Timothy Delmont

Early career, 1960s 1-2
Intellectual climate - University of Minnesota, 1970s 2
Undergraduate - St. John's University 3-
Ph.D. work - University of Minnesota, 1970s 5
Department of Finance, Morrill Hall 6-
Higher Education Coordinating Board 7
Origins of university planning 8-
    Magrath, C. Peter 9
    University of Minnesota decentralized 12-
    Keller, Kenneth 13-
    Faculty Consultative Committee 14-
Management Planning Information Services, 1971 15
Legislative relations 16-18
Board of Regents 19-
University of Minnesota mode of management 20-
Donhowe, Gus 22
Keller, Kenneth 23
Litigation 24
Faculty participation in governance, 1980s 26-
Role of "merit" 32-
Final reflections 37-38

Interview with Timothy Delmont

Interviewed by Professor Clarke A. Chambers
University of Minnesota

Interviewed on November 2, 1994
University of Minnesota Campus

Tim Delmont - TD
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers. I am interviewing this afternoon, which is November 2, 1994, in his office, Timothy Delmont who has been with the university in various administrative assignments since 1971 and we'll trace through those. He's been able to see the university from a central position, held many different kinds of portfolios, and they will become clear as we converse.

Tim, it's always helpful to have a little autobiography so that listeners five, ten years from now will kind of be able to put what you're saying in context; so, do you want to say something about your academic, intellectual history?

TD: Thanks, Clarke. I appreciate the chance to talk with you today. I was educated in the early and middle 1960s, both at the bachelor's and graduate school levels. What drove my choice of education and, subsequently, of work was a sense that this was an amazingly resourceful country that I'd grown up in. It offered stupendous opportunities to people; but, something had gone awry in the 1960s as we looked at our institutions. I thought that a role for me, across my adult life, that would make some sense is somehow being involved in public service. I wasn't initially sure what would mean; but, I thought it probably meant somewhere working in government, maybe at the local level. I always enjoyed education and did well in it at all the levels that I had participated; so, I thought there might be something there for me, too.

I spent a part of the 1960s moving between jobs in government and education, as it turned out. The opportunities, again, were there because funding was there as well. I worked for the Kennedy Space Center, which is a NASA [National Aeronautics and Space Administration] agency, for awhile, which was kind of a spectacular introduction to big time government. I worked for Hennepin County government, taught high school at the local level, in a private high school. At that point, I decided that the university was a wonderful place for me because I

wished to go on for some kind of advanced doctoral training beyond the masters. I had worked in budget and planning legislative relations in government and had taught at the high school level; so, it seemed if I came to a place that was as rich as the university was, or at least as it appeared to me, I would have a chance to bag an advanced degree, have a chance probably to do administrative work, and also have an excellent chance to continue teaching.

Once I got here, I realized that faculty also had wider portfolios than that. Research was a part of it and scholarly inquiry, of course, plus consulting, plus a lot of other kinds of things; so, by the early 1970s, I thought, This is a wonderful place. It enables me to grow intellectually, in terms of some disciplinary roots, and, at the same time, it offers me chance for really quite a versatile and changing professional experience. Now, twenty years or so down the road, I am grateful that I made the decision to come here, at least partly because it ensured that I could become a more versatile . . . challenged but a more versatile, professional and over the last fifteen years, in particular, I've almost always stitched together full-time administrative work, with professional consulting for pay, with teaching mostly at the graduate level, and a variety of other kinds of services in my community. My feeling is universities are terribly unique, rich places. For an individual like myself, they gave me an opportunity that I probably would not have found anyplace else. I can't think of another single institution, public, private, or non-profit, that would have allowed me the mix of experiences that I've had professionally—and challenged me to grow in multiple areas simultaneously.

CAC: Yet, many of us in this large institution don't have that versatility in our own careers.

TD: How do you mean? What evidence do you have of that?

CAC: I'm thinking of professors who teach their courses, and do their articles and monographs, and occasionally will sit on a college committee but, by and large, they follow a pretty specialized career development of their own, which is structured around their own. You have a discipline but yet you're doing all kinds of things and have.

TD: I knew early in my career that the decision that I had made about the choice of my discipline, however, was a risky one in the research university community because I'm coming out of education and specifically educational administration. It was pretty clear, after I'd been here a little while—much to my surprise—that the majority of scholars do not look kindly on professors of education . . .

CAC: There is a hierarchy.

TD: . . . and perceived minions who move into administration.

CAC: Yes.

TD: There's no getting away from some of those status, almost political and sometimes personalized, issues. But, on the other hand, I believed in the institution and I also thought that the institution doesn't exist wholly based on its own energy. It has to contribute to society and more than that, it has to be perceived to be contributing. Society supports it in significant ways. It's sort of reassuring to see this enormous place—now up to almost a $2 billion enterprise—and, yet, it's very fragile. As those people who give it its identity—those are, to my way of thinking, faculty—grow more worn, a little bit tired, and less in touch with each other, I think it's more difficult for them as a group and for any one as an individual to somehow communicate their own sense of identification with this place and their feeling of how beneficial it is to society. We're having trouble communicating that successfully, I think, to the wider public, or at least, we're seen as less relevant to the needs of society than we once were and other kinds of institutions are perceived as more needed.

CAC: We may be hearing society accurately.

TD: Could be. [sigh] Could be. But for me, as someone now in midstream . . . a little more than midstream, this place, this particular research university and others like it, still offer me opportunities that I would be hard pressed to find anywhere else and I value that.

CAC: I've talked with people who share these values and this mixed career and have moved in and out. I talked with John Brandl the other day, who treasures his work in the community in politics and public administration, and then brings that back into his classroom in his seminars, and feels the poorer if he cannot keep doing all these different things that he has. A certain number of the professors do that. I want to back up just a little bit though. You were an undergraduate student and graduate student during the 1960s, which was a tumultuous time.

TD: Yes.

CAC: You used a word . . . a sense of a public career or a responsibility to the public sphere. Where did that come from . . . family, from your undergraduate, from certain professors or was it the culture of the 1960s?

TD: Probably a little of all of those things.

CAC: Did you have any model at St. John's University for that kind of concern?

TD: Not a single individual as such; but, part of the St. John's culture is that is sees itself as having a responsibility to positively affect the community around it. You get a message over and over again that one of the more gracious and self-respecting acts one can do as an adult is, in some fashion, to contribute to your immediate community and that when you assume that responsibility, it, from the St. John's point of view, is an expansion of sort of the notion of Christian charity.

CAC: Sure.

TD: But, unlike other colleges where I've been or visited or from where our friends have come, I think St. John's did a good job of institutionalizing that message, that to be an effective religious person in the modern era, you carry a responsibility of some kind to contribute to your community, however you define that. I certainly heard that. In my family, we had a fairly politicized family . . . good Democrats from way back, reaching to my grandfather who was a printer by trade and, eventually, was promoted to a white collar job; so, he was the manager of the printers for West Publishing in downtown St. Paul and a good German. They picked the right man as far as efficiency. He might have been a little short on bedside manner; but, I know he was efficient. He had the neatest garden on the block, among other things. At seventy-eight, he was still leaning over, almost catching apoplexy, trying to pick a gnat off the carpet. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

TD: But, the Depression hit and with it, he lost his white collar job. He returned to being a printer under a very demanding schedule, longer hours and less pay, of course. From what my mother says, that was a terrible experience in personal terms. He lost a lot of his pride and self-respect; but, what it made him was absolutely committed to the union movement that was emerging in that era in our state and in our country. We grew up with a long line of Democrats in our family. When I was a teenager, I was touched by John Kennedy's emergence as a candidate and he was Catholic, for that matter; so, there was another connection there with our background in our family because we were Roman Catholic. Kennedy caught my interest. I was sixteen when he was elected [president]. It turned out that our choir from St. John's University was invited to Washington [D.C.] for the first Christmas that the Kennedys were involved in; so, there was another connection. These ties just kept filtering back and forth. The Kennedy message clearly was of service—there were a lot of messages but that was clearly one—and for youths to wake up and contribute something. I think in that sense, I heard the wider message as well, reinforced by a family experience and by the college that I chose to attend.

CAC: How much of it did you find when you got to the university, into the graduate seminars you were taking?

TD: Oh, considerably less. My master's program was in public administration. The way that program was delivered then was that courses were taught along functional lines, administrative tasks or functions; so, there was a course in budgeting, a course in personnel.

CAC: I see.

TD: I would describe it more as specialized professional education.

CAC: Technical, yes.

TD: On the other hand, what caught my eye were the courses and opportunities in the international area, international administration . . . some fellowships. I did think that the world was a lot bigger than Arbor Street in St. Paul in which I had grown up and that, maybe, there was a place for me overseas as well. So, I took some of those courses, too, which got me beyond kind of the nuts and bolts of administration in municipal government and opened my eyes to the reality that the world is interconnected. The economic system for well or ill ties cultures, and peoples, and countries together in this warp of economic relationships. I could also see in the 1960s and early 1970s that there were inequities there as well on a massive scale.

CAC: All the time you were in graduate school here, you were also working part-time, were you not?

TD: Yes, at the master's level in public administration. The school arranged internships. One was at the Kennedy Space Center, which became a full-time job for awhile.

CAC: That's how you get that, good.

TD: When I came back, the school arranged an internship at Hennepin County government over the summer. That expanded to a full-time job.

CAC: These were paid apprenticeships?

TD: These were paid internships. I think it's to the credit of the institution that it did that. In fact, we had a number of choices of internships that we could have taken. When I came to the University of Minnesota, specifically then, to assume a professional job in 1971 . . .

CAC: It was at that time that you had earned your doctor's degree in education [unclear]?

TD: I came back and started taking courses then in the early 1970s so that I could complete a Ph.D.

CAC: I see.

TD: A little later than that time, my wife died. We had small children; so, I put any further graduate education on hold for a good year, year and a half, until our lives had stabilized and I had more support at home. Then, I did go back for my dissertation. That was a process that itself lasted from 1977 to 1979, two and a half years. During that stretch, taking courses in the early 1970s and of doing the dissertation work, I was working either at central full-time or I took partial leaves of absence and worked 75 percent time.

CAC: And were a single parent on top of that.

TD: Yes.

CAC: You were in your late thirties and forties?

TD: It was a full plate. [sigh] It was a full agenda.

CAC: You bet.

TD: I had support of family and in-laws . . . a mother who helped with the children. In order to get the dissertation work done, I usually used virtually every Sunday morning as a kind of free time to work on it. I took my kids to their grandparents Sunday morning and part of Sunday afternoon. Then, to actually get the work done, I negotiated on three occasions partial leaves of absence covering three, four months at a stretch.

CAC: Your dissertation addressed what issues?

TD: It was a comparative study of budget planning processes . . .

CAC: Which was what you were doing part-time in any case?

TD: Yes . . . in over thirty public research universities. I was testing a so-called open model of budgeting, which involved, among other things, a set of variables that administrators could control. I was most interested in seeing what were the consequences of sharing information and involving constituents in the decision making process that would then lead to a budget request. Among other things, I found out that the processes, by and large, in the 1970s anyway, were being centralized almost without exception in the big universities and the players included senior managers, V.P.s [vice-president] for finance and academic affairs, and their newly emerging centrally located planning and budgeting staffs.

CAC: Ahhh. So, everyone is adding these kinds of staff in the 1970s?

TD: Yes, they were. Some of the other findings were that those who thought themselves to be constituencies, the faculty, the dean, the students, other staff, more and more, at least based on my study, felt that they were not full players in the budgeting processes, that they weren't getting the information they needed about those processes, that they didn't understand the rationale of decisions, and that for the most part, they didn't support the decisions that were reached; so, there was a centralization of a process that had, for the most part, invidious consequences and I think we're still dealing with that issue now, which is really the issue of what is the appropriate policy and decision making process in a research university community?

CAC: Starting in 1971, when you really move into Morrill Hall and begin to observe and carry portfolios along this line, how consciously aware were top administrators of the themes and limits that you're talking about now . . . for budgeting, for example, open or centralized?

TD: I think they were quite aware. The vice-president for Finance, as a matter of fact, approved of my leaves of absence and, on one occasion, actually provided some additional resources to me to offset the drop in my salary. In return, I briefed him on the results of my dissertation research, as well as other senior vice-presidents. It didn't come as a surprise that that was the process that was happening across the country.

CAC: It didn't surprise them?

TD: It didn't surprise them; but, they just chose to do it that way.

CAC: Did they know why they were choosing this way anymore than the other administrators elsewhere?

TD: Pretty much. The vice-president for Finance, who was my chief supporter . . . his rationale was, "I'll talk to one or two people whose opinion I respect and that's enough. I don't believe in all this business of talking to everybody in town. I'm hired to make these decisions and I'll make them. If they don't like them, they can get rid of me."

CAC: To what degree would the climate of retrenchment, which, if my memory is right, was May 1971 . . . This was the first time that we really got hit with not a big retrenchment—we saw bigger later on—but that's the beginning. You came in right at that moment. Is it retrenchment that powers or drives this centralization in some degree? There must have been a sense that the good times were beginning to slide a little bit?

TD: Yes, and I think it was rather frightening, as well, because there was a perceptible increase in accountability for the institution mostly focused on the use of budgeted resources, appropriations from the state, but not exclusively. The federal government began asking for more reporting of how we used our grant money and in a variety of other ways, reporting on student characteristics, and loan rate returns . . . those kinds of things. Other committees in the state legislature asked for more detailed reports on a variety of educational policies. The Higher Education Coordinating Board, while it was fairly toothless, it was toothless because it didn't have review of the budget as part of its portfolio.

CAC: Did they review anybody's budget in the state university system?

TD: Every system was asked to submit a summary of its requests to the state legislature—to wit, that went the board—but it did not have any appreciable control.

CAC: What did it do with it then? Was it purely advisory and, if so, whom did they advise?

TD: They advised the governor if the governor thought that he wanted to listen at all. The two things the board did do that I think fit in with this generalization of the early 1970s as a time of

increasing accountability: the board was given responsibility for program review, review of new degree programs and . . .

CAC: There, they did have authority?

TD: There, they did have authority and they could at least try to prevent an institution from instituting a new degree program if they didn't approve of it . . . and also, they began to administer student loans.

CAC: Ahhh.

TD: That was a huge pot that's now an enormous amount of money; so, instead of that loan money coming out of state government and going directly to the institution for distribution, it was going to the Minnesota Higher Education Board, which then had a lever on determining what policies would affect the allocation of those dollars to students.

CAC: You had that portfolio for awhile in the early 1970s?

TD: Yes.

CAC: You did communicate with . . . ?

TD: I did. I did.

CAC: How, at that time, did you find those policies of accountability and review for new programs or for student loans? They are doing an effective job of this?

TD: I think that they lacked the staff and administrators on those boards lacked professional sophistication and expertise to do as good a job as they might have. Within public administration and educational administration, those jobs were not seen in the field as the most desirable jobs; so, they tended to attract younger professionals in their twenties who really, often, just didn't have a sense of what the higher education community was about. The more senior managers often were able; but sometimes, they were people in career transitions and weren't sure where they were headed. You can be sort of in state government but not be of it when you're in one of these positions, sort of be associated with higher education but not really be of it. Not too many make their careers of management or administration of higher education boards. They come in it for a sojourn and then they fly out again . . . a way station before they can land—my judgment—someplace else. I believe that this board, along with many others around the country, was not held in either respect or esteem, for the most part, by either its sponsor, which is the legislature, or by the higher ed community that it's monitoring.

CAC: So, this gave the University of Minnesota a good deal of elbow room?

TD: Yes, absolutely, and they used it.

CAC: And the university took advantage of that elbow room?

TD: Yes . . . I would say, depending on who the governor was and how able the chairs were on the money committees in the state legislature. Those were factors that would determine the extent to which the university closely worked with state government on its biennial request. For example, in the early 1970s, when Wendell Anderson was governor, there was a fairly convivial, at least professional I thought, working relationship and there was a lot of communication.

CAC: Who was his chief of staff for that [unclear]? Was it John Haynes?

TD: Haynes had part of it; but, it seems to me his finance commissioner, who was at Berkeley and, then, went to Boston to be head of the redevelopment agency . . . I'm blocking on his name now. He was a real professional. He was there and that made a difference. Plus, he had other bright staff like John Haynes around. I think there was a climate of some regard within the university for the leadership in state government and we knew we had to respond in an appropriate manner to these accountability requests. If I can say one thing . . .

CAC: Please.

TD: . . . within our university, it seems to me, we varied in the extent to which we have, either in reality or it was perceived to be, had a relatively open budget process across the twenty some years. I think it was more open than other universities used at the time I did my study; but, it's also probably fair to say that it tightened up considerably.

CAC: When?

TD: Probably later in the 1970s. There was an interim period there. We had an acting president. We had transition in the vice-presidencies. Then, about the early 1980s, we began, I think, again to try to open the process a little bit more. Peter Magrath was president and we began a very structured, highly complicated, I thought, planning and budget process that then wove its way out across five, six years.

CAC: I'm sure you appreciate that to most faculty that is a great mystery . . .

TD: Yes.

CAC: . . . how this was done. Maybe, we should pause and think about Mr. Magrath: where he was getting his ideas; why he opened up; with what groups he communicated; how the budget was, in fact, shaped; how it was modified, whittled; etcetera. Is this an annual process or is it a biennial process? If so, how many people are . . . lots of questions.

TD: But, they are very fair questions. I would agree with you; my perception was that, outside of Morrill Hall, a lot of the time, it was quite mysterious and perceived by many constituencies to be a very mysterious process . . . maybe in general, but some years better than others. Magrath was a political scientist and I think he was fond of process or at least felt you could reach decisions through intelligently conceived processes but the other side is that if you process enough, you can also end up obfuscating your decisions and not really having to set terribly obviously priorities. But, you've involved everybody one way or the other; so, people won't object. The upshot is that we had a very detailed planning process. It came out of a model of rational planning, which Magrath accepted. Carl Adams was then a young professor of business administration . . .

CAC: My! very young, he must have been.

TD: Yes . . . was a consultant to the planning process. In my judgment, he was the one who recommended that a mission goals objectives kind of planning process, reporting system, be put in place and the president agreed. That's why it took six years, at least, to get [Kenneth] Keller to a point where, later, in the 1980s, he felt he knew quite well what the strengths and weaknesses were of these various units because the information had been tumbling out for half a decade or more. The nub of it is that it was both a centralized and decentralized, top down bottom up, process. Even if it didn't look that way, it actually worked that way. The mission statement that was out was already there, such as it was; but, the president wrote what he called an institutional planning statement which attempted to identify the broad goals, and directions, and priorities of the university as a higher education system. He sent that down then for review by deans, and faculty committees, and what not. Then, at the same time or shortly thereafter, he asked the colleges to prepare their own plans. In turn, the departments were asked to prepare their own plans. The trick was that they were asked to do it using this format of the mission goals and objectives. Once you start down that road, you create an enormous paper blizzard because there is no constraint, to speak of, on the number of objectives that an awake faculty or any other group can identify. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

TD: So, when all the stuff came back up, the institutional planning statement, which was supposed to be the president's sort of personal statement, moved up and down for a year or two years. Once all that paper from the departments came up to the top, the poor governance committees were then stuck with trying to review this mess. I remember Carl Auerbach almost having a stroke one day. He was either chair of . . .

CAC: The Law School.

TD: Yes, and then a dean eventually. Good citizen that he was, Carl chaired, I think it was, the Faculty Consultative Committee [FCC] and I walked into the room and sat down, since I was one of the planning staff so I should be in attendance, and he had these mountains, these

tremendous mountains of reports. [laughter] Two hundred departments had all written out and not in one or two pages [unclear] . . . they do what is right. He had all this stuff and that created a great deal of work and a great deal of effort, much of it outside of the knowledge or comprehension of faculty or other people.

CAC: I'm going to interpose here very briefly.

TD: Go ahead.

CAC: I was chair; I came to the chair in May of 1971 when the first telephone message I got was, "Take 2 percent off your budget," having no idea what the budget was . . . no idea. I did not, as chairperson in 1971, have access to the college or university budget. It was a closed budget.

TD: Yes.

CAC: I had to hire a research associate, administrative associate, which I managed to do, to go over to St. Paul and to university archives and copy the kinds of budgetary information that I needed just for one department so that when we were doing our goals and our missions, it was without a supply of the universe. Indeed, it was a joke that you if asked the dean for the budget, he wouldn't give it to you. That's an awful story you're telling that they're trying open it up and these folks at the departmental level . . . they don't know what the budget is!

TD: Yes.

CAC: Am I inaccurate on this?

TD: Not entirely.

CAC: Some more clever administrators . . .

TD: At the time that you assumed your chairship, I believe that was true and it continued to be true, to some extent; but, during the 1970s, one of the responsibilities of this planning and budget office, of which I was a member, was to create and make available information relative to budgets and the various measures and indicators that we use in budgeting, whether it's accounting student workload . . . that kind of stuff. Those reports started to get distributed widely. The other piece that I think it's important to know is that the university lived, during that decade, with an extraordinarily archaic financial reporting system. It's the financial reporting system from which should come monthly budget statements and kinds of information in an understandable format that the chairs, and department heads, and administrators should get. We did not have that available. That budget, that financial and reporting system—it's really an accounting and financial reporting system—was not an effective tool. It did not provide information that was clearly understandable and it did not offer it on a timely basis; so, I think right on into the 1980s,

if one was a department chair, or a head, or an administrator, you still had to work with your dean to try to get immediate information in a timely fashion to use for planning purposes.

CAC: I intend not to fault any dean. This is a conversation as well as an interview, you understand.

TD: Yes.

CAC: I came to have a sense—you can check me because you were looking at these centrally—that some deans were reluctant share a college budget of any detail because there were inequities between departments in salaries, in perquisites going to chairs or in some cases heads in released time, in obligation for course load, for example. These were so widely dispersed within the Arts College certainly, that it was very embarrassing to see what those discrepancies were.

TD: Yes.

CAC: I was just shocked as a chairman when I realized what was going on in other departments. Am I misreading?

TD: I don't think so. I think one explanation for that is that like the University of Wisconsin-Madison, I believe this institution has long had a tradition of really quite decentralized decision making at the college and departmental levels. For quite a long time, Central Administration, I don't think even really knew what the nature was of a lot of the decisions that were being made at the department level. Those conversations simply weren't held. If a dean had a little more inclusive style and chose not to have conversations with heads and chairs at the college level, there really wasn't anybody in this whole institution that knew really what the sense of those decisions was and certainly not the faculty. A lot of department chairs and heads were comfortable with a little more of a military model even though they prided themselves on their collegial instincts; but, when it came to making decisions and sharing information that drove those decisions or even explaining a decision, quite a few people chose not to say very much. There wasn't any publicized materials otherwise readily available, accessible.

CAC: Morrill Hall knew that this was the case . . . I mean senior vice-presidents and the president were aware of the lack of flow?

TD: Only incidentally in a way.

CAC: That makes planning impossible.

TD: Yes. Depending on who the vice-president for Academic Affairs was and how close that person chose to be to collegiate deans, he or she might know full well what was happening in colleges if not necessary in departments, but usually departments, too. Some of that knowledge

comes through review of promotion and tenure documents. My sense now is, let's say the decade of the 1990s . . . maybe a little bit in the 1980s, that there is more knowledge within the Academic Affairs group of what some of the issues are relative to promotion and tenure; whereas, in the earlier era, I think that was a fairly circumscribed group of people, maybe not beyond just the one or two, who really saw the flow of documents and from that grew quite well aware of where disciplines were [unclear], what kind of criteria were being used by departments for promotion and tenure, what rewards were . . . that kind of thing. My belief is that by the middle 1980s, once this tableful of reports had showed up from the departments—by the Keller era; Keller was then Academic vice-president—that Keller benefitted greatly from that mountain of reports. He is a highly intelligent person, a man of greatly effective work habits. He was there. He was the original enlightened iron butt if there ever was one in Central Administration. He read everything. He read everything! Once he went through all those documents, he was really, I believe, in a position to make judgments for well or ill about where funding should go relative to academic program priorities. He was the one who crafted the document titled Academic Program Priorities; so, by the middle 1980s, he started what has now been the ten-year—it's really longer than that; but it's been most significantly felt in our community over the last ten years—retrenchment and reallocation system. As you pointed out, that began in 1971 at least, and it has continued, and was visible in the early 1980s when the state went through some tough economic times and this institution had to retrench. The thing about what Keller started and [Nils] Hasselmo has continued—[Richard] Sauer, too, for that matter—is that they have retrenched fairly significant funds; but, they have also reallocated those funds into identifiable units for specific purposes. There are haves and have-nots. Among the dean and certainly within Central Administration, there is common knowledge of which academic units and which support services have truly been hit. I think that started with Keller and I think it started with his reading of the information that was, for the first time really, available in central to do that.

CAC: He was, after all, associate dean of the Graduate School and he learned a lot there. He was chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee.

TD: Yes.

CAC: And he is a quick learner and he was in a great department . . . Chemical Engineering.

TD: Yes. I characterize the budget and planning process together as opening up. One of the things that he did do in the middle 1980s, with President Magrath's concurrence, was to have a series of ongoing conferences between himself and the deans, as well as the heads of major administrative units. There was a series of conferences both to look at planning ideas that had emerged from the planning documents created at the department level and also a separate series of conferences relative to budget plans, the annual budget and the biennial request. They were enormously time consuming. Magrath attended a lot and sometimes [they were] not very fruitful.

CAC: Typically, how many people would come to such meetings and what kinds of folks?

TD: Not more than maybe a half a dozen in a room at any one time.

CAC: I see.

TD: It was small. It would be a dean . . .

CAC: That's a workable size.

TD: Yes, you can have conversations. Those conversations were an hour to two hours long. I staffed some of them; so, I know what happened. I was there. We had done the analysis. He had a budget and planning staff to analyze the reports that came in, either the planning documents or the budget requests. In addition, as part of this opening up process, they created a little more widely integrated staff—staff in quotation marks—which included volunteer faculty and some line administrators.

CAC: What do you mean by volunteer?

TD: John Turner, for example, comes to mind. He volunteered his time to sit in for six months as part of a seven to eight person group which reviewed the planning documents that came into central.

CAC: This was not through any senate committee?

TD: No. I don't know how they were selected or how they were appointed. There would usually be at least a couple of faculty members who came from and had a grounded experience in faculty governance, who were well-regarded in the community. They would join with some professional staff, like myself, and some line administrators and we would form a staff. Then, it would be our responsibility to sort through these various reports and to raise a series of intelligent questions about what . . .

CAC: Did the deans know this was going on?

TD: I think they did, yes. I think they knew that. They didn't object. What it did was it objectified the process a little bit more. Then, you could have a conversation. I think we even sent the questions out to the deans in advance of the meeting. We might raise a question on why they were choosing to move in the direction they were in undergraduate education or how they interpreted the lack or the success in scholarly output of their collection of faculty members based on what we'd seen from the vitae and what now. I thought it was helpful, specifically, because it gave the dean some sense of expectation of where Central Administration was coming. We need to talk about these items and then . . .

CAC: Presumably, these volunteer professors went back to their deans or their chairs and shared this information?

TD: They might have if they could walk; but, there's only so much you can do and these sessions went on forever. In order to prepare for the hearings, you had to do the analysis. Well, there's hundreds of academic departments and then all these other support units. Somebody had the assignment to analyze those; so, the volunteers would do their duty and then wobble away because they had to go back to their other lives. That was a good thing I think . . . helpful, even if it wasn't well-understood around campus.

CAC: Was the Faculty Consultative Committee part of this process?

TD: Yes, the president usually, if not, one of the vice-presidents. President Keller then would go to the faculty Consultative Committee and explain some of the directions. I have a sense though that the working relationship between that president and those committees left something to be desired on the part of the chairs of the committees. I don't know that they felt had quite as comfortable a working relationship as I understand they feel they have now with President Hasselmo and Provost [Ettore] Infante. Hasselmo and Infante, typically, go to those committees as sounding boards before they've gotten ideas clearly thought through. They'll run ideas past the Faculty Consultative Committee well before they've reached a decision and are looking for reaction. From a point of view of political decision making, Hasselmo and the provost use different kinds of decision making models. They will go and get information right off the start, right from the beginning, before they've even thought carefully through a problem. They'll come up with alternative decisions and ask for reactions. They'll give them some preliminary decisions, and let the committees really chew on them, and come back with alternates. Sometimes its a fait accompli decision and they are just simply doing it for courtesy. I think there's a little more variety than what I believe I saw in terms of how President Keller interacted with those committees. For the most part, he was quite a dominating personality and his style didn't vary an awful lot. He told people what to do a good deal, whether they were vice-presidents, or staff, or faculty committees, I would say.

CAC: I've heard that.

TD: [laughter] People may differ on that.

CAC: In the meantime, staff such as you . . . name some others who would have been your peers on this. How many of you were engaged in this kind of work?

TD: The ones that were there pretty much through the decade included: Rick Heydinger; Ann Pflaum who is on Continuing Education as an associate dean; Dave Berg who continues to be the director of MPIS . . .

CAC: Explain to posterity MPIS.

TD: MPIS is an acronym for a unit whose title is Management Planning Information Services. That unit, which he's been the sole director of now for twenty-three years starting in 1971, has

responsibility for policy analysis studies, budget development, and a variety of planning analyses and data analyses functions at the central level of the university. George Robb was involved to some extent. I think we were the ones most involved.

CAC: The same coterie had also then to confer with the Higher Education Coordinating Board, and the legislative committees, and the governor's staff or was that left to . . . ?

TD: There was a division of labor; but, those of us who were in this management planning unit, which was mostly Berg and myself, along with some other colleagues in that unit, would have the responsibility for legislative, gubernatorial liaison. In addition, in those years, Stan Kegler was vice-president for external relations, and he had clear responsibility for being the university's chief lobbyist, and he had some staff who worked with him. I would describe our work as behind the scenes work. We would provide the data and information, and clarify it, and work with counterparts for the most part.

CAC: You had an advisement to Kegler and others?

TD: Yes, that's correct; whereas, Mr. Kegler, and then the senior vice-presidents, and the president would carry the public roles, the . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

TD: . . . vice-president for external relations. At that time also, there was a beginning effort to provide the faculty more access to influence and lobbying of the state legislature. I think that Ken Keller might have been the first so-called faculty lobbyist before he moved into . . .

CAC: From the faculty?

TD: From the faculty, yes.

CAC: But there was also a free-standing from the Faculty—what did they call themselves?—Caucus Association or something, which was composed of any lobby of professors who wanted access.

TD: That was a voluntary effort.

CAC: Yes.

TD: We've had a so-called faculty lobbyist or lobbyists now probably for ten years. I'm not certain how that person is selected; but, I know that it comes out of the governance decision making system . . . maybe the FCC identifies them. I think the person has released time, for

example, from classes and does a rather systematic job of bringing out faculty points of view on a lot issues and then lobbies visibly at the legislature for perspective points of view, institutional and faculty driven.

CAC: This sets up all kinds of tensions, does it not, between Mr. Kegler, who is the official lobbyist and outreach person, and the person representing the Faculty Consultative Committee, and the faculty association itself?

TD: Yes.

CAC: That's not an easy thing to ride and coordinate.

TD: No, it isn't and probably another variable that's also difficult to control are the perceived needs of individual colleges or units to lobby the legislature over interests of their own. The classic case is that the dean or the department is looking for a new building and chooses to move outside of the university's general lobbying process in order to find support for his or her particular building.

CAC: Do such persons normally get the green light from vice-presidents and presidents?

TD: No.

CAC: I see.

TD: No. The perception is that there are mixed messages coming to the legislature from the university as to what its priorities are and the reading of the mixed message is, They don't have their act together. They don't really have priorities. If the music building, for example, was something the university wanted, why wasn't it ranked first? How is it I'm hearing from the chair of the Music Department, lobbying independently of university administration, in favor of that building, for example.

CAC: Those kinds of end runs were frowned upon?

TD: Yes, they are; but, they're not fully preventable.

CAC: I would guess that Agriculture and Health Sciences have their own regular liaison to the legislature?

TD: They do. Actually, Health Sciences added a person at an assistant vice-presidential level probably four or five years ago, who was himself a chief analyst in the House Appropriations Committee. Now, he's one of the chief lobbyists for the Health Sciences relative to their concerns.

CAC: How is that coordinated with the general budget from the university and its presentation?

TD: In a slippery manner. This administration has attempted to create a united front over the last four or five years so the discussions internally lead to decisions and priority setting for which there's general agreement internally. It's certainly not a perfect process. The constituencies are so powerful outside of the university that deans of strong units internally are certainly not going to . . .

CAC: The professional schools particularly?

TD: Yes, absolutely. The vice-president for Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics also has a professional lobbyist in his office now to match the Health Science lobbyist on the other campus. [laughter] The pie is shriveling, or shrinking anyway, at the state level and people see it in their best interest to make sure that they get information to legislative decision makers on their behalf.

CAC: In the meantime, there's another constituency we haven't mentioned and that is, the Board of Regents.

TD: Yes.

CAC: What was the liaison from Morrill Hall into the board when you were on this planning group?

TD: There were really multiple points of connection. The staff office in which I worked reported directly to the president and the president tended to get assignments from Board of Regents' members, which he then gave to us. But, in some cases, Board of Regents' members conferred with the director of our unit rather than the president personally and we got an assignment then from a Board of Regents' member to do a piece of work of some kind. Out of professional courtesy and political viability, of course, then we'd go back and talk to the president. [laughter] We'd tell him that regent so and so is looking for *X*, *Y*, or *Z*. That was not unusual. Other people could have access—by other people, I mean, collegiate deans, or heads of administrative units, or even outsiders—to the board through its own office. There is a director and a staff to the Board of Regents. Many people would try to see either individual regents or communicate at the board's monthly meetings by going directly to the board staff, trying to find access through that, by-pass, in effect, the president or the vice-presidents or anybody else. That happened. It's up to the board to decide whether it chose to hear the supplicant.

One thing I do think about the board is that there was a perception within Central Administration that it was quite an able board in the early 1970s and that there were a fair number of statesmen or stateswomen on the board who really tried to help create policy to advance the interest of the university but in the widest sense to serve the state. They viewed the university in that way, that it was there to serve the state and the wider community . . . but the state. There was some sense,

I think as the 1970s continued, and on into the 1980s, and later in the 1980s, that the board itself became more fractionalized, and argumentative, and was a less cohesive group, and that the members on it began to work to further the special interests from which they had come to the detriment of viewing the needs of the university as widely as possible and serving the state as widely as possible.

CAC: In your judgment, did this come from the change in the process for electing or selecting members of the board by congressional districts and the state legislators and senators from that district having the say? Does that make the regents more accountable to particular regions of the state?

TD: That's a good question and I don't have an answer.

CAC: Okay.

TD: I almost think it had at least as much to do with the people who were drawn into public life. There's a certain idiosyncrasy at work here. One example that comes to mind is the regent who typically had represented organized labor in the late 1960s, early 1970s.

CAC: David Roe?

TD: No, Neil Sherburne. I think Neil Sherburne was respected highly. He spoke for labor's interest when it was, I guess, imperative; but, he also spoke to the greater good. He was perceived, I think, to be speaking to the greater good of the institution. He didn't just carry labor's banner into every discussion; he really didn't. Whereas, once David Roe assumed that position, succeeding Sherburne, Roe is seen as an avid partisan for labor's interest, even to the point of intervening regularly in the administration of the university. He's famous for making phone calls singling out administrators and managers and berating them or at least informing them of what labor's point of view was relative to their behavior, particularly for units [unclear] collective bargaining. Facilities management, the former Physical Plant unit, is one where a lot of people feel in central that Roe had a profound effect and it wasn't positive. He protected union members at the expense of stimulating a unit to create better service for the university community as a whole. In the case of Sherburne and Roe, it was a change of personalities but a profound change in how they impacted the board as a board. I'm not sure why there were different personalities drawn. I don't know that it was the process. I do have a sense that in the last few years when there's been an advisory committee formed and a Blue Ribbon Committee to review the candidates, that often they have screened out the more bogus people and have come up with some, not all but some, who really are qualified and do the board justice. I don't have a better feel for that. I do know that individual members of the board though have exercised a lot of political influence at different points and that's contributed sometimes to a deterioration of our climate around here.

CAC: I interviewed one professor who was an associate or an assistant vice-president—these people come and go in Morrill Hall—and his observation was that during the late 1970s and the 1980s, and that's the time period we're talking about now, that no one in high place had time to think at all, not that they couldn't think and weren't high intelligent [unclear] studies, but that the pressures of the daily calendar were such that to administer at that level . . . you didn't control your own calendar. That's an exaggeration but that was his observation.

TD: I think his point is well taken.

CAC: They worked hours, and hours, and hours, and hours, and weekends, and so forth.

TD: And they still do.

CAC: Yes.

TD: In fact, there's a general sense that if you're not willing to work sixty-five hours or seventy, don't even bother to apply for these positions because that's what's expected. There is something else here though . . .

CAC: That's a more cruel expectation than many corporations would have.

TD: Yes. There is an issue here though about how well do the senior administrators in any era communicate with each other. How effective are they at balancing their work and life responsibilities? How savvy are they in stepping back enough to be able to talk to each other and reflect cogently not only on the work that they themselves are doing collectively but on the direction of the institution as an institution? It's very easy to get trapped in the sixty-five hour a week business and lose sight of the larger issues for which one as a leader/manager should be held responsible. I think there's been tremendous variation in my twenty years with respect to that.

CAC: Which of the high administrators really had that capacity to protect their calendar and find time to reflect?

TD: I could really be inaccurate about this; but, I really think that probably the most admirable system that we had was in the early 1970s. We had an ineffectual president in many ways—Malcolm Moos—but he had an excellent group of vice-presidents. The system that he created or they created with his approval involved one of the vice-presidents, Don Smith, serving as the executive vice-president—not in title but in actuality. It was Don's responsibility to create the agenda for the meetings that attracted the other vice-presidents. He would do that with President Moos but mostly on his own. He kept in really quite consistent communication with those V.P.s; so, none, I think, felt they were out of the loop and most understood prior to the meetings they attended what the agenda was and what was expected of them. Then, he kept

them on task. It wasn't very long—that whole group then split off and went in many different directions—a period there in 1971, 1972, where I think they were working long hours, as long as we've been describing them, but I do think they were talking to each other and understanding each other better and also thinking about larger issues, precisely because there was, if you will, better organization and management of their time. It was more structured and structured by an intelligent, and sensitive, and politically aware person, which is how I would characterize Don Smith, as I came to know him, before he went to Wisconsin.

Now, we've had trouble with what's called the president's cabinet . . . finding ways to bring that group of often disparate spirits but able people together in conversation sufficiently regularly in an intelligent fashion so that they can debate the merits of major issues that have institution-wide implications. Sometimes, it's because the president we've had has not had that skill of bringing his people together or did not value it. I hear a lot of stories now—this is 1994—that our present senior managers meet for two hours at a crack and accomplish very little, partly because the agenda hasn't been set, partly because they don't know how to communicate and listen to each other, partly because there's really no one who is serving as the facilitator, [unclear] controller, partly because they don't set assignments and hold each other to deadlines. These are very elementary things; but, I think they go to the heart of our problems with administration in an academic enterprise. You have to have some people who have simple meeting skills and communication skills even at the top or maybe especially at the top. You get very little progress but you get hours, upon hours, upon hours, upon hours of time invested for which there is almost no discernible product.

CAC: There are a lot of ceremonial things that these folks have to do.

TD: A lot. I also will say that I believe the roles of the deans have exploded. We have a series of programs that bring deans together in conversation about issues that affect their lives and their administrative responsibilities. It's just for the deans. I usually go to a sample of the deans and ask them, "What issues would draw you to a dinner and conversation with your colleagues?" They'll name a certain number and, then, I'll arrange the meetings for them. They all told me—I interviewed nine, I think, of the twenty-five—"We have to eat so let's have some supper and I can make myself available after that until eight o'clock or so." I said, "Fine." We set up a series of four meetings. This was two years ago. What we found out was that we could get about 50 percent there . . . maybe ten or twelve out of twenty-five each time. Frequently, when the others didn't come, I would get a personal phone call, or a message, or a handwritten note from one of the deans saying, "I fully intended to come. I wanted to come; but, events have occurred that I couldn't predict." What's happened, I found out in retrospect, was that most of the deans, especially of our larger units, are doing university business anywhere from three to five evenings a night, in addition to all day.

CAC: I'm sure.

TD: The result is they couldn't come even to the meetings that they knew they would benefit from where they would be doing business with their own colleagues who are people they often do want to see. We have to try to help them in some way find times when they can get together.

CAC: You go to national meetings and you've probably heard the same observations from administrators in other universities?

TD: Yes.

CAC: Some people have observed that Gus Donhowe, had he lived, might have been able to play that role that Don Smith did earlier.

TD: I think he would have and he was starting to.

CAC: That was really a great loss.

TD: It was a terrible loss. He was one of the few people with experience in finance and management at several levels, the public and private sector, who I think had a genuine respect and regard, even a fondness, for academic life and for the work of the mind. He demonstrated that over and over again, I think, convincingly to people. Some of his most enthusiastic admirers and supporters were faculty.

CAC: You bet.

TD: So, Gus transcended cultures. He knew how to operated in the business culture in its various manifestations; but, he was quite comfortable, maybe more comfortable, than any finance V.P. I've seen in twenty-five years, being part of the academic milieu and he did have the ability to communicate clearly with faculty. He was not bulldozed. On the other hand, he was not demeaning to academicians as such.

CAC: He knew how, in his personal life, to claim nights and days for music, for example.

TD: I think it's not an accident. Someone who finds that balance in human endeavor is someone who brings often an enlightened mind to the affairs of administration and doesn't get caught in this trap of chasing each detail down to its last breath, or getting involved in all sorts of things, or whatever. There's a discipline there that's really needed, an intelligence, to shape priorities.

CAC: Before we come to your more recent work, which is management but development of staff of all sorts . . .

TD: Yes.

CAC: . . . do you have anything to add to the turmoil that surrounded the Keller years? Were you in Morrill Hall?

TD: Yes, I was.

CAC: Do you have anything you could share on those events? They moved awfully fast.

TD: They did; but, on the other hand, the trails that led to the president's demise, I think, were visible. You could see things happening in central that were leading to an isolation, I believe, of him from his colleagues and from others and a narrowing of the sharing of information about the governance of the university. Let me be specific. There had always been a series of meetings that the president had held, most presidents held, at least with their vice-presidents of Academic Affairs and Finance and usually with other within that vice-presidential group who were seen as influential; so, it was, in effect, the president's cabinet, so-called. Our office staffed that operation for many, many years. Shortly after President Keller assumed responsibility, he disbanded the cabinet. He simply took counsel from himself and from some faculty or others he chose; but, he did not have a committee of near peers chewing on and reviewing the major issues that will perk to the top of an institution like this. It was a terrible, terrible mistake. He used his vice-president, I believe, on specific assignments that were not shared with anyone else in the vice-presidency. David Lilly was the only person who knew what the expenditure line was at Eastcliff. David Lilly was the only person who knew that certain resources were being stockpiled into central reserves. David Lilly gave that information to the president only; but, it wasn't shared. Now, that's the kind of issue, the use of university reserves, that benefits from having collective intelligent review and decision making in the best interests of the institution. I don't believe that happened. I think that Keller, for all of his spectacular gifts, tended to isolate himself in process and, in some ways, even in personality, even initially. By the time some of the revelations were made that cast aspersions on the judgments involved, it was too late. The damage was already done and he was a dead duck. He also, I believe, did not appoint strong people who would challenge him. You could see it in a couple of his appointments . . . those that he made. There's a premise that a confident leader, by definition, brings in the most able people that he or she can find so that from that, those set of conversations and relationships will grow the best kind of decision process. I don't believe that he welcomed that. In terms, in just some of the structure and some of the process and some of his personal decisions, I believe he was setting himself up for a situation that would have been problematic at best; but as it turned out, it was a disaster for him. It was an avoidable disaster. As a matter of fact, personally, because he was doing so many things by himself, he wasn't giving our staff assignments. As a result, I got bored; so, I started to do more consulting . . .

CAC: [laughter]

TD: . . . and was hired by St. Mary's College to develop a graduate program for them. I took a leave of absence during part of the Keller era, half-time, and I went over to one of these private colleges, and learned about the adult education market, and sustained a program that is still going

on. I taught more. I took on more classes. I cut back on my administrative load because it was disappearing and moved into other areas which I was more interested in at the time. When Hasselmo came back, I came back. I guess that's what I would say about the Keller era.

CAC: That's very helpful. I have to take your initiative and your judgment. We've covered the major themes, not that you couldn't go on for another five hours about stories and details. But have the essential ingredients of that role in Morrill Hall pretty well been covered now or do you have some other things you would like to say?

TD: If I could say one other thing?

CAC: Sure.

TD: I do believe that over that era, over that time period of perhaps fifteen to eighteen years, there was an expansion of administrative staff in Morrill Hall mostly along specialist functional lines; so, you saw an enormous growth in the attorneys. There was one in 1971. There are probably twelve or thirteen now.

CAC: And a lot of it is farmed out to private firms?

TD: Oh, an enormous amount is farmed out.

CAC: Do you have any idea what the order of the investment in lawyers is?

TD: No, I don't know. Not only there, there was a growth in some of the promotion and news relations staff. There was a large growth in foundation staff. There was a growth, of course, in the staff of which I was a member. The unit hadn't existed and when I left, there were ten. Computer and information systems professionals . . . some of whom were in Morrill Hall as well as in other parts of the institution. What I'd like to suggest is that with that growth of administrative staff, chiefly in response to demands again for accountability from outside, what we created was a large pool in and around Morrill Hall of people who tended to share similar values and interests. They may have had different training but certainly, in general, it was not the training of a faculty member. I think, like anywhere, there was built a set of informal relationships and informal relations. Even the senior people who came out of the academic ranks . . . the longer they stay in Morrill Hall, the more they talk to themselves; so, I had a real sense by the late 1980s, despite all these different trends that we've talked about, that as an entity, Central Administration, personified by Morrill Hall, was not only perceived across the university community as a more distant citadel, it, in fact, has become a more distant citadel. One of the absolute by-products is the terrible complexity and confusion over trying to communicate successfully from Morrill Hall to the rest of the institution. There are other things happening to drive people further into their own enclaves at the department level—and we haven't talked about that yet. I do believe that no one is sort of to blame; but, also, it's an unrecognized reality that administration has grown up in Morrill Hall and we haven't quite found a way to sustain and

bridge the personal and professional gaps between that entourage and much of the rest of the institution as an institution. We pay a price for that. There's a gap there, a lack of trust, a lack of respect, a lack of regard, and most especially, a lack of information about even what people are doing. I think it's important to say that.

CAC: Or it's a body of information that nobody can understand?

TD: Yes. That's still with us today. That issue is there. It's not just our issue at this university, although we're decentralized and very large in comparison to some peers; but, it is an issue that other large-scale institutions struggle with.

CAC: But would also recognize that in the main, those pressures were external to the university. The growth in the legal . . .

TD: Legal, and finance, and budget . . .

CAC: And patents.

TD: . . . and patents, and all of that are requirements that have escalated from the federal government, state government, granting agencies, funding agencies.

CAC: And from individuals who sue the university?

TD: Yes. A lot of the people who are prepared, even at the graduate level, to assume those positions may or may not be people who fully understand the academic mission of departments; so, the more that we compartmentalize, the more risk there is that some of the values that ultimately drive planning and budget decisions will be divorced from, or not informed at least, by the value that many of the faculty hold. I think there still is a real issue of institution-wide governance. What are the most appropriate vehicles or structures for that? In addition to that, clearly [the issue of] leadership and management of individual departments and colleges. Maybe that's a bridge to our next part of the conversation. I believe that's part of what I see.

CAC: Before we leave it . . . one final question and that is, to what degree and with what authentic insight do you think President Hasselmo recognizes the barriers that accountability have created in management style and in communicating to the various constituencies the university has?

TD: I think he's well aware of it; but, I think he's struggling now with how to deal with those barriers and he doesn't have a clear set of strategies, or tactics, or ideas even about how to do that and about how to improve what's happening. I've heard him say, "I don't know what I can do. I've gone on television. I've gone to meetings all over campus. I've put things in the *Daily*. I write things in newsletters. I go to faculty governance meetings."

CAC: But, he can't stop litigation.

TD: No.

CAC: And he can't stop the need for computer control of information.

TD: No. He's trying to explain, I think, as best as he can what is happening to the university; but, I believe that he feels he's simply not getting his message out or if he's getting it out, it's not being received or accepted.

CAC: One imagines that Mel[vin] George has to join the staff precisely for that mission.

TD: Yes. Mel George, as a matter of fact, is having some lunches now with small round-tables and invited chairs and heads just to talk to them, tell them what's going on—six at a crack—in Morrill Hall.

CAC: Bravo!

TD: That's a good thing.

CAC: But, he has to reach out to the larger community as well. That's an interesting job.

TD: The other side of it is even if a president is able to consistently get the attention of wide numbers of members of this community, what does it say to them? How much do you try to explain the character of what's happening outside of the institution and how it's affecting us? You can only get the attention for a short period of time. Typically, that time is used to explain some sort of priority for the institution, some planning, some budget request, some reward. You have these snippets of time to use and it's very difficult to explain complicated social changes and institutional behaviors outside of our boundaries that are truly influencing what we try to do with ourselves and our time. It's a challenge that will be on the table. [laughter]

CAC: This does create a good bridge to the present position you have . . . the last five, six years?

TD: Yes, this is the sixth year.

CAC: There wasn't the job until you took it?

TD: That's correct.

CAC: Were you given a green light to do this job and given various kinds of folders of expectations? How was the job described and how were you chosen?

TD: When it was clear that Nils Hasselmo was a leading candidate for the presidency . . . in fact, it may have been down to when he was one of two finalists, both the office of Academic Affairs and MPIS, Management Planning Information Systems, independently of each other, crafted a proposed set of agenda for those two offices. MPIS would report directly to the new president should it be Nils Hasselmo and the academic office, of course, is led by the provost who reports directly to the president. What each of us identified in our respective offices was a need to help entice faculty members to become chairs but more importantly that once they became chairs and heads, or otherwise academic administrators, that we give them some kind of preparation to help them deal with this very kind of complicated changing environment that was affecting their lives. It was well understood in Academic Affairs that the recruitment of chairs and heads was going in the wrong direction. An able faculty member just didn't want to step up and assume that job, partly because of legal issues more and more, partly because of how much time it took away from maintaining viable research versus the rewards that were there, partly because the student body was changing as was the staff and it was more difficult in some ways to handle personal issues and personnel issues . . . a whole set of reasons. Work lives felt more attenuated and demanding. The end result was that college after college . . .

CAC: Let me add one more thing.

TD: Go ahead.

CAC: It's in the way of a question mark. There was a smaller pool of persons who were moved by general citizenship and loyalty?

TD: Yes.

CAC: Maybe that begs a question then, Why was that the case?

TD: These were discernable trends that were occurring and in Academic Affairs, I know that they were of great concern because it was felt we cannot have a viable academic community unless talented faculty will be willing to help lead their colleagues at least for part of the time. It rests on that assumption. Collegiality rests on that assumption.

CAC: The assumption that the real work of the university goes on in the departments, the divisions, and the programs?

TD: Yes, absolutely. I think there's that recognition even within central, maybe not in the attorney's office or the auditor's office; but, I think broadly speaking within Morrill Hall in the decision making arena, that's well understood. The upshot was then that when Nils Hasselmo was selected president, he then reviewed the agenda that we independently had given to him and he agreed that it was time for the university to commit itself to the preparation of academic administrators for their work as academic administrators. In fact, he had begun to hold some meetings with his deans and department heads and chairs in 1988, which was his last year as

provost at the University of Arizona, Tucson, campus. Once the decision was reached by the president, then there was just a question of who should do it. I had a Ph.D. I had a master's degree, a couple of bachelor's degrees. I had graduate status as an instructor.

CAC: You had a track record.

TD: I had a track record. I'd done a lot of consulting, had created these management programs at other institutions, and I was close to both offices.

CAC: And you wanted to do it?

TD: I wanted to do it. After fifteen years of preparing budgets, I was ready for a different breakfast. We reached agreement. Then, it was up to me to do a needs analysis and determine what we should try to do as an institution. I did do that. I used about twenty-five interviews with people from divergent groups all over campus and the main question I asked them was, "What's the process we should use to create some kind of program that will be accepted by the faculty and seen as viable?" My sense was that you couldn't really do it out of what used to be called the Personnel Office and use trainers because they simply would not be accepted by intellectuals. We had to find a way to create this so that it would earn the regard, or at least the curiosity, of our faculty and not be dismissed out of hand. The second question was, "What's the chief priority? What should programming try to address?" The interviews were wonderful. We don't have to time to go into them now. They were with faculty administrators, civil service, a whole bunch of people. The consensus overwhelming was that, unlike other institutions, we ought not to start at the top. We should start, not necessarily at the bottom but at a different level.

CAC: The mezzanine floor.

TD: That's the one! Overwhelming, people felt that the chairs and heads were in the most precarious positions, especially those moving in. They had almost no support, virtually no rewards, and nothing but headaches.

CAC: Nothing but apologies and "Good luck. It's too bad. You're going to do it for three years." There was the sense that it was all rotating. You just rotated in and rotated out.

TD: That's it. Of course, there are many subcultures around here. There are some professional schools where the heads are heads in the more traditional sense and they have sinecure almost for life. That's the case in the Med[ical] School. In IT [Institute of Technology], they serve for five years. CLA [College of Liberal Arts], in my judgment, is somewhat on the other end of the continuum.

CAC: Rotating threes.

TD: I think the faculty have made it quite clear that that's what they feel is appropriate; but, I do think within CLA itself, there's a widening understanding that three years just can't cut it and that you really do need first among equals, that somebody has to assume little greater sense of responsibility, and help bring the group together, and lead it because it's so difficult these days to be a really successful academician, carrying as full a portfolio of responsibility that it's possible to carry.

CAC: And trying to take care of your own career, in the meantime, and your own graduate students.

TD: Chiefly, taking care of your career. Then, we had some focus groups to help sift through different ideas on programming for the chairs. It took a couple months to do this. We ended up with really, I thought, a very thoughtful, useful little plan about how we should proceed. The first thing on the agenda was a program of evening seminars, taught chiefly by chairs themselves on topics that they selected that we would compare with topics being looked at other universities, at other management leadership training programs. That's what we did. We had a thirty-hour seminar series, about one every three weeks, roughly three hours a crack, from five-thirty to eight-thirty with a meal. My job is to find the most able people on campus who know something and are expert even about an aspect of academic administration and bring that person in. It's informal. They talk to each other. We have a session before dinner and then a dinner with a little wine thrown in. The social piece is very important to allow people to digest what they've heard and simply to get to know each other. Then, we have a second session and people are gone by eight-thirty or so. It's been a very successful series no matter how you measure that in terms of participation, post-session evaluation. I did an evaluation. I did a set of interviews one year with half of the group six months after they had completed their thirty hours. I asked them if they had learned anything in the sessions that they transferred into the administration of their departments. This was eleven, I think, of the twenty-five who went through that year. On average, each could point to three separate actions that he or she had taken that they felt had increased productivity, morale, enhanced the administration of the department, and in some way made life better . . . something they had learned about in our sessions that they had not heard about before that they introduced. Everything from opening up, let's say, a P&T [Promotion and Tenure] process to include more faculty members who are part of that, to changing the budget process. Some chairs and heads now are meeting with their faculty at least once a year, one-on-one, outside of the P&T process, outside of the salary process to talk about what is that faculty person's agenda and how can I be helpful as a chair or head? The chairs and heads who have done that—I've heard from them—each one has said it's made a tremendous difference, particularly in bigger departments, to find out really what their colleagues aspirations are and then to be able to say, "How may I help you?"

CAC: Most of the departments I know well, and there are a large number of them, speak of scholarship, teaching, and outreach, or administration, or citizenship, whatever it may be called. It's weighted very heavily in that order, right?

TD: Yes.

CAC: To what degree have these seminars been able to address the values that underlie that hierarchy. It seems to me in talking with lots of folks in this project that that is a crucial problem. It's the reward system.

TD: Yes, I agree. We have a variety of different kinds of programming; so, this first one that I've just described, the merits I've suggested . . . the purpose of that program is to help faculty members understand some of the roles and responsibilities that they have to assume and to find resources in the university community to help them do that. Sometimes that has meant that we've had reason to ask them to think through these questions of faculty career and faculty development and rewards; but, we basically tried to help them just simply learn the basics so that they could get some of the things done. We haven't spent as much attention on more critical, very deep issues, like the one you've just mentioned. We have another series whose purpose is to help individual academic administrators develop specific skills of administration, such as planning, budgeting, performance review. We have almost 100 hours of free courses that we offer during the year, about three to four hours a crack in the morning. Again, I found people within the university community who are especially good at whatever that is. We don't use very many vendors from outside. I'd be happy to share these materials with you. The administrators will come to pick up what they need when they need it from that menu of courses. The next thing that we're going to try to address is really exactly the question you've raised. I've been asked by the vice-president for Arts and Sciences and by the president to create some additional opportunities that would bring chairs and heads together to start talking about some of the issues that are at the heart of the so-called U-2000 Plan. One of those issues is how can university enhance undergraduate education in a community where the faculty overwhelmingly are rewarded for their scholarly endeavor?

CAC: Which means their graduate student [unclear].

TD: Their graduate students and scholarly endeavor. Another is an issue, of course, with a wider sense of community in this place. There's a lot of feeling, I believe, and I think it's accurate, that we're splitting apart within our departments, across our departments, between the college and the central. All the way across the whole system, people are being compartmentalized more and more in their daily lives and they're working harder maybe, or longer if not harder, at trying to keep up. There's some sense of detachment—not desirable—that they're feeling even from closest colleagues. That's an issue. The big issue from my mind is the one that you mentioned earlier. It really has to do with the multidimentionality of faculty lives. Of the roles that one can play, to which to give the most weight and why and how . . . ?

CAC: And how do you evaluate?

TD: . . . do you evaluate and reward these? My sense, in talking to administrators and faculty the last month or two, is that there's an enormous chasm between Central Administration and its

various plans, including some strategies for addressing the issues I've just mentioned, an enormous chasm between them and the colleges, especially between central and the department and almost pathetically so between central and the individual faculty member. There's discord, dissonance here, between the agendas set by an individual faculty on the one hand for all the benefits and requirements that it suggests and the institution as an institution on the other, which is trying, I think, to be more responsive to the outside constituencies and adjust it's priorities. We have to find ways to close some of those gaps or bring them a little bit more in concert or I think we face very trying days because we're going to see, as we have before, our state funding, if nothing else, continue to lessen. If the widespread perception that our faculty really don't care about instruction at the undergraduate level persists, we're going to have trouble internally, I think, maintaining what we've . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: . . . body language, it's clear we're getting to present concerns that are of deep interest to you—and to the interviewer.

TD: [sigh] Yes.

CAC: Not that the others were not.

TD: I have a lot of regard for our faculty and individual faculty members I've met and I find of those who have become friends that this is a dilemma for them as well. They came here to participate in the life of the mind more than anything else and to find people of kindred spirits. It's hard for them to find anything that's as appealing or motivating as an excellently done piece of work, scholarly in nature and revelatory in its tone. It's a wonderful contribution for a human being, I think, to do, to create that and to share that with somebody else. It's one of the almost beguiling purposes for which this institution exists. I think we have to do this and we have to reward this above all. It's one of the things that makes us different and more interesting, in some ways, than other institutions, higher education or not. Clearly, we have a complex mission before us. This business of serving students and the wider interests of the state, I feel, has to be looked at intelligently and responsibly with decisions made about how can we do that? How can any group of faculty members, any department do that? What I'm seeing is sort of some cynicism, particularly in members of faculty in the professional schools, who are doing, by their own admissions, wonderful work in scholarship, and in attracting first-rate graduate students and teaching them, and maybe making a lot of money by consulting, who feel utterly removed from the wider purposes for which the institution exists. It's not just that they're part of a disciplinary group or they're part of a wider professoriate that goes beyond state boundaries or national boundaries. It's kind of living in splendid and happy isolation from the institution in which you're housed, sort of like you're a roomer or a boarder and you want nice conditions or I won't be here. I'll take my booty and go. One of the critical issues in my mind is how can we help

encourage faculty to do their best at what they're really good at but also to support them when they contribute something that enhances the community spirit and the well-being of the institution as an institution?

CAC: Even if those contributions may be difficult to measure and weigh?

TD: Yes. There's a good deal of conversation going on now nationally at other universities and among professional associations. Some of it has to do with trying to redefine what the teaching function is; so, it becomes, in and of itself, more galvanizing for faculty, that they begin to see that they can teach and communicate or at least disseminate inside information in a variety of ways, not exclusively through the lecture method, which is the method of choice most typically. Once you find you're getting something back intrinsically from using a variety of teaching approaches, for example, that, in and of itself, is a motivating factor. If you're not very good at teaching, why would you want to do it? You may do it because you have to; but, you don't do it because you want to. I think you're much more likely then to wish to invest your time in what you really want to do, which in this case might be scholarship. There's a question of our weighting our reward system, weighting the criteria we use. I know departments are struggling with that. Some will openly, after a discussion, identify the weights that they choose to use in promotion and tenure and in salary decision making. I see more willingness to probably reward a variety of activities when it comes to merit decision making. Although scholarship drive is the driving engine, there are departments that will weight teaching and service to the community or internally in some fashion, at least to recognize to the recipient that this work is valued. I think in the promotion and tenure area clearly scholarship should carry the day and it typically does, by and large. Getting promoted and tenure are important decisions; but, one way some people are looking at it is you do have a career of maybe forty years of service to the institution and while those decisions for promotion and tenure may be based nearly exclusively on scholarly productivity and, perhaps, should be, there still are a lot of other decisions made during the course of one's career.

CAC: You get another thirty-four years to go.

TD: [laughter] People are beginning to look more at that as an issue, too . . . how to help faculty continue to do well after promotion and tenure.

CAC: While were on this subject, let me press you a bit further having in mind a comment made by a professor I was interviewing the other day who said that it was sometime in the 1970s—I think that it was during [Henry] Koffler's vice-presidency—that the measurement of merit for distribution of salary increases within a departmental unit came to be—the interpretation was made—weighted far more heavily on traditional kinds of publication as the chief criterion and that it was that merit system that, over a ten year period, meant that there was a growing gap in salaries of different persons in the same rank and of the same seniority. They are making contributions of a different sort. He said that the merit system as interpreted and implemented during the 1970s . . . I'm asking you this because you were in Morrill Hall; I don't know if

making budget whether this was something that Morrill Hall was aware of or not. I can cite departments where full professors of the same age and tenure . . . the salaries may run between $40,000 and $95,000. That's, I have witnessed, very subversive of morale within a department.

TD: Yes. I'm not in a position really to answer that in as informed a way as might like because I didn't review the promotion and tenure documents and I wasn't privy to those conversations for any one individual. I have a sense though that, unless there was some very unusual reason, central would not intervene in the decision reached at the department level.

CAC: But we were hearing the signs from central.

TD: You were not?

CAC: We were . . . that that is the way to go with merit . . . that if it's going to be only a 5 percent increase for a department budget, don't do it across the board. Don't do it cost of living . . . none of it. You do it entirely on merit.

TD: I would concur. I think that was . . .

CAC: The message was very clear.

TD: Merit . . . then it becomes the issue that we have talked about.

CAC: Yes.

TD: How do you define merit at the departmental level?

CAC: In the cultural climate of the 1970s, it was the merit that we've been speaking of the last ten minutes.

TD: Yes, that's what you meant. I didn't see Central Administration suggesting to units that they should redefine their sense of merit at all.

CAC: Oh, no, no, I should say not.

TD: It's just that merit is . . . yes, I would agree. I think that's still pretty much the case—although, it may not be as this decade proceeds. It's very difficult to envision a faculty energized, for example, and wishing to teach at the undergraduate level, and experiment in its techniques, and keep advising hours, and all of that if there is no adjustment in the reward system or the assumptions that drive it. Now, there are other things that a chair, or a head, or a collegiate administrator can consider doing that I do think can affect the culture of the department or the college. There's a whole [unclear] of possible things that send out messages that we value what you do in a variety of ways—if that's what's desirable. It may be a moot point if we're in

a unit whose faculty feel quite comfortable in doing what they're doing and rewarding themselves as they're rewarding themselves. But, if you make the assumption that somehow the agenda of the faculty should in some fashion discernibly be reflective of the wider institution's purposes, then I think there is room for the conversations we wish to have this year and later because these are thorny and difficult questions whether you look at promotion and tenure, whether you look at reward, whether you look at what are the components of a departmental culture. Should one do anything to try to change that in one direction or another? Wider climate issues, issues of what roles might a department, or chair, or a head assume in trying to create a discussion and even move changes in some . . .

CAC: Or in letting individual faculty members go to their own strengths.

TD: Right. I know there's movement in different departments to begin these conversations; but, I also know, given the demands on most faculty, that these are not issues that are necessarily being talked about. They really aren't. People feel fortunate if they can do what they're doing as well as they're able, let alone take that longer, more reflective step backward, forward, sideways, and say, "Is this what we're about? Is this what we really should be doing? Is this what we want to commit ourselves to?" I think it's quite an interesting challenge and I look forward to finding ways to bring colleagues together and in a civil manner start talking through the various subissues and the options that are open to people because it seems quite clear if U-2000 disappears into the vaults of Morrill Hall, after all that's been said publicly, and attempted privately, and within our own councils, we won't be better off for it as an institution. It will feed the cynicism that central administrators really can't serve the community, can't define issues in any real way and address them, and they make up these show and tell exercises that collapse unto themselves. I don't believe that's going to help at all.

CAC: At least three or four persons I've interviewed have suggested that the public, the citizenry, the community, faces now the most overwhelming problems which our political system is not addressing successfully; and that the university above all other institutions should be able to address in some way these issues which emerge out of our near community, whether it's the metropolitan area, or whether it's the state of Minnesota, or the region of the Upper Midwest and that unless those issues can be identified and addressed by the faculty, that is where you regain the credibility with the citizenry of this institution. That's slightly different from the system of rewards that we're talking about.

TD: But, I see it as a very valuable factor. Just as one could work to enhance or in some way to modify or change a departmental culture through individual behaviors, irrespective of promotion and tenure or merit, it is true that a redefinition or at least a serious review of applied research, technology transfer, of consulting—What is that? What are those things?—are well worth talking about because our faculty could serve their need for scholarly advancement in many ways should they choose social issues that of themselves are inherently complicated and that are crying out for an informed, objective, professional analysis that's lacking right now in a climate that seems to value political sloganeering and simplistic solutions. It's possible to

positively redefine and recommit to the Land-Grant mission and do it in a way that serves many masters, I think. But, if we have the kind bogus gap between teaching and research or between research and service and we maintain those gaps, then, of course, a faculty member is going to choose scholarship. He or she has to. But, I don't think it has to be that way. Some people are arguing that there's scholarly work beyond the colleges of education that would be helpful if one applied it to the teaching and learning function. Other people are arguing that clearly the community in the widest sense could benefit from highly intelligent and discernable research projects. I think there's a lot of food for thought in looking at it that way. The reward systems could be modified in some fashion . . . particularly salary. There's a wider issue here of whether we can help create a sense of institutional community that's [unclear]. I think if one sees oneself as part of a larger community with both rights and responsibilities, then it's easier to think more broadly about how we reward the behaviors that help to enhance that community, whatever they might be. But if we see ourselves as iconoclastic individualists working in a specialized area of human knowledge on our own terms, then, of course, we can only call for rewards that will be consistent with that effort. I think that's the challenge. Administrators can help that. Administrators and faculty need to think about these issues of community and how to address them carefully over time. That also would be part of what we would be trying to do with our programming.

CAC: What is your sense of the new standards—new the last two or three years—of liberal studies which are to have university-wide application, one of which is student service to the community as I understand it?

TD: I think it's probably too early to tell yet. I have a sense that there is more variety in teaching. Faculty are trying other methods than they might have before. There is a little more use of technology in classroom applications. I haven't seen a really good study of the student evaluation processes. I do have the sense that with smaller classes—which is one of our planning priorities . . . to reduce class size—that students are somewhat more satisfied. I think, too, they're getting more instruction across disciplinary areas, which potentially may be more fruitful for them. I know that some are involved in service projects specifically; but, I haven't seen anything about that.

CAC: It's expensive and difficult to stage.

TD: Yes.

CAC: It seems to be it's at the intersection of having the university address public issues and if one can engage undergraduate students in that process of service and then analyzing and evaluating what they learn from that experience, whatever the internship or the volunteer activity may be . . .

TD: But, there's an issue of here of how does one conceptualize one's course? I think if we can make certain that students are introduced to concepts and ideas consistent with the direction of

the field but marry that with learning experiences that involve at least some applied learning experiences that take them into the community, we really are in good shape. To the extent that we don't do that, then I think it hurts us in terms of the affinity the students have for our programs and for the institution because they see that as academic learning and not wholly transferable to their lives. I wouldn't want us to make the mistake of essentially doing technical education. These kids have to be stimulated intellectually and for that only faculty can make a judgment call.

CAC: Oh, absolutely.

TD: Variety will help, I believe, in a classroom and that's a slow process . . . helping faculty see that they can do other things differently but just as well. There are converts out there. There are people who are talking to their colleagues about that.

CAC: The direction of this program that you have . . . to whom are you responsible? Whom do you report to?

TD: I report to the associate vice-president for Human Resources, Carol Carrier. I report directly to her.

CAC: Then, she reports sideways to the . . .

TD: To the provost, Jim Infante. It looks like we probably will be going to the Bush Foundation with a proposal. Both the president and the provost feel it's in the university's interest to provide some more resources so that this kind of programming that we're discussing can be done.

CAC: Oh, absolutely, Tim.

TD: Part of what I'm going to be doing in the next couple months is getting advice from faculty, and administrators, and other constituencies on how to frame and cast a proposal that might elicit positive Bush support. That will make a big difference. Right now, we're on such limited amounts of money and staff that the things that really go well and work well, like the sessions for the deans or the new chairs . . . we just can't offer enough opportunities because we're spread so thinly, at this present point. Then, Anne Hopkins, the vice-president for Arts and Sciences, also was willing to commit some funding, again, to the same issue of having faculty administrators begin to try to address these terribly difficult questions and find some answers to them. We'll try to facilitate that in some fashion.

CAC: You've got a real challenge.

TD: It's well worth it.

CAC: Obviously, you love it.

TD: If we can do some things well here, then we're thinking a bit about extended programming outside of the University of Minnesota, as part of our Land-Grant mission if you will, to provide administrative development training and workshops and even consulting to other higher ed systems and private colleges. There's almost nothing in our region to which people can go and have the kind of conversations that we've been talking about and almost no one is prepared to be a manager/administrator. In some of our other institutions they do log longer tenures as administrators than is the case here, since they don't have the scholarly piece to attend to. It's all learning by the seat of your pants and good people have done it for centuries; but, it is a more complicated world and it's easier to make a mistake that can be hurtful to oneself and one's colleagues and have legal implications, consequences. We think there's a larger mission . . . the answer being the university here, if you will, building a kind of continuing ed unit within Central Administration but in partnership with others in the university. But, before we would do that, we want to put up this new programming and hopefully make a difference.

CAC: This may be a good point to resolve and turn off the machine. Before I do that, however are there other ultimate thoughts you would like to share with posterity about your experience and your understanding of this sprawling institution?

TD: One of the things that I've learned in this last five year period, as I've had an opportunity to work more widely with colleagues throughout this sprawling institution, is that it's a remarkable, remarkable entity and one that if society hadn't supported or created, I don't know what this society would look like. It's very rare that you can find a place that attracts the collection of able people who are given, almost as a birthright, the opportunity to do intellectual work together. There is no other institution quite like this with its multiplicity of purposes. The Rand Corporations and R&D [Research and Development] institutes are not the same. The entertainment industry that houses a group of intellectuals, the media corporations . . . none is quite like us. We are unique and distinctive from every other higher education institution or system. I glory in that. I'm glad to be part of this. It's an institution that has transcended centuries with a mission that's highly different but utterly needed. I'm glad it's been protected, mostly by society, from itself. I think it is important to be radical, to return to our roots, and to think very carefully in this modern era about how best to do what we do. I do think that some of the criticism that shoddy scholarship and, maybe worse than that, useless scholarship is a charge that we ought to take seriously. There is something insane about specialization of knowledge the way it's going so that many people end up writing for these obscure, esoteric journals that a tiny number of other scholars read and their whole lives are energized around and directed to doing that. Now, what about that entire intelligence and the capability of that human being? Could that person not be doing related tasks or at least focusing on more broad issues, when they're out in society begging for us to try to recognize them? I think there are some criticisms that are well taken . . . that we're too isolated, too preoccupied with minutia of academic adventurism, that we don't manage ourselves and our resources as well as we can. I think in the next five, eight years, we need to do something serious to change those and, in turn,

attract people to us who feel that they can be vibrant scholars but who also if they wished to, say, during the course of their working lives, might shift gears somewhat and still stay in the flow so that the institution as an institution really is responsive . . . setting it's own direction as an intellectual enterprise; but, also being simultaneously responsive to the issues of our era. I think if we can't do the latter, we're going to be seen as increasingly irrelevant and someone else will assume those duties and gain the rewards thereof, whether recognition, or funding, or money, or however you define it. I'd hate to see that because I think of universities as one of the most viable institutions in human society wherever they've been. It's certainly true in North America. There's reason to think about reform, not wholesale but at least on the margin to be part of that.

CAC: That's a good ultimate statement!

TD: [laughter]

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:
Hermes Transcribing and Research Service
12617 Fairgreen Avenue, Apple Valley, MN 55124
(612) 953-0730