

## Keith McFarland

### Youth and education 1-

- University of Minnesota, St. Paul campus 2
  - Animal Science and Agricultural Education 2-3
- National (National Youth Administration) 3
- military service, Medical Service Corps, 1942 4
- courses at University of Edinburgh 4

### McFarland returns to University of Minnesota as assistant to dean of Forestry, 1946 4

- student personnel - cooperation with YMCA 5
- Educational Psychology graduate program 5
- social and intellectual climate - St. Paul campus 6

### McFarland - acting dean, 1970 7

- Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics 7
- over-worked faculty, lack of research 7
- Shepherd, Gerry - intervenes for Home Economics 8
- creation of College of Home Economics 10
- administration reorganization, 1970 10
- increase in Home Economics budget 11
- excellence, design program 12-13
- retrenchment, 1971 14
- impact of Koffler/Ibele memorandum 14

### Outstate secondary schools of agriculture: Crookston, Grand Rapids, Morris, Waseca 16-20

- Sahlstron, Stan - upgrades Crookston, 1960s 20
  - two-year program 20

### Role of Experimental Stations 22

- research in agriculture, forestry, and home economics 22
- mixed funds 22-23

### Creation of Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics, 1972 23

- three deans, director of Extension, director of Experimental Station 23
- Sauer, Richard 25

### Berg, Sherwood - his role, 1962 26

- fight for buildings 27
- outreach to state 29
- Hueg, William 29-30

### AID (Association for International Development) assignments in East Africa, 1965, 1969 31-35

### Other projects 31-35

- Meyers, William 32
- Cochrane, Willard 33
- Blackmore, John 33
- Agronomy, Economics, Basic Sciences 34

### St. Paul campus colleges - reliance on department heads 35-43

- role of faculty in governance 39
- role of students 40-41
- "culture" of St. Paul campus 41
- pressures on faculty 42
  - student and faculty morale 43

### Center for Youth Development and Research 43-45

Konopka, Gisela 44  
Status of Home Economics 45-47  
McFarland and legislature 47  
Wenberg, Stan and Kegler, Stan 48  
Williamson, E. G. 49

**Interview with Keith McFarland**

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

**Interviewed on August 14, 1984  
University of Minnesota Campus**

Keith McFarland                   - KM  
Clarke A. Chambers               - CAC

CAC: I am interviewing today, Dean Keith McFarland of the . . . School of Home Economics?

KM: College.

CAC: College of Home Economics. It is August 14, the summer of 1984, and we are conducting the conversation in his office in McNeal Hall.

Keith, as I suggested to you in earlier remarks, it's always useful just to start very informally with a few personal remarks. I know that you're a small town Minnesota boy just like me. You were born in the same year.

KM: [laughter]

CAC: You were born in northern Minnesota; I was born and reared in southern Minnesota. Why don't you just say a little bit about your family background, how and why you came to the University of Minnesota; and then we'll carry it from there.

KM: I am the son of farm parents who lost their farm in the Depression years in northern Minnesota. We moved from a farm home near Mentor, Minnesota, up near Crookston, in 1927 to Austin where I grew up. My father was a laborer at the George A. Hormel and Company. I graduated from high school in 1937 and worked a year at the Hormel plant.

CAC: You were very precocious; you graduated at age sixteen?

KM: Yes. I'll tell you, when I was a child in northern Minnesota, I went to a rural school. I had two older sisters, one younger, and the two older ones were in the years immediately preceding me—one had been ill for a year—so, they were both going to school when I was approaching five and I made such a fuss around the home that it was easier to send me to school than not. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

KM: During that first year in that rural school, we had a very vicious winter. We lived one mile and a half from the school and I believe we were the closest family.

CAC: Heavens.

KM: There we were three, and for part of the year just two—one of my sisters was ill—my sister and I and the teacher; so, I did the first and second grade while I was five. When we went to Austin, then, I started the third grade.

CAC: You've been ahead of your career ever since.

KM: Well, I took two years out to work during my college age years because I didn't have any money.

CAC: Sure.

KM: So, I got evened off. Then, of course, Uncle Sam took care of three years, plus.

CAC: In the meantime, you did come to matriculate at the St. Paul campus?

KM: Yes. That's interesting, too, and a marvelous example of terribly bad procedure and counseling. I shudder when I look back on it. I was a coming ninth grader, registering for my year's classes, standing in the hallway in Austin High School. I had the standard pre-college curriculum: algebra, civics, general science, English, and Latin. No one in my family had ever been to college but for some unspoken reason, a never articulated reason, I guess I thought, perhaps, I would be going to school and my mother certainly was a supporter. We read a great deal in our family and that was the program. So, there I was two students from the registration desk when the principal came down the hall. He stopped me, and without knowing me from Adam said, "Hello," and asked who I was, and what I was taking. I showed him. He said, "Where are you from?" I told him, "A little truck farm on the edge of the city." He wanted to know what my associations were and I told him the 4-H Club and things like that. He just out of the blue said, "Why don't you consider substituting agriculture for Latin?" and the whole course of my academic career changed . . . [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

KM: . . . because a little youngster standing in the high school does what the principal suggests. I've always felt that that was a terribly bad procedure on his part and I've used it as an illustration of carelessness.

CAC: It was one that paid off.

KM: In any sense, yes; although, to be perfectly frank, although I came here in agriculture and graduated with a double major in Animal Husbandry at that time, now it's Animal Science, and Agricultural Education, more than once and indeed once I was so close to initiating a transfer to the Arts College in Speech and Literature that I was practically at the streetcar stop before I decided that the jobs I had were so crucial to my continuing in school that I thought I'd better stay in Agriculture. I did finish.

CAC: That meant you were supporting yourself while you went through school here?

KM: Oh, totally, totally.

CAC: Did you have jobs on campus?

KM: Three of them most of the time—and enjoyed it. I started under that NYA [National Youth Administration] program.

CAC: Heavens.

KM: It was a marvelous help to me. My first position was in the library. As I look back on it, that was a good stroke of fortune because after dusting shelves for awhile, I was assigned the task of carrying the magazines around the campus—at that time, they had a circulation room—so, within two months after I came as a freshman, I knew every professor on the campus, including the faculty in Home Economics. Many, many years later, some of those were still here and, of course, the emeritus people have been my friends ever since. It was kind of fun to get that introduction to a campus in a way that most students never would.

I finished in Animal Husbandry because we had, at that time, a provision that in certain curriculums you could use quality credits in substitute for earned credits. The war was coming on. I was a student in the fall of 1942. I had enlisted in the Enlisted Reserve Corps. I tried all of the other programs but my eyesight was such that the army was the only one for which I qualified. I was working in the Ag-Ed office writing war production programs for the dairy farmers and the sheep farmers in Minnesota, and working at my fraternity house, and carrying twenty-seven credits, I believe, and doing practice teaching. I decided that I might as well accelerate and get out of this place. I had been deferred until the following June but I switched curriculums, majors, from Ag-Ed to Animal Science two weeks before Christmas in the fall of

1942, and graduated then, and went in the service. I was assigned to a basic medical training program because of my animal science credentials and intended to go to a meat and dairy inspector's school. In fact, I started the first day and, then, they called out a group of people for a preliminary officers' training program and, ultimately, I was commissioned in the Medical Administrative Corps, later the Medical Service Corps. I worked through the war with a field hospital unit in the European Theater. After the war while waiting to come home, we were up in Czechoslovakia, I heard about a program for American GIs in English universities just as a rather useful pleasant gesture . . .

CAC: Mark time but . . . creative.

KM: . . . while we were waiting. I let the people in Corps Headquarters know of my interest and, interestingly enough, they called four days later and gave me a list of about fourteen institutions from which I could choose. I went to Edinburgh. Clear back, maybe 400 years, I have some Scots ancestry and I had always wanted to explore that area; so, I spent the fall quarter, a wonderful four months, in Edinburgh in 1945. I took some courses in British history, and English literature, and the history and philosophy of education course from a man named Godfrey Thompson. I didn't know him from Adam since I was really not expert in that field at all at that time—nor now—but he was apparently a noted child psychologist and an elementary educator. He directed Moray House, the Child Development Center at Edinburgh. I became much interested in what he was doing. It was while I was at Edinburgh that I received a letter from Henry Schmitz, who was then dean of the College of Forestry, Agriculture, and Home Economics. He invited me to come back as an assistant in his office. I didn't know Dean Schmitz—when I left, he had been head of the School of Forestry—but his invitation was pleasant and, of course, it came at a good time. I had been planning to come back and teach agriculture in one of Minnesota's high schools and probably start a poultry industry on the side. Most ag teachers did that at that time. I did come back. I saw him in February of 1946 and started on February 16, 1946, which is a long time ago now.

CAC: You came right back as assistant to the dean?

KM: I came back as an instructor and assistant to the dean, I guess. What I found I was doing was the student personnel work on the St. Paul campus. You may recall that at that time there was no office of student affairs. You had the dean of men and the dean of women but no outposts whatsoever. So, that at that time, the encompassing undergraduate institution on the St. Paul campus was the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics. There were two of us: the dean and myself. Dean Schmitz was one of the university lobby team; so, he was gone a great deal of the time attending to the business of the university with the legislature and I was the administrator.

CAC: [laughter]

KM: Clarke, I was young . . . I guess I was twenty-four when I got back. I shall never forget that first day. I went in my office, and we chatted for thirty minutes or so about odds and ends, and he told me about a little problem that he'd like to have me explore; and, then, I didn't talk to the dean for four months.

CAC: [laughter]

KM: I just went in and started to work. [laughter] People started coming by. From that day until this, I've never been . . .

CAC: Oh, this is the GI bulge coming right back to class.

KM: Oh, yes, we were just on that start of that.

CAC: And you've been at it ever since.

KM: There were two of us and I was, in a sense, doing what twenty-five years later when I left that office . . . We had five people [unclear]. I was starting a graduate program.

CAC: And probably carrying several courses that [unclear] as went along?

KM: Yes. It was a vigorous time—but I enjoyed it.

CAC: Now, you say student personnel. You really invented . . . you created that program at that time?

KM: Really kind of rebuilt the program on the St. Paul campus—most of the student organizations had become dormant during the war; there were no men out here to speak of. —in addition to doing the admissions and the deposition work. At that time, they were much more formalized than they are today. We used to have as many as 450 students on probation in a single quarter out of our college and you needed to do a lot of individual work with them. We worked with the "Y" [Young Men's Christian Association], and the professional groups, and the like. I enjoyed that.

I felt after I'd been here awhile that a graduate program in Educational Psychology would help me most with that general work. Since I was quite open about the future, as most students would have been at that stage, had no idea that I'd be in the university on a permanent basis but I did start an Ed-Psych Graduate Program, influenced by the contact in Edinburgh. Walter Cook was my advisor.

CAC: Oh, my.

KM: He was marvelous. Later, when he became the dean of Education, Cy White<sup>x</sup> stepped in for him and was a co-advisor through the end.

\* Hoyt

CAC: Let me interpose just a second because what you're talking about raises a question that's so difficult to get at and that is, the spirit, and mood, and temper of different campuses at different colleges. You were here in the mid/late 1930s as an undergraduate and it's a widely perceived observation that there is a friendliness and a sense of family on the St. Paul campus as opposed to other large ones. That was your experience as an undergraduate?

KM: Oh, no question about it.

CAC: Then, that is what you tried to implement as assistant to the dean?

KM: Yes, it was important to me. The setting contributes to it. People are busy here. They work very hard. Much of the work on the campus is in laboratories that are open so that the faculty tend to be available in person to the students as they come by.

CAC: To undergraduates as well as . . .

KM: To undergraduates and graduates. That's changed because of the changes in the promotion and tenure situation. Maybe, we're jumping ahead, but I view the observable change in what we can expect from younger faculty members as taking place from about 1973 on. One used to assume that a younger person coming on to the faculty would work with the professional organizations relating to a department, and carry a pretty good part of the advising load, and be available to students. I suppose there were as many disadvantages as advantages to that system. Students didn't progress quite as rapidly toward the degree as I think sometimes it's felt important to do. In these last ten, twelve, fourteen years, where selection has become much more critical, where there's no substitute for evidence of scholarly endeavor and the like, the young people can't afford to give the time that they used to give. It's almost easier these days to snag a senior professor into some kind of student service than it is the youngster. We've lost some things but we work rather hard to try and offset that.

I have a feeling, Clarke, that fifteen years down the line, it might be necessary for a university like ours to have a third faculty grouping: the teaching/research faculty; the administrative types; and then the student personnel facilitators who are more than central operatives who work with very limited numbers. We have good people of that kind in the university now—Tom Fiutak, Roger Harrold in the Student Development Center, and so forth—but they are dealing only with a core leadership; and, I think, our college office probably needs five of these people working with the departments and with the students to help the students profit to the fullest from the out of class environment to do those things that I think the younger staff used to do with reasonable comfort fifteen years ago but can't do today.



CAC: Keith, do you think you're describing something that was happening in many different colleges and different campuses around the country in the early/mid 1970s? It certainly can't be peculiar to the St. Paul campus alone?

KM: Oh, no. I think maybe in terms of degree of need, I expect this college might be the least needy of any in the university for this thing and, yet, I feel desperately that we need it.

CAC: Why did the profession nationally in each discipline come to take a first priority, do you think, at that time? What you're saying is confirmed by my own experience and by other people I've talked with.

KM: When you're on a twenty-five year growth cycle, I suppose you can be a little freer in your selection. I think the university probably was touched in more ways than we might have thought at the time by Hal Chase's emphasis on excellence . . . in spite of or because of Henry Koffler's orientation. Henry Koffler had an influence on this place because he defined or helped to translate into documents some things that were being talked about. I think the Koffler/Ibele memorandums did really translate into actuality a general feeling of need. Let me talk about *this* college for just a moment. I came up here in 1970 as an acting dean. It was an accident of circumstance that brought me here. Home Economics and Forestry under the old Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec combine weren't doing very well—in fact, they were being starved to death.

CAC: You mean Agriculture was the senior partner in that?

KM: Yes—nothing vicious about this—but they were aggressive. That might be a topic for a little later discussion. The point is, Home Economics had been a service oriented faculty, generous to a professional fault. Their student numbers had grown by twice over the last, say, 1945 to 1960 but their faculty had grown very little. In order to provide classroom hours, they took people at the lowest possible level of salary, which meant at the lowest possible level of training really, in order to get teaching hours for the dollar and instead of either limiting their enrollments to the available staff or reducing some programs, they tried to respond to the pressure from students. It was a very self-defeating cycle because they ended up with a faculty that didn't have research confidence, was overworked, some people carrying as many as seventeen credits per quarter teaching load.

CAC: Oh, heavens. That's worse than a junior college.

KM: Yes. How could you expect research expression from them? They were in trouble . . . financially and program wise. In an attempt to build good programs for students, their programs were highly prescribed. Students might have had five or six elective credits out of 202 required for graduation. You know, you can pick from among twenty-six different options but once you chose an option, you really were captured tightly. They were in a building that dated back to 1914 or 1916 and some of the facilities hadn't been improved much since that time. I had been working with Mr. [Stan] Wenberg in the previous decade and Mr. [Ray] Amberg as one of the

legislative team for about three bienniums; so, I had known some of the legislators and some of the process. It was felt that, perhaps, I could be useful to them. We decided in about 1968 and 1969 that we had to have a change or these programs were simply going to go to pieces— Home Ec and Forestry in particular. Gerry Shepherd, as the vice-president, and I made a trip across the country looking at typical Home Economics programs just to get a feel for things.

CAC: The two of you went around together and traveled?

KM: Yes. I enjoyed it. We went out to Cornell . . .

CAC: God! how marvelous.

KM: . . . Pennsylvania, Nebraska, Davis, California.

CAC: He was vice-president, academic . . . okay. What a nice picture.

KM: He felt strongly enough to do that and I think he believed in the program but he was concerned about its health, and welfare, and future. I was the director of Resident Instruction, which was essentially chairman of the faculty but without budget, for ten years, from 1960 to 1970.

CAC: This is largely a curricular responsibility rather than student personnel?

KM: It was curriculum and student personnel combined but that critical element, the budget, was not in that office. That was in the office of the dean of Agriculture, which was at that time Woodie [Sherwood] Berg who had followed Joe Macy. We felt the program was worthy but in order to provide some liveliness and a chance to build some vitality, and some visibility, and some identity, it was proposed that we establish three separate colleges rather than the one. This would change the relationship. Instead of fourteen Ag Department heads, and one director of the School of Forestry, and one director of the School of Home Economics relating to the dean of Agriculture in their budget discussions, you would have three deans relating to the dean of the institute. It made quite a difference in the promise of the place. I think it's fair to say that the leadership in Home Economics had certainly been well-intended and hardworking but probably hadn't been as effective as it might have been in defining their needs. I'm ashamed of the fact that when I came up here in 1970, I, for the first time, realized the enormity of their deprivation.

CAC: Even though you'd been working in the lower campus?

KM: For twenty-five years . . . down below the hill. I found not a new typewriter in this place. They didn't have a dime.

CAC: And they didn't have constituents in the state as the Agriculture people would, right?

KM: That's right. They had friends but they weren't really organized. I had known that they were in trouble in terms of staff and the like because I had been working with, primarily, the Associate Dean Roxanna Ford, up here helping draft some expressions but never did I realize that their total budget for supplies expense and equipment for 1200 undergraduate students and the college was not more than \$3,000 more than I'd had to run my office of five people down in the college office at that same time.

CAC: Heavens.

KM: These facts really had never been laid out in a forceful manner and I regret that we hadn't . . .

CAC: How did that come to the attention of vice-president Shepherd?

KM: We used to talk program review in a general sense. Dr. [Louise] Stedman, the director of the School of Home Economics, had called on Dr. Shepherd on occasion. She wasn't having much success with her funding problems with her Agricultural colleagues and she used to transfer certain of concerns to Shepherd. Their relationship was not cordial and I think it was the manner of the presentation that had distressed him; but he felt he needed to know more about it and it was at that stage of the game that in a discussion of the question, we agreed we'd better go look at some programs and kind of see how ours stacked up.

CAC: It wasn't as though he had nothing else to do. I'll tell you his calendar in those years was pretty heavy.

KM: He took this very seriously. We looked at Cornell, which had changed its name to Human Ecology at that time. It was the precursor of a new view of what Home Economics could be. Penn State had a diffused organization bringing together social work, nursing, occupational therapy, criminal justice studies, and home economics.

CAC: That early?

KM: Yes, in a program called Human Development. The traditional home economists across the country have always viewed Penn State as a complete disaster. I tend to feel that it was a rather farseeing view of the promise of Home Economics and, to some extent, we're moving in that direction. Our faculty, this last spring, has proposed that we change our name to Human Development. Whether that will develop or not will depend on things to come but the fact remains that was a different view. We looked at a traditional program at Nebraska. It had a very vigorous leader, Virginia Trotter, who is presently the academic vice-president at the University of Georgia, but she was leading the Nebraska Home Economics program at that time. Then, at Davis, California, where they had Home Economics but it was intermingled with the other departments out there in a way that didn't give much structure. Gerry supported Woodie

Berg's recommendation that we change our structure out here; so, in July of 1970, this became a School of Home Economics and, then, in December, they changed the name to a college.

CAC: I'm going to interpose here. Sherwood Berg was also supportive of this whole development?

KM: Yes, he was.

CAC: When did he become dean of the institute?

KM: He became the dean of the institute at that moment. Before, he had been the dean . . . well, maybe it'd been the Institute of Agriculture . . . had it?

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

KM: It was still the Institute of Agriculture but under the new structure.

CAC: But in any case, he was the chief officer of the St. Paul campus at that time?

KM: Right . . . except that, at that time, Veterinary Medicine which used to be part of the College of Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec had been split out back in about 1952 but Woodie had about the rest of it so that instead of being the financial officer—in essence, the budgets went to the new deans of the respective colleges—Woodie had an executive council of the three deans, the director of the Ag Extension, and the director of the Agricultural Experiment Station. These five constituted the working, coordinating group. I guess you would best call that structure an intermediate administrative unit but with program very clearly centered in the colleges and a lot of collegiate autonomy. That developed over the next ten years into a good working relationship but with some problems which were resolved, I think, just in 1983. Let me finish this Home Ec faculty development and then we'll talk about the institute structure because I think it's fairly important.

CAC: Yes, right.

KM: I came up here as an acting dean to help them get a building; we decided that facilities first needed to be improved. They started a search for a dean but they didn't start that for about nine months, I think, after I came up. Woodie was in no hurry to press that. He wanted to get things kind of settled down first and, I think, he wanted to see what he had here. We organized a committee in every county from among our alums . . .

CAC: Heavens.

KM: . . . and went to work with the legislators. We had a very active Twin Cities group of homemakers, professional home economists who were no longer full time employed.

CAC: Would some of the them have been in home demonstration through the 4-H out in the rural counties?

KM: County extension home agents were key to the outlying groups.

CAC: You just have a built in kind of structure out in the countryside?

KM: Yes, except that very few of them are Minnesota graduates . . . less than a third of them are graduates from this institution.

CAC: My heavens!

KM: We were kind of a haven for graduates from North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

CAC: But once here, wouldn't they identify with their state university?

KM: Those that are here would but the loyalties of many of the others . . . You know, out in the western borders of our state and north, the loyalty to South Dakota and North Dakota are very strong . . . and Iowa State; so, at that time at least, you didn't always have the unalloyed enthusiasm but we did have wonderful alum support, got the writing program going. We received plenty of money in 1971, and the first major appropriation in 1973, the second in 1976, and the third in 1978—the last one was a deficiency appropriation—and with an internal transfer from an overage on an Animal Science building of about \$1 million, we ended up with \$8.6 million invested in Home Economic facilities; and at that time, that was pretty good. What it did though, it got the Home Ec faculty thinking it had a future and with some pride and gave it a chance to start planning and looking ahead. Planning

There had never been a distribution of the budget internally to the college. They had a number of divisions but the division heads didn't have any budget responsibility. It seemed to me accompanying the building, we needed to have a distribution of responsibility to multiply the leadership up here; so, we created departments, and established departmental budgets, and began to expect things to happen in those created departments. I did ask them to start cutting down on teaching loads. Ultimately, we put some limits on those program areas that were under the greatest stress. I had encouraged a review of their curriculum structure. We had twenty-six options, as I mentioned earlier, all very tightly programmed and they were very parochial. I think this was a faculty that had been, over time, pulling together under its stress to defend itself and really talking to no one. With the type of recruiting that had been going on, many of the faculty weren't in a position to interact across the university because they weren't doing the same things that other colleagues were. They weren't writing and they weren't researching.

CAC: Would the design group have had campus-wide kind of recognition, visibility?

KM: I think as I talk about the weaknesses, if you will, in operation, I'd want to be sure that you'd be aware that the undergraduate teaching program, in spite of its rigidity, had a marvelous reputation across the country and the Design Program was recognized everywhere as being a rather special type of program from the days of the [Vetta and Harriet] Goldsteins, right through Gertrude Esteros, and on up so that the teaching was well done. Our Home Ec Education Program—then the largest, now the smallest of our curriculums—was generally recognized across the country as being superior.

CAC: You're saying across the country . . . perhaps, more there than at home?

KM: Quite without question. In California, where they asked for the fifth year of preparation for their teachers, a good many of their supervisory people are Minnesota trained Home Ec Eds so that you find the reputation useful but in our own setting as academics, they really hadn't permitted themselves to be as good as they could be. I proposed in the fall of 1971 that we make a major change in curriculum structure in the college. We had established a Policy and Planning Committee of the faculty to advise the dean; and I suggested that we split the programs away from the respective departments and make them free-standing, managed by a faculty committee drawn from those who would most logically contribute to the programs. I wanted to bring in some of the across-university influences and to change the complexion a little bit. I was soundly and roundly defeated in the early discussions; so, we kept working through the winter looking at our situation and seeking a way to make major change and still be organized and reasonable. Somewhat in the spirit of desperation in April of 1972, I believe it was, I suggested again that we look at that idea that we'd talked about in the fall. I drafted a memorandum and it seemed to find acceptance at that time—we had a 79-2 vote, I think, in favor of the change—and we split our programs away from departments. To illustrate . . . in a program in, at that time, Fashion Design—which was a popular word; we've changed that now to Retail Merchandising—we had a planning committee, not drawn just from our Textiles and Clothing Department but from the School of Management—then the Business Administration—Family Social Science, and several other departments that had contributed some of the programs in Design. We began to bring architects, engineers, and economists, and the like and within four or five years, the programs of the college had undergone a major transformation because now we had people like [Richard N.] Cardozo from the School of Business, and several of the architects, and others. We had moved from the department related programs to the free-standing program committees. It actually worked. I would say that today, it's, perhaps, a bit more pro forma and, in a sense, we're moving them back to relate to our existing departments but at that time, it was much needed. I think during this last ten, twelve years, this college has reached out into the university in ways that you just didn't imagine would happen before . . . very exciting.

CAC: Through the faculty but also through the students who come to take your courses?

KM: Oh, yes, and the [unclear]. I've just been so pleased at the reaction of not only the Basic Science people who like our students but the architects, and the Business School people, and those in Public Health, and the like who interact with the . . .

CAC: Is there any cross over in the field of Studio Art?

KM: Oh, yes.

CAC: Let me tell you where I'm coming from. I have a perception—again, I think it's not entirely personal—that your staff in Design or in the visual arts is recognized as one of the best on the whole Twin Cities campus. I'm just wondering whether students then perceive that and are able to . . .

KM: I think they do. I think they do. We were pleased a few years ago when three major Studio Arts people, who should perhaps remain unnamed, actually called to inquire about a transfer to the Design Department. I suppose, had they been able to transfer their funds with them, we would have been delighted to take them. The relationship is just very fine. This holds for Art History. We work very closely with Marion Nelson and that group and with Art Education. That has brought vitality to the whole program but more importantly . . .

CAC: For the record—to just interpose a second—this is at the graduate and the undergraduate level?

KM: Oh, it's largely at the undergraduate level.

CAC: All right.

KM: The graduate program is a separate topic.

CAC: We'll pick it up later.

KM: What it's done is expose the Home Economics faculty to a university atmosphere and environment that they had pretty much isolated themselves from over the years, up until the late 1960s; and it alerted them to the fact that you don't need seventeen credits a quarter. You might teach maybe eight, better six, and the writing ought to come and some of these other activities.

CAC: You were able to expand staff in the meantime?

KM: We had some growth in staff. At the time that I came here, they had a pretty sizable segment of their younger staff on non-recruiting monies that were fed in annually either from Woodie's office or more particularly from the vice-president's office; and during those early years of the 1970s, where I think Shepherd and then Hal Chase were trying to be helpful, they firmed up some of that money and we began to build our staff.

CAC: Yet the first university retrenchment is May 1971 . . . as a minor flurry, to be sure, but it's beginning.

KM: Let me tell you that was not minor up here because it made a major change in our philosophy and curriculum. Here I came up—I found a faculty that was right up against the ropes and with some comments and assurances of support—and the first thing that happened was that I got hit with a \$20,000 retrenchment and at that time \$20,000 was major.

CAC: Ohhh, I remember.

KM: We had a core program at that time, four courses I believe, that all students who graduated from this college had to take. It was taught by an associate professor and a couple of instructors. When that retrenchment came, I just had to get \$20,000 from somewhere. There had been student question about the usefulness of the core and as a personnel administrator down below the hill, I'd received some of that comment over the years. Having to make a choice, I chose to retrench the core and the temporary appointments at that time totalled just about \$20,000. In that 1971 retrenchment, the core went; and it has never been restored. That has set us somewhat apart from the bulk of Home Economics programs across the country. It's influenced our attitude toward accreditation by the American Home Economics Association where common learnings stimulated by a core is an important part of the accreditation requirements; so, it was more than an insignificant moment in our history. The fact remains, at that time, it gave us \$20,000 to retrench. We did begin to cut back on teaching loads. We eliminated a lot of courses. I expect we might have just simply restructured and probably eliminated a fourth of the courses of the college. We reduced the majors from twenty-six to thirteen and did quite a few things to kind of firm up the operation.

Then, with the coming of the Koffler/Ibele memorandums and the earlier pronouncements from Chase, we began to change the selection of staff. I think I could say today, Clarke, our criteria and our procedures would bear inspection in any part of the university; and it's quite typical, but I would have to say that in the early 1970s, had you come into this faculty as a graduate student, then instructor, and you worked hard and were earnest, and noble, and gave service, you probably would have had the expectation of working up into the faculty over time without too much reference to your promise as compared to other potentials in the field. The first time this was directly challenged in one department . . . a young man had finished his six years of probationary service and the nomination came down for appointment with tenure as assistant professor. I did feel the situation had merit but not special merit and I asked the department to reconsider it. There were tears and recriminations but I think as they talked about it, they decided that there was a superior talent available had they chosen to look for it; so, the appointment was denied. From that time forward, there was a massive change in their approach and behavior. It just took one good example, and we all agonized about it but we agonized together, and it worked out.

CAC: This line of conversation began with an innocent question about the mood and temper for undergraduates on this campus.



KM: Yes.

CAC: Let's get back to that for a moment. I do know that when you came in you were still doing your graduate work and you were assistant to the dean. Then, you get the Oil Can Award in 1948. This is a kind of sense not only of your own personal contribution but of a sense of family on this campus?

KM: Yes, not unrelated to the perception of the College of—at that time—Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec as a service unit but one affecting the lives of the people of Minnesota. Not many people realize that in 1940, Minnesota ranked, I believe, next to Mississippi among the forty-eight states at that time in having the least number in proportion of high school age farm boys in school.

CAC: You mean after high school?

KM: Yes.

CAC: Gee, I didn't know that.

KM: Sixteen, seventeen years old, as I recall . . .

CAC: I had no idea.

KM: It was a product of, in a sense, the successful farms of Minnesota . . . German and Scandinavian parents who needed labor on the home farm—not the Finns but the Germans and the Scandinavians—and some of our most prosperous agricultural counties. Brown County, for instance, Sleepy Eye, and Morgan, and around in there simply were not sending their youngsters either to high school to finish or to college. We had fewer college trained people as farm operators at that time than any state except Arkansas.

CAC: But a very high level of farm management?

KM: Oh, productivity. At that time the Vo[cational] Ag program in Minnesota high schools was growing bigger and the leadership was clearly centered on the St. Paul campus with people like A.M. Field and George Exstrom. They were making a big change in farm management practices and procedures in local communities, adult farm training, and rural youngster planning. I did my thesis on factors relating to the post high school choice of rural farm boys and; it was quite clear that the College of Ag, or the segment of agriculture, was in a sense not training youngsters who return to the farm—only 7 to 8 percent of the graduates did—but training rural farm youngsters who were ultimately going to have to leave the farm for some other activity, for farm service programs, sales, educational contacts of one kind or another, agricultural research, and the like.

CAC: And Agri Business?

KM: And Agri Business, clearly that was the major outlet. That push to assist in, really contribute to, and respond to changing rural environment, coupled with the emphasis in Minnesota of the 4-H Club programs as youth development endeavors, kept this faculty very close to its constituency. At that time, you would find the bulk of the faculty, certainly in Agriculture, involved in some way with the Minnesota State Fair and being consultants to county fair programs, and the like—both Extension specialists and the academic appointments—so that the faculty were heavily rooted in the activities of rural Minnesota.

CAC: There were technical schools, high schools or something, out there at Crookston . . .

KM: Grand Rapids, Morris, Waseca, and one here called the Central School, right on this campus.

CAC: Is that what you're speaking of now?

KM: No, I'm really talking about the college programs.

CAC: Talk about those others just for a minute so that it will be clarified.

KM: The technical schools were . . .

CAC: If I'm confused, any historian will be confused. [laughter]

KM: Okay. Let's talk about a short-lived, if you will . . . The first School of Agriculture in Minnesota, operated under the auspices of the university, was a secondary level school up at Crookston, Minnesota on land donated by James J. Hill. This was at a time when the road system was undeveloped, when rural youngsters (a) couldn't travel long distances to high school because of transportation and (b) were needed on the farm late in the fall and early in the spring.

CAC: You're talking about 1900, 1910?

KM: In 1906, that's when this thing [unclear]. A School of Ag was started up there that persisted until 1962 or 1963. There was one at Grand Rapids that must have started in the 1920s, perhaps. The Morris one followed shortly thereafter. The Waseca school, I believe, opened in 1949. That, you couldn't excuse on the ground of transportation or other need.

CAC: There was a great senator there.

KM: I think he was a representative but he was certainly an effective . . .

CAC: He became a senator . . . we're talking about Mr. [Rod] Searle?

KM: Yes. Was he a senator? Did he ever become a senator?

CAC: Oh, yes. Oh, I think so.

KM: Are you sure? I don't think so.

CAC: He had such authority, I assumed he must have been a senator. [laughter]

KM: No, he was a representative all the way.

CAC: I see.

KM: But he certainly was effective. These schools served high school age youngsters and, in those early days, I think were marvelous. You'll find these big farmers up and down the valley and many of the people in our leadership positions in the agricultural community and elsewhere had their start in a School of Ag.

CAC: What was the relationship of these schools that you're describing now to the College of Agriculture here?

KM: Essentially, no relationship.

CAC: I see . . . not even through Extension which would have been centered here on the campus?

KM: No. They were administered by an officer. They reported from a budgetary point of view to the dean of Agriculture but each was pretty autonomous in its operation. Do you remember J.O. Christianson?

CAC: Oh, yes

KM: He was the head of the Central School of Agriculture and one could, I think, reminisce for hours—I won't—on the relationship between the college and the school on the St. Paul campus. It was J.O., you know, who administered the dormitory program on the St. Paul campus, who really controlled the St. Paul campus gymnasium . . .

CAC: [laughter]

KM: . . . and who was the . . .

CAC: Except for insiders, these subtleties would not have been perceived? I always assumed that J.O. was kind of running things centrally.

KM: He was running his School of Agriculture and he did it with aplomb . . .

CAC: [laughter] This was down to when? How long? It's within my time.

KM: Oh, yes. J.O. must have stepped out in . . . would it have 1962 or 1963 or something?

CAC: He had this radio program, too.

KM: Yes, *The Friendly Road*, wasn't it?

CAC: On the Minneapolis campus, we always perceived him as playing a . . .

KM: He was really the master of a little domain but it was self-contained. Some of the academic staff did teach at both the school and the college but the accounting was very clear and, in the main, he had a Central staff.

CAC: This may come back, if he had control of the gymnasium and the dormitories, to the sense of a community among undergraduates?

KM: That might . . . The School of Ag people, since they came in and were dormitory students here, have built a tremendous loyalty and a feeling of belonging. They have an annual reunion and each year, in April, as many as 300 people come back for their reunion. They have a Last Man's Club . . .

CAC: What does that mean?

KM: That means ten of their earlier graduates of the Central School formed a club and they celebrate each year with a dinner the survival. I think it's down to about three now.

CAC: I see . . . and no women?

KM: No women at that time in that particular program. These Schools of Ag had, I think, reached the point where they probably weren't being as effective as educational institutions as the local high schools simply because they weren't as well staffed as they might have been and because what they did in the early days was being duplicated in the local schools; so . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

KM: It was quite clear that there needed to be a change. We had quite an investment as a state in these schools but it was, I think, not in the best interests of the students to continue them over time. I believe the first one to go was the Morris school.

CAC: Has this become the nucleus of that campus?

KM: Out of the Morris School of Agriculture came the Morris collegiate program.

CAC: And like that?

KM: Just the staff of the Morris school, almost to a man or woman, moved over and continued as the initial staffing of the college program out there.

CAC: The same would be true at Waseca and Crookston?

KM: Right, and Grand Rapids . . . I can remember going up there with Bob Keller and Al Vaughn from the General College as part of a task force to look at the Itasca program at Grand Rapids; and we recommended that that, in essence, be transferred, if you will, to the community college, which was building in that area. That proved to be a very helpful transition except for a technical forestry program which was quite specific to the school and that, too, I believe, has transferred over to the community college.

Northwest Minnesota was a little different situation . . . tremendous loyalty to the Northwest School of Agriculture. Bernie Youngquist, the superintendent of the school and station, was a very successful community relations person and they had a Northwest Education [unclear] Association that worked very closely with the school and the Parents' Association was strong. I, as the director of Resident Instruction in those early years of 1960 to 1970, inherited the task of leading the transition from the School of Agriculture to something different. In my own graduate study and as I grew acquainted with agriculture programs around the country, I had been impressed by the New York State Technical Institutes in Farmingdale and Delhi and . . . they had six of them. These were much like the diploma schools in England, and in Germany, and in Sweden, two-year associate degree programs, if you will, preparing the intermediate service agent for the agricultural business community. There were many jobs in agriculture that called for training beyond the high school level but not necessarily baccalaureate degree programming: elevator operation, sales, a whole range of outlets. It was my feeling that the Northwest facilities, the Northwest School at Crookston, could be changed from a high school level program to a technical college program patterned after the New York institution. I met with the community up there. Ted Fenske, who was here in the dean's office on the St. Paul campus and had the title, at that time, of director of field operations which included the branch stations for research and the schools of agriculture—they kind of checked in with him—had in a sense, relinquished responsibility for those schools to the director of Resident Instruction. He was a School of Ag graduate himself and he felt keenly about them and about their contribution. He was supportive of the move; although, I can recall being on a platform in front of a hostile audience at Crookston of some 300 people trying to make the point that this was a time for a change and it would be an opportunity for that community to move and Ted, rising out of the audience, saying, "Why are you fiddling about? Why hasn't this been done before?" This was one month after I had taken over from him the responsibility of these things and the rascal . . .

CAC: [laughter]

KM: [laughter] . . . I could have shot him! Dean Macy of the institute was in the audience at that time and he held my hand later—in a sense— . . .

CAC: [laughter]

KM: . . . and consoled me for the behavior of his colleague but I had thought that at that moment, I didn't need that kind of a comment. But it went well. Ted was cooperative in helping and once the idea was established that we didn't need to close the institution—the community felt very keenly about that—and that we had a positive response to offer, that community had been marvelous in its support. Wenberg was vice-president for Educational Relationships, I believe it was at that time, and was active in handling the politics of that situation. In a sense, he inherited responsibility for those programs after they had been established. I was working rather closely with him at that time. I had the assignment of finding a leader for that development and I located Stanley Sahlstrom. I had known Stan Sahlstrom. He was a student when I was a student here on the campus, an athlete, a good student, an operator in the best sense of that word. I know of few people who have such positive brass, if you will, who fear nothing, who have got such tremendous optimism, who can rouse enthusiasm from the part of others. That's what we needed for a program at that time because the facilities were meager, the community was in turmoil, the future was uncertain. Stan was acting as the director of field programs for St. Cloud State College at that time; so, we invited him to come down and he did. He has done a marvelous building job of this program at Crookston. I was on the campus last week and it is impressive.

CAC: Now, happily, a lot of these things got started in the 1960s when there was more money? That's a question not a comment.

KM: Yes. I think I would say we didn't think there was more money at that time because it was hard coming but it did come. I think the action probably was taken about 1964 and I believe the program kicked off in 1966 or thereabouts. I know Sahlstrom, and Al Vaughn, and I spent time . . .

CAC: Why was Al Vaughn involved?

KM: Because there were some elements of the teaching program that had <sup>no</sup> remarkable similarity to the General College program. This was going to be a two-year program . . .

CAC: Would be close to the General College [unclear]?

KM: Yes, and it was going to have a general education component. Al was quite sympathetic to the concept and he was very helpful. He, and Stan, and I toured the New York institutions, four of them I think, and spent quite a bit of time chatting about concept. I was close to the program. At that time, I made a policy decision which may or may not have been the right

one—although, I guess I'd do it again. We chose not to relate the faculty at the Crookston Technical College too closely to those on the St. Paul campus. This was a program which was viewed by some as competitive for students. Even though it was a two-year program, it was picking off agriculture students that might come to the college. After they got acquainted with it, there were many who felt that the courses up there ought to be set up to duplicate our lower division courses so that those students could go up there for two years and transfer down. It had always been my feeling that that was not the objective of that program. The objective was to be, in a sense, a self-contained two-year program preparing those people to go into the field, that obviously there were those who were going to transfer but that was not the prime objective. Today, about a fourth of those students do transfer to collegiate institutions but the bulk of them go into the field. I didn't want them to be just a carbon copy of introductory courses in a collegiate program. I think today, there is a closer relationship between our teaching departments here and those there than there was at that time—and maybe that's appropriate. I strove for some distance between those groups. It didn't contribute to the building of the warmth and relationships that would have been a mutual support expression between this campus and the Crookston campus. I thought it was more important to establish the philosophy of that program than it was to build a working relationship between faculties.

CAC: That could come later and you say it has now.

KM: I think it has come; so, it's worked out very well. Sahlstrom had done a great job. When the Waseca question came up, obviously, we had the pattern established at Crookston and since it was quite clear that something was going to happen at Waseca because of Searle's interest and others', they really followed the same general curriculum pattern. By that time, I was no longer responsible for the outlying schools. I think they were pretty much a function of, I believe it was, [Stan] Kegler at that time in his role as vice-president. They had been moved around in their assignment.

CAC: Portfolio moves, right.

KM: Yes. That, too, has developed. They've had aggressive leadership, remarkable success in establishing rapport with employer groups. They're in a setting where they can work with parents in a way that university faculties generally don't do—although, they might well do. I would say that they've added a dimension to agricultural education in Minnesota that has been useful. It's been a kind of burr under the saddle at times for some who feel that the funding that goes there might better be used elsewhere. I think hard reality would suggest that if it wasn't used there, there's no guarantee that it would be directed here, for instance.

CAC: Sure.

KM: But I think it's giving good educational service to students.

CAC: This might be a good time just to pause and to think about the persons who are going to be listening to these tapes who will be as confused as I am about the relationship—you've helped clarify those schools and those campuses very well—of Experimental Stations and the Extension. You're as well-informed as . . . tell me about those and how they relate to the whole mission of the university and this campus. Is that too big a question?

KM: No.

CAC: [laughter]

KM: It's a good question. From the earliest days of the establishment of a State Agricultural Experiment Station, which was, in a sense, the response to the establishment of the Hatch Act of 1887 which called for the establishment of a state experiment station, there had been a fund matching arrangement down through the years, an arrangement that now places a major fiscal responsibility on state appropriations to these agricultural experiment stations.

CAC: It was originally was federal?

KM: The impetus came from federal and now, I suspect, 12 to 15 percent of the annual appropriation to the Experiment Station is federal and the bulk is state. We've had a concept which says that a member of the faculty and in the early days primarily in agriculture because the research program in Home Economics was very slow in coming . . . These were, after all, agricultural experiment stations. Home Economics research wasn't viewed, at that time, as being part of that concept—I trust it is now and I think it needs to be more in the future. Forestry lagged behind Agriculture but has made marvelous strides in the last fifteen years. It was rather understood that the outcome of the research funded through these stations would be in the direction of service to the agricultural industry of the state so that although members of the faculty would be in a position to choose their topics, really it would be choosing their topic within a frame of service reference.

CAC: The expectation of applied research?

KM: That's right. So that when you recruited an agronomist, if you needed a plant breeder, you recruited a plant breeder on the assumption that his work ultimately would contribute to a specific service end. Over the years, although it's quite clear that much of this work is very basic, it has been oriented toward service; and, indeed, that's led to the continuation of the funding in a very substantial sense.

The question always arises . . . what is the expectation of a staff person in the academic sense, in the research sense? We identify the monies that we use to support our staff people. Most of the people in Agriculture, and about 40 percent of the Home Economics, and most of the Forestry are funded from at least two different sources: the O-100 Maintenance Funds at the university and the O-302 monies which are monies from the Agricultural Experiment Station



appropriation. The proportion of time funded by the Ag Experiment Station is clearly defined. Let's say if they're 40 percent funded by the station, you rather expect that their research will be substantial and it'll be contributing to the mission of the station. The 60 percent of their time which is funded from the maintenance appropriation should cover their teaching, less some segment of research which is that proportion you would expect from any faculty person. But, therein lies a very delicate question because to look at the total effort of an individual who is jointly funded and to separate that segment responsible to the station and to really identify that segment that you might expect from anybody on O-100 monies to couple with his teaching, that gets pretty tricky.

CAC: It has to be done within the former schools, now the colleges, but also there has to be a central officer in the institute of the St. Paul campus to get this flow going?

KM: Yes.

CAC: Is there a director of the Experimental Station . . . was there?

KM: There is a director of the Ag Experiment Station. Let's talk about structure for just a minute because I think it will help.

CAC: Okay.

KM: When we reorganized in 1970 and set up what was then the Institute of Agriculture and became in 1972, the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics—we were pressing for equal recognition—we had a dean of the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics, who was at that time Woodie Berg, the three deans of the colleges, and then the two directors of the Experiment Station. There's a lot of shared leadership in this operation. We have the Ag Experiment Station appointments which are funded in part by the station and in part by the maintenance appropriation. Really, if the station directors put any money on these people, he has a leadership responsibility for them. The dean who controls the O-100 monies controls that part of the money. If you have Extension specialists who are located in the departments, they're funded by Agricultural Extension, the Ag Extension Special, almost totally. The director of the Agricultural Extension Service figures that he is responsible for their operation. We had a few people that might have been funded from all three sources but mostly it's station and maintenance. So, you've got a shared relationship between the director of the station and the dean. We decided that we would work that relationship through by having this executive council of the institute. It used to meet every couple weeks for a couple of hours to talk through common problems, and give us a chance to ventilate, and to interact. [William] Hueg, who followed Woodie Berg as the dean of the institute, was the moderator. We did talk problems. We never took any formal votes but we always worked out a consensus on differences.

CAC: Those three deans of the colleges were present, plus the director of Extension . . .

KM: The director of the Experiment Station, the director of Extension, and the dean of the institute. The dean of the institute . . .

CAC: But coming into these conversations, the directors of Extension and the directors of Experiment Station come in with a little money.

KM: That's right.

CAC: They come in with their pot.

KM: In essence, this was a meeting of people with . . .

CAC: Mixed funds.

KM: . . . merged funding and common interests; and there needed to be agreement or you were in for trouble.

CAC: I can't imagine there is any model like that anywhere else in the university?

KM: No, and I'll tell you it worked beautifully but it had one flaw, which I think was corrected last year. The flaw was this: Bill Hueg, who was the dean of the institute, really played no role in operations. He was a moderator and he was, essentially, an external PR relationship man. But, you know, for somebody who came up through the ropes as first Extension specialist and assistant director of the Experiment Station and director of the station, who had been an operations man all the way along, to suddenly find himself in a position where, in essence, he was an overseer but he didn't have any operational control, he managed himself beautifully. He stayed out of that and I can't tell you how much we appreciated working with him and how helpful he was but I do know that in his later years, he felt that he was gradually losing his touch with the reality of the thing because, although he was handling the politics, he was one step removed from the action. At the time that he was retiring, we thought this is a good time to talk about the structure of the institute. Dr. [Kenneth] Keller was aware of the situation and the president. It was proposed in an initial discussion that we could resolve some of this . . . and we could make the dean of the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics and the dean of the College of Agriculture one and the same. That, in essence, posed a real threat to the dean of Home Economics and the dean of Forestry . . .

CAC: I should think so.

KM: . . . because Home Economics and Forestry had not fared well in the earlier history of this place when, in essence, the dean of Agriculture directed the budget. So, we proposed an alternative in discussion which really was accepted by everyone. We said that the unit that needs to be ecumenical in its impact is the Agricultural Experiment Station. That's the one that should not be under the control of any one of the colleges.

CAC: Okay.

KM: So, why not make the dean, or the presiding officer, of the Institute of Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec and the director of the Agricultural Experiment Station one and the same? That's what we did. We had a real good young man, Dick Sauer, who was the director of the Experiment Station. He clearly had the quality and the capacity to carry a [unclear] of responsibility. By keeping the operating responsibility for the station, or at least the ultimate responsibility for the station, and tying that in with the relationship responsibilities of the institute position, it added a great deal to the stature of that position. It kept him tied in. It seemed to be a pretty good answer. He did one further thing which I thought was crucial. When he saw that this was going to be accepted, he recommended that each of the deans of the colleges be named an associate director of the Ag Experiment Station . . .

CAC: Ohhh.

KM: . . . and gave each of them responsibility for all monies of the station that were allocated to the colleges. Now, the director of the Experiment Station will make the allocations of new monies so he is in a position to guide, and direct, and influence in the long term but from the standpoint of operating, the dean of the college, who formerly had responsibility for instruction, now has the money for the research done by the station; and it greatly simplifies focuses and defines his role. I think it's an even better setup than we had before.

CAC: Before 1970, 1945 to 1970, how were these arrangements?

KM: We had a director of the Experiment Station and, in essence, he managed the money of the station. The dean of the, at that time, Institute of Agriculture—or ultimately the Institute of Ag; it used to be the department and formerly the division but it grew to an institute—had the teaching money. Those two more or less determined what was going to happen but the dean of the institute was clearly a major figure in decisions. By statute, the director of the Ag Experiment Station has responsibility for those funds; so, if he wanted to be stiffnecked about it, he could say to the dean of the institute, "These are my responsibilities and you really can't intrude." In actuality, the dean of the institute really is a university official and more or less [unclear].

CAC: While we're talking about these complexities, it would have been in 1972, 1973, that Mr. Hueg who was then occupying this [unclear] was encouraged or set in motion himself tendencies to become a vice-president, what came to be a deputy vice-president, I think. What are the politics of that?

KM: This movement preceded Bill Hueg's coming into that spot.

CAC: Okay.

KM: Woodie Berg, Sherwood O. Berg, who came to us as the head of the Department of Agriculture and Economics, and then later became the dean of the Institute of Agriculture and later Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec, was the first administrator on this campus of note, I think, to fully appreciate the role of political organization in development. We'd been led over the years by, at least in my history, two very marvelous gentlemen—but they were *gentle* men: Walter Coffey and Clyde Bailey. They were the cream of the crop. They were thoughtful, sensitive, and insightful but the political arena was not their forte. If you just look at the history of building on this campus, it moved rather slowly and with great deliberate speed until about 1960 or immediately thereafter. When Woodie Berg came in as dean of the institute . . .

CAC: That would have been in the early 1960s?

KM: In the early 1960s. Was it 1962?

CAC: Early [Meredith] Wilson Administration.

KM: Upon Macy's retirement. Woodie, in short order, organized advisory councils, began to build relationships with the agricultural committees of Minneapolis and St. Paul Chambers of Commerce. He pressed working relationships with the agricultural industry in all of its forms and gave as much attention to the urban industrial sector as the rural.

CAC: Presumably this was with the knowledge and encouragement of Mr. Shepherd and Mr. Wilson?

KM: Oh, no question about it. Woodie was a cooperator. He didn't go around any ends but he . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

KM: . . . did things that had not been done before and which have been done by almost every successful administrator since, I think. If you just walk around this campus, it's been transformed in the last twenty years with that marvelous Fisheries and Wildlife building and, certainly, the Veterinary Medicine development, which was in part an Ag development but kind of preceded Woodie . . . Food, Science, and Nutrition, this new plant science thing, the animal science development, [unclear] office building . . .

CAC: The library?

KM: The library.

CAC: McNeal Hall . . . where we are.

KM: Yes. These came because (a) Woodie had a good support group organized and (b) he expected his people to get out and work for their buildings.

CAC: This meant directly with the state legislature or committees thereof?

KM: Right. You know, that's a part of the university process. They accept the fact that if you are in the university priority listing so that your case is presented down there, then, in essence, you really are expected to get in there and carry the load.

CAC: You may get on that priority list in some part because of the political support outside that precedes it?

KM: There's no question about it. Home Economics . . . we worked pretty hard to get people to convince our local administration, both Woodie and then the vice-president's office, and the regents that we were in desperate need—we were, but they hadn't recognized it. The most crucial step is to get on the university priority list but after that then, you're pretty much on your own.

CAC: I see.

KM: A few years ago, when there was much weeping and wailing about the lack of advancement of the music building, one of the deans related to it made a comment in the deans' meeting one day that there was kind of an anti-intellectual tone in the legislature and they weren't supporting these kinds of things. The question was asked, "What have you done to include the building?"

CAC: [laughter]

KM: The answer was, "That's not my job. We've got Kegler down there and that's what he's there for." Well, that is not the way the system works these days . . .

CAC: Or any days, right?

KM: . . . or any day. With some changes over there, they really did organize some troops and they got the music building.

CAC: It's going up right outside my office.

KM: Yes. Woodie really was the first visible mover in this direction and [unclear] School doing this and later on the [unclear].

CAC: Hospital.

KM: And the hospital, yes.

CAC: Let me interpose here as an historian that I'm looking also at the expansion of the Twin Cities campus generally during the 1960s and the whole west campus building effort. The Wilson Library, what came to carry his name . . . there was expansion of building just everywhere.

KM: Yes.

CAC: So that Sherwood Berg is really part of . . . ?

KM: Part of a major program but . . .

CAC: But he is [unclear] presiding [unclear]?

KM: When you think about the growth of specific program within a major program, he really broke it open. I have a feeling that if you look back in the history, at least during the Middlebrook years, Bill Middlebrook was probably the major building mover in the university . . .

CAC: No question.

KM: . . . for many years but he wasn't moving things on the St. Paul campus in particular. Woodie certainly started that process but it's the sort of a process that the recent dean of Engineering certainly managed to a *T* and some others. It's been kind of fun to both watch it and in a minor way be a part of it these last few years.

CAC: Now, is this accompanied by an expansion in the numbers of students on this campus?

KM: Yes . . .

CAC: But not significant when put against the new physical facilities?

KM: No, this is a research campus and these facilities . . . let's say . . .

CAC: The classroom building . . . McNeal Hall has got an awful lot of teaching going on in it . . . the library.

KM: Yes, but our problem with [unclear] McNeal was that we were on the down slope of available money and we got the money for the building but we really did not get money for increased staffing so that my problem was that in a building that gave us twice as much assignable square feet for instruction, we didn't have one . . . I think we got two new staff positions and one of those was a [unclear] clerk, this kind of thing, but no addition to the academic faculty. If one could have moved our building program back two years, I think the whole situation would have changed. We were fortunate anyway.

CAC: Let's get back to Woodie Berg. You're defining his style of leadership and initiative and this relates to the move to create a higher title for that position.

KM: He worked with an institute advisory council, established it, brought together . . .

CAC: This means *extra*-university? These are people from the community?

KM: That's right, major agricultural leaders, the major farm organizations, the agricultural industries. They served as both a sounding board and, certainly, picked up the cudgel in support of the activities out here. I think its membership felt that if you look at the industries of Minnesota, if you view the attention given to, say, medical administration within the university, that if there was a Health Sciences vice-president, that there could very well be an Agriculture vice-president and just in terms of the well-being of the program, they ought to shoot for it; so, they really went for a vice-president for Agriculture. A number of the colleges in a number of the states around the country have done that. I think it was the Central Administrations feeling that it might have been a little awkward there in congress to have a Health Sciences vice-president and that they'd hate to compound the question by adding other vice-presidents because if you have a vice-president for Agriculture, what are you going to do about Engineering and Education? Then, after awhile, you just have a whole new range; so, I suspect they struck a political compromise and made a deputy vice-president for Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics and placed him in the academic vice-president's office.

CAC: [unclear] rhetorically, what did that mean? What kind of authority did this person have that he hadn't had before?

KM: In the initial phases, I think it was felt that he would work very closely with the vice-president for Academic Affairs, probably be his spokesman to represent the university in a—what shall I say—somewhat elevated plane in their relationship to Minnesota's industries and agricultural and forestry industries but, in actuality, probably didn't change his role a great deal. Over time, where you have a title that's really not suggestive of activity, it erodes. Bill Hueg used to have an office over in Morrill Hall but after awhile he didn't use it. I don't think it's unfair to Bill to suggest that his very vigorous personality and his very straightforward way of approaching problems at times proved an awkwardness in his relationship, certainly, to Kegler.

CAC: The title has been dropped now?

KM: No, we still have a deputy vice-president. His full title, Sauer's title now, is deputy vice-president for Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics and director of the Experiment Station. We do not have a dean of the institute anymore. We had real trouble recruiting, I must tell you, a dean of Agriculture the last couple of times because the question always kept coming up on the part of candidates, if you've got a dean of an Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics, what remains for the dean of the College of Agriculture and who really is the voice of agriculture in the state? Try as one might to explain to them that under our system the dean

of the college really could be as significant and as powerful as he himself viewed himself to be, the fact remains there was always that sneaking suspicion, here's Bill Hueg up here. He's identified as agriculture from the word go . . .

CAC: You bet.

KM: . . . and it was always a problem. Now, with the dean of the College of Agriculture administering the Ag Experiment Station funds under his control as well as his teaching program, there is no question and we're off and running with a real fine new dean appointment.

CAC: It's also possibly the case that the creation of the vice-president for the Health Sciences, the creation of a deputy vice-president for Agriculture was accepted by President Moos but not with much pleasure by the vice-president for academic administration and may have been one factor that led to the resignations in the spring of 1973?

KM: I'm sure that there was always a little awkwardness there. I never did visit with Woodie and it would have been inappropriate to do so. I think at one time, Woodie would have enjoyed carrying the role and the responsibilities of a vice-president for Agriculture but he certainly was politic in his comment and never open in recrimination.

CAC: Why did Mr. [unclear] . . . ?

KM: Early in the game, he made it clear that he wouldn't be a candidate for that position?

CAC: Why did he leave?

KM: I think he wanted to run his own program and he went to become the president of the South Dakota State University. That was his alma mater and he always had quite an affection for the institution.

CAC: Did he go on from there?

KM: He retired from there just this last spring.

CAC: I see. So, when he went there, he stayed?

KM: He stayed there for nine years, yes. He was very active in the international agricultural development activities in [unclear]; so, I think he was challenged. South Dakota offers quite a challenge in terms of administering a program with very limited funds, but he also had opportunities to express himself through these other programs, with his relationship to AID [Association for International Development] and . . .

CAC: You've done yourself some work with AID in Africa?



KM: Yes, not a great deal but some.

CAC: Would this be true of lots of persons on the St. Paul campus? Would they have a sometime or a part time relationship?

KM: The Ag people, quite a few of them, have been really quite active over a number of years.

CAC: What was yours?

KM: I just went on two special assignments. The first one . . . West Virginia University had a contract under AID with Makerere University, the University of East Africa at that time, and there was a request in for a rather major building program; and they wanted a neutral party to come out and assess the need for the building. One of my associates from my office and I went out and I must say, Clarke, it was a marvelous growth experience for me because although I had read a little bit in comparative education, this plunged me right into it. I went into a college there that was related to the University of London as their external examiner of sorts. The question was, do they build a new chemistry/biology wing? They had a wing that could seat only forty-four students in the labs and they wanted to have an intake of eighty-eight; so, the proposal was to duplicate these facilities. We couldn't find an organized curriculum; so, we spent some time detailing out the kind of teaching that was done and the time spent in each. We discovered that this biology building that they were going to duplicate was only in use about eight hours a week, the one offering, and the chemistry about twelve. We kind of gently, after a couple of weeks, asked about double sections or multiple sections. I can remember . . .

CAC: [laughter]

KM: . . . [unclear], I guess, a lecturer from New Zealand saying, "God, if I have to repeat the course, I'll lose my enthusiasm and spontaneity." But we suggested that rather than duplicating facilities, it might be better to have a multiple section arrangement. We did, before we left—we were only there six weeks or so—make some recommendations on curricular change and staffing—this was in 1965, I guess—for that program. I had occasion to go back there on another assignment in 1969 to find that they had used our report as a blueprint right down to the last paragraph. It was just exciting. One of these books written by Sterling Wordman of the Rockefeller Foundation makes reference to a change in a program that has some significance and I went through it one day and I found a beautiful little comment which says, "In 1966, the university installed a full time dean who was dedicated to the development of the country" and so forth. This was one of our recommendations.

CAC: It's the American model transformed into another kind of society.

KM: In a sense. We encouraged them to make more efficient use of their . . . they had a farm in connection with the school. They used the farm only as a kind of a work experience for students and we encouraged them to get some scientists out there and introduce these students

to plant breeding and cultural practices that were useful. The problem was that at that institution, they were using a curriculum which might have fit the University of London, maybe [unclear] but certainly was inappropriate for . . .

CAC: With developing nations, certainly, in the third world, certainly in the American Extension outreach model [unclear].

KM: It has a great deal of promise. Obviously, you can't just set it down and say, "This is it," but we found that they had a research establishment which was totally and completely separate from their teaching program and from their extension program and no provision for communication among any of the three. Those are changing over time. But that was my first experience. The second time, we went out to look at manpower needs in agriculture and I was primarily looking at the diploma schools in East Africa. They're really quite a fine set of institutions and not unrelated to the kind of thing we're doing at Crookston and Waseca.

CAC: You say East Africa . . . is this Kenya, Mozambique?

KM: Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, yes. Now, unfortunately, what was at one time a unified support of the University of Makerere at Kampala, Uganda, has broken up and there are separate institutions.

CAC: They have their own troubles [unclear].

KM: They're duplicating veterinary schools and at a time of great fiscal stress, it's unfortunate—but, you know, we do the same thing.

CAC: Fiscal stress and political turmoil.

KM: Yes, right.

CAC: The St. Paul campus has had a liaison officer to encourage or to implement this kinds of overseas work or do you work through OIP [Office of International Programs] or both?

KM: We relate very closely to OIP. It was, I suppose, kind of an informal development in the early stages. Bill Meyers, you may remember him . . .

CAC: Oh, yes.

KM: . . . as the head of the Agronomy Department, was active in those programs and, ultimately, became I believe the first university . . . was he dean?

CAC: I think he was the director for the Office of International Programs.

KM: Did they call him dean of International Programs?

CAC: He was called director.

KM: [Willard?] Cochrane, I guess, later held that position.

CAC: And Blackburn?

KM: Blackmore.

CAC: Blackmore.

KM: John Blackmore was an agricultural economist with a long history of involvement and he came to the institute as a director of International Programs for the Institute of Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec. He was aggressive and stimulated a lot of things. There were some problems. They weren't personal problems; they related to structure. We're a strong department head institution, as you know, out here.

CAC: I was going to lead into that sometime; so, this would be a good time.

KM: Okay. You take programs such as Animal Science where they have longitudinal research programs involving large investments in livestock . . .

CAC: Over a long period of time.

KM: . . . over a long period of time, where a constant change in leadership really would create some problems and that's been the pattern of administration in agricultural colleges in the American pattern, I think since the start. As a head—before the introduction of the term system of administration of recent years—you really were appointed for a term that ended only when you retired or when relationships were such that you couldn't continue but there were very few replacements. Once you were a head, you ran your program for years and years. Blackmore, as the director of International Programs for the institute, really wasn't in the administrative framework as far as the management of personnel. Over time, he would see some opportunities and he would begin to move toward them and begin to contact faculty in terms of responding to them. Then the question would come up, who makes these administrative decisions as to whether we can free up a person and whether we should free up an individual and get into this thing? There was kind of constant, oh, exacerbation . . . a little bit of tension between Blackmore's office and the department heads as to the role there. I have a feeling that they were matters that probably could have been worked out over time had people wanted to do it that way but I think a decision was made to, instead, decentralize the responsibility and place it with the colleges; and since most of the International Development work out here was either Ag or Forestry at that time—it really wasn't involved in much . . . they aren't yet very much—Blackmore's office was abolished and much of the impetus for Title XII development and

planning now rests with a position called the assistant dean of the College of Agriculture for International Development.

CAC: I see.

KM: Delane Welsch is presently acting in that role. Malcolm Purvis, who was that officer, left a year ago to take a position with AID as an adviser in Morocco. We need a little definition about that position yet because it's a position that is partly funded by the institute office on the assumption that service will be given to Home Economics and Forestry as well as Ag; and we're not uncomfortable in the relationship—Welsch is cooperative and helpful—but I have a feeling as our own program develops, if it does develop, we'll probably want to share a little bit more in university planning money and the resources given to it. Ag has been nicely aggressive. I think the last legislative appropriation, maybe the last two, contained some monies to support this general development. I, in a reasonably selfish mode, would hope that some of this assistance will devolve upon us.

CAC: I'm kind of guessing—this is in the form of a question although it will be statement—that probably no division in the university has had more impact throughout the world than your campus since 1945.

KM: I think that's fair. We've had some remarkably fine leaders in the Economics area and economic planning is important.

CAC: As well as Agronomy?

KM: As well as the Basic Sciences.

CAC: Could you comment about those two fields. I know this is not specifically your field but . . .

KM: I think International Development calls for the melding of resources from many, many areas. If the planning isn't right—the assessment of a country's resources and its long term use—then, you face tremendous waste and effort. That's where I think people of the Ed[ward] Schuh variety, [O.B.] Jesness, and others before him are crucial. The problems that relate to technical practice in handling livestock disease, plant disease in the development of improved varieties . . . these are all fundamental but there's a third element that we think is important and that's this question of involving the person power of the developing countries, the role of the family in production and the long term planning for the utilization of the people. In 1965, when I was wandering around over there getting acquainted with the situation, I was kind of . . . well, I was distressed and disturbed to find that the AID supported program in extension development was focused on the male population in Kenya and Uganda when 90 percent of the food in the area was grown by the females, and there was no communication between males and females,

and the women weren't getting any of the benefit of that instruction. That was simply a matter of not sensing the . . .

CAC: Yes, the culture.

KM: . . . cultural patterns and applying those lessons; so, while I think that we can be very helpful in providing technical input in new development, it's got to be accompanied by attention to the social structures as well. Over time, I would think maybe somewhere people in Family Social Science and in the other areas will offer much more to the equation.

CAC: That's a very delicate, controversial area and it gets right away to demography and family planning.

KM: Yes. This recent conference in Mexico . . . that's fundamental, I think.

CAC: It is, but it's also very delicate.

KM: It's certainly an explosive issue and there's no quick answer to it.

CAC: Perhaps, less explosive is this matter of internal structure. You were speaking earlier about a tradition of head shifts in the St. Paul colleges generally. I think that is perceived; although, I gather the last ten or fifteen years, there's a gradual drift in some areas away from that structure and style?

KM: Yes. I grew up with it so I suppose I feel . . .

CAC: Let me just interrupt a minute. When I came to the Arts College in 1951, there was a tradition of long, strong heads in a number of the major departments: Psychology, Economics, History, Sociology.

KM: [unclear].

CAC: So, it's not peculiar?

KM: It's not peculiar. I suppose this college has a greater infusion of non-agriculturally oriented people than any of the other groups out here and it would have been easy, I think, for us to switch over to the . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[Tape 3, Side 1]

KM: I think that it takes a long time to change a faculty if one is working in the development mode. It seems to me that if your administrator is in a chair for just, say, three years and then moves, a university program of personnel development doesn't get accomplished in that period of time; and I think it's difficult to transmit from one chair to another the planning element that goes in working, say, with an individual, and individual growth, and individual development.

CAC: This would be true in any department in the whole university?

KM: It would. I guess, I wonder how well it does work in departments where the leadership changes with regularity. I'd like to think that given a little more time, a head can bring things together in a little more solid fashion.

CAC: Do the departments on the St. Paul campus have a system of review of the heads?

KM: Oh, yes.

CAC: How often is this?

KM: Five years.

CAC: That serves the same function as a turnover of a chair doesn't it?

KM: In a sense it would.

CAC: I see a pattern that where there are chairs, it's a three and three . . .

KM: Yes.

CAC: . . . and very often it's a six. That would coincide very closely with five.

KM: Yes, yes.

CAC: It may be that we aren't all that different.

KM: We may not be all that different. Our Family Social Science group in the earlier years, since that's a new department in a sense—it really has been developed in the last twelve years and it's turned into a superb collection—voted initially after McCubbin's coming to operate on a chair basis but two years later requested a return to the headship. I think in the Ag Department, because of the properties involved and the long term planning, there is a pretty strong rationale for leadership that extends over time.

CAC: What would the tradition of faculty participation in internal governance of the departments be?

KM: I don't think it would be unfair to say that in the earlier days, the term benign dictatorship could apply. Without any question, the department heads of the late 1940s, 1950s, and even into the 1960s pretty much wrote the ticket. That isn't totally true . . . it might be unfair but not completely. I had mentioned earlier in a note . . . when I came here as a very young administrative assistant, if you will, I used to watch with great wonder the interchanges within the faculty meetings in the College of Agriculture and in those days, Jesness, [Herbert] Hayes, [Ross] Gortner, and [Elvin] Stakman were giants and, I expect, offered 90 percent of the conversation and most of the argument.

CAC: You're describing a system of natural deference?

KM: Yes . . . and strong heads.

CAC: Certainly, a person like Jesness and Stakman?

KM: They would surface in any group but they also ran their departments in that spirit. It was, I think, in the 1950s when we introduced the question as to the adequacy of the Social Science requirements in the Ag curriculum that we began to broaden the participation of the total faculty in curricular decisions. A young man name [Ronald] Beazley up in Forestry was a real rebel—I don't know where he is now—and I enjoyed his energies. We worked together for some time. We used to have a Social Science requirement of eighteen credits but for the Ag boys, that could be completed by any eighteen credits in Agricultural Economics; so, you fulfilled your Social Science requirement by taking Marketing and Management and . . .

CAC: Which you would have been taking in any case?

KM: You would take it anyway. We had a fine task force with Gordon Swanson in Ag Education and some of the others. We had Bob Beck out here seminaring with the faculty on the role of liberal education in a professional program and it needs integration not separate segments. Out of that came some changes in our requirements which at the time of the university move toward the general distribution requirements found that we had to make no essential changes really. I was always rather pleased that that had come about. It was the younger people on the faculty, of course, that really helped us carry that through.

CAC: Through an all-faculty meeting structure?

KM: We had task forces galore working on that.

CAC: But there was an assembly of the whole faculty?

KM: Oh, yes. They had to ultimately improve the changes.

CAC: But you're saying these anticipated the Council on Liberal Studies?

KM: In a way, that . . .

CAC: That would have opened up for you the Humanities as well as the Social Sciences?

KM: That really stimulated its coming to the Rhetoric Department, that is, emphasis on . . .

CAC: I see.

KM: . . . the Humanities and the literature in addition to their basic work in speech and reading.

CAC: Now, the Rhetoric Department had been located where in this structure?

KM: It was in the old College of Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec and when we split that up, we left it in Agriculture because that was the strongest unit and at that time, it had the most students; and it seemed a reasonable place to put it. They were out here because we always felt that it was rather foolish to run all of our students across on the inter-campus streetcar, later bus, to get English on the other side . . . or Communication. It developed into a very strong unit. You'll recall the contributions of Ralph Nichols in Listening and James Brown in Reading.

CAC: Right. This may be an indication, again, of the strength of a headship?

KM: It could have been, although . . .

CAC: My gracious, he was a head for a long time.

KM: [Robert] Lansing preceded Nick [Ralph Nichols]. Nick, I think, was very strong. They gave superb service and every administrator on the campus, I think, recognized that and really held for many years that we needed to keep that service with us. It's added a great deal to the quality of our graduates over time. I was influenced by the work in that department; although, I never did take any of their basis communications and I wish I had.

CAC: Nick would have been one of the forces politically around the campus generally in the 1950s?

KM: Nick didn't ever enter into campus politics. He was a quiet one. He was a marvelous supporter and he was a good quiet initiator of ideas but he wasn't out ever really campaigning. I must confess, he was . . .

CAC: He comes back occasionally. I hope to be able to cut a tape with him.



KM: Oh, it would be a joy. He was in earlier this spring just for a couple of days. He's sold all his property up here; so, I think it was just a matter of coming in for a visit.

CAC: Tell me a bit more about faculty participation. You're describing an increase in that during the 1960s at a college level . . . also at department levels?

KM: Yes. It varies by departments. The history of the old College of Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec was that the curriculum committee was an assemblage of the heads, not the faculty but the heads.

CAC: Okay.

KM: There was a double purpose there. One of the preceding administrators who was in office for quite some time just didn't believe much in meetings. Actually, the heads of the Department of Agriculture could go for years without a meeting with that administrator so, in a sense, they found the curriculum committee of the College of Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec a substitute forum for their general questions. I was assistant to the dean for awhile and then for ten years the director of Resident Instruction and by custom, I guess, served as chair of that committee; but I always felt—it began to move toward change—that it just simply was not appropriate to have your department head serving as your curriculum committee. The people that were working with the students were not well represented on that committee; and so, over time, we got it changed. I think this faculty is so interlaced with outside influence now and so strengthened by the bringing in of personnel from different kinds of structures and institutions that there is a very active faculty participation in governance and direction. It's a type that we just didn't even sense or see until later.

CAC: This is kind of a philosophical observation but what we're talking about now happens everywhere starting in the mid 1960s and not only at this university in all of its diverse colleges and campuses but throughout the country.

KM: Yes.

CAC: There just has to be something *going on* that would lead to a participatory rather than a hierarchical structure of governance.

KM: Yes.

CAC: In your case, did it lead to—and in what ways—to student participation, graduate and undergraduate? That was a major thing . . .

KM: We've always emphasized in the old College of Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec a good deal of interaction with the Ag Student Council and the Student Center Board; and I suppose maybe I brought some of those patterns with me to this college. We have students on every committee

of the college except the Faculty Complaints Committee. We encourage their participation. We have an Home Economics Board that I meet with at their request and sometimes at my encouragement, but not regularly. One of my office people serves as the liaison but I am always available to them and I try to follow them. I guess my general suggestion would be that you don't have students on collegiate committees to gain direct benefit from their suggestions. They don't have enough perception, and they don't have enough experience, and they don't have the longevity of interaction that allows them to help; but, you do have them on there to capture some of their enthusiasm. They help define the issues, and the problems, and the stresses of the moment; and the participation gives them a feeling of being a part of the process and it helps you through many tender relationships with them. I've never encountered a situation where I thought having students as a part of the process damaged the process. The gain is so much better than the costs in bother or the time that you spend in orienting them. They can, at times, wield the scalpel pretty skillfully and they do; but, it just seems to me that we ought to pull out all the stops in terms of bringing them into the planning. We do it better with the undergraduates than with the rest.

CAC: Yes. Was there any time historically that the pattern you're suggesting really began to gel and work?

KM: Really, it's always been a part of the picture. I was an undergraduate student on this campus and although I wasn't on the Student Council, I was on the Student Center Board and I was quite active in things around the campus. Dean Edward Freeman, who was the dean from 1917 to 1942, was a great hand with students—he was a plant pathologist and a very eminent scientist in his own right—he loved students and he worked with them. I can recall being called into his office as a sophomore and wondering why I was being hailed before the dean. It developed that he wanted Maynard Speece and I to assist him in writing the poetry for the annual Christmas program on the campus.

CAC: [laughter]

KM: It was that kind of . . . so that it carried over.

CAC: Sure.

KM: My whole history out here has been that students have something to offer.

CAC: Do you have a hunch . . . what percent are resident on your campus?

KM: Not very much. That's the change.

CAC: Historically, would it have been more of a resident college?

KM: Oh, yes, much more. At the time when we had 1700 students in total in Ag, Forestry, and Home Ec, and very few cars so that people didn't flee in those early days, I expect 50 percent lived either on or very near the campus. At the present time, we've got 1400 undergraduate students, about 1300 in Forestry . . . maybe 500 but I doubt if we have more 600 or 700 at the outside near the campus; so, we're a commuter campus quite different from our counterparts at Iowa State, and River Falls, and Stout, and the like.

CAC: Do you think it makes a difference in the educational experience of the undergraduates?

KM: Oh, I think so. The bulk of our students are working part time. They're here and then they're gone. The old weekend experiences that used to be [unclear], and plot the use of your time, and make some choices in terms of your entertainment. For so many of our students that's taken care of by their normal routine and family life or their work responsibilities. I'd be inclined to feel that the quality of the out of class experience is not where it was three student generations ago; and we ought to work pretty hard to see that it's pretty good but that imposes an increased responsibility on the way we use the time we do have with them.

CAC: Coming over this morning on your campus, parking way down and walking up the hill, four times young people said, "Good morning!" and "Hello!"

KM: That's wonderful, isn't it?

CAC: I can walk that Washington Avenue Bridge and if a student knows me, she or he may say, "Good morning and how are you, Professor Chambers?" . . . it's a funny . . . and here it is the middle of August.

KM: I look upon college teaching or college staffing . . . it's a lot like volunteer work. You could be a professor at the University of Minnesota, I suppose, and you could fulfill your contract in a rather straightforward manner . . .

CAC: Many do.

KM: . . . and I'm afraid many do. The difference between that individual and the one that really makes the place go is the spirit and that additional effort and enthusiasm that they bring. You know, a dean can't order that nor can a department head. You better support it, and encourage it, and pick people for it but you've got to get it one way or another. I guess, I would like to think that the spirit of this place is in that direction. My office staff are pretty carefully selected for their friendliness. We walked out of here a minute ago and there was a lady working at my desk. She's not my secretary but she used to be our front office receptionist but she just simply didn't project the spirit and intent that we wanted, and we've moved her back here, and we've found another person to fill that role. I've got a group of people that really are service oriented, and we sit down every fall before we start, and we talk about that for awhile just to kind of refresh and to agree that our role here is to give service to these students. We all are reminded

that nobody comes to see me unless they've got a problem really, or an opportunity, but most of them are problems. It's easy to become weary and to respond in unhelpful ways; so, I work a little bit at keeping the spirit of the enterprise up. I've got people like Natalie Gallagher who I think is the best Student Personnel administrator in the university today who is just a marvelous supporter of students. She's not namby-pamby. She's straightforward, and honest, and demanding but these kids know that she's really with them and tries to help. So, I select my staff that way. When we interview department prospects and out of courtesy, if nothing else, they route them all through me before they select positions. I'm looking for people who care about people and I think it pays off over time.

CAC: Dean [Theodore] Blegen, who was dean of the Graduate School for eighteen, twenty years, whenever he went on a conference of deans or whatever he might be representing in the Land-Grant institutions for the president and so forth . . . when he came back, he always had an informal half hour or hour with all the staff, the clerical staff, the professional staff, just to talk about what he had learned. It gave a sense of community across that line which is very important.

KM: It sure would.

CAC: I find that's not an administrative style very widely used.

KM: [sigh] No, but we really need it. All of the pressures are in the other direction. I weep for these young people in the tenure track because the pressures are just unbearable. Even when they get on board in a permanent sense, they feel they need to produce academically and they do and with our transportation patterns, the increasing role of consulting, the professional endeavors that take them away, it would be so easy to simply abandon these students. Once in awhile, you find a jewel of a department head who by his or her own behavior just say, "We don't do things that way." Elwood Caldwell, Food, Science, and Nutrition, in my judgment, is the finest administrator that I've ever encountered. He's not effusive. He's very quiet in manner. He has a very dry sense of humor and you've got to be with him for awhile to appreciate it. He's very competent professionally. He comes out of a role as director of research for the Quaker Oats Company and, before that, he was a professor of nutrition in a Canadian institution. His department is recognized as one of the strong departments of the university and rightly so, I think. In that department, it is just assumed that you do your teaching well and they have a built-in program where each year in their reviews with their staff, the staff member has to present his plans for self-appraisal for the year ahead. It calls for three approaches. One of them must be student evaluation, but then any two others, they choose, but they have to be in that appraisal and that includes peer visitation or you name it. They expect them to write, and it's a very productive department from the research point of view, and they give public service; but, the interesting part is that there's never any debate about doing things with and for students. That's just part of the operation and that's leadership of a high order. Gee, you wish you had that in every spot. This university of ours needs to work at that.

I think, last year, Clarke, coming out of John Wallace's task force on the student experience, I headed up a committee reviewing the university orientation program and our findings were just about the same, that we haven't been really very user friendly. We've got to start thinking about our consumer concerns, if you will, service to students, and be a little less cut and dried, matter of fact, and maybe reexamine our efficiencies, if you will, vis-à-vis, student response to some of the things we do with them. I thought in the deans' discussions, there was a fairly clear indication of a recognition that we'd gone to far in the recent retrenchment in really savaging the student service elements and that we've got to start rebuilding some of those. I've been close, I guess, to the Student Personnel Administration aspects over the years. I've always felt that there were problems with what seems to be a columnar relationship by column . . . faculty's on one side and student personnel workers on another . . .

CAC: That's a nice way to . . .

KM: . . . with very little interrelationship and each working with the best of intent. I'm not sure that I know the answer. For awhile, I had thought that what we needed was to reassign the resources of the Office of Student Affairs to the colleges. When you get right down to it, the affiliation of the students . . .

CAC: The identification [unclear].

KM: . . . is the college. But, obviously, there are campus-wide questions, and concerns, and activities, and no single college can respond to those; so, this is not clean but I suspect that we need to work a little harder at bringing the experiences of the Tom Fauteks into contact with those of the department head and the college student personnel workers so that at all times, we're sensitive to the pressures that each carries. It would be so easy for our admissions offices to become just machinery. Boy! they're dealing with people and people in a very vulnerable . . . varied family relationships, finances, time, jobs, lack of clarity as to objectives . . . all of these things; and you shouldn't handle those with a clerk in a routine manner. I think we need to invest more in the service to these students at the entry phase and that's not a high efficiency operation but it would really pay dividends over time. Wallace and his crew are working in that direction, I think. I thought that task force report was a healthy thing for the university and I hope they take it seriously.

CAC: You may be inadvertently describing an aura of hospitality and generosity that may account in some degree for the Center for Youth Development and Research [CYDR] being located here in your college. Would you care to . . . does that prejudice that story too much? Let me say where I'm coming from and you know what it is but for the tape. It would have been logical to have that in the Institute of Child Development. It would have been logical to have it in the School of Social Work. It would have been logical to have it in the Family Center with Reuben Hill, lots of places—but it ended up here.

KM: I think the objectives of CYDR have a great deal in common with the objectives of this college and, more particularly, some other aspects of the St. Paul campus operation. If you view that as almost having three major objectives, to do research in youth studies, and to assess research, and to do some model building, and then you look at our 4-H Club program with 120,000 enrollees, students if you will, in the Extension program and these are youths in a kind of a structured situation, boy! what a laboratory for work in this area. The outreach tradition of the campus through the Extension specialists and others . . . I think the developing Family Social Science program, which at the time we were talking with CYDR, was just kind of getting off the ground but moving . . . I thought there was good reason to invite them and I was pleased . . .

CAC: How did Gisela Konopka know about you? You're describing a kind of logic but it would be a logic that would operate elsewhere on campus.

KM: Paul Cashman used to be a professor of Rhetoric before he became vice-president for Student Affairs and I was always fairly close to Paul. Somehow, I think I encountered Gisela when she was working as kind of a special assistant to Paul Cashman.

CAC: And of course, Gisela's very close to Mrs. Cashman.

KM: Yes. We rather enjoyed each other and I think I became a member of her Advisory Council for CYDR.

CAC: Which was then free-floating?

KM: Free-floating. That was CURA [Center for Urban and Regional Affairs], you see.

CAC: Ah! okay.

KM: It had, what, that five-year period that they gave it and, then, they had to make a choice. I did interpose the suggestion that they come our way and it was, as you might have expected, greeted with a little bit of amusement at that time; so, I drafted a . . .

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

[Tape 3, Side 2]

CAC: Not on Gisela's part?

KM: No, no. She would not have but others, including other members of the Advisory Council. You could understand that. Before we quit here this morning, we need to talk a little bit about image, I think.. I did draft a little memo, which talked about (a) the possibility of working relationships with the Extension Service and that lab and (b) the fact that there was a prospect of some continuing research funding through the Agriculture Experiment Station and said that

I thought I would be able to move toward internalizing the CYDR budget into the maintenance appropriation. That may or may not have been a mistake. It did fix the funding but it also took it out of the public eye and incorporated it into the structure; and we really haven't grown since. We might have if we'd kept it outside . . . oh, had greater success but from a tenured relationship, there was advantage to these people. That seemed to find favor with them and so they came out. I don't think they regretted it. Gisela felt quite at home. I do think that it's been difficult for Gisela to, in a sense, relinquish the [unclear] leadership to those who followed.

CAC: Oh, I'll tell you, she had a harder time retiring than anybody I know.

KM: Yes, she did. To be honest with you, that particular unit, after she left, felt the need to examine what it had been doing with great care and the need to make some changes, which I think were useful but were difficult for her; so, it's not been easy. I get out and have breakfast with her on her porch once in awhile.

CAC: Good for you. She stands in such need. I do, too.

KM: She's not enthused about the . . . There's been a loss of visibility. In part, it's because of the change in direction and, in part, because of [Jerome] Beker, who came in to replace her, has a speech impediment which keeps him off the platform. This is one of those situations where you make some choices. He is a brilliant man. He's a marvelous editor, and writer, and a conceptualizer. I treasure him as a part of this faculty. He is terribly handicapped in an area where I think we desperately need visibility. His other people have had other interests; so, I've got a problem there. It's part of a developing situation.

CAC: This may lead logically into what you wanted to say . . . something about image. It's image not only within the university but with students and with the larger community?

KM: Right. Home Economics, in my judgment, is an exciting field because it deals with the human condition. Most people equate it with the experience either they have had or their children have had in rather poorly taught programs in the junior high school with an emphasis on certain skills of cooking, and sewing, and the like—that's too bad. If you look at a program that seeks to understand man as a social being and the elements of his inherent environment, housing, food, clothing, community, and then the way in which they impinge and influence each other, you really have an exciting area to explore. The impact of color on mood, the nature of our working relationships, the sexuality and its terrible and wonderful aspects, the growing realization of the importance of good nutrition on both prenatal and postnatal development and its impact on intellectual growth . . . we rather feel we're working in an important area. We're working with and seeking to cooperate and interact with disciplines that don't quite have that concept of what it's like. Once you break in and establish the working relationships, there is no problem. We interact here with Social-Psych, Sociology, Anthropology, a great deal of work with Public Health. Our latest appointment in Nutrition is a shared appointment with the Department of Medicine, Andy Collins' program in Child Development . . . you name it. This

is a relatively recent [unclear] and this is not true across the country. I think really, for whatever reason, we're quite a different program from 95 percent of the Home Economics programs in the country.

When one of our people writes a research grant that has to go to the National Science Board for the National Science Foundation for review, Home Economics on that title doesn't help because nationally, that doesn't provide the image of research competence and the history of the field is that it doesn't. So, over the years, we've talked about name change. This is a tricky business. We've got a devoted clientele. The Extension homemakers of Minnesota are many and they get good service from the Extension home economists. The home ec teachers of Minnesota . . . we do not draw a larger proportion of our students from home ec programs but, just the same, they are a very visible segment. We have a devoted alumni. I've worked pretty hard, and those before me, to maintain a relationship with them, and they are supportive, and they are proud of what's happened at the University of Minnesota under the title of Home Economics. I've had two task forces work on this question of name. The first one, I think back in 1977, worked for two and one half years. They came up with the suggestion that we ought to change the name, that Home Economics was not an accurate depiction of what's happening here; but, they did not have a name to propose for the moment and, until we found one, they suggested we stay with Home Ec. I appointed another task force two and one half years ago and, a year ago, they recommended that we change to Human Ecology. This is the title used at Cornell, and Maryland, and Michigan State. The faculty endorsed that and we sent it forward. For some reason, President Magrath never felt very kindly toward the term and, indeed, Ken Keller felt that it had strong biological overtones; and we do have a department of Ecology in the next building. So, they encouraged us not to press on that. I think Keller would have taken it to the Regents' committee. In fact, it did go to the Committee on Educational Policy of the Regents; they didn't like it either. That pretty well stopped that but we kept the committee at work and, this last May, upon the recommendation of the committee, the faculty, I think by a vote of 79-21, voted to propose the name College of Human Development—now, this is a name used at Syracuse and one or two other places—and they'd press, in a sense, for some action as a clarification by the moving of the School of Social Work to the college.

CAC: We talked about it in that liaison committee . . . what might be.

KM: Yes. I felt kind of a moral obligation to move a change because they really thought they were going to get [unclear] in it.

CAC: Oh, yes.

KM: I thought that it would be unfair if we didn't. This may cost me my position, incidentally. I don't know whether this is for the record or not but there is quite a distress on the part of some of our alums and some of our faculty members at this move toward change. I guess I felt that the role of a dean is not always to wait; so, I've been encouraging a grapple with the problem but there's an unhappiness, only it's more the casual. It's tied in a little bit, Clarke, with my



relationship with the American Home Economics Association. I've tried to be a contributor to the field since I came into it. In the late 1970s, and maybe around 1980, I served as president of the Association of Administrators of Home Economics. That was a little unusual. I think maybe I was the first male to fill that function, and I served on the board of the other major administrative group, and I was elected the vice-president for Public Affairs of the American Home Economics Association; so, in a sense, I've tried to participate. But I've been quite critical, critical of the criteria for accreditation which calls for common learnings at a time when students are coming with specialization in mind; and even though it's a limited specialization, it is a specialization and it influences their choice and selection of institution. The move of this college from primarily a freshman admitting institution to one serving transfer students is, in a large part I think, because students are avoiding Home Economics at the time of admission because of the image of Home Economics as [unclear]. Then, they find out what we've got and then they come in. But there are easier ways to do that I think; so, I've been pressing for change in accreditation, as well as in some other aspects of the program. It could be said, if I suppose one would wish, that this dean has been a little hostile toward the national association in terms of the way it does its business and seems to be leading a drive to change the name from Home Economics . . . that therefore, he is not a supporter of the program. I hope I can get through that but I wouldn't swear to it. There are casualties in all major movements and I think maybe, right now, I'm as close to being injured as I've ever been in the years I've been administering programs around here.

CAC: Keith, I think we're kind of winding down to miscellaneous things at the end that were on my agenda that we haven't looked at directly and, at least, one item that you wanted to talk about earlier. We mentioned earlier Wenberg, and Amberg, and the whole legislative process. Can you say a bit more about your experience with the legislature, what the St. Paul campus does, how it's coordinated with Central Administration at the university?

KM: I must confess, I think there is a remarkable feeling of unanimity in general mission and approach. I came into this thing rather precipitously. I certainly didn't invite the role but in the, I guess it must have been, early 1960s, I received a rather sudden telephone call. I think it might have been after the death of Ted Fenske, who had played that role with the legislature, to fill in for him. Then, I guess, for three bienniums, I went down there. Wenberg was the maneuverer and the operator, of course. He was a very outgoing and ebullient person. Amberg did the personal contacts for the hospital and certainly built support there. My role was as a listener, I believe.

CAC: Ah, I see.

KM: I sat on the benches and chatted and, of course, got well acquainted with the committees and so, in a sense, tried to interpret our needs and programs. I enjoyed it. I thought Wenberg was a master. I suppose, if there was ever any criticism of his operation, it probably was that he was affiliated so strongly with the party in power in those early days that it was difficult to make the shift when things changed; but, gee, he was a good worker and we owe him much.

But I think maybe Kegler has just done a superb job in a relative sense. I would have to say, in all honesty, I think during the President Moos years, we probably lost the initiative, or, at least, we lost the definition of primary leadership in higher education in Minnesota to the figure and the expression of the chancellor of the state university system.

CAC: Who was a master politician, Ted Mitau.

KM: Yes, Ted Mitau. He was superb in that relationship and Dr. Moos was not quite as aggressive. I think Mitau just simply stole the show there for a number of years. I think Magrath has brought that back in a healthier way.

CAC: All through this period that you've been associated with the University of Minnesota, there's been this coalition presentation of budget and testimony, and seeking out legislators, and in this people from St. Paul would have played, did play, a major role but coordinated through Wenberg or whoever is in that position.

KM: Through Wenberg and now Kegler; so, we followed the rules. I think the difference is, maybe, in terms of building support for, let's say, the specials is that the dean of the institute, and the deans of the colleges, and the director of the Experiment Station and the Extension have worked almost on a non-stop basis with their clientele in building understanding of the program and understanding of needs and support for seeking responses to those needs. Each fall, the last number of years, we make a swing through the state with regional groupings of community leaders. One year, we're going to talk about the needs of the institute and what our request is going to be, and the next year, what we did with what we got and what kind of service is being given. This last year, a most interesting year, Sauer set these meetings up so that we went out and listened. We brought these people together but instead of taking a program to them, we asked them to tell us how they felt about our program, and what it was doing, and what changes needed to be made. It was a very effective program. It was in one of those meetings down at Rochester that President Magrath was really harpooned by some parents who said, "Why isn't the university as interested in our superior high school graduates as many of these other institutions are?"

CAC: Now, we have that initiative.

KM: Yes, following that meeting. On the following day that he came back, he wrote his memo to the vice-presidents to start working in this area. But, we picked that up at every single instance.

CAC: When you say these meetings, how many of you folks were out in various settings?

KM: Oh, there were usually four or five of us at each of these meetings. There was always the director of the Experiment Station, and now Sauer, and the director of the Extension Service, and the three deans or somebody representing them. They are low key and informal, but a lot of

good exchange takes place. In a sense, these specials, don't get support automatically. You just have to work at it all the time. I think that, maybe, that's been a difference over the years between the collegiate administrators out here and those on the other side. It's been the investment of time in community relationships with intent to maintain this kind of fiscal support.

CAC: You mentioned the students and particularly the honor students, but just to come back to the student body in general, I have a sense from your time, 1945 to the present, that all universities, and particularly here, there has been a move away from the kind paternal protection of the student. You've been closer to that than many people. Would you comment on that?

KM: Yes. I came up through the E.G. Williamson era . . .

CAC: Which was pretty patriarchal . . . at first.

KM: Ed was an interesting fellow, kind of a conundrum. Philosophically, he was the strongest exponent for student freedom and involvement of anybody around this place; but in his behavior, he really was quite patriarchal. He started some ideas, I think, that bore fruit over time and we're a much healthier society today not seeking to guide the behavior of these people and not pretending that we can play the role of parents while we're here. I expect there are excesses and errors of omission; but this is a better approach than the one we had a few years ago.

CAC: You see Williamson as a bridging figure into all of this kind of [unclear].

KM: Oh, yes. I don't know that I could ever have worked for him. I think he must have been a bear cat as a personal administrator. He was hard on his people; but his ideas were marvelous—not the way he expected them through his own immediate programs. After you could distance yourself from Ed, the things he was saying were worth doing. Yes, it was grand.

CAC: We're kind of coming to the end, Keith, of the tape but also three hours and there are kind of diminishing returns after that. Do you have final kinds of remarks for posterity?

KM: I do have one general area of concern. I've been following the university planning statements of recent years. While I view the role of the university as being a servant to the society of which it's a part, and I don't decry our recent sensitivity to high-tech and to the elements of business management and the assistance of these people to be successful in their enterprises, it does trouble me at times that in moving in the direction of activities that have dollars signs related to them, we could lose sight of those things that contribute to the improvement of the human condition. I'm being quite selfish in this expression. This college is concerned about man and his behavior. I'm concerned about those things that lead to family stress and family break up. I have walked the streets and watched these youngsters wandering. I just came back from a meeting in Scandinavia and to see these troops of youngsters on the streets in Denmark, in Copenhagen, and some [unclear] cities in Germany, and in Sweden, and in Norway, boy! it's remindful that unless we do well with the problems of youth and their

relationships to the larger society, and give time to that study, and to work with patterns, we really are falling short of our responsibility. I don't want to distract from the other things we're doing; but I think that if we neglect this area of our business, we're not being fully responsible. I just don't want the university to get carried away in the enthusiasm for keeping up with the technology of the time and forget the fact that in the final analysis, it's the people that count.

CAC: [sigh] You saw this in Denmark, and Sweden, and Norway, and Germany. Do you see the same thing here?

KM: Ohhh, the same thing here.

CAC: But to go away, some towns just clarify it?

KM: It clarifies it. I have a staff member in CYDR who talks about the youth prostitution problem in St. Paul.

CAC: Ohhh.

KM: Do you know this is more than just an incidental concern. [sigh] I haven't been successful. I hope that the person who follows me in this role will be more aggressive and more successful in exciting fiscal support for work on human relationships. We got some good things started here and I'm very proud of some things that have happened, but we're moving too slowly and the problems are large; so, I would just hope that those who make policy decisions over time kind of keep this part of the equation in balance.

CAC: That's a very good note of inspiration, mission, to end on. I certainly thank you very much. This has been useful to me, which means, I hope it will be useful for hundreds of people who will listen to the tape later.

[End of Tape 3, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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