany with it as School of New Resources.

JS: At that time was the Graduate School officially the Graduate School?

DAK: No, it was a graduate program. [What would become the Graduate School] was already beginning to take hold, but in any case, we took our first nine graduate students in the summer of 1968. … The graduate program grew slowly, much more slowly than New Resources did. … What was becoming apparent, once it was clear that New Resources was going to take off, was that it wasn’t going to be possible for me to be like the Dean for it, with two directors. The numbers and requirements were getting too big. It seemed to me what we needed
to do was to give the two new programs, Graduate Program and New Resources, a par with Arts and Sciences ... from a standpoint of running the programs. ... We went from Graduate Program to Graduate School, School of Arts and Sciences, and School of New Resources. Then the next hurdle. I got the help of three Deans; Nursing was a little bit later. I called them Deans from the start. ... Vice Presidents came in the late 1970s.

Those were very difficult times for faculty and for anybody. Because every time you turned around something else radical was changing; and for some of those changes, all I could say was that we needed to do it.

**JS:** How was the decision made to move toward a School of Nursing? Was it financial? Was it mission-related? Was it a request from local hospitals?

**DAK:** A little of each. I was on the diploma school board over at what is now Sound Shore Hospital Medical Center in New Rochelle, and I was on the committee ... when all of the discussion was to do away with the diploma schools, those two-year associate degrees, or no degree, just the diploma. You took the nursing exam then, which you still do, and that's the only thing that makes you a nurse. ... Many of the women were getting the license with the diploma school education. The pressure from the nursing associations was to do away with those, so the hospital was "iffy" about whether it should continue to run the program. ... I thought that we were talking about how we would phase out the diploma school, and I picked up the paper one morning, and it was gone. The Board of Directors decided that it was losing too much money; it wasn't the future of nursing; so out it went.

I had been having a conversation for about six or seven months with people at the hospital about, when you are ready to phase out the diploma school, we will think about a program in nursing. ... We had never considered ourselves in any way called to do nursing; however, there it was popping up all the time. And we needed to shore up the enrollment in Arts and Sciences by introducing some new fields. ... For those reasons, we sat down and talked seriously about it. And the more I came to understand the liberal arts direction that the teachers of nursing were going in, the kind of education they wanted for the nurses for the baccalaureate degree, the more compatible all of that seemed. It was nursing that we decided to pursue, ... and their first, if not their first two years, they would take liberal arts courses integrated into Arts and Sciences.

**JS:** Several times in our discussion of your role at the College, you have made a distinction between issues of race ... and issues that really are financial. You said that it is better to talk about the things the College has done in terms of providing opportunities for those who are "financially strapped," the term you used, rather than talking about it in terms of minority or ethnicity. Do they go
together? Or do you really feel that the economic issue is in a way just as important, or maybe more important, than the minority issue?

DAK: Well, I certainly wouldn’t say it was more important. … I felt we had a mission, as The College of New Rochelle, as an Ursuline college; and it was worth surviving only if you could enhance that mission, move it along, not do it exactly the same way, but move it along. If you could do that, and do it in a way that was educationally holistic, then you should do it; and you couldn’t continue unless you could make it work economically.

Concluding Remarks. After leaving the Presidency in 1997, Sr. Dorothy Ann held the office of Chancellor of The College of New Rochelle until 2001. She then turned her leadership talents to working directly with her sister Ursulines, serving as Superior of the Ursuline Community of St. Teresa and then as Provincial Superior of the entire Eastern Province.
Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly assumed numerous roles during her lifetime from Ursuline and teacher to administrator and peacemaker and so many in between. On the following pages, just a scant few whose lives were touched by Sr. Dorothy Ann reflect on the extraordinary woman as they knew her.

Reflections on
Professed as an Ursuline more than 50 years ago, Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly lived her vocation with grace-filled fidelity and stalwart singleness of purpose. The encompassing umbrella over her life was fortified by her union with the “Lord of her life.” Strengthened by grace, her heart included her family, her Ursuline Sisters, my family, her many friends and colleagues, and multiple commitments. My friendship with Dorothy, or DA as she was frequently called, came about and grew in the last 15 years.

She had a personal way with people. Knowing names, remembering anniversaries, contacting friends by phone, all were part of her daily regimen. With a memory which defied a match, she did her best to convey that each person was remembered, mattered, and was important.

There were many aspects to her roles in life, but what was constant was that she always desired to bring out the best in people. She looked for the good and found it in others. She worked successfully in so many areas. I think immediately of her vision for a better world. She worked with various peace movements, here in New Rochelle as well as in Northern Ireland. What she always sought was to foster understanding among people.

Dorothy Ann Kelly as …

Her days as President of the College, religious superior, and during the last six years as Provincial were filled with personal relationships, countless meetings, and difficult decisions. To list her involvements becomes overwhelming. The world of education, on all levels, the causes of peace and racial justice, the roles of women and of the laity in the Church, and the importance of ecumenism are but a few. She had indomitable energy and an executive style which often was envied. She went through the process of respectful listening, earnest collaboration, then moved to often difficult decision making.

Appointed the Superior of the Ursuline community on Willow Lane in 2001, Sr. Dorothy Ann responded to a varied style of leadership. Concern for individual Sisters walked hand in hand with the administrative tasks before her. Within two years, her ministry expanded to the Ursuline Sisters of the Eastern Province.

With clarity, gentleness, and openness to suggestions, Sr. Dorothy Ann grasped the role of governance on varying levels. She saw radical changes within religious life; she did not know what shape was evolving in this 21st century for religious life and for the Catholic Church in the US. However, she was convinced that we all must strive for the common good – seeking dignity, unity, and equality for all people. The call to be dauntless seemed to be ever before her. Perhaps her courage was strengthened by the legacy left to the Ursulines by Sr. Angela Merici, the Foundress. “If according to times and circumstances the need arises to make new rules and do some things differently, do it prudently and with good advice.”

What was most impressive to me was that while she was committed to the Ursulines and the religious life, she had great faith in the laity. At CNR she continued to bring the laity to the campus as faculty and administration. She sought to have the laity take a larger role in the workings of the Catholic Church. She saw the future of the Church in the expanding role of the laity in Church matters. With gratitude for her own Baptism, she believed in the call to holiness for all Christians.

Responding to alumnae seeking an opportunity to share their concerns and hear guest speakers, she facilitated a group known as the Upper Room. Over 150 Catholics gathered from time to time, always grateful for Sr. Dorothy Ann’s grace-filled directions. These earnest women and men desired to be knowledgeable about matters which concern the good of the Church in the midst of adversity, uncertainty, and confusion. They listened, learned, and supported each other along life’s journey. Today the Upper Room remains as part of Sr. Dorothy Ann’s legacy.

With an aspect of the enigmatic, she didn’t push herself forward but she could, as they say, work the room. She was small in stature, gentle in manner, and did not command attention, nevertheless others gravitated to her. She was a woman who was always accessible to close friends as well as strangers. She was greatly respected during her tenure as president of CNR and as Ursuline Provincial. And the reason was that she was, to use a colloquial expression, a straight shooter. Everyone knew what she thought — at least they thought they knew. Governor Hugh Carey once said that if she hadn’t been a nun, she would have made a great mayor of New York City.

As I socialized with her and met her countless friends, I was often reminded of the ancient call to deal with the one and the many with wisdom and gentleness. There is no doubt in the way she governed that her convictions were strong and often came across as fearless.

Since her death, the Ursulines have been touched by the messages of love and admiration. Her engaging presence, first and foremost as a devoted Ursuline, warmed the hearts of so many. One friend wrote, “The Lord knew what He was doing when He put her on this earth.” Another wrote that it was her ability “to see through the clouds that gave her the gift to make progress.” The messages came from all over the world. That I was influenced in my Ursuline life by our shared friendship will always remain among my treasured possessions.

Yes, we miss her, but in her wonderful way, she left a legacy of good deeds and achievements behind her that we have every day to remind us of who she was and what she accomplished, and how fortunate it was for all of us to have her with us.

On the morning of her death, she prayed the Divine Office and then copied the following prayer in her address book. In few but powerful words, it reveals the spirituality she expressed in her life.

Gracious God, help us to work with you to make this world alive with your Spirit, And to build on earth a city of justice, love, and peace.
By Patricia McGuire  
President, Trinity Washington University

She could not boast about the exploits of her football team, but she knew all the moves in New York politics. She had no massive research laboratories, but she could navigate Capitol Hill with ease. She had no use for the collegiate edifice competition, but she created campus environments of elegance and style. In an age of lavish presidential houses and executive perks, she lived simply, according to her vows.

She was one of the most influential presidents of her generation.

Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly led the revolution for Catholic women’s colleges in the late 20th century. Capacious of mind and compassionate of heart, she was a visionary advocate for students who once were excluded from educational opportunity – older students, part-time learners, those from many different racial and cultural backgrounds. She established the model for transformative mission that endures to this day.

I had my first encounter with Sr. Dorothy Ann in 1987 when I was a young alumna trustee on the board at Trinity, before I became president. Like so many Catholic women’s colleges that once were the pride of Catholic enclaves in cities around the country, Trinity was suffering through an era of declining enrollments and financial hardship in the late 1980s. New Rochelle, Trinity, and the others made it possible for the daughters of Catholic families to receive an outstanding college education. These colleges were so successful in proving women’s academic prowess that the men’s schools finally relented and opened their doors to women in the late 1960s, much to the ultimate distress of the women’s institutions.

While the coeducation movement devastated our enrollments, the Catholic women’s colleges suffered even more serious economic losses as the “free” labor of religious women disappeared in the wake of Vatican II. With shrinking student bodies and increasing numbers of lay historians

By Dr. Philip Gleason  
Professor Emeritus of History,  
University of Notre Dame

My contact with Sr. Dorothy Ann goes back to her days as a graduate student in history at Notre Dame. Two recollections in particular stand out. In the first, she is one among a handful of graduate students who arranged a picnic beside one of the lakes on the campus. It was a lovely day, probably in late spring. As a faculty member, I was an outsider to the culture of the graduate students, but I had the distinct impression that Mother Dorothy Ann (as she was known in those days) was a quiet leader among her fellow Ph.D. aspirants, indeed a tower of strength, who exerted a steadying influence in the midst of their travails. At the picnic, however, she proved herself equally adept in keeping little children entertained and out of trouble – for which my wife and I were grateful, since our four youngsters were among those scampering about.

The other recollection is more properly academic. Sr. Dorothy Ann’s dissertation was one of the first I directed. From that experience, I learned that the work of supervising the writing of a doctoral dissertation is inversely proportional to the ability of the dissertation-writer. More simply put, good students write their own dissertations and all the director has to do is say “Keep up the good work!” By contrast, weak students need lots of help, especially in organizing their findings and presenting them in readable prose. Sr. Dorothy Ann definitely belonged to the former group – she made dissertation-directing a breeze. Her thesis dealt with Walter Lippmann as a commentator on American life and culture in the 1920s. Besides the obvious sources – that is, Lippmann’s books and magazine articles – she worked her way painstakingly through reams of unsigned signatures.
faculty who expected competitive wages, many Catholic women’s colleges closed or merged with their local male counterparts. From the high of nearly 190 in 1960, just 16 such institutions remain today.

Under Dorothy Ann’s leadership, The College of New Rochelle was one of the first among this genre to realize that a paradigm shift was essential. In the early 1970s, Sr. Dorothy Ann founded the School of New Resources to educate adult students on campuses throughout the New York region. This model became the inspiration for Trinity’s Weekend College in 1985 (now the School of Professional Studies at Trinity) and similar programs at other women’s colleges.

Change proved difficult for Trinity, and the creation of our Weekend College was controversial as more part-time adult students, women with children, and women of color came to call Trinity’s campus their own. Several Trinity presidents came and went in the 1980s as the institution struggled with profound questions about mission and market and the shape of the college’s future.

Enter Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly. Chairing a special Middle States accreditation team to Trinity during those difficult days in 1987, she exerted her customary clear vision, passion for women’s education, and hard-nosed business judgment in calling upon Trinity’s board to exert stronger leadership for institutional change. I sat in awe of her extraordinary presence.

Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly galvanized Trinity’s board to think about the future in ways we had not previously imagined. Her call to action was a turning point in Trinity’s history. We left that meeting convinced that we could achieve the same kind of paradigm shift at Trinity that she had achieved at New Rochelle.

Later on, when I became Trinity’s president, Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly extended her considerable wisdom and sound practical advice to me on numerous occasions. I had the great privilege of watching her in action on many fronts — lobbying Congress for federal student aid, taking the lead in working with bishops on *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, and championing the cause of women’s colleges.

I will long remember Sr. Dorothy Ann’s great wisdom and grace, wonderful presence, strength of will, and kind humor. Even as I write these words, I can see her, dazzling blue eyes flashing, voice filled with conviction, calling us to fidelity to our mission. Her enduring spirit remains as a luminous inspiration on even my most challenging days.

While I admired them at a distance, I cannot but regret that her devotion to the responsibilities of administration kept her from being able to do more in her first love, history — especially by researching and writing it. Had she been able to do that, she would certainly have made notable contributions to scholarship. Her providential task was not, however, to write history, but to shape it. Future historians will, I am confident, honor her for the courage and intelligence with which she took up that task, and for the brilliant successes she achieved.

Her providential task was not, however, to write history, but to shape it. Future historians will, I am confident, honor her for the courage and intelligence with which she took up that task, and for the brilliant successes she achieved.
Since my graduation in 1964, I’ve watched with pride and admiration as CNR moved beyond its beautiful suburban campus to embrace and inspire people of all backgrounds and experiences. Its vision has kept it alive and thriving. And at every step, Sr. Dorothy Ann provided not only the inspiration, but the hard work and dedication that made it possible for CNR to welcome anyone willing to share her joy in learning. She was the ultimate leader for her time: a strong, kind, visionary woman. Her work has blessed us all.

But when I met her close to 50 years ago, nobody would have anticipated her great accomplishments or the way she would help CNR grow. I now realize that she was not all that much older than I. She was fun, and funny. I picture her laughing so hard that there were tears in her eyes. And she was compassionate, and encouraging, and loving.

Like all of our Ursuline teachers, she was Mother, not Sister, Dorothy Ann then. She and “Malice,” Mother Mary Alice Gallin, were my inspiration and what I learned from them will always be a deep and profound part of my life.

Sr. Dorothy Ann was smart and articulate, a wonderful teacher who taught us to think clearly and to be careful and precise in our work. We learned from her that history was not a list of facts, but the living story of real people that constantly changes, and that its study requires intelligence, attention, flexibility, and open-mindedness. And it was important to do it well: she held us to very high standards and showed us how exciting and satisfying it is to see in a new way those things we thought we already knew.

Those lessons have given me 45 years of satisfaction and pleasure. I have spent my career as a lawyer researching and writing, mentoring young people who are learning to do the same, and encouraging them to do it carefully with a passion for excellence. And I continue to read history constantly and to find excitement and joy in learning an old story from a new point of view.

Those are lasting gifts from my Ursuline “Mothers.” Whatever Sr. Dorothy Ann’s other accomplishments, it is her joy and love of learning that have touched my life the most. That’s how a good teacher lives on; and she was a good teacher, a very good teacher indeed!
Sr. Dorothy Ann and I traveled to different parts of the country to visit various alumnae during my stints as Chairman of the Development Committee and later as Chairman of the Board of Trustees. On one particular occasion, we went to Florida during Super Bowl weekend. We couldn’t find a quiet place in the hotel where we could meet and plan our strategy before our meeting with this very important alumn- na and her husband.

We wound up sitting in the rented car with the air conditioner going full blast. We met with the couple for lunch that afternoon and performed our tasks exactly as we had planned.

Well, we almost fell off our chairs when they agreed to contribute exactly what we had asked for. On the way back to the hotel I wondered aloud whether we should have asked for more. DA cautioned me against that kind of thinking, suggesting that we had done enough research in arriving at the requested amount, we got what we asked for, and we should be thankful. We then gave each other a high five and proceeded back to our hotel and had a glass of wine to celebrate our success. We made many calls during my stint on the Board. The positive responses were great but we had our share of being turned down. DA’s reaction to these rejections was often philosophical. Many times people would respond that they had commitments to other institutions or charities, and she would remark that at least some other needy cause was getting help. She did, however, coin the phrase “Equal time on the check book” for alumnae donors whose husbands were making contributions to their own alma maters. Camille never lets me forget that one!

While college advancement is an important activity, there are numerous other responsibilities which a college president has. She performed her job admirably, efficiently, and with dedication. She was kind and considerate to all, yet always firm in her commitment to her responsibilities. I look back on my work with her with a great deal of respect and love for a remarkable woman.

Sr. Dorothy Ann was more to me and my family than President of CNR and later Provincial of the Eastern Province of the Roman Union of Ursulines. DA was a close and beloved friend of our family. There were many times when one or another of our family would seek her counsel in personal or professional matters. Her kindness knew no bounds. She was an important presence at our family functions, baptisms, marriages, first communions, confirmations, and funerals. She shared our joy during good times and was the steadfast rock upon whom we leaned during the worst of times.

Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly was even more than this. Of course, she is remembered as a talented teacher, brilliant administrator, and loyal friend. I would do a disservice to her memory were I to neglect to mention that she stood as a stellar example of womanhood, no humanity, to us all. Sr. Dorothy Ann was a woman of extraordinary talent, grace, kindness, and beauty, but above all else, she was a woman of deep and abiding faith: faith in God, in God’s people on earth, and in the capacity of His children to do good. We are all blessed to have been touched by her extraordinary gifts — those who knew her personally are truly privileged.

Leader
By Mauro C. Romita
President, Castle Oil & Former Chair & Member, The College of New Rochelle
Board of Trustees

I first met Sr. Dorothy Ann at a Sunday Mass at the Holy Family Chapel at The College of New Rochelle sometime in 1977. I approached her because I wanted to let her know how impressed I was with the College and how thankful I was for the School of New Resources, which gave my wife, Camille, the opportunity to earn a college degree. At the time, I didn’t realize what I was getting myself into! Shortly thereafter I received a call from Sr. Dorothy Ann (DA) one evening asking me to become a member of the President’s Advisory Council. This group, created by her, met twice a year over dinner and was treated to a presentation by a member of the faculty or an administrator, the objective being to familiarize us with the College and its attributes — a great advancement tool. I was hooked!

At a dinner a year later, I was introduced to the College’s then Chairman of the Board of Trustees – Bob Keeshan (a/k/a Captain Kangaroo). It was a lovely dinner of the Trustees and other benefactors of the College. A couple of weeks later, on the first Saturday in May, Derby day, came a phone call from DA. She apologized for pulling me away from watching the fanfare preceding the Derby, but promised that she only needed a few minutes of my time. For her, I was willing but promised that she only needed a few minutes of my time. For her, I was willing to miss the Derby! Those few minutes became a more than 20-year love affair with the mission of The College of New Rochelle and that of the Ursulines. She invited me to become a member of the Board of Trustees. It took me a few seconds to decide. I was deeply honored to have been asked to join the Board.

Over the years, Camille and I developed a close friendship with DA. Under the leadership of Dorothy Ann Kelly, CNR became an icon of women’s higher education, community involvement, ecumenism, and women’s quest for equality in education, politics, business, and the Church. Someone mentioned to me at her funeral that she was almost unique. My reply was no, she was truly UNIQUE.
Advocate for Access to Education

BY DR. JOAN BAILEY
VICE PRESIDENT FOR MISSION & IDENTITY,
The College of New Rochelle

I came to The College of New Rochelle from a university that had been founded with a clear mission but over time had drifted from that mission in its practices. From the beginning at CNR as an adjunct instructor at the DC-37 Campus of the School of New Resources, I found the School grounded in the mission of The College of New Rochelle, and the College’s mission alive in the day-to-day life of the institution as only happens with the active support and direction of institutional leadership, in this case the leadership of Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly. In her actions and her words, she affirmed the importance of providing quality liberal arts education to adults, especially women, who were being served poorly, if at all, by existing higher education institutions.

St. Dorothy Ann Kelly brought to her Ursuline charism extraordinary gifts and talents. One of the many dimensions of the teaching of Saint Angela, the foundress of the Ursulines, and also the Gospel message of serving the marginalized members of society, was of special focus in Sr. Dorothy Ann’s educational ministry. She recognized the existing inequality of America’s educational system and used her personal talents for teaching, for leadership, and for persuasion to address this inequality.

In the late 1960s, as the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, Sr. Dorothy Ann recognized that the racism that was limiting access to CNR for young black women would need to be addressed head on if the young women in Arts and Sciences were ever to be fully educated to live in a multi-racial society and if a quality education were to be available equally to young women of color. Thus she negotiated with New Rochelle High School to bring a group of academically gifted young black women to The College of New Rochelle in the fall of 1969. In subsequent years, this initiative became the Community Leadership Program, dedicated to preparing young women who would indeed become leaders in their respective communities.

That first foray into educational opportunity became a model for which Sr. Dorothy Ann advocated as an outspoken leader of the New York State Commission of Independent Colleges and Universities. She is acknowledged to be one of the pioneering leaders of what has become the Higher Educational Opportunity Program (HEOP), having persuaded her independent college president colleagues of the justice of access.

Addressing educational marginalization of poverty, regardless of race, has been the object of the HEOP program for over 40 years. The successful graduates of these programs at New York’s independent colleges and universities are celebrated by their institutions today as leaders and valued members of our society. She supported educational initiatives designed to serve underserved and disadvantaged students in many venues, serving on the Board of St. Aloysius School in Harlem and urging other educators to undertake similar activities to address inequities in education.

Perhaps the most widely acclaimed educational access model that resulted from Sr. Dorothy Ann’s leadership is the School of New Resources at The College of New Rochelle. Three years after creating the Community Leadership Program for the School of Arts and Sciences, she led the College in creating a first in American higher education: an educational model designed to provide excellent liberal arts baccalaureate education centered on the learning needs of adult women and men. This model incorporated the great Catholic intellectual tradition of the liberal arts with the pedagogical influence of the great Catholic educator, Paolo Friere, whose educational foundation was respect and dignity of every student as equal partner with the teacher in the learning process of seeking the Truth.

Almost 40 years later, the School of New Resources has successfully graduated over 17,000 students who have become teachers, pastors, and community, labor, and business leaders, and who have demonstrated the added value to society created by providing access to quality education.

As a member of the Board of Trustees of The Catholic University of America, Sr. Dorothy Ann spread the message of the importance of access for working adult students that led that Board to create the University College, now called the Metropolitan School of Professional Studies, dedicated to serving adult students in pursuit of undergraduate and graduate degrees.

Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly’s legacy for American education is a message of mission for justice and equality that is not only morally correct, honoring the dignity of each person, but also beneficial to the common good and the well being of the society.
I had the great pleasure and privilege of getting to know and work with Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly during the 1970s when I worked at the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities (cIcu). As a product of Catholic education, in Queens, NY, and on Long Island, I had known sisters of religious orders only in the classroom setting, and all of them in those days wore the traditional “habits.”

So, Sr. Dorothy Ann was a new experience for me in many ways, and to this day I often reflect on her leadership style and the personal charisma that made her so extraordinarily effective in shaping public policy at both the federal and state levels. I learned a great deal from her and am so proud to have known her as a friend and mentor.

As chair of cIcu in the late 1970s, Sr. Dorothy Ann would often need to be a “calming influence” on the organization’s then president Hank Paley. Watching the two of them spar and debate over the best way to achieve cIcu’s goals for independent higher education was a learning experience in and of itself, but they were the best of friends and always, always first and foremost had the best interests of students at heart. As different as they were in some ways (Hank was a rough and tumble kind of guy, Jewish, and a labor organizer, while Sr. Dorothy Ann was Roman Catholic and the epitome of classic grace), they shared a mutual dedication and commitment to the needs of lower and middle class people and particularly to the importance of educational access and choice for all of New York’s citizens. Individually, they were each a force; together they were unstoppable.

A particularly memorable event was the day, I believe it was, The New York Times published an article about Sr. Dorothy Ann with a headline that went something like “The Nun is a Tiger.” It was a great tribute to her tenacity and her spirited advocacy, and the respect that she had engendered from people such as then New York Governor Hugh Carey. But Sr. Dorothy Ann was just mortified, not so much about the content of the article, but about the headline! As I recall, she was especially concerned about what her father would think (her earthly father, that is). Given what her advocacy efforts were aimed at, I would say in hindsight that both her earthly father and her other Father were likely both very proud!

I continued to have the opportunity to see Sr. Dorothy Ann in action after I left cIcu in 1979 and joined RIT, as she later also became chair of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU). Once again, she provided outstanding leadership during some turbulent times. She simply had a way about her that was authoritative yet respectful, confident yet humble, and decisive yet willing always to listen to all sides of an issue.

I would always look forward to seeing her each year at the NAICU annual meeting, along with her wonderful colleagues at The College of New Rochelle, including Steve Sweeny, who became her successor. Above all else, Sr. Dorothy Ann was a wonderful mentor not only to her colleagues at the College but for those of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with her over the years. I still keep the citation that I was given when I left cIcu in 1979, signed by Sr. Dorothy Ann, right above my desk as a constant reminder to me of all that she did for me and for independent higher education.

Sr. Dorothy Ann was a new experience for me in many ways, and to this day I often reflect on her leadership style and the personal charisma that made her so extraordinarily effective in shaping public policy at both the federal and state levels.
Mentor and Friend

By Joan Bristol
Vice President for Student Services,
The College of New Rochelle

It has been more than a month since I received the early morning call that Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly had died. I am still experiencing the magnitude of her loss not only for myself but for her family, for all the people she knew, for all the organizations she served. As I write this, I am still feeling the absence of her presence here on Earth, but I am blessed with many inspiring and happy memories.

She was a guardian angel to me and so many others. Her friendship was a source of great comfort. I always knew I could rely on her for a direct and honest opinion given with love and understanding. She did this for all her friends and family. She taught through example, showing others how to accept and value all people.

In May 1972, I interviewed for the position of Dean of Students at The College of New Rochelle, and it was Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly, then Dean of the College, who saw the potential in a young woman beginning a career in Student Affairs. Sr. Dorothy Ann had a real gift for recognizing potential, particularly in women. She was willing to nurture, affirm, and encourage them to achieve beyond their wildest expectations.

Professionally, she would push you and was intuitive in knowing what you needed to succeed. And when Sr. Dorothy Ann asked you to do something, you never said no! Early on in my career, she recommended me for a position on the board of the YMCA of New Rochelle, which, at the time, included just one other woman. By the end of my association with the board, I was vice president and there were five women members. She was also instrumental in my involvement with the Residence Park Association, for which I’ve served as President.

She was a guardian angel to me and so many others. Her friendship was a source of great comfort. I always knew I could rely on her for a direct and honest opinion given with love and understanding.

Her advice was not singularly focused on successful careers but on addressing complex issues of women and social injustices in today’s world. She believed that women have the right to live life as full participants in accordance with their beliefs and dreams. Sr. Dorothy Ann did not have a prescriptive message but one that convinced women their voices were important and needed to be expressed and heard at every level of life experiences. She understood the realities and humanity of life.

Above all else, Sr. Dorothy Ann wanted you to be happy with your life. She was the solid rock that supported so many of us – never intrusive but always supportive, compassionate and willing to listen. After talking with her, you somehow always knew things would be okay.

Sr. Dorothy Ann loved children. She understood them and always treated them with respect and a touch of humor. Parents might be mortified when children acted up in her presence, but she never blinked an eye. She understood the special nature and enthusiasm of children. I loved to listen to her stories about her own nieces and nephews and their children. I was lucky to personally witness her bond with children as she talked and played with my three daughters, always giving them her complete attention. She would look forward to the visits with the children and always had a treat or trinket for them. When I brought my third daughter, Margaret, home from the hospital, Sr. Dorothy Ann sent flowers to the house — not one bouquet, but three. One for me and one for each of Margaret’s big sisters, Kathleen and Elizabeth.

Through the years, in times of great joy and great sadness, she supported me in so many ways. After my divorce, Sr. Dorothy Ann saw a now single, working mother of three young girls who desperately needed some quiet time. So she asked if I would like to spend a week in the Hamptons with her. We spent our days shopping, reading, and visiting – Sr. Dorothy Ann knew everyone! She would flip through her ever-handly phone book, and we would be having dinner with friends that night. Our vacations became a 15-year tradition, the memories of which I will cherish forever.

For 37 years I had the privilege of having Sr. Dorothy Ann's mentorship and friendship in my life. But I am just one of countless women whose life stories include Sr. Dorothy Ann as the catalyst for their success, as the light in dark times, as the compassionate listener, the wise counselor, and the one who would always be there for them in good times or bad.

Sr. Dorothy Ann was an extraordinary woman of faith, and I always thought of her as a holy woman. So many have reflected that she was a modern Saint, sent here to touch the lives of ordinary people, and upon reflection of my memories with her, I know this is true.
I first met Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly shortly after I arrived in New Rochelle and became involved with the Inter-Religious Council. This new Council was formed to draw membership from the Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and Eastern Orthodox congregations.

The idea for this venture had begun in 1973 within the all-Christian body – the Council of Churches. By 1974, 13 of us religious leaders had met at the Zion Baptist Church to launch the idea, and in December of 1974 I sent a letter to all the religious bodies listing the sponsors for the new group, inviting them to attend the organizing meeting at Temple Israel in early 1975.

Sr. Dorothy Ann was one of those first sponsors, representing The College of New Rochelle. From the beginning, she was very active in our organization and opened up the College to many inter-religious activities. For example, in just our second year, Dorothy Ann sponsored a huge gathering at the College to promote the Irish Peace People, started by the Nobel Prize winners from Northern Ireland, who were guests of the College.

What struck me the most about Dorothy Ann was how readily she had accepted the tenets of the Second Vatican Council convened by Pope John XXIII. There were the obvious changes within the Ursuline Order, the new habit, no longer a semi-cloistered order, but what was impressive to me, someone of the Jewish faith, is how readily she reached out to engage me, and others, in a variety of good works for the New Rochelle community. She saw the opportunity and the potential for cooperation and services to all of New Rochelle; she promoted a coming and reasoning together, across religious, racial, ethnic, neighborhood, and class lines.

We began, for example, a joint Thanksgiving worship service that was hosted by The College of New Rochelle. I think she understood quite clearly that the Ursulines not only needed to modify their habits, but also seek new ways to fulfill their mission. Because of Dorothy Ann’s thinking, we have all been the beneficiaries.

The College of New Rochelle, because of Vatican II, had also become more “catholic.” The student body was more religiously diversified, and in the Religious Studies Department of Arts & Sciences, courses in non-Christian religions were regularly offered. The works of Protestant, Jewish, as well as Catholic theologians were studied. I became, at Dorothy Ann’s invitation, an adjunct faculty member of the College.

Within the same period, Dorothy Ann also became involved in establishing, with Rev. Vernon Shannon and myself, the Coalition for Mutual Respect. This initially came about because of the tensions in the country at the time between African-Americans and Jews. Reverend Shannon and I saw an opportunity to develop an ongoing dialogue between our congregations and others to get to know each other and to hold special events and joint worship services. Dorothy Ann was involved and encouraged us at every turn.

She was way ahead of many people in terms of racial relationships on a college campus. Back in 1968, when she was the Dean of Arts & Sciences, at the time when Martin Luther King was assassinated and there were so many racial incidents across the nation, she went into the New Rochelle community and selected six black women from the high school to attend CNR. She told me she thought it would never break the color line unless she disregarded all admission requirements and just brought these students to campus. The school also started the Community Leadership Program, and in May of that year, they had special study days to explore issues of racism in response to the King killing.

However, the real change came in the 1980s with the Project on Racism and Cultural Diversity. Dorothy Ann was president of CNR then and there were 11 Westchester colleges in the program. Each college picked a team of students, professors, and staff as leaders and they would attend weekend workshops sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews at the Pawling YMCA. They would discuss causes of bias and ways to combat it on campus. It was not the only cultural diversity project at CNR. Dorothy Ann was always working to promote peace, not only on campus, but in Northern Ireland, and everywhere else that hatred breaks out in the world.

She was truly ecumenical, in person and in deed. I was fortunate to have her in my life. We were all fortunate in New Rochelle to have her in all our lives.
I count myself extremely fortunate to have been a friend of Sr. Dorothy Ann Kelly. It was she who first involved me in trying to help solve the “troubles” in Northern Ireland. She had become aware of an increasing number of Irish organizations in New York that were involved in raising money to purchase arms for the Irish Republican Army. She felt very deeply that shootings and killings would never provide the answer. And she became increasingly determined to help seek justice through peaceful means.

Her opportunity came when Mairead Corrigan Maguire and Betty Williams were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for their work with the Northern Ireland Peace People. Mairead Corrigan, a deeply religious Catholic, had become involved with the peace movement when her sister’s three children were killed in the fighting that took place in Belfast. Mairead and her neighbor, Betty Williams, who had witnessed the tragic deaths, rallied 35,000 people into the streets of Belfast petitioning for peace. Both women had become completely convinced that violence was not the way.

And, Sr. Dorothy Ann became more and more convinced that the violence had to be brought to an end. She began by inviting Mairead to speak at The College of New Rochelle in 1978 and to begin the task of convincing Americans, particularly those of Irish heritage, to support this new Irish peace movement. She wanted, in particular, to help the families of Irish prisoners pay for food and rent on their homes and to have money enough to hire buses to take prisoners’ wives and relatives (Catholic and Protestant alike) to visit their kin in prison.

A group was formed in New York to finance the Northern Ireland Peace People. Sr. Dorothy Ann became deeply involved and, in fact, became the group’s first President. My wife and I attended many of their meetings. And we contributed as well. At one point, I mentioned to Sr. Dorothy Ann that I wished to know a lot more than I did about the “troubles.” She responded that the only possible way to do that was to go to Northern Ireland and see for myself the conditions that exist there. And, so it was that a few weeks later, I journeyed to the North of Ireland. Sr. Dorothy Ann, together with the leadership of the Peace People in Belfast, saw to it that I met with the various and sundry individuals who were involved in the dispute.

It turned out to be a good learning experience for me. It helped me to decide how I could best assist those on both sides who were seeking peace and justice. Subsequently, I helped sponsor a “Beyond Hate Conference” in Derry, Northern Ireland, where, for the first time.
The sprigs of peace were beginning to sprout in Northern Ireland. A small group of Irish Americans led by Niall O’Dowd, publisher of the Irish Voice newspaper, and the very generous Chuck Feeney were part of the group. The rest is history. But it was Sr. Dorothy Ann who put me on the right path. And for that, I will be forever grateful.

In so many other ways she was an inspiration and a gift to all of us. She had an excellent mind and was a very deep thinker. And, she had this great quality that I find in so many Ursulines – the ability to be open to new ideas.

In recent years, we managed to meet every few months or so at LaFontanella Restaurant in Pelham, NY. Joining us for each meeting was her associate, Sr. Regina Kehoe, as well as Fr. Joseph Novack, the former Provincial of the Jesuits who is now headquartered at Fordham University.

It was a very sad day for me, as it was for so many, when Sr. Regina called to tell me of Sr. Dorothy Ann’s passing – that she was now with the angels, a new saint. And, it was a very sad day for everyone who loved this dear person and treasured her many gifts as an Ursuline, an educator, a woman of wisdom, and a lover of peace.
Following Sr. Dorothy Ann’s death, the outpouring of notes and remembrances received at the College from alumnae and others who had been touched by her was tremendous. Here are a few of those remembrances.

Sr. Dorothy Ann's achievements here in New York and especially at The College of New Rochelle were extraordinary in every sense.

EDWARD CARDINAL EGAN

Dorothy Ann said “yes” to my college application in 1967 and was a force in my life from that September on. I genuinely miss her on so many levels — as a friend, as a mentor, as an inspiration — she was the original iron hand in a velvet glove! It seems inconceivable to me that with all of her amazing accomplishments, she was yet a mere mortal whose time had come to exit this world — one that is far, far better for her having been in it.

JANE D’APICE VERGARI SAS’71

Remembrances...

I am sorry to hear of the passing of my friend Dorothy Ann. I shall always remember her great kindness to myself and Ann Close, when we visited in 1977 The College of New Rochelle. Sr. Dorothy Ann and the College became close friends of the Peace People Northern Ireland and helped greatly in our work for peace.

MAIREAD MAGUIRE, PEACE PEOPLE NORTHERN IRELAND

I have carried Sr. Dorothy Ann’s witness and leadership in my mind and heart since I graduated from CNR. I can still remember walking across the platform and Sr. Dorothy Ann hugging me. I was blessed to have had experienced her strength and leadership as a woman and president, as well as her warmth. Words cannot express how much I appreciate the start I was given at CNR. She was one of those God-placed hands that prompted me forward — first to a master’s in public administration from Baruch College and then a master’s in divinity at Princeton Theological Seminary. Today, years later, I still have a passion for learning and am working on my doctorate in ministry on the West Coast.

The world has lost a vibrant presence. Because of how she believed in so many of us, I learned to believe in myself.

THE REV. RUTH SANTANA-GRACE SNR’84

The loss of Sr. Dorothy Ann cannot be measured in words. She gave so very much to so very many. I am so grateful for having known her.

MARGARET CROAKE CHERICO SAS’53

Sr. Dorothy Ann was a woman to be admired. She was an inspiration and role model to me for years! She had a sense of humor and dignity that many women of influence don’t possess. I think CNR has a saint in her future!!

KATY McCAFFREY SAS’72

Sr. Dorothy Ann was clearly a classy, intelligent lady who was resourceful, passionate, and determined while fighting for many an educational cause on behalf of so many young women at a time when many women’s colleges were beginning to fade away. During my years on campus we witnessed firsthand the growth of CNR with the introduction of the School of New Resources and the School of Nursing and even the Graduate School. Sr. Dorothy Ann leaves us saddened of heart yet joyful in knowing that she left behind such a legacy.

CATHY HYLAND ZAVORSKAS SAS’82

I knew Sr. Dorothy Ann as a day student advisor, sitting in her office in the day student cafeteria downstairs. She seemed shy but always accommodating and friendly. What a transformation when I next knew her in the early 1970s, and she was heading the search committee for the new president and reporting to the Alumnae Advisory Board. She was so articulate and on top of all questions, we kept nudging one another and asking why the search committee didn’t pick her! And eventually, they did!

EILEEN GALLAGHER HARRINGTON SAS’62

Sr. Dorothy Ann came into my life at a critical time in my development and through her wisdom and compassion actively changed the course of my life. I was a high school senior who had lost my father to cancer and was living with a mother who was unable to properly nurture me. My high school counselor had branded me as “not college material” and my future prospects were less than positive. At my admission interview Sr. Dorothy Ann patiently drew me out. Throughout my four years at CNR, I always knew that she was looking out for me and believed in my abilities. She was also the first woman I had ever met that held a position of leadership and influence and her example told me that I and
my fellow students could achieve similar successes. When it came time to raise my daughter, it was Sr. Dorothy Ann’s example that I tried to follow: honesty, compassion, understanding, and firmness when the situation warranted it. Both my and my daughter’s lives have been made far better because of her. Hers was a life well lived and her qualities will live on in many of us who were fortunate enough to have known her.

MARGARET PATTERSON McElwain SAS’73

Sr. Dorothy Ann was one of the most profound role models in my life. She was unfailingly kind and fair. Her wisdom and life have been guiding forces for so many.

SUZIE SMITH SAS’76

When I think of Sr. Dorothy Ann, I think of a woman of strength. She had the unique capability of guiding so many of us as a friend, confidant, therapist, educator, leader, and spiritual woman of faith. I am not sure if enough people realize how respected she was by children. They always sought her approval. She never raised her voice or expressed disapproval. She always let the children know in her warm, kind way that they mattered and no matter what, that they were loved. She wasn’t afraid to frown at something that was unacceptable but somehow conveyed that disapproval without judgment. That grandmotherly side she had may not have been known by many but was genuine and a big part of who she was.

MARGARET HEALEY SN’09 NIECE OF REGINA KEHOE, OSU SAS’56, GS’85

Sr. Dorothy Ann was truly an emissary of faith, good will, and understanding of all religions. We became close when we worked together with her and Rabbi Amiel Wohl of Temple Israel of New Rochelle when they co-founded the Coalition for Mutual Respect. To know her was to love her.

RITA AND PHILIP ROSEN

Sr. Dorothy Ann was an extraordinary person who could see way beyond her background, the educational institutions she attended, and her vocation to the needs of people completely outside her world. Her vision of taking a small, fine women’s college and expanding its reach six times to the needy areas of the Bronx, Harlem, and Brooklyn was philanthropy in the fullest sense. She was an exemplar of what the best in Catholic education combined with deep democratic values can be.

SANDRA PRIEST ROSE GS’77

Sr. Dorothy Ann was a great lady who left a remarkable legacy that lives on in all the lives she touched – her life is truly one to be celebrated.

Eleanor Swanson FORMER DIRECTOR OF SELF-STUDY RESEARCH, CNR

Sr. Dorothy Ann was a wonderful woman, whose contributions to The College of New Rochelle will long live on. Her dedication was commendable and, coupled with her immeasurable talents, made her an administrator par excellence. She will be sorely missed by all whose lives she touched.

FLORENCE D’URSO