

Interview with Josie Johnson

Interviewed by Ann Pflaum

Interviewed on August 3, 1999

Josie Johnson - JJ
Ann Pflaum - AP

AP: This is Ann Pflaum. I'm interviewing the Honorable Josie R. Johnson. Josie is a very distinguished citizen of this university. She is a former regent. She is a former senior officer in Central Administration and she is a former instructor and a former fellow in the College of Education. Josie, have I missed anything?

JJ: No, I think that's correct.

AP: Josie's a graduate of Fisk University. I will start with: how did you first become connected with the university and, if you remember, approximately the decade that it was in, that would be helpful but not essential.

JJ: It was the decade of the 1950s. I moved here in 1956 and became involved in the work of the university in the late 1950s as a person just introducing my children to the Northrop Auditorium and the programs that were there. Then, in the 1960s, the student uprising began, their protests, and efforts to have black history introduced in the programs at the university and I supported the students by providing refreshments to them when they took over Morrill Hall. So, that was in the 1960s.

Towards the end of the 1960s, we were successful in getting the Afro-American Studies Department introduced in CLA [College of Liberal Arts]. I was one of the first faculty in that department teaching a course on Black Families in White America—that was the title of the course—and also introduced an experimental program on black people and the welfare system, looking at the history of black people and their relationship to welfare and policies that were developed and implemented around welfare and the African-American community.

I was elected to the Board of Regents in November 1971 and resigned from my position in the Department of Afro-American Studies and served as chair of the Faculty and Student Committee on the Board of Regents, was co-chair of the Health Science Committee. I remember that we were a part of the beginning discussion of HMOs [Health Maintenance Organization] because we had this committee on the Board of Regents dealing with issues of health and Health Science. I left the board

in 1973 to move to Denver, Colorado. Chuck was transferred from Honeywell-Minneapolis to Honeywell-Denver.

In Denver, my life took on a particular turn there that had nothing to do with the University of Minnesota. I served in the state government there as chief of staff for the lieutenant governor, who was the first black lieutenant governor since Reconstruction in Colorado. I left Colorado and did some political work in Texas, some work in Nashville with the Carter/Mondale campaign, went to the University of Massachusetts and got my master's and doctorate of education administration.

I came back to Minnesota and became a fellow in the College of Education, introduced a piece of research in the College of Ed dealing with black families and black parents being advocates for their children in the public schools. My dissertation dealt with the role black parents and black communities played in providing education for black children after Emancipation up to the Brown [vs. Board of Education Topeka] decision. I was curious as to whether black parents here in Minnesota, in Minneapolis in particular, understood that historical role that the community and parents had, so we created a discussion group with black parents to look at ways that they could examine and discuss their own involvement in education and ways of being advocates for their children in the public schools. This is in the 1980s when I came back to Minnesota in 1985 and worked in the College of Education on this project I just described and also taught two graduate courses in the College of Education.

Then, the president of the university, Nils Hasselmo, asked if I would attend a meeting that had been called between African-American university personnel and a local Jewish community of citizens to talk about the speaker who had been invited by the students and that had caused some concern among our Jewish community members. Minister [Louis] Farakhan, I understand, had been the speaker. Out of that grew an interest in doing some research conducted by African-American faculty and Jewish faculty in looking at some rather basic questions about black people and Jewish people and their experiences in America. There was an experimental course offered in the Women's Studies program taught by Professor Riv-Ellen Prell, R-i-v-E-l-l-e-n P-r-e-l-l, and Rose Brewer, B-r-e-w-e-r, looking at those issues of the experience of Jewish people and African-American people in America. Riv-Ellen Prell is associate professor in American Studies and Professor Rose Brewer was from the African-American Studies. She was chair of that department. The two of them team-taught and developed an experimental course looking at the historical role or pattern that had been developed for African-American people and Jewish people in the American society.

AP: That sounds very interesting.

JJ: It was just wonderful. The other thing that we did, that had never been done before on campus, was we had a meeting at President Hasselmo's home between the African-American faculty and a representative of students and Jewish faculty and representatives of the Jewish student body and had a very interesting retreat at his home to talk about the issues of African-American and Jews. It was my dream that the communities would come together and talk about these things and that's what we did at that time.

Out of this grew our Diversity Forum. I was on leave from the College of Education to develop and execute a series of diversity forums that were designed to talk, to have communities talk, to invite different community groups to come in and talk about their perception of the university and the university's work in the area of diversity. So, we had a series of forums that were annual events, all university events, to talk about different subjects. I think those reports are on record someplace.

AP: Yes, I'm looking at some of them right now.

JJ: After that, I was asked to become the associate vice-president for Academic Affairs, with responsibility for Minority Affairs: faculty, students, curriculum, and those issues. I had served on the search committee that recruited the first person who served in that capacity and that was Delores Cross. Do you remember her, Ann?

AP: I do, indeed.

JJ: The committee that worked on that wanted the position of associate vice-president to be one that would not be a minority affairs office. That was not the intent. It was one that was to look at the academic life of faculty and students, to be in a position to assist the university in meeting its diversity goals and objectives of hiring and retaining and promoting faculty of color, and to recruit potentially successful students at the university. The job was carefully defined and described so that we would not advertise a position that was interpreted to be one that was minority affairs. Therefore, we were successful in getting Delores Cross to accept that position. After Delores left to take a position in Illinois—she became president of Chicago State University—we began searching again for another person to fill that position. I was asked by [Ettore] Jim Infante and the committee searching for a replacement if I would take the job and I agreed to, on a three-year basis.

That position was one that I think we were able to do some rather important things, in that we created the Minority Advisory Committee. Recognizing that each minority group has a different perspective of the university and what it should do, we had separate committees and had a process by which the president would meet with those groups. They would identify issues that they felt were important in the specific communities. The president then, through the assistance of our office, would assign those issues, expressed by those minority groups, to the appropriate department within the university and, then, there was a time line set up of to whom the issue was presented, and what action was to be taken, and what kind of results were anticipated. The president, then, would go back to those groups and report back what he had authorized to happen within the structure of the university.

We also were instrumental in, as you know, the strategic planning of the university and getting the issue of diversity into the mission and objective of the university so that diversity became one of the strategic goals. We were able to create, as a result of the strategic planning, a process by which departments would be evaluated on their meeting their objectives of faculty and student and curriculum and budget, and all of the issues that are university-related that would enhance, improve, and encourage diversity, honest diversity, within the university and to have it become an integrated part of the university, an integrated part of the total picture of the university, so that it did not stand

as a separate entity but that it became a part of the total goal for the university. We think we at least got started on that objective.

We were able to create also through our office a process by which faculty could be hired and the office would assist departments in hiring by providing resources for the departments that were making a serious effort in trying to find people who met the needs of a given department and, then, were trying to create opportunities for those people to join the departmental staff. So, the office was instrumental in creating that opportunity. It also created an evaluation process by which departments would request the kind of help that I just described of hiring qualified personnel in their office. We created an evaluation method so that we could keep up with the people who were hired and could help the department meet their objectives in having quality faculty.

AP: Josie, may I stop you for a minute?

JJ: Sure.

AP: When you say you would help the department... Let's say I'm the Department of History and I identify a fine African-American scholar and I want to hire them. I go to the university and what kind of help would...?

JJ: The process we had was that the chairman of the Department of History and that faculty would present their case to the dean of the College of History. Then, the dean would approve the search for a faculty person. The dean of that college would, then, come with approval from its chair and faculty to our office and say, "We need this staff person and we don't have that money available in our budget at this time." Our department, then, would help them pay the salary of that faculty person on a 100 percent basis for the first year, 75 percent the second year, 50 percent the third year, and the fourth and the years that followed, the department would have that salary in the budget of the department.

AP: So, in other words, it was, in effect, a phased gift?

JJ: That's correct. It was a three-year gift.

AP: And the fourth year, it would be on the college?

JJ: Right. We wanted, in our effort to do this, to make sure that it was something that was being done blessed by the department and was the reason we wanted it come up the chain from faculty to chair to dean and, then, to our department, so that it was a complete buy-in of the members of that department.

AP: That certainly makes sense, doesn't it?

JJ: Yes, I think so. We think that, in a variety of ways, we were able to at least get some of these ideas... There were just so many things, Ann, when you stop to think about it over a period of time... all the initiatives and efforts that were made.

The year before I retired, we became the custodians of the rest of the diversity issues: women, gay/lesbian, bi-sexual, handicapped. All of those departments became a part of our operation, our responsibility, under the office of minority issues. So, we became the office that had ethnic minorities as its responsibility and, then, included the other minority or diversity groups trying to fulfill our mission as we had defined it in the strategic plan. That was an interesting and exciting process, getting some clarity about our relationship with all of the groups that were classified as diverse and ways of getting us all to work together as a community and becoming one big family... issues facing people who are classified as diverse.

AP: That must have been a fascinating time?

JJ: Ann, when I think about it... I fully intended to write about that when I retired. Of course, you don't know because you're so disciplined. You go ahead and do things that you say you're going to do in this field. I just have not done it, but I want to because it has so many pieces that need to be thought about and examined as to what we tried to do in our area, in our department, what we were trying to do and how we went about it. I believed very strongly that the university was, indeed, a university not a special interest group, that we could force the university to behave as if it was not a university, and that we had to help our community understand how the university is organized and how it is managed and how it gets things done and that what we needed to do was to put the mission of diversity and full opportunity and access placed within the context of the university and how the university operated and to have these things work within that structure. I think we were pretty successful in that.

AP: Josie, can you explain a little bit more? You said, "A university is not a specialized interest group".

JJ: What I mean is this. Because we don't understand how the university is organized and how it operates, there is a tendency to try to force the university to behave in ways that we want it to at the speed and level that we think it should, as we might take a complaint to an NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] or an urban league or to a court or some other entity that's designed and organized to handle a special kind of interest. So, we wanted the university to accept its mission of diversity and to do it in a way that the university is accustomed to doing things, through the budget process, through the hiring process, promotion, etcetera, rather than trying to create a special relationship between the university and some of its community members that would create a separateness or a special case relationship. We wanted the issues of minorities and women and others to be treated as every other department is treated and to have the issues that were of importance to our special groups included in the total operation of the university—if that makes sense to you. What I'm saying is that instead of us trying to encourage the university to behave outside of its character, we wanted our issues of integration and diversity, hiring of faculty, promotion of faculty, recruitment of students and faculty, programs, budget kinds of issues to be included in the normal process of the university, so that it didn't become some entity that could be forgotten about if you get another president or another associate v.p., but that it became integrated in the university so that budget issues for a department would also include an evaluation of the department's commitment

to the issues of diversity, the department's hiring and promoting and retaining of faculty, just as you would those things that were important in the College of Engineering. What kind of progress had we made on meeting the objectives of the College of Engineering? It would have certain ways of evaluating itself on an annual basis and we wanted part of the evaluation to also include the issues of diversity and not be treated special—by, that I mean separately—so that you could ignore it if you wanted to. We wanted it so integrated in the process of the university that you could not ignore these issues dealing with faculty, students, curriculum, issues of diversity.

AP: Would you be willing to comment on some of the people who you felt made a positive difference to diversity change at the university—in addition to yourself? You have a very long record of knowing lots of generations and lots of efforts here. Are there people that stand out in your mind as sort of exemplary?

JJ: Yes, I think, during my tenure, when I go back to the beginning of my intimate relationship at the university, Dean [Jerry] Shepherd was extremely, in my judgment, supportive of our developing the Department—and Fred Lukermann—of African-American Studies.

AP: Fred Lukermann was dean of CLA?

JJ: That's correct. They were helpful and, of course, [Malcolm] Moos was president then. I don't recall whether he created any obstacles. It seems to me he was helpful, also, in creating the right attitude about the department. The African-American Studies Department, as you know, was the first at the university that began to look at issues of special groups. Then we had the women; then we had the Indian; then we had the Chicano; then we had the other groups. The African-Americans were the ones that opened the door for all of the groups to have an opportunity to have their history examined and treated at a research institution like ours. The early administrators, those who were in place at the time to help us get that department, were helpful.

Elmer [L.] Andersen, when I was on the Board of Regents... I had worked with Elmer before that when I was a lobbyist for fair housing and equal employment and Elmer was governor. I had developed a positive attitude about him in that period and so when we were serving on the Board of Regents together and he was chair, I had the feeling that he was very fair and very open-to-open, honest discussion about the issues facing faculty for policy issues that the regents could develop. So, Elmer was extremely helpful.

When I left, of course, to go to Colorado, we were searching for a replacement for Malcolm Moos. When I came back to the university, I really had a very positive feeling about Nils Hasselmo. I felt that Nils was just unbiased, was consistently positive about the issues facing us as a people and all minorities or diverse groups. I thought Jim Infante understood the issues and was smart and able. You know, you get into a little bit of dangerous territory when you start trying to identify people. I thought [Robert] Bruininks was a person that I appreciated working with and felt that he was very committed to the issues of diversity and illustrated that in our College of Education. There were just a number of people in Administration who helped. The big thing was sitting around in those meetings where you could present your objectives to your colleagues and get some reaction and some positive

reinforcement. I thought Jim Infante was very good at that and so was Nils Hasselmo. I'm trying to think of other colleagues who were instrumental. To my surprise, and maybe not to yours and others, I thought [Richard] Pfutzenreuter was very helpful to me. He was instrumental in demonstrating how you needed to get budgets drawn and language in order to get things to happen, so I was very impressed with him. The person who served as our treasurer... What was his name? Roger... he went to the Caribbean, I believe. His last name won't come to me right this minute. But Roger and Pfutzenreuter in the staffing, in those offices were very helpful.

AP: As you traveled around the country and looked at other Big Ten schools or other research universities, did you have any particular sense of how we were doing compared to others?

JJ: Each year, when we gave our report to the Board of Regents, we would make that kind of comparison. We, generally, among the Big Ten, might have been fourth or fifth in that group. You used the kind of criteria of budgets and number of students and faculty. The University of Minnesota still has a lot of work to do among its faculty of color so that would always bring us down and the number of students graduating from the Big Ten. There may be other schools that had larger numbers of faculty, like Michigan. Even Wisconsin, sometimes, had some programs that could show more results. But, actually, I always felt that the University of Minnesota, because of its people and administration and attitude, did very well comparatively speaking. We just, when you compare us to others with numbers of faculty, couldn't stand up in that arena. I always felt that we did, probably, better in the kind of criteria, the hard data, that you needed in order to rank us. We were generally about mid point among the Big Ten.

AP: Do you have any comments about athletics, student athletes?

JJ: I know from the time that I was there that we were very interested as an office to make sure that anything we could do to assist the athlete in getting through successfully, we wanted to do. We were eager to, but the organization was such that our office was never directly involved in it. I just know that there was a great deal of respect for the work that our coach was doing and the students seemed to always have very positive comments about him. I always had the feeling that he was dedicated to the students.

AP: We're talking basketball?

JJ: Basketball is what I know best. But, the athletic program, as such, is what you're speaking of?

AP: Yes, I was just asking in general whether you had any...

JJ: We were always concerned about the need to have more students successfully graduate from the University of Minnesota. That was always an issue and we felt that we were moving in that direction, where we had more students of color graduating from the university than some of the other Big Ten institutions. You don't know that much about it in my work because those programs were treated separately. We just were not involved in it.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

AP: ...had mentored you. You mentioned earlier Regent Elmer Andersen. Are there other people that, as a woman and an administrator, have been supportive to you?

JJ: I think, generally, so much of my interest was trying to make sure that the things we were working on were implemented and that they got recognition and approval. I think it's very hard, Ann, in an institution that recognizes the common, cultural way of life, for them to fully understand what people of color and women are trying to do and to think about. It takes a lot of conversation and time and that gets to be hard, I think, for us as a people to hang in there and to always be in a position where you have to explain and work at everything, because it's just different: the way we think, the way we problem solve. The kinds of issue that we see, sometimes, are just not readily observed by other groups and other people. I think on the whole, I could not say that I was not, personally, supported. I was very supported by all of my colleagues with whom I worked. That's how we were able, I think, to get anything done was through the support of the people with whom I worked and interacted.

AP: At some point, one of the challenges that had been observed about the early to mid 1990s was that we had a lot of top women administrators but we didn't absolutely maintain them all.

JJ: Right.

AP: There was a lot of ebb and flow. How would you help one understand that, if you have a thought on the subject?

JJ: I have wondered a lot about that and used to worry about it. What I think is the case with women and some other people who may be creative, who may bring forth an approach to problems that others haven't thought about, is there is something about—I don't quite know how to define it—the Minnesota culture that can wear you down. You come to the university believing that it is a place where you can test new ideas and be creative and make a difference. I think the culture—I don't know quite how...—is difficult to adjust to new ideas and to approaching ways of really making a significant and substantial change. I think that, after awhile, you feel worn out and I think the fact that the system is more geared to men and the way men function makes it difficult for women and for people of color who may have a different process, who may want to introduce a new way of doing things and some new ways of solving very old problems. But, it takes time. It takes really getting to know and work together, having people really interact with each other on an open and honest and trust level. I think the work of the university and the rhythm of the university, the way we work... Look at you, working as late as ten o'clock at night and I have done that many times and most administrators are in their offices from early morning till late night. You don't have a chance—I think this is part of it—to really get to sit and reflect, get to know your colleagues in ways that you can understand how they think and what issues they're trying to bring forward and to resolve. Therefore, the pace of our work blocks an understanding of people who are different and, therefore, it's much easier to just do business as usual and to continue functioning the way the majority in that system can

work, rather than the time that is required to understand people who are different, who may work differently, who may think differently, who may problem solve differently, who have some ideas that need to be truly tested—if you understand what I'm saying. The system, the rhythm, the process is just all time consuming and in order to introduce something that's different and new, it's almost impossible. The rhythm of the system doesn't allow you to spend the time to get to know what people are trying to do. I have asked many people who have come to the university, women in particular, to take a job and, then, they've left and a number of people say, "The University of Minnesota is different. It's different than other systems." Yet, it's very hard for people to put hard language around that. What do you mean it's different? But, I believe that it's different because the rhythm, the culture, of Minnesota is one that does not deal well with conflict. It shies away from talking honestly and directly about things. It has a hard time with that. The *Minnesota Nice* mentality and behavior keeps us from being open and honest with each other, so we never quite know what people think. I think that because we are unable to deal with conflict and difference, we seek the arenas that allow us to do things as we've always done them and to deal with people and issues that are comfortable. I think that drives away many people who are creative and energetic and want to make a difference. They come and they try and they get defeated. It's just hard to put that in good, clean language. It's more of a feeling thing than it is one that you can actually articulate. But, I believe that's part of it. I know when I was working in my last job as associate v.p., it was impossible to find a time when you could just sit with your colleagues to deal with an issue that was of prime importance to you and try to chew on it until you could have some clarity or understanding of the issue. Our life is too busy at the university to allow you to do that. So, you have to just keep on moving, keep on churning out the reports and making the kinds of assessments that you have to make.

I don't think in this society where issues of minorities and women are so deeply etched in the fabric of our society that you can hold on to people who are different and can make a difference and bring a breath of freshness to a system unless you're able to get to know them and to understand the way they do things and begin to allow those people to have an influence in the system so that the system can reflect these differences, not just nice words, but to really make a difference and to encourage people to feel that they're welcome and their ideas are of value and that we really want to be a multi-ethnic society where we celebrate these differences, that we aren't just a system that says the right things and that we tolerate the differences. I just pray—this is off the record—that Mark Yudof is able to stay strong in expressing some of his real deep commitments. I worry a lot about it because I think the system is going to wear him down, too. It just does. It wears you down. I don't know if any of that makes sense, Ann.

AP: It certainly is incredibly challenging. I wanted to end by asking you to reflect. Did I detect a change in your philosophy from the time, say, the 1968 occupation of Morrill Hall and your later thinking about the role of student groups and how they should interface with the system, where you were saying that you didn't want external groups to misunderstand what a university was and only operate on special interest bases?

JJ: That really needs to be spelled out a bit. I think what you learn—hopefully, what you learn—are different strategies to meet your objectives. I don't think my philosophy changed. My strategy

became one that was more directed at working the system in a way to get what you needed. By that I mean, understanding how the university is organized and how things happen at the university. I think understanding how it's organized and how things get accomplished are the critical things for making issues dealing with women and minorities successful. If what we do is to continue the occupation strategy of being confrontive and combative and impatient, the system can learn how to ignore you.

I think what I tried to do in my last assignment in my work with the university was to figure out how we could take everything we had learned over the decades and, then, apply it in ways that would make the system function in meeting its mission and goals of diversity and fairness and research and productivity and all of those things that we had in our mission statement of the university: service to undergraduates, and research, etcetera, etcetera. What I meant was trying to encourage the external community to develop a sense of faith and respect for a system that needed to work within its design.

You can get the system to respond to your objectives by taking the time that's required to fit your objectives into the natural rhythm of the system. That's why I'm saying the important things at a university are its budget, its curriculum, its faculty, its students, its programs and what you have to do, then, is to work your mission and objectives into that rhythm so that the university can naturally include and be persuaded to include the issues that are important to women and people who represent the diverse community. Does that make sense?

AP: Yes. That's very helpful.

JJ: It's not changing your philosophy. It is changing your strategy to accomplish your original objectives. As we grow, you have to be very careful that you don't lose your objectives. What you must do is to study the environment you're in and figure out how to get that environment to respond to your needs in the way that it can without having to treat you in such a way that if you're not there, you're ignored. You have to figure out how to integrate your issues into the natural flow of the system. You have to make sure that: in the strategic plan, diversity is there; that in the development of budgets, issues of diversity are there; that in the promotion of deans and administrators, the issues of diversity are there in the evaluation process; that it's a part of the system.

When Mark Yudof first came and talked about issues, he automatically talked about issues of diversity and minorities and protecting those interests. They were a part of his way of being. So, he illustrated that by bringing on Tanya Brown, bringing her with him, giving her a significant place in his office, trusting her. He did that by supporting David Taylor in General College. He did that by saying positive, affirmative things that let you know that in his process of evaluation and thinking, issues of minorities are there. They are etched in his fabric. They're not something that he pulls out when he goes into the black community and talks or when he talks to the Jewish community or to the women's groups. It's a part of his being. When I say to you that I worry, off the record, that he may be worn down...

There is a part of our Minnesota culture that encourages you not to talk about minorities, not to talk about issues confronting people who are different and, somehow, you are surrounded in that environment by the majority group who think and behave in a different way. You have to be consistent and firm in your belief system or you will lose that integrated attitude—if you know what I

mean. You have to be able to place in the system those things that are important to you. You have to put them in in a way that they become a part of the system—that's what I mean—so they become a part of the budgeting and the hiring and the promotion and the evaluation and da, da, da. They're not something that you can say, "Oh, that's minority affairs and you treat that differently." Do you know what I mean?

AP: Absolutely.

JJ: It's the philosophy that guides you. Your eye is always on the prize! So, you don't lose that. What you do is try to figure out how to make it last beyond your years, beyond you, so that it's not tied to *a* person, *an* event, *a* time. It becomes a part of the system. You know what the issues are. You never lose sight of that. Your eye is always on that prize. It's just how do you go about it? How do you understand the system and respect for it? I don't believe we ought to work in a system that we don't have respect for and understand and appreciate how it's organized. What used to worry me was that there would be people who were so angry with the university that they could be *destructive*, in my judgment, rather than *constructive* and helpful. I could not work in a system that I didn't respect or believe that I could make a difference in. My philosophy didn't change. It's just the strategy. What I tried desperately to do was to get my community to focus on the things that were happening. Our community, the people of color community, and African-Americans in particular, can become very concerned so that they don't see a difference, they don't feel a difference. Sometimes, the things that happen are so subtle that they can be missed. I was often trying to make sure that our community knew what was going on. But, it is very hard in a society that has had so few successes and always feels that these issues are temporary and they're momentary and they are personal. Until you can really get them integrated into [unclear] change down the road, our people won't have the faith they need to have or patience they need to have to help a system fulfill its mission and goals. If you've got diversity and women in your mission, then what you have to do is to help the system figure out how to meet those objectives. You can't do it if you don't understand how the system works and you're not a part of it and you're angry with it. You can't get anything done. You have to understand it. You have to work with a sense of respect and appreciation for the system that you're working in. Then, you have to be persistent. You have to stay on the case. You have to keep your eye on the prize. That's the long and the short of it.

AP: We've been doing some interviews to try to entangle the issue of the General College as it came up in 1996. Do you have any thoughts about how that transpired?

JJ: I was away from it so that, by the time I got back from someplace, much of it had been discussed and was in the news. So, I really am not in a position to talk about it.

What I have often discussed with Dean Taylor is the contribution that I think General College can make because it does open its door to all youngsters who want to—and oldsters, too—make a difference in their own life. There's just a lot of researchable data that's there. I know that that's what they are doing and passing that on to help the university, the rest of the university, understand its population and what it has to do to be an institution of higher learning and one of helping people be creative and to be productive. I know that as old as our General College is, it's just got lots of

information to share. We have to have a vehicle by which it can do that successfully and not always be in a defensive posture. I know that's what the dean is trying to do and it seems that Mark is trying to support that effort.

AP: That's probably a supportive note to end on. It's interesting: a woman that I was talking to earlier today, Betty Ann Whitman, a Native American, had been a student in the 1950s in General College and she said that the supportiveness of the advising and staff there was just phenomenal.

JJ: Yes, I've heard that, too.

AP: It's nice to have such a strong record.

JJ: It is, indeed. I don't know if you remember Tricia Anderson, the woman who worked for me? Her daughter just loves General College. She is back in school and is there to get her feet on the ground again. She's very bright and very able. Marj [Marjorie] Cowmeadow was just wonderful when I met with Marj to help this young woman get started, just wonderful.

AP: Isn't that exciting? That's what it's all about, in a way.

JJ: That's right, exactly, helping people find their sea legs and get them going. [laughter]

AP: Josie, this has been extremely helpful. I appreciate it.

What I will do is send you a form.

JJ: Wonderful.

AP: That's for you to sign for the human subjects and I'll include a self-addressed envelope.

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

Hermes Transcribing and Research Service
12617 Fairgreen Avenue, Apple Valley, MN 55124
(612) 953-0730
bhermes1@aol.com