

Jeanne Lupton

- Youth and education 1
 - Washburn High School, Minneapolis 2
- Lupton - University of Minnesota, SLA and College of Education, 1940-44 2
 - West, Edith 2
- Lupton - high school social studies, Chaska, 1944-47 2
- Lupton - teaching assistant, University of Minnesota, 1948 3
 - lack of opportunity for women 4
- Lupton - at Mankato State Teachers College 5
 - teaches history 6
 - dean of women 6
- Lupton - University of Minnesota - position in General College 6
 - teaching, counseling 6
- Lupton returns to Mankato, 1954-60 and returns to University of Minnesota, General College 10-11
- Council on Liberal Education 12
- College of Biological Sciences created, 1965 13-
- Lupton joins administration, 1967 14
 - Shepherd, Gerry - his role 16, 19
 - funding - NSF, Department of Education 16-
- Lupton - director, Student Services, CBS, 1972 19-
- Council for University Women's Programs, 1970 20
 - Lupton becomes chair, 1973-74 22
- Lupton becomes assistant to President Magrath 23-25
- Minority programs 25
- Student activism 27
- Regents and University of Minnesota's South African investments 28
- Magrath's administrative style 29-32
- Lupton - dean of General College 32-33
 - new student constituency 34
- Commitment to Focus, 1984-85 35-
 - impact on General College 35
 - standards raised for Associate of Arts 36
 - Lupton lobbies Regents 36-37
- Child Care Center 37-38, 43
- Student Affairs 39
 - draws on president's reserve 40
 - work for disabled 40
- Women's issues 42
- Lupton assistant to Hasselmo, Nils 44
 - reorganized president's office 45
- Work in community 45-47

Interview with Jeanne Lupton

**Interviewed by Professor Clarke A. Chambers
University of Minnesota**

**Interviewed on August 8, 1994
at the Home of Jeanne Lupton**

Jeanne Lupton - JL
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers having a conversation with Jeanne Lupton, who played many different roles at the University of Minnesota for many years. The interview is being conducted in her home in University Grove. It is Monday, August 8, 1994 in the morning. That's for the record . . . *provenance*.

Jeanne, you have a long attachment to the university. You took your baccalaureate here, and you took your MA and your Ph.D. here, and you taught here, and as we will learn, you did many, many different things. I'd like to start very briefly with a bit of your background and why you got interested in teaching and why social studies. I see you were a high school teacher for three years before coming back to graduate school. Tell us a little something about yourself.

JL: I have a sister. Our parents were in Illinois. We were born and raised for a number of years in the Chicago area. Our mother had been an elementary school teacher. Our father was a railway mail clerk, an occupation that no longer exists. That was a time, in the Depression period, when there wasn't a lot of money; and our father and mother were determined that they would provide us with an education. We lived in the Chicago area and the only way we could do it was to live at home; so, we moved from Chicago to Minneapolis. They said they could not afford it otherwise. Our parents always said, "We won't be able to leave you much in terms of money or anything else; but, we'll do whatever we can to provide an education and, then, you do what you can with it." That was our beginning. The time at the university was, for both of us—my sister is four years older than I—one in which we would work summers. We'd work weekends. We'd work Christmas time and so on to try to help out.

CAC: Just like Minnesota students now.

JL: The typical help yourself whatever you can and in that period of time, there was not the loan program or anything else. The folks did without a lot of things to be able to put us through. We'd always been kind of geared toward education just because of what it meant. In high school, I had two very, very good teachers. Miss Goldsworthy—I'll never forget—scared the heck out of me; but, she was just a wonderful historian. She taught the American history. A man by the name of Halverson dealt with the social studies aspect of it. They were just prime teachers. I was, indeed, much influenced by them.

CAC: What high school was that?

JL: Washburn High School in south Minneapolis.

CAC: That was one of the best in those days.

JL: Yes. When I started at the university, I found out very quickly that literature was not for me. I have no imagination. [laughter] I had to deal with what I considered realities. I thought of psychology. That was just a nice expression; but, I didn't really know what that meant or what I would do with it. I had had a very, very poor background in math education because of a series of things, moving from school to school and, then, having teachers that let me grade papers for them and not really participate in some of the course work; so, I could not go into science. At that time, the education of the university was to require particular areas of interest; but, there was no specificity in terms of fulfilling the science requirement, for example. I was able to fulfill it with psychology and psychology lab. I just steered my way around and I'm probably one of the most poorly educated individuals over all.

CAC: Among other places, you end up in Biology Sciences. [laughter]

JL: That's right. Exactly. [laughter] I, then, went through the university, moved from Science, Literature, and Arts at that time to the College of Education. I had, as both my practice teacher and mentor, Edith West, who was very well-known even at that time. She had been growing in position in Social Studies.

CAC: She was a person of great authority, wasn't she?

JL: Yes. She, too, was very influential for me. I graduated in 1944 and took my first job, which was at Chaska, Minnesota, for three years teaching history and social studies. I had started taking certain summer school courses when I was teaching in high school because I found, as I taught, that there were a lot of things I really didn't know in history that I should know. I was there from 1944 to 1947. In 1947, I started back into graduate school and, at the time, I was going to be married. I decided I'd help out in getting monies together; so, I stopped after one quarter and started working in the business office at the university. I worked there for nine months and that broke up. I'd had Professor Don Beatty in my fall class that fall quarter that I was in. When I was planning to go back to school, I was going around to the various instructors

to see if I could begin where I had left off without having to retake. It just so happened that a teaching assistantship [TA] had opened up. Someone had been appointed and, then, was not coming. So, I was able to get a teaching assistantship in the fall of 1948.

CAC: These are the GI Bill days and lots of undergraduate students.

JL: Yes.

CAC: Some of them older than you, I would guess?

JL: I would think so. This is a period when the GIs were still there and in the undergraduate classes. Luckily, they did want to take a woman. [laughter] There were two of us that were teaching assistants at that time out of the History Department.

CAC: Who were females?

JL: Yes. That, again, was a terrific learning experience; plus, it was a lot of work in terms of trying to pick up the graduate work and then dealing with the TA position.

CAC: I'm going to interrupt you briefly, as I will frequently as we go along.

JL: Certainly.

CAC: That was a classic History Department.

JL: At that time . . . that's right.

CAC: Whom else did you study with? Mr. Beatty in Latin America and American Diplomatic and who else.

JL: [Ernest] Osgood and, then I TA'd for him, Herbert Heaton in Economic History, Rodney Loehr in American Economic, [Lawrence] Steefel in Historiography . . . I was also taking Political Science as one of the minors with Asher Christianson of that period.

CAC: Ohhh.

JL: As I went on then with the Ph.D., [David Harris] Willson in English History. Those were the key ones that I had.

CAC: As a young student, did you realize what a fine faculty that was—not that they were all equal.

JL: You were impressed and you knew that their names were known elsewhere. I started going to the local meeting of, it is now, the Organization of American Historians and the American Historical Association.

CAC: The old [unclear].

JL: That's right. You'd be well aware of the fact that these people were well-known. I had had [August C.] Krey as a senior in my baccalaureate program. That's how I had first had contact with him. He was a dear, delightful man and very fatherly, but also very traditional in terms of what he saw for the future for people in general. I'd finished the master's that first year I had the teaching assistantship. Then, to go the second year—they allowed two years at that time—it was a matter of whether or not I would go on. I determined that there wasn't much else for me to do. [laughter] Apparently, I was moving along all right.

CAC: A.C. Krey was the chair of the department at that time?

JL: That's right. He asked if I'd come in and talk with about it. I did. He made the comment that, indeed, he thought I could participate effectively in a Ph.D. program; but, he did want to let me know that there was the general opinion that most women really should not pursue this level because sooner or later they'd just start on something, and never finish it, and take the places of the men who would, of course, go on and finish it. He said if I did decide to go on—that was up to me—he wanted me to realize that there would never be a great push in placement for me because they just didn't think I'd stay in it.

CAC: It's ironic. There were two giant women on the faculty then: Alice Felt Tyler and Faith Thompson.

JL: I know.

CAC: Did you study with either of them?

JL: No.

CAC: As a woman, you weren't attracted just to try that out?

JL: No. It wasn't an area. I was looking at the areas of interest.

CAC: Sure. Alice Felt Tyler was somewhat in Diplomatic . . .

JL: A little but mostly social intellectual history. I had some of it but that was not my main goal.

CAC: You were sensitive to these issues primarily in a negative then? You got signals that there wasn't much promise, however promising you were?

JL: That's right. It's the lap of the gods kind of thing.

CAC: But, the model there of Alice Felt Tyler didn't impress you?

JL: You've got to realize . . . think how long it took them to get a professorship.

CAC: Oh! [unclear] 1951, they still weren't full professors.

JL: Yes, that's what I mean. It was that kind of situation. You thought you had to deal with the area. At that time, I was naive enough to think maybe it was it was just the area that they were in that set limitations. [laughter] I'll go ahead and say it . . . Alice Felt Tyler didn't cozy up to women at all. Her favorites were the men and that came through loud and clear very quickly. Faith was very sweet and very supportive; but that was not an area of interest that I had, the Medieval [History]. It was an interesting period. At the end of the two-year period, I was actively looking for jobs. Economically, without the TA-ship, I could not go on and, at that time, quite properly I think, the policy was that each TA could have just two years in the History Department. That was when there was a very strong secretary by the name of Louise P. Olson in the department. We had gotten along very well in terms of everyday things, and in terms of listening, and in terms of having lunch with her, and so on. She, always, of course, opened all the mail for every one and got word of this position at Mankato.

CAC: [laughter]

JL: They wanted someone just temporarily because one down there was going to go to finish his doctorate . . . maybe one year, maybe two; they didn't know. She gave me the message to get down there right away. I did and I got the job. [laughter] This was the mentoring of that period. Mankato, at that time, was still a state teacher's college, concentrating primarily on the development of their education program; but, they had a small and growing liberal arts segment in all of their departments. It was compatible with what I had done in high school, but also with the idea of advancement in connection with the straight history activity. They were pushing the doctorates like mad. They were trying every way to upgrade the faculty and the history department.

CAC: They were not yet a state university?

JL: Not at that time.

CAC: They were still a state teacher's college?

JL: Yes, a teacher's college. It's in the mid 1950s, then, that they make the change. It was conducive to continuing. I taught Ancient History; Ancient History was the one that everyone had to teach. Then, others just concentrated on American, which was unusual at that period of time, particularly in a state college. The first year went swimmingly and I enjoyed it. As I was trying to decide what I was going to do the next year, the one person was coming back but another was going to take a partial leave and they had an opening for a dean of women on a temporary basis because she was going to finish her doctorate. So, for one year, I was dean of women but also you dealt with all the students.

CAC: This is an early introduction to student counseling and that whole area.

JL: That's right. That was an interesting experience all in itself . . . the days of the panty raids and the days of . . .

CAC: Oh, my . . . even at Mankato.

JL: Even at Mankato. Those two years went speedily. Having had that experience and knowing even there, I must have the doctorate in time, I decided I might as well as go back and finish it up without lengthening it out. That was the time that General College [GC] did work closely with the History Department through [George] McKune and Bill Stout . . .

CAC: Oh, yes.

JL: . . . to try to work the TA-ships so that there was compatibility. As a result, I got the TA-ship there. In that period of time, General College was still following the philosophy that you take the student where the student is not where you want him to be and then move in that direction.

CAC: Was Horace Morse still alive then?

JL: Yes. Horace T. Morse was the dean. This was before they had moved into much more of the occupational areas and all as they did in the late 1960s and 1970s. It was still concentrating on what I think was a good general education that provided the student with lots of opportunity to move into these specific areas of interest.

CAC: Was it a two-year program then?

JL: It was just a two-year program.

CAC: Then, they would transfer?

JL: Then, they were transferred. The Associate in Arts degree was provided.

CAC: It was kind of the community college for the university.

JL: Exactly.

CAC: Excuse me. There wasn't any other community college in the metropolitan area?

JL: No, not at that time.

CAC: So, it was serving that function.

JL: Yes. At that time, too, probably about 35, even to 40 percent of the students transferred directly into other university programs. That was a much higher rate than was to be in the future. Of course, the concentration was on teaching the application of the general education approach for students to be able to relate what they were dealing with in the classroom with their background, their interests, all of that, but still with the goal of, if at all possible, moving on into other areas.

CAC: In specific terms, what did that mean in the classroom teaching history?

JL: For example, in connection with, say, teaching American History . . . At that time there was so much more of the chronological approach. Even then, we were dealing with the problems approach or the social issues approach, still incorporating all of that, what I'd call, direct knowledge, but in a frame of reference that related to particular kinds of things.

CAC: What issues were in the forefront at that time?

JL: For example, one quarter, we had a program on—it would be social studies as we would think of it—social problems dealing with the police in the community.

CAC: I see.

JL: Even at that period of time, you were relating the issues of crime, of sociological problems, with what is going on in the community. We'd have case studies. We'd have contact with the police structure. We'd have contact with the court structure. We'd bring in lecturers, as would think of them, to deal with those particular kinds of situations.

CAC: Would race have been one of the issues?

JL: Not very much. When I got back in the 1960s, it was the key one; but, at that time, it was just on the fringe.

CAC: Poverty?

JL: Yes, and housing was beginning to be a part of it. It dealt, too, with the returning vet[eran] from the Korean war, as he had to reemerge as a citizen. It was much more of a problems approach.

CAC: And diplomatic as well as domestic?

JL: No . . . concentrated almost exclusively on domestic.

CAC: You had Korean war veterans but not a discussion of America's position in Asia?

JL: That's right. Depending upon the quarter that you picked to teach, you could vary that. For example, in one or two quarters when I had it, I tried to deal with the world view in terms of what happened. Here's the Korean War. What happened to bring that about . . . still a problems approach.

CAC: When you're a graduate, it feels like diplomatic history.

JL: That's it. There was a great deal of freedom at the General College to do with a course what you felt was reasonable in connection with the course. At first, I was TA-ing so I had to follow the other; but, the second year . . .

CAC: Did you get to TA for either Stout or McKune?

JL: For Stout both times and then for Forrest Harris.

CAC: This is fifty years later and their reputations for classroom . . . what did you learn about the classroom from them?

JL: Again, following very closely on that idea, you looked on the student as (1) an individual and (2) found out just as much about that student as you could in relating to moving him or her from where he was to where you wanted him to be. It was still that approach. You're not assuming automatically that all these will make the giant leap that you hope will be forthcoming and so adjusting constantly.

CAC: Were there many minority students?

JL: Very few at that time.

CAC: We want to get this down.

JL: That's right. Six years, it's very different, indeed. There was a lot of experimentation going on in connection with classroom methodology and there was great freedom in trying various things in connection with it; so, it was another learning experience. The second year I was

there—I was still a TA—one of the instructors became ill; so, for two quarters, I became a part-time instructor. That's when I was able to focus on what I wanted to do in connection with the course work.

CAC: You mentioned earlier that the case method was one technique. This wouldn't slip sideways into History itself until twenty, twenty-five years later. What kind of cases were you using? Were there case books that one could use?

JL: No, no.

CAC: Documents books.

JL: It was just a matter of pulling various readings together.

CAC: So, you had to do it yourself?

JL: Yes. The paperback was beginning to come forth at that time and then through the lecture and then through the reading, you'd try to round this out in terms of what your goal was in connection with the course.

CAC: You speak accurately of the concern of the student and where the student was; but, the student load must have been quite high?

JL: Yes. At that time, for example, all of us had an average of fifty students as advisees; and they carried on their famous testing program, whereby, in these seven areas of knowledge, students had to pass five of the seven before they could achieve an associate degree.

CAC: I see.

JL: All instructors participated in that testing and participated in the advising related to the results of that testing.

CAC: You really got to see these fifty students rather regularly?

JL: That's right. We would have advising right at the beginning, of course, to introduce ourselves to them. Then, at least, once every month, you were supposed to meet with your advisee and if they didn't come in, you were supposed to contact them. Then, before the testing, we had a requirement that they had to come in so that they were really aware of what this testing meant. Then, there was the follow-up to that as to what maybe they should take the next quarter. It was a very rigorous, active advising program and it worked at that time. It really did work.

CAC: The concern even currently is to make the university more user friendly, as we say.

JL: That's right.

CAC: It's that kind of intimate care . . .

JL: It's that follow-up that makes a difference.

CAC: General College was ahead on that.

JL: Yes. I've had some, probably through the 1970s and into the early 1980s, students still contact me over time . . . a couple of them problem students that had trouble and wanted to talk things out.

CAC: Sure.

JL: You view it with mixed emotions . . . oh, not again and, yet, so glad that they were willing to make contact and talk out some problems.

CAC: Were you in a position, given your own position as a woman in a male History Department, to, the word now is, empower, encourage . . . did you have a green light to win them? Was that in your mind at that time?

JL: It was wherever there was one that wanted to approach me on it. I had still—probably I have been all life—the idea that the individual has to do something herself in relation to these issues. If you're concerned, you just can't ignore it or talk about it, you've got to try to do something. I wasn't looking for women to approach. If they were there and needed help, I was more than glad to help; but, it wasn't just concentrating on women alone.

CAC: Again, it's kind of an anticipation but this breaks later in the 1960s and 1970s.

JL: Yes.

CAC: We'll pick that up later.

JL: Those were great learning years. I took my pre-lims in the fall of 1953 and in 1954, I went back to Mankato because they wanted me back full-time. I needed to finish the thesis, of course; so, I concentrated on that. I got through in 1956 and was interested in looking around for other jobs; but, at that time, our mother had a serious accident and I felt I had to remain close in the Minnesota area.

CAC: Sure.

JL: I went on in General College and expanded very great activity. I was able to introduce a Diplomatic History course. I was able to introduce some course work . . .

CAC: This was when you came back in 1960 as an assistant professor?

JL: No, this was in 1954-1960 at Mankato.

CAC: Oh, I see. It's at Mankato, you're doing this. I'm sorry.

JL: They were at that time introducing a master's program. It's when they first started to. They'd just gotten state university status. In fact—this is an aside—in 1952, Mankato tried to get the university interested in taking it instead of Duluth.

CAC: I see.

JL: That was interesting, too—it didn't work. I don't know if you know the name of Ted Nydahl or not? He was the chair and had been out of History at the university here. He was pushing to really expand the History program there so there were lots of opportunities. Then, moving into what was their master's work for those still concentrating in education, that wasn't it; but, for the social studies teachers to get them more to the particular field instead of to the methodology. There was a lot of activity going on at that time. I had kept contact with a number of people at the "U", as you do. Forrest Harris and I were in Graduate School together and he was a very good friend. It was in 1959 that Bill Stout was found to have cancer. In the fall of 1959, Forrest contacted me and asked me if I'd be interested in coming back. I was because of the good experience there and I felt really I'd gone about as far as I could in Mankato. It was beginning to become a little more routine and I guess I'm not very good with routine. [laughter] I thought here was an opportunity to move back to the Twin Cities and still stay within range of care of the parents. I came back in the fall of 1960.

CAC: John Wolf was . . . ?

JL: John Wolf . . . I'd known him. He was a good friend. I'll never forget that fall when I was waiting for the bus and he was waiting for the bus—I lived over on Como at that time in a little double bungalow; but, I often took the inter campus bus on a route to 28th and then walked back and he rode the bus because he was here in the Grove—and he said, "We're just so glad to have you back on campus; but, you know, we never would have taken you in the History Department."

CAC: [laughter]

JL: I said, "Yes, that was very clear, very clear." [laughter] At that time, Harold Deutsch was chair and Don [Beatty] was vice-chair. I was able to teach summer school for the History Department. Then, I started to fill in for various people like you and others that were off in the basic American History course. I was generally teaching half-time then in CLA [College of Liberal Arts] and half-time in GC. The second year I was at General College, Forrest went off on a political appointment with Art Naftalin, who was mayor; so, "Hud" [Horace Morse] named me chair of the department, which was very unusual.

CAC: Because of your youth or because you were a woman?

JL: That I was a woman, yes. They had never had any woman before.

CAC: Isn't that interesting? They were so progressive in so many ways.

JL: That's right. "Hud" was willing give me the opportunity. I was appointed to the first Council on Liberal Education as a GC representative; so, he was able to provide me with opportunities that I hadn't had before.

CAC: This is the early 1960s that we're talking about?

JL: That's right.

CAC: Who chaired the Council on Liberal Education?

JL: Don Smith.

CAC: And this was under [Meredith] Met Wilson?

JL: Yes.

CAC: What is your memory of that council and its work?

JL: It was a very, very hardworking council. There was good representation from all the units, I felt. I think I probably learned a lot more than I ever would have learned otherwise because of this exposure. It was the first time I had exposure to individuals in the sciences and in terms of their philosophy, their approach, their interest in students or their lack of interest in students . . . it was on both sides.

CAC: Excuse me. That is an interesting side comment because we don't often think of committee work as being a learning experience or a broadening experience for a young faculty person. That's just right . . . there's an orientation.

JL: It was just superb, really.

CAC: If you'll forgive me . . . interviewers are supposed to interview.

JL: No, no, no. That's fine.

CAC: I don't think we overlapped on it, but I was in it in the mid 1960s also. I found it a less rewarding experience. I found they just meandered.

JL: Starting out, I was just lucky, I think.

CAC: You bet! They were a high-powered group.

JL: It went on for about a year or a year and a half, 1964 to 1965, right there. Personally, I learned a lot. Also, I became much more aware of university politics in terms of the jockeying for position of the various groups, the various interests, whether it's science, or philosophy, or what have you.

CAC: As a junior person, you could take a more distant view of this.

JL: Yes, very definitely. It was a tremendous learning time. Morse gave me a lot of opportunities that I wouldn't have had otherwise. I will always credit him for that because he was one of the few. As you know, he died in 1965 and, at that time, Al Vaughn became dean. It was at that same period of time that the College of Biological Sciences [CBS] was being set up. I had read about it and I'd heard about it; but, I didn't know anything at all about it.

CAC: This was part of the breakup in the Arts College?

JL: That's right.

CAC: Physics and Chemistry went earlier and then Biology.

JL: Biology was all over the map . . .

CAC: Yes.

JL: . . . in CLA, and in Agriculture, and in Vet[erinary] Med[icine], and in the Medical School. Vice-president [Gerry] Shepherd determined that there should be a task force to look into what would be the new biology of that period, the molecular approach, the cellular approach that had not been focused upon.

CAC: Bringing into one household . . . ?

JL: That's right. It's weird the way I've gotten jobs. My husband was a stockbroker. I was married in 1962. Bob was a stockbroker and worked with a man whose wife was working in the Graduate School, [Martha] Hostettler. I don't know if you remember her? She was an assistant to the dean of the Graduate School. When Biological Sciences opened in the fall 1965, she went with the college as assistant to the dean, Dick Caldecott. She only was going to keep it for a year because she was planning a family and did go ahead with a family. We had had some social contacts together, and she knew I was at the "U", and I knew she was at the "U". Out of that came her suggestion that Dick Caldecott contact me about being his assistant. As I said, there are these weird contacts that provide you with different opportunities.

CAC: All institutions have networks.

JL: That's right. The woman's network was really beginning to grow in that period, too . . . much more so than it had before. I did talk with Al Vaughn about it. I asked if he thought there would be any chance for me to go into administration there. At the time, there were too many others, too many men lined up. I thought, I'll take a chance. It was agreed, both within CBS and General College, that if it didn't work after a year, I'd go back to the General College because I wanted to preserve my tenure.

CAC: Of course. Did you have to get up to speed in Biological Sciences? How did you do that?

JL: Not quite. They wanted someone out of the Liberal Arts. They were just developing their undergraduate curriculum. They had more people in science than anything else. They wanted someone from the Liberal Arts. I'd sit for awhile in meetings and then I'd go work a dictionary just to become acquainted with terminology. It was a learning time. At the time I went with the college, there were nine students in the college. I went in January of 1967.

CAC: It means there were nine graduate students?

JL: Nine students, undergraduates. They were just starting up.

CAC: Each of these must have had graduate students in the department?

JL: They did have graduate students in each of the departments.

CAC: What was the size of the faculty, then, that was brought together . . . roughly?

JL: It was about thirty-seven. Some had been teaching in Agriculture. Some had been teaching in the Medical School . . . all the way around.

CAC: Were they brought together physically, geographically?

JL: Part of it, yes . . . everything moved except Botany and Zoology on the Minneapolis campus.

CAC: Were they administratively part of your group?

JL: Administratively part of it.

CAC: Otherwise, they had offices on the St. Paul campus?

JL: That's right. This, for a long period of time, as you can imagine, caused a great deal of consternation in the travel time and in the movement.

CAC: Ohhh. Excuse me. Was there resistance within the Biological Science Departments to this kind of coordination?

JL: On the whole, I would say the only resistance came from the two Minneapolis-based colleges because they came out of the College of Liberal Arts.

CAC: What was the advantage for the other departments?

JL: The concentration. For example, Genetics was taught in three different places and this brought the coterie of researchers and teachers together. Biochemistry had been taught in Agriculture, and in Vet Med, and in Medical School. The Medical School biochemistry remained; but, the others were brought into CBS. That still is a bone of contention.

CAC: But then, they had to share the basic courses and the advanced courses, didn't they?

JL: That's right.

CAC: Sometimes there's jealousy about a course.

JL: Dick ran a tight ship for that period. He was an excellent . . .

CAC: What was his own particular field?

JL: It was genetics.

CAC: Did he continue teaching?

JL: No, he didn't because the administration was just unbelievable at that time.

CAC: He had to encourage all these folks to get together and work in concert.

JL: That's right. We had meetings, and meetings, and meetings.

CAC: I'll bet.

JL: You had to. Communication, communication, communication . . . try to hear it out. You almost felt you were a circuit rider going around from department to department and then getting the chairs of the department together.

CAC: Now, Shepherd and Wilson were both very supportive?

JL: Very supportive of that. Without Shepherd, it wouldn't have worked at all.

CAC: Was their presence known? Did they come?

JL: Gerry did. He was just an active supporter.

CAC: So, he could back up Caldecott?

JL: That's right. He gave Dick a lot of support. That first year, he was meeting with Dick and the faculty all of the time.

CAC: Wilson was more distant?

JL: Yes. Shepherd was the one that really pursued it and caused it to happen.

CAC: Did he have specific rewards for those who were quicker, more . . . ?

JL: Now, this is a thing that is causing some difficulty. There was agreement that there would be a very limited teaching load. CBS, to this day, has the lowest teaching load of any college or department in the university.

CAC: That was one incentive, a trade-off, to get them together?

JL: That's right. There was a lot of monies provided for support for setting up of labs and a very active support for recruitment of people outside that were well-known to bring it up just as quickly as possible. Then, of course, there was support for the new building. That's where I got involved with grants and all.

CAC: Did you have to do groundwork for the new building?

JL: I worked with a fellow by the name of Lee Snyder, who was the science person on it. He would do the leg work in connection with what was needed in the labs because I didn't know one lab from another. Then, I would do all the compilation of what this meant in square footage, what it meant in equipment, how you followed the federal guidelines because they were wanting federal support for it. I wrote the grant for the Biological labs in Kolthoff Hall because, at that time, there was space and they needed to teach on that Minneapolis campus. The National Department of Education had a program that would give support to that; so, I wrote that grant—and we got it. I don't mean it was that . . .

CAC: Was this to the National Science Foundation [NSF]?

JL: Yes. It was a National Science Foundation and the Department of Education. They were working together on pushing science at the time. I learned a lot. I didn't know anything about

science; but, I knew what it meant in terms of how much square footage you needed for this kind of a course, and this kind of lab, and so on. It was a tremendous learning experience.

CAC: If persons want to follow up on this, they can do so with printed and manuscript records, and reports, and memorandum; but, do you have a rough sense of the increase in federal funding that came when you were administrative assistant in the College of Biological Sciences? This was from 1967 to 1972. A lot of money is coming in.

JL: There was both state and federal. Of course, the state gave backing to building, the big center over there.

CAC: Yes.

JL: There was a big political fight. They put it up first in 1968 . . . the legislature.

CAC: What's the nature of the fight?

JL: The College of Agriculture fighting . . .

CAC: For it?

JL: No, fighting against it.

CAC: But, it's going to be on their campus.

JL: But, it was another college.

CAC: I see.

JL: The stories they told about the limited number of students . . . it would never go, all of that. The first session, it didn't go; but, then in the second one . . . When I went in 1967, there were nine students and by 1970, there were about 185 students. We were really building like mad.

CAC: Good gracious.

JL: These are undergraduates. Of course, the state legislature was interested in undergraduate education even then. That was our big ploy . . . this need.

CAC: Did you testify yourself or did you go to the legislature?

JL: Dick did most of the testifying but I was backup in terms of the detail of what the building would do for the students. Although this was a research building, there would be undergraduate research and undergraduate opportunities because of it. It was that kind of relationship.

CAC: I push you on this point because I have suggestions from some that the lobbyists for the University of Minnesota, the president, but then whoever was responsible for carrying it through, was very jealous of his prerogative and didn't like other people coming in. I'm wondering, did you testify . . .

JL: This was the time of [Stan] Wenberg; he did not follow that. He wanted to know everything that was going on; but, he wanted the ones that knew the information [to be] there. There was no problem in that period going to the state legislature. Dick did receive funds for federal visits and all. He took most of those, of course. There was no problem at that period of time.

CAC: That's important to know.

JL: That was very important to the college. It was growing. We went . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

JL: . . . and Zoology was beginning to make its move into molecular and cellular; so, the younger ones were just beginning to take hold there. There were numbers of grants, sometimes small, sometimes large, coming in for the younger faculty—and some of the older ones, too. The younger ones were using, what they called, the new biological approach. It was a very active time in connection with that. Of course, in connection with all the grants, the dean had to guarantee that there would be lab space, there would be all the support necessary.

CAC: Sure.

JL: Central Administration was extremely supportive.

CAC: I don't know how to ask you this next question without making it a leading question. In science generally and education generally many would see, not from the inside necessarily, that the era of 1940, let us say, to 1965 was Physics and Chemistry, that the action was going to be in the Biological fields in the 1970s and 1980s. I think in some ways that proved to be the case. My question, in that leading way, is, How aware was Mr. Caldecott and other faculty persons of the shift of the whole field of science to, what we used to call, the life sciences, botany and so forth.

JL: I believe that was Dean Caldecott's greatest strength in terms of being able to push that philosophy.

CAC: So, he was very self-conscious about it?

JL: That's right, very, very much so. He was able to recruit individuals who were also in that same philosophical mode. I think this had a lot to do with the fact that the college did grow internally but also grew in some stature in a very short period of time.

CAC: To what degree did an ecological concern [unclear]?

JL: That was just beginning to show itself in the early 1970s. It's at this period of time that what became the Freshwater Biological Institute was beginning to take hold. There were some in what was the old Zoology that were now moving into ecological problems and concerns and in Botany, too . . . Eville Gorham and that coterie.

CAC: Gorham was out of Botany?

JL: Yes, right. This is a period when Dick began to recruit in that area as well. He had what he felt was the strength that he needed at the time in Genetics . . . what became Ecology, now the Ecology Department. The move [was] in terms of recruitment in Zoology and Botany. Eventually, as you know, the old departments disappear and the new Ecology Department finally comes forth.

CAC: Shepherd was out of Electrical Engineering, which is quite a different beast. Was he aware?

JL: Yes, he was.

CAC: And willing to see that it happened?

JL: He was supportive the whole time. It wouldn't have happened if he hadn't been pushing actively. I just know it wouldn't have happened.

CAC: In what practical ways was his influence felt?

JL: I mentioned the teaching load and in terms of specific economic support to Caldecott for recruitment, full support for any of the grants that were forthcoming, if possible, and full support for the buildings that were online.

CAC: Those are lots of things.

JL: Those are lots of things that have a great affect upon build-up. By 1970, besides 185 students in CBS, I was actively in contact with about 50 Agriculture students and over 200 CLA students that were wanting to transfer into CBS because it was an upper division college.

CAC: This is why you then become director of Student Services?

JL: That's right. It was just becoming too big. I couldn't do all these other things Dick wanted me to do and he let me choose which job I wanted. At that time, there were a lot of people recruiting him from outside and I could see him leaving—he didn't—and I thought I'd better get into a position that would give me a little more position to move from that time on. It was in 1972 that he split the position, and kept an assistant, and I became director of Student Services.

CAC: Was this both for graduate and undergraduate?

JL: No, just undergraduate . . . concentrated on undergraduate only. I had contact with potential graduate students to try to refer them to the right people. We got them to the discipline advisors just as quickly as possible. I had the training programs for the faculty advising.

CAC: Were you also advising students from other colleges who were enrolling?

JL: That's right. Norman Kerr was associate dean at the time; so, technically he was responsible for the undergraduate program. As director of Student Services, then, I handled all of the busy work in connection with it. I became quite proficient in the vocabulary of biology. The students didn't know I didn't have a science degree; but, if they would go into anything in depth, I'd refer them right away. [laughter] It was a fascinating period; it really was. We had very small staff. I had two young women that worked with me and we handled, in all, between 500 and 600 students by the time I left.

CAC: Norman Kerr was associate dean?

JL: Responsible for undergraduate education.

CAC: I should interview him. Is Richard Caldecott available? I know he's fully retired.

JL: Yes. He's retired now. Oh, yes.

CAC: He lives in the area?

JL: Yes. If you ever want to go into that in more detail . . .

CAC: Oh, I have to. I think that's a very important story.

JL: During that period of time—one other thing I should bring up—the Council for University Women's Progress [CUWP] started.

CAC: Please, do.

JL: It started about 1970. Informally a number of us women . . .

CAC: On whose initiative?

JL: Remember Mabel Powers?

CAC: Oh, yes, she was in Counseling.

JL: Mabel and Phyllis Kahn was a research associate at the time, Caroline Rose in Sociology, Anne Wirt . . .

CAC: Out of Morrill Hall?

JL: Yes, that's right.

CAC: Who was the convener? Who really took the initiative?

JL: At that time, it was just sending around a memo and anyone interested would get together. That's what started it. Then, Carolyn and Mabel really did most of it in the early days. It included not just faculty but staff, graduate students . . . just tried to broaden the base.

CAC: What mission did they undertake then?

JL: Just to look into where we were and what was happening at that period of time. Affirmative Action was just beginning to be talked about.

CAC: Just barely.

JL: That's right. It was in, I think, 1971 or 1972 that Lillian Williams was brought in as an Equal Opportunity officer; so, everything was just kind of churning at that time.

CAC: This group had no official standing?

JL: No official standing whatsoever.

CAC: It was a caucus within the faculty?

JL: That's right. It was just whoever wanted to come, please, do come. Shirley Clark was in it . . . Carol Pazandak . . . just a bunch of us in various positions.

CAC: Did you wait upon officers of Central Administration or how did you function?

JL: In terms of function, developing committees for information, how many, who, where they are, salary, things like that, to develop an information base, a data base, if you will, because it didn't exist for the university and also to look into the practices of hiring. By 1972, it was still

small but more formalized. We had regular meetings and decided that we should have some officers, limited as it would be. The constitution was very limited.

CAC: Did you wait on Shepherd or [Malcolm] Moos, who is now president?

JL: We asked for meetings with key officers. After Shepherd, who was in there?

CAC: Hal Chase was acting.

JL: It was before that time. It was the fellow that went in as V.P. [vice-president] of Administration before [Stan] Kegler. He was involved during the time of the riots and all, in 1969, 1970. I can't think of his name. Eisenberg maybe . . . [Gene Eidenberg]

CAC: Ohhh, of course . . . that's coming closer. Then, he left the university [unclear] and went to Washington, I think.

JL: I'll think of the name later. We had a number of meetings with him because he was vice-president of Administration. Mabel Powers served for two years as chair. We didn't call it president, just chair of the group. We were successful in the data base gathering and beginning to meet to give support to what was pending when Central Administration itself was going into the matter of the Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action program.

CAC: But, you never had official standing?

JL: Never had official status, no.

CAC: Although later, some committees would select persons from this group?

JL: That's right. For example, Lillian Williams met with us informally as she was drawing up the Affirmative Action policy of the university. There was always the informal tie not the formal tie. It was never formally recognized. In 1973, we decided, since a number of things were going on and we had to keep information flowing as much as possible, that instead of a having a person hold the office for two years, we'd just have them for one so that there would be more . . . It was, with everyone else doing every other work, it was beginning to get quite time consuming. It was 1973-1974 that I was the chair of CUWP. That's how I got into the president's office.

CAC: Ahhh.

JL: The policy had just come into effect in 1973 and at the time Peter Magrath was chosen, he had decided on some reorganization—quite properly—and he had named a vice-president for Administration without a formal search. Now, Lillian Williams had given approval. After all, it's president's prerogative and so on. We decided that we had no question about the authority or ability of Walt [Bruning] but that we should at least make a point; so, we wrote a letter. It

was a collective letter—Carolyn, Mabel, and I, and Carol Pazandak, but I signed because I was acting chair at that time—just saying that while we had no questions about the qualifications of this individual, we are concerned about your willingness to give support to the new procedure and would you respond accordingly? He did saying that he did not have any particular problem. He was fully in support of it. Then, in good faith, because the assistant that he was bringing with him from New York decided not to move with him, he opened up the assistant position to a search.

CAC: Although, one did. Mitch Pearlstein did come with him.

JL: Mitch came as a speech writer and the other one did not. I didn't even know but Stan Kegler put my name in. I had worked with Stan on the Department of Education and the NSF grants when he was working through things. Also, I had become involved in a group of counselors of the university in contact with the community colleges for transfer and everything else.

CAC: I see.

JL: I chaired the annual meetings that we'd have with the counselors in the metropolitan area. Stan's office supported that; that's where I got the money. Through that contact—I had these weird contacts—he put my name in for this assistant position. Shirley Clark was chairing it. She called and said my name had been put in and they had narrowed the gap. Would I be willing to go ahead? I said, "Yes, I would; but, I'll have to talk to Dick Caldecott first." And he already knew it, of course, because Stan had called him. [laughter] I was one of the finalists.

CAC: Your spouse was supportive of all these things?

JL: Bob was so supportive. He was just wonderful and said, "Go for it." A little later, that's why I went for the deanship of GC because I didn't plan to. Bob said, "You're an idiot not to do it." That's another story. I'll tell you why I didn't. Anyway, that's how I got the assistant to the president position.

CAC: Mr. Magrath defined the position. What portfolios did you have initially? This is a new position?

JL: That's right, it was a new position . . . there were always assistants to the president but by and large, they had been social assistants. When I had my interview with him, I said, "The one thing I want to be sure of is that I'm not going to be a social secretary, not with my background. I just don't fit in that." He said, "No. You will not be a social secretary. I will have you involved in all of my administered activity." Right from day one, I was involved. Again, it was another tremendous learning period.

CAC: You had no specific portfolio or charge?

JL: Not specific, no . . . a general assistant as to whatever he wanted me to do. He, and Walt Bruning, and Mitch Pearlstein, and I worked together very, very closely.

CAC: Walt Bruning was then vice-president for Finance?

JL: For Administration.

CAC: Okay.

JL: I remember one thing that he did say right at the beginning. He said, "One thing we have to do that no one else can do is tell the president, 'No,' or why he shouldn't do something." He said, "He's got everyone else saying, 'Oh, yes, sir, to this or that.'" He said, "Peter will make the decision. That isn't it. We've got to present him with the negatives as well as the positives." This is very important because I've seen in other presidencies where that has not been the case at all.

CAC: Yes. This bears on administrative style.

JL: That is right.

CAC: You're suggesting that Mr. Magrath, explicitly and up front, was aware of the need for this kind of honesty?

JL: Yes, at least the whole time I was with him, he supported it fully.

CAC: Could you illustrate? On what kinds of issues, for example?

JL: For example, in dealing with certain kinds of appointments, he depended upon us to know a lot more about the individuals than he might know. I think that was probably one thing where, if I had any strength that was it because I had been around so long. He was much more aware of the sense of history than some administrators I've worked with. He was aware that things that went before could, indeed, affect how a committee chair, how an administrator acted or reacted to things.

CAC: Were you doing research papers for him then of substantive issues?

JL: In connection with issues related to details of money, details like the building history in connection with legislative things. I found out a lot more about sports than I ever wanted to know. [laughter] Things like that where he needed the background to it.

CAC: Tell me about that sports thing. What kinds of questions would you get there?

JL: If you remember, it was a period of time when basketball was chastised by NCAA [National Collegiate Athletic Association] and I had to get what had happened but also what had been the pattern of policy in the university before, what practices had gone on that might be the same or different. Did we have a leg to stand on in connection with opposing it . . . things like that.

CAC: Did this mean that you did research in University Archives?

JL: Yes, both in the archives but also with individuals in their background.

CAC: You'd have to do what I'm doing now . . . go talk with folks?

JL: Yes, that's right, and in dealing with, for example, certain areas in Student Affairs. That's where I became more involved, too, because this was a period, if you remember, when there were various disputes and the students were coming up before the Board of Regents and proclaiming, "This was a time I was kicked." Things like that.

CAC: But this is post-Vietnam?

JL: This is post-Vietnam.

CAC: What issues are the students . . . ?

JL: The issues were, again, equal opportunity, South Africa investments . . . remember the grape and lettuce boycott? We'd have sit-ins in the office regarding it. Also, this is a period when the various minorities began to become much more vocal in terms . . .

CAC: Even though they were established?

JL: That's right, they're established. This is a time when Peter set up various councils for African-American, for Chicano, for the American Indian, and later the Asian-American. I would be his representative to those councils.

CAC: I see. Did this put you in liaison with the office of Student Affairs?

JL: Yes, right.

CAC: Why didn't the initiative come from there or did it? Were you in partnership?

JL: How can I put it? There was not an active interest in that kind of approach in Student Affairs at that period of time.

CAC: Who was vice-president?

JL: Frank Wilderson.

CAC: He would have been a natural person being African-American himself.

JL: He supported it; but, he didn't initiate anything. I over simplify; but, that's the truth.

CAC: Now, you have these portfolios and that raises in my mind a question that anybody looking at the university in the 1970s and 1980s would have to look at, that some of these minority programs initiated in the late 1960s and early 1970s worked reasonably well. Others never seemed to work. I'm going to tick them off: African-American Studies, first; then, Chicano Studies; American Indian Studies; and Women's Studies. What is your sense, looking back upon the 1970s, of why some of these took off, and did well, and are still with the university in 1994 and others not?

JL: I think some of the people involved recognized the necessity of having to become part of the establishment not be apart from it and therefore, the problems in, what I would call, basic communication for the people that were teaching, the people that were advising in these particular area studies. I guess I'd put it this way. Some were quite naive about what it meant to participate in the everyday academic politics and therefore, didn't realize that without that participation, they would not garner the support that would be needed for a continued activity.

CAC: By those criteria, which ones did better in your mind?

JL: In the long run, Women's Studies and Afro-American Studies. Chicano has been all over the map. Now, I think it's stronger than it was. American Indian, basically, [there was] on their part a failure to relate but also on the part of the usual, the traditional, not willing to accept the cultural difference in terms of approach to programs of academia.

CAC: Would this raise the question then of how close these various programs were to their own communities in the metropolitan area, for example?

JL: There is still, as you know, lots of problems in relating to what the community believes the university can do and what the university can actually do.

CAC: Or properly do.

JL: Or properly do. It isn't enough to have the course work. There has to be more than that and that has to come from community support for the students and the goals that the academic program should hold. It's the idea, they're in there, they should automatically get everything and get out or if they're in there, you've got to provide them with every time and opportunity to make their way through that program. There's a failure to relate to what I still see as the necessary rigor or academic programs.

CAC: I see.

JL: As you know, these last four months, I've worked with [Nils] Hasselmo.

CAC: Yes, we're going to come to that.

JL: One of the things that came up in connection with this was the failure of the community to think . . . they think that the university can do everything and it cannot. It's still there. It's still to be dealt with.

CAC: We'll come back to that at the end with a few particulars.

JL: Again, it was a great learning time. I was involved in anything and everything I wanted to be involved in and a lot more that I didn't want to be involved in. [laughter]

CAC: Both of us are historians and know that legends are created. You're aware that there's a legend of your being kicked in the shin.

JL: Oh, yes. [laughter]

CAC: Like other legends, it really happened?

JL: That's right.

CAC: But, then it becomes legendary. Say a bit about your perception of that affair.

JL: This was a period when there was a great deal of concern about university monies in South African investments. There was a small—I wouldn't call them . . . yes, I would call them—a militant group. There were about six. It was the beginning of the Student . . .

CAC: SDS [Students for a Democratic Society]?

JL: Yes.

CAC: Of course, they'd been around in the anti-war.

JL: They'd been around; but, they were reemerging in this period of time. They were led, actively, by a daughter of a History professor.

CAC: I remember that.

JL: Yes. They had been very vocal, very active, and brought forth some good arguments. I won't say that at all. They really knew what they were talking about. They were much angered with the slowness of the administration to responding. Peter had had several . . .

CAC: Was that the case? Was Magrath being very cautious about this?

JL: Because of the Board of Regents. He was pushing it; but, there is the procedure that you go through in terms of being sure that . . .

CAC: Resistance came primarily regential?

JL: That's right. It wasn't resistance in terms of we won't do it but we want to find out more about it. What are the implications? What are the affects if we have loss of money in the investments for the university?

CAC: I see, yes.

JL: The broader approach. Peter had met with the young students a number of times. There wasn't anything else to say. At this time, they were coming forth with a petition; so, he asked me to accept it. This was traditional, too . . . the assistant stepping in and he was tied up in something. I can't remember what. I did. At first, we had them in the office; but, so many were coming up the stairs so I said, "Let's move out into the hall so that more can hear what we're both saying." We exchanged our difference and I said, "There really is nothing else I can say. This is the procedure. This is what is going on. The president is going to present this to the Board of Regents." I can't remember the name of the little gal. She said, "It's obvious. You're just a flunky." I said, "That may be; but, that's my job. I just don't think we have anything else to say." As I turned, then she kicked me. That's when I said, "You kicked me and I want an apology." [laughter] I said, "You talk about peace in South Africa and against demonstration and all and then you do this." Of course, she wouldn't; so, the police came in, "Do you want a charge?" I said, "Yes." They said, "What do you want?" I said, "I want an apology." Of course, it got all over the place. I got the apology eventually down in the judge's office. It went that far.

CAC: It went that far? I'd forgotten that.

JL: It went that far. Here, she had been in the old army fatigues and everything else. I didn't even recognize her when she came in the judge's chamber. Her hair was fixed. She had a beautiful dress on. She had her nails fixed, just a prim little gal. [laughter] The judge said, "Will you explain what happened?" I said, "Yes." He said, "You don't want any damages?" I said, "No. I just want an apology. This is improper behavior for a college student." And I got it and that was it.

CAC: No wonder it became legendary. That's a good story.

JL: All right. I'm slow to temper but when I get angry, I'm afraid people know it. [laughter] In 1978, Walt Bruning left the university and the position was open for the vice-president. Peter wanted to appoint me as the vice-president of Administration; but, quite properly, he had to follow the search procedure. He asked for three to five names and the committee came in only with three. I was four and Al Link was five. Peter was very upset that I wasn't in the finals. I knew why I wasn't . . . because I didn't have a research record. Ken Keller and Betty Robinette were chairing the committee. I was very disappointed; but, there was nothing I could do. That fall, the dean of GC had died, Richard Bailey, unexpectedly from a heart condition.

CAC: I'm going to come to that. I want to ask a few more things.

JL: All right.

CAC: You had a unique opportunity having all portfolios to observe the presidency of Mr. Magrath really up close.

JL: Yes.

CAC: One knows that a president of a large university has many constituencies: the legislature, the people in the state eventually, the regents, the faculty, the students, and so forth. Could you say something to enlighten posterity about how one sets priorities? How do you attend to one constituency and then another? Was Peter good at that? What kind of priorities did he set?

JL: I know his number one priority, when he came, was to work with the legislature. The university had been having lots of problems. That was his number one priority. How can I put it? I believe he didn't push himself well enough in connection with some of the constituencies. They didn't get to know him.

CAC: Namely?

JL: Some of the academic constituencies. I never understood why because he had all of the credentials in terms of meeting on an even ground. Yet, I think he was uncomfortable on the whole. I'm not saying he was in awe of people. I don't mean it that way. His best foot did not come forward in some of those contacts. For example, they're such little things. There was always the cry that he never went over to the Campus Club. I kept his schedule and if you saw the schedule, you could see why really he didn't.

CAC: People would remember that all the way back to Wilson.

JL: Yes, it's that kind of thing. It was such a time of activity, federal, and state, and local. I will agree, he probably should have . . . knock out some other meetings and go to that. Things like that . . . he thought, Here's my number one priority. I've got to respond in connection with

the legislature. I got to respond in connection with the feds. It was a perception as much as anything.

CAC: I went through the minutes, the records of the regents a couple of weeks ago. One knows in the abstract but, I'll tell you, it's staggering the things that they have to deal with.

JL: That's right, and the hours, the hours, the hours spent. Nils does it now with the regents. It's just mind boggling.

CAC: And Magrath was doing that also?

JL: Right.

CAC: Did you go with Mr. Magrath to the Consultative Committee ever?

JL: No.

CAC: You don't have any firsthand notion of how that functioned?

JL: That's right. At that time, they asked that just the president . . . I think that is still followed now. Naturally, we abided by it. I was instrumental, I think, in pulling together the staffs of the various V.P.s. There had been isolation. This is yours. This is mine. I worked very hard—a person is only as good as his staff member; you know that—to get information, to see what have you heard? Are we working the same way or are we at odds with one another?

CAC: How about the staffs of the colleges? Isn't there an executive cabinet or whatever it was called then?

JL: Yes. That was where the vice-president for Academic Affairs became and does become so very important.

CAC: You had experience in Arts, Biological Sciences, and General College.

JL: You'll get a kick out of this. I was now a member of the Administrative Committee; that's what they called it . . . the deans. I had sat in on those. I always sat in on those with Peter, his meeting with the deans. I'd always noted that certain key deans always sat in certain places. There was a peanut gallery and that's where all the minor figures went. I used to always get so mad because Al Vaughn always sat there and, then, Bailey always sat there. It just made me furious. I never said anything to them. I thought, okay, I'm going to break this up. [laughter] At the first meeting, I went down and sat at the big table. I sat at the back. I didn't get up in front.

CAC: [laughter]

JL: It blew everyone's mind. Here was someone breaking up . . . All they had was the pecking order right down . . .

CAC: You had to get there early to do it though.

JL: That's right and I knew it. From that time on, there was never any seating in the Administrative Committee. Then Crookston . . . [Stan] Sahlstrom came down and then [John] Imholte came down and whoever got there first, then, got in the seat.

CAC: Do you have a sense when you were there with Mr. Magrath who the powerful deans were, who really carried weight, not because of their departments or . . .

JL: [Frank] Sorauf was tremendous. He really was. Peter thought very highly of him. Dick Caldecott . . . still very strong. Who was in IT [Institute of Technology] at that time? It was before [Etorre] Infante. There were changes there in IT. He made great efforts really to make some contact with the Medical School because it was completely separated when he came in.

CAC: Was it any less so by the time he left?

JL: There was more activity in terms of Lyle French participating in and responding to the concerns of the rest of the university to the Medical School. He was unable to make inroads . . . For example, it is at that time that the whole question of doctor's salaries came up and there was much conversation about opening up the records. Finally, he was able to get them to agree to open them up to a certain amount of money, up to \$100,000. The regents accepted it up to that. But, of course, there were so many that were making beyond the \$100,000.

CAC: Sure.

JL: At least, he got them opened up to the \$100,000 in terms of salaries. There were these little inroads but, by and large, it kept its separate status in terms of the academic programming.

CAC: How did the vice-president behave with the other vice-presidents and with the council of deans?

JL: To me, Lyle slowly but steadily opened up. To me, he was very different by the late 1970s than he was when I went in 1974. He was much more willing to, I'd call it, share information than he was.

CAC: And still maintain . . .

JL: Still maintain that separateness.

CAC: How about the St. Paul campus, which was the other separatist . . . ?

JL: I know Peter made some regular trips to meet with the various colleges there and tried to participate in every activity that seemed to be purely St. Paul. He always was sure to make the retirement luncheons, which the presidents . . . they'd always send their representative. I went, too, to all of them. He had us all go. He tried to have more events on the St. Paul campus of a university nature.

CAC: But, there was the same tendency for St. Paul to be autonomous or wishing to be?

JL: That's right, particularly the College of Agriculture was the one that was the most so. With support that he gave still to CBS, and then Vet Med was going through a number of changes at that time, that provided the base for the St. Paul campus becoming the St. Paul campus instead of the College of Agriculture campus.

CAC: I see.

JL: He introduced the deputy vice-president for Agriculture. Remember Bill Hueg?

CAC: Yes.

JL: Of course, as you know, even today, that's a question of how to handle the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses in connection with the plans for the new provosts.

CAC: These basic issues are dealt with but never resolved?

JL: That is correct. They take on a little different form and substance and different leaders.

CAC: Is it your sense that they are beyond resolution or that a really vigorous president could maintain a centralized control to a larger degree?

JL: I think slowly but surely, they're being pulled in. They aren't incorporated as yet; but, there has been movement. Whether or not it will stay that way and then they'll move out again or not, I don't know.

CAC: But, it's persisting as you see it, a persisting problem that all presidents have to . . .

JL: It's persisting. There are twenty years that I've seen it directly. I can't see that changing over night at all.

CAC: This is very helpful. I interrupted you for that. We can come back to your appointment as dean of General College. It was going home.

JL: It was the fall of 1978, when I lost that other position, that this had come up. I thought, it will be the same thing. I don't have a research record. They'll never choose me as the dean so why bother.

CAC: Neither Vaughn nor Horace Morse had either.

JL: Yes, I know but it was a different world. I understood that. I accepted it. That was the way it was. I thought, I'm not going to bother with that. I can take one turn down and it hurts a little bit but I'm not going to take two. [laughter] That's where Bob got involved. He said, "That's one that you should do. Okay, so you're turned down. So what? You'll regret it if you don't try it." So finally, the last day that they were taking nominees, I wrote a letter saying, "Yes, I would be considered." By that time, I kind of took it lightly because I thought, I'm not going to get it anyway. I'm not going to worry about. I got the recommendations and so on. Slowly, it started to come through that I was going to be one of the finalists at least. Then, it did come through. I know I had support of all the members of Central Administration except one. That was Don Brown who was vice-president for Finance. It was his idea—he wasn't against me—that GC should just be done away, therefore, don't name anyone but incorporate it into another college.

CAC: GC had gone into a four-year program by now?

JL: It had. They had started their four-year programs in 1972.

CAC: So, you were going back to a college with a four-year program as well as two-year.

JL: That's right. It had changed considerably. Their baccalaureate programs were a bachelor of general studies and a bachelor of applied studies. The students could incorporate a lot of learning outside. At that time, they only required a 2-point grade point average to get into the program. I was the first to say, "These are weak programs. I can see the need for them; but, we've got to start to give them some credibility." That was one of the main things that I started to work on when I got into GC, trying to upgrade their programs.

CAC: How does one go about doing that?

JL: We had a study. We brought in some outside consultants, plus a self-study of where things were, and what students had done in the period of time they'd been in the program, and what was the effect. It was obvious that numbers and numbers had started and never finished and probably would never finish; and also, sad but true, there were some in the program that I don't know how they ever got past the first two years. I'm being very specific now. There were some horror stories. The one problem I faced when I went into the General College was a number of the faculty had decided that if they were going to have to be the conscience of the university, they weren't going to turn down anybody and they were just going to help . . . Everyone was a good kid and if he did wrong, that's too bad, we'll give him another chance and so on. That wasn't

the whole faculty but that was still a good portion of the faculty. They had kind of accepted the image that others had . . .

CAC: Namely that it's "bone head" college, right?

JL: That's right. This was one of my big pushes. There were some young faculty that were really wanting to get . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

JL: I believed, and the vice-president supported me in the fact, that something had to be done to upgrade the General College program. The Associate in Arts degree was still pretty much standard and strong; but, it had not been reviewed for fifteen years. The baccalaureate programs had to be reviewed. Out of this came a number of GC studies to try to deal the particular problems. By 1983, we had brought upgrading to the Associate in Arts program in terms of requirements and background for the students. If they had just GEDs [General Education Degree]—some did—and then had gone to the Associate in Arts, we still did special testing to be sure that they were ready to go, particularly in English and writing. We raised the requirement for entry into the baccalaureate program to a 2.5 [grade point average].

CAC: Good. Did you find that you were attracting a different student body than when you were there earlier or not?

JL: Oh, yes. This was an older student body, by far.

CAC: Tell me about that. These are really, so-called, non-traditional students?

JL: That's right.

CAC: Why are they coming to GC?

JL: One, the opportunities for basic education and advancement and also the AFDC [Aid to Families with Dependent Children] mothers were provided with an opportunity to take a two-year degree. The counties generally opposed a four-year program; but, they were willing to support a two-year program. They were getting into the Associate in Arts program and then found that they were some of the better students.

CAC: You bet.

JL: We were fighting hard and I worked very actively in connection with the legislature to change it whereby the counties would be agreeable to supporting certain students to go on to

baccalaureate programs if they met very rigorous academic programming. There was a lot of activity that way. This is also a period of time, as I said, when the Associate in Arts had not been reviewed; so, we held another national review of that looking at what remained of the testing program that originally worked so effectively. It had, more or less, been watered down where they could substitute in one area for another. Originally, it was seven areas and they had to pass five. It had gotten down to the point that they were really, by substituting, only requiring passage in three areas. Everything had been watered down. It was our look at the Associate in Arts . . . do you want to continue with this testing program and if you do, you've got to rewrite the whole thing. It was decided that the rigor would go into the particular course work and not requiring that total ban kind of thing. I would say, that I believe the instructors responded beautifully in the upgrading and in the requirements; but, we still had to worry about the fact that they would allow a student to carry on much longer than a student should have carried on in terms of not meeting the requirements . . . too many incompletes, too many dropouts. They'd take a course for three weeks and then dropout. All of these problems were still there but were, at least, being responded to.

Then, of course, in 1984-1985, it was the move toward Commitment to Focus. In December of 1984 that Stan Kegler called me around Christmas and said, "We've got some troublesome news. [Governor Rudy] Perpich says he's going to close the General College. I wanted you to know. He's also saying he's going to close Morris, and Crookston, and Waseca," at that time. Ken Keller was president. He said, "Ken's been working on it for quite awhile. He's going to come forward with a plan that would put all of this in perspective." Of course, that was the Commitment to Focus. From January till the next January, it was a matter of trying to relate to what President Keller wanted to do and keep the faculty on focus in what we had been doing already. Then, it was decided that the degree programs would be done away with. This was a response, in part, to Perpich . . .

CAC: I see.

JL: . . . but also a response, in part, to Keller's belief regarding what a university should do. I had no problem—although, I did with the faculty—with Keller's determination to do away with the baccalaureate program because it was draining the faculty from what it should be concentrating on. With opportunities elsewhere—particularly at that time Metro State was really expanding its baccalaureate programs—we could see that competition wouldn't do any good for anyone. Keller said that if there would be agreement, he would guarantee that GC would be supported and it could still work on its developmental aspects. The big battle came over the Associate in Arts program because it had been offered since 1933, and it was still showing what it could do.

CAC: I should think the students would really want to have that certification, recognition.

JL: That's right. This was our argument and we could still show that of the Associate in Arts, by that time, about 25 percent were accepted into university programs. Then, we had another

about 22 percent that transferred to other four-year programs; so, we were doing pretty well in connection with going on beyond the associate. Keller said that (1) he did not believe the university should be offering these programs and (2) that the legislature and the governor were such that he had to give in because of the community college seniority in connection with it. We had a task force within the General College.

CAC: Excuse me. By then, both Minneapolis and St. Paul really had community colleges, not by that name but serving . . . ?

JL: That's right. Oh yes, and doing a very good job. I never had any question . . . I worked very closely with them, too. [laughter] We had to hang on wherever it was. The result was that, finally, the faculty developed what it would be willing to do in connection with a strong two-year program. They still hoped to maintain the associate degree. I went through, that last year, the complete reorganization of Student Services so that they could have a daily and monthly follow-up of students. I got rid of a number of—I shouldn't say this—what I call, touchy-feely counselors who would never say, "No," to any student but just let them wander and we really strengthened the counseling program considerably. By fall, it was do or die. I had to make a decision. I didn't know how much support I'd have to give up both degrees. I had the support of most of my immediate administration. I had the support of all the younger faculty. With that, then, I said, "Okay, we'll go for it and fight to maintain GC as the developmental education entry." A number of the faculty hated me as a result and they mounted a very good program for keeping it with the Board of Regents. So, I mounted a counter program. I went to every regent and talked about the pluses and minuses, and what we could do, and what I could see for GC in the future. Of course, we got the vote to follow what my recommendation was . . . to maintain the developmental program but without the degrees.

CAC: Is it difficult for a dean to get direct access to the individual members of the Board of Regents? This would seem to be kind of unusual.

JL: It can be done. There is protocol. I always contacted the secretary. It was Duane Wilson, at that time, and then Barbara Miesing because it is better that she makes the contact saying, "This person wants to talk with you."

CAC: I should think, in some circles, this would be seen as an end run, as we say.

JL: That's why I made it through the secretary and Keller knew I was doing it.

CAC: He did?

JL: Oh, yes.

CAC: Is this often done by deans or is this a [unclear]?

JL: Yes and no. Sometimes, it's done without anyone knowing it and that's when it causes consternation. If it is known that there is this contact and interest in it, to my knowledge, there's always been support. In other words, we may disagree with what you're doing but we know we're doing it and you have the right to do it.

CAC: You say this is a protocol. Is this a protocol of the Board of Regents?

JL: Yes, right.

CAC: They reserve the capacity to communicate directly with . . . ?

JL: If they call directly, that's another thing. They can call any individual they wish.

CAC: Sure. That path is kept open by specific protocol?

JL: That's right.

CAC: All right.

JL: Out of that came . . .

CAC: You knew these things from being in the president's office. To be dean after that . . .

JL: It helps when you're aware of that. Some, quite truthfully, don't realize that some of those protocols do exist because they're not openly proclaimed. It can cause difficulty.

CAC: I'm going back about twelve minutes, I think. You were speaking of the non-traditional students who were in larger numbers when you returned as dean and that many of these were AFDC mothers. Was it that that got you interested in child care at the university?

JL: Yes.

CAC: Say a bit about that.

JL: These women were in GC and in other colleges, too; but, the counseling activity for AFDC was in the Help Center in GC.

CAC: I see.

JL: That's why you got it across the university. One of their big problems always was that they'd get the money for tuition, and for food, and some limited money sometimes for child care; but, it was always eaten up as the cost for child care went up, and up, and up. Also, the Child

Care Center at the university was strictly a pay-as-you-go. It was primarily faculty and staff that used that so there weren't openings.

CAC: Under whose auspices was that run?

JL: It was kind of all over the map. It was out of the Administration Department for awhile. Then it was given to Student Affairs; but, no one did anything with it in Student Affairs. Then, finally, it was out of the president's office. It had been all over the map.

CAC: It seems to me, Student Affairs would be a logical place.

JL: I know it.

CAC: Why weren't they hospitable?

JL: As I said, there wasn't much initiative for new programming in Student Affairs when I went there. I just have to put it that way.

CAC: All right, that's fine.

JL: Here is this need. The university can't take care of it. The counties are such, because of the legislation, that they didn't feel they could offer child care for people going beyond one or two years; so, these people were always caught. It was men as well as women.

CAC: I see.

JL: You had a lot of single men as parents, too. That's what got me into that. At this time, when I was leaving GC, it was the matter of whether or not the college could wind down the baccalaureate and associate programs and then move in terms of redoing some of its curriculum that would really be much more meaningful, and developmental, and much more in the way of specific requirement. In other words, if this student showed that the reading level was at this level or that, there was a special program for that student. Now, to me that wasn't revolutionary. We should have done it all the time; but, they wouldn't do it before. No, you can't require these kids to take things that they don't want to take. It was a push and pull and hit them over the head as much as I could. After that big break, there were a number of faculty that wouldn't even speak to me. They had said I never communicated; so, I started having weekly meetings of the faculty with them. They'd been in on everything but they just opposed my decision and they have a right to oppose it—that wasn't it. By spring, it was really pretty bad. Strangely enough, while it was a year and a half later, suddenly Bob's death was hitting me just all over the place. I suppose I had probably buried it before.

CAC: Sure.

JL: I thought I've got to get out of here for awhile. I went to see Ken and said, "I wonder if I could have an administrative leave for maybe just the summer. I've just got to get my act together. The faculty will calm down."

CAC: You hadn't really been allowed to grieve.

JL: No. That was really true and that's why it hit me. He said, "Do you mean you don't want to work?" I said, "If you've got a job for me to do, I'll be glad to do it; but, I just can't stay in GC right now. I think a couple of months for everyone will do us good." Don Zander was leaving Student Affairs . . . retiring.

CAC: Oh.

JL: He said, "Would you go in there? We need some help there. With your background . . . then we'll see what comes up next spring." That's how I got that job. [laughter] I went in and it was different. There were a lot of problems. I took over registration, and orientation, and fees and tuition, that whole accounting thing, and then these bits and pieces. Disabled students, at that time, were within Counseling but they were not supported by Counseling. Sue Kreager was operating on a shoestring.

CAC: Tell me, what range of disabilities did these students present?

JL: Everything.

CAC: But some more than others?

JL: The greatest number were deaf students, actually.

CAC: Heavens. I've had so many blind students but very few deaf.

JL: Sue had more support for the blind students. She didn't have much support for the deaf students . . . in monies to get the aides, to get the signers. At this time, to look at the university for the disabled to move from one place to another . . .

CAC: The problems of access?

JL: That's it. I had these little side pieces. Child care, because it had been operating out of the president's office and they didn't know what to do with it. I don't mean anything wrong that way; but, this was not something that should be in that office. It was a time when the political scene was growing on that as well; so, they gave me that. It was fascinating. I learned a lot very quickly.

CAC: Where did you get the monies to beef up those programs for the disabled?

JL: I'd go to the reserve.

CAC: The president's reserve?

JL: Yes. I'd have to battle with Keller and who was the one that left . . . the one from St. Paul. He was vice-president for Finance . . . Dave Lilly. This was before the big reserve issue hit and there was a lot of reserve money. They had a procedure to go through and go forward with. I'd have to show numbers, effects, everything else . . . also, then to get them to agree that we could support something in the legislature for child care. It was a political activity at that time and I did, I guess you'd say, lobby but also give testimony before the legislative committees on some of those issues, both child care and the disabled.

CAC: I'm going to ask about the mobility disabled students a bit more having in mind students down the line ten, fifteen, twenty years from now. Even looking at it from 1994—I will state the background for my question—that it has been an amazement to me for a long time how slow the university, on its own initiative, was in recognizing the problem of physical accessibility. They built Ford Hall and you had to go upstairs or downstairs to get into the building. There was no way you could enter it.

JL: That's right.

CAC: That was in 1951. That's pretty far along. How do you account for the blindness, so to speak, of the university in recognizing that problem?

JL: First of all, they follow certain state guidelines and the guidelines didn't include any of those things. That was one factor.

CAC: You're saying that the public doesn't recognize it and the legislature doesn't either?

JL: Yes, and then there weren't people to fight for it within the university political structure.

CAC: There wasn't an organized caucus?

JL: That's right.

CAC: Because the students couldn't come here because they couldn't go to class!

JL: Absolutely.

CAC: They really were excluded?

JL: They were excluded.

CAC: And the mobility more than the blind and the deaf, do you think?

JL: Yes, yes. Also in connection with mobility . . . When GC moved to Appleby [Hall] . . . That's one thing I got when I was in GC . . . we got support for Appleby. I had to fight the administration to get that one; but, I had a lot of good support outside. I had developed a group called the Friends of the General College who were not of the General College at all, except for John Daris. All the others had never been tied with it but were supportive of the idea. They were very helpful in getting me to certain legislative leaders. I let the administration know. We were not on the list; but, I knew how the other big operators had worked to get to the legislature and get support. That's where I got the money for Appleby Hall.

CAC: And making it accessible?

JL: Making it accessible. They put in—this is a perfect example of, again, even of standards to deal with it—the door opener at one side of Appleby, as they should, for the disabled; but, when they got in, they had the elevator three steps up. They could get in the door but . . .

CAC: Oh, my heavens!

JL: So, they had to redo all of that. On others, they would have the door openers too far up so that the people in the chair could not reach it. That's in several buildings at the university even now.

CAC: It took legislative specials to respond to this problem?

JL: That's right.

CAC: Did you have allies within the university, other deans, who were also pushing for this?

JL: Yes.

CAC: Like who?

JL: Good support from CLA and also from Gene Allen in St. Paul in the College of Agriculture at that time and then V.P. He was dean of the college at that time. It was a matter of just bringing it to the attention. No one had brought it to the attention of the legislators.

CAC: It required money, a lot of capital to do that. I'm shifting now. You were also active in some way with the Women's Center, with the Sexual Violence Center?

JL: Yes, because Counseling was under my domain as acting associate V.P. The Women's Center was connected to that, was inherent in it; although, technically, it should have been separate, but it was within the university Counseling.

CAC: This is the Anne Truax [unclear]?

JL: That's right. Then, the Sexual Violence program was also within that bailiwick.

CAC: Was that separate from the Women's Center?

JL: Yes, it was separate from the Women's Center. Problems came because of personalities, primarily, in the Counseling office.

CAC: You aren't talking about sexual harassment now? You're talking about real sexual violence?

JL: That's right. There was a belief, some right, some wrong, that the Counseling office was not supporting the activities of these two centers the way it should. The Counseling office, for the limited funds they had, was supporting as best they could; but, there was, as I said, a personality conflict between the head of the Women's Center, and the head of the Sexual Violence Center, and the head of Counseling. That interfered with what were already limited activities.

CAC: Do you mean each of them wanted to be in charge or were there sensitive issues?

JL: Wanted to be in charge and each felt that the other was not giving proper attention to what was in its domain as against another. It was just bad communication all the way around. Out of it came the recommendation to move the Women's Center to the office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, in other words, Anne Truax moved there. Then, this was a time when the Commission on Women came forward. It had been developing in the mid 1980s. Janet Spector now heads it.

CAC: Ah, yes.

JL: It was, again, greater attention paid to the position of women within the university. So, they determined that the Women's Center would logically rest in that general domain. The Sexual Violence program was expanded and moved as a separate entity within Student Affairs, but not directly under Counseling, and the same for the disabled students. Those were set up as separate units and not subsumed in the Counseling office.

CAC: How did the politics of that work? Did you have to have vice-presidents and others to guide or to accept?

JL: Yes, the vice-president . . .

CAC: For Academic Affairs?

JL: . . . had to accept and the president had to accept. That's right, in Academic Affairs.

CAC: But, the initiative came from you folks and not from Central Administration?

JL: That's right.

CAC: I'm trying to understand how change takes place in a large institution.

JL: All right. I have to go back a little to tell you how I got my feet in all these doors. After the one year as acting associate V.P., at my recommendation, Keller agreed not to go for that position because the whole Student Affairs structure needed complete restructuring. They had two assistant V.P.s as it was. I said, "At this time, until you get it straightened out, don't go for that position." So, the position was wiped out for the time. Because I'd been doing a lot of these things, they set up this special position and I worked as special assistant to the vice-president for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. I was trying to bring these two together.

CAC: I see.

JL: They just weren't together at all. [Roger] Benjamin originally wanted to name me vice-provost but it wasn't appropriate and I said by this time, "I'm leaving soon. Any title will suit." We had to go through a search, which we did, and I wrote up an elaborate paper on it; but, because I'd been so active in all these student affairs, I got the position—naturally. [laughter] I was sitting in Student Affairs staff meetings and Academic Affairs staff meetings. You could see where some things would come together. Some things were completely separate; but, other things should have been together. It was really a good working operation.

CAC: A lot of your work was really brokerage, wasn't it, in whatever position you had?

JL: Yes, trying to work it through. If you can't go this way, go another way.

CAC: That's one thing that makes a large institution work.

JL: Yes. A lot of people do the same thing. It is a matter of knowing, what I'd call, the positives and the negatives and seeing if you can pull them closer together. Out of that, then, came more on the separation of the disability student. I got special funding for that to really get it expanded. Then, the beginning of the movement for what became the Child Care Center that was built. First, it was getting the counties to change their support and, then, what are you going to do within the university? There was a strong faculty and staff group that wanted it. That's where [Gus] Donhowe and Neil Bakkenist came forward with an economic plan which provided for the Child Care Center. It's fun to see the things completed that you were in on the idea of anyway and starting it off.

CAC: Oh, right.

JL: Then, that next year—I was this special assistant—Wilderson resigned. Nils was coming in for the presidency. Richard Sauer was in for a year and he named Nick Barbatsis as acting V.P.; so, then Nick asked that I come back as acting associate V.P. The last two years, that's what I was again.

CAC: The same portfolios.

JL: That was the end of it! [laughter]

CAC: Then, you retired and then you were called back just this last year.

JL: These four months were really interesting.

CAC: Tell posterity about that.

JL: Yes, posterity. First of all, it was supposed to be four to six weeks and it turned out to be fourteen weeks.

CAC: This was because of the resignation of Kathy O'Brien [unclear].

JL: She was associate to the president.

CAC: Was her position much the same that you were doing for Mr. Magrath . . . some of the same?

JL: Pretty much except that she was much more active in labor union affairs because her background had been that when she was in the city council. She became much more active in that area. Then, because there was still no V.P. for Institutional Relations, she did a number of things in connection with that. She was carrying kind of a job and a half with these special assignments.

CAC: She was a woman and a half.

JL: She really was. She was a powerhouse. When I came back in, as I said, it was supposed to be four to six weeks and it was fourteen. The one thing I did find out—maybe it's just my old age—is that Kathy was working with the staff sometimes as the queen bee, if you know what I mean by a queen bee.

CAC: Yes.

JL: There was much anger in the staff and much anger of the other offices with the presidential staff. One of the things I started to do and I did—whether it will last, I don't know—is reopen all that communication again. I knew so many of the people; I had worked with them before.

I reorganized the president's office while I was there because the individual who was office manager [though] brilliant in economic matters—she was budget officer, too—just had no awareness of what it does mean to manage a group of individuals. I changed her assignment and she'd doing budget and loving it, and I put another person in charge of the office, and got rid of the good little student that answered the phone. You shouldn't have a student answering the presidential phone. Things like that . . . I had a lot of busy work that I did while I was there. [laughter] I hope it's working.

CAC: It sounds as though [President] Bill Clinton could use you, Jeanne.

JL: As I said, you're only as good as your staff in any office. Nils knew it and, quite properly, he shouldn't have to monkey with stuff like that.

CAC: That's an engaging story.

JL: I don't know if it's working now; but, so far it was. I visited them about three weeks ago and they were all communicating with one another. [laughter] I'm a people person. I think that's it.

CAC: These will be our final points . . . We've been going on a long time and you've kept your wit and your memory very well over more than two hours.

JL: I don't know about that.

CAC: Just briefly . . . (a) you were active in a community beyond the university and (b) you were somewhat active in national professional affairs as well. Do you care to say a little about each of those?

JL: Starting with national affairs, apart from what I did in CBS, I was very active in GC in working with the Department of Education, the national one, to get monies for the Help Center and also for the Trio Programs. Those are the Upward Bound . . . all of those. This was for Minnesota not just for the university. I went to Washington every spring and met with all the of our legislators that were involved in connection with the monies that would be forthcoming. That was fascinating, too. Then, at the state, working in connection with child care and the disabled . . . the same similar kind of thing, contact with the legislators, in terms of not just what was going on at the university but I worked with the community college people and the state university people on those programs, too. We weren't just out there by ourselves. That proved to work out very well. When I was GC dean, I remained very, very active in, it used to be, the Council of Junior College Presidents. They included me as well. For example, in that period of time, we drew up agreements whereby GC students not taking the Associate in Arts degree when it was offered and then when it was ended could apply their credits from GC directly to the Associate in Arts program in the Minneapolis Community College so they wouldn't have to

go back and take more. We did that with White Bear, too. In those early days, we had the prisoner program at Stillwater.

CAC: Yes.

JL: That wound down, of course. It was interesting. This is where I saw the competitiveness of Metro State because they were starting to move in and we were still there. They were doing some good things, some interesting things; but, then that dropped, of course, when we dropped the baccalaureate program. I remained active with the high school counselors when I worked in Magrath's shop, and I continued with GC, and then I worked on it again when I was Student Affairs.

CAC: You were active in the Citizen's League?

JL: Yes, for about two years, when all this change in Commitment to Focus was coming. I'd started a little before because of their interest even before Commitment to Focus with some of the special programs we had in GC, particularly the Upward Bound. That was their most successful program . . . the day community programs. It was a matter of trying to ride the horse like Paul Revere and get the word out about GC as to what it was doing. [laughter] We had the Gift of Billboards, remember?

CAC: Yes.

JL: To try to get that word out . . . I could not get money but I could get things like that.

CAC: And the Minnesota Women's Network?

JL: This was working primarily through Pat Moland and, then, Janet Spector when she was coming on board. I did participate in a couple of meetings. The president of Mankato State was very active in the state network; so, I went down there a couple of times, because I knew some people still there, trying to keep out of the competitive mode and into the communicative mode of the university with the other systems . . . a people to people kind of thing.

CAC: You had a long, and versatile, and peripatetic career.

JL: It wasn't dull. It was weird; but, it wasn't dull. [laughter]

CAC: This has been engaging. I'm sure that we could go on for a long time. If, on second and third thoughts, you remember things that really we should talk about, we can do it.

JL: This brings back things that I'd forgotten, just as you talk it out. I'll let you know.

CAC: We covered lots of territory; but, so did you cover lots of territory.

JL: Thirty years. [laughter] That's right.

CAC: I thank you very much. It was very engaging.

JL: It's fun to dredge it out again. Seriously, you forget about some things.

[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