

Roger Page (1984)

- Early Education 1-4
 - University of Richmond, VA 1-
 - NYA (National Youth Administration) 2
 - Page attracted to University of Minnesota for graduate work 2
 - tradition at Minnesota of student psychological testing 3-
- Counseling of returning veterans 5
- University of Minnesota leads nation in student survey 6
 - Patterson, Donald G. 3-6
 - McConnell, T.R. 5-7
 - Williamson, Ed 2-5, 7
- Deans concerned with student welfare 7
 - Cooper, Russell 7-8
 - Buchta, J.W. 7-8
 - Slumway, Royal 7-8
 - Darley, Jack 8
- University of Minnesota tradition of psychological testing 9
 - MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) 10-11
 - data not confidential 10-11
 - freshman assigned to faculty 12
 - orientation of new students 13
 - turn to graduate students for freshman advising 14
- SLA administration 16-17
 - deans meet chiefly on student issues 18
- University of Minnesota, only Land-Grant, urban, state university 19
 - large enrollments and classes 19
 - but individualized attention 19
- Enlargement of college staff, 1960s 22-24
 - placement office 22
 - upper division offices decentralized 2
 - Honors, 1966 22
 - Ombudsman Service, 1970 23
 - Student Services Committee, 1976 24
- Promotion and tenure changes, 1971 25
 - retrenchment 25
 - Koffler/Ibele memo 25
- College governance 27
 - constitution, 1941 27
 - Dean's Advisory Committee 28
 - McConnell, T.R. 28-29
 - McDiarmid, Errett 29
 - revised constitution, 29
 - all-college (elected) council 30
 - proliferation of committees, 1973 32-
 - resources, 1976 34
- Decanal styles 38-
 - McConnell, T.R. 38-

Buchta, J.W. 38-
Cooper, Russell 39
McDiarmid 40-
SLA becomes CLA, 1961-63 42
 Physics, Geology, Math to Institute of Technology 43
 Biological Sciences 43
Divisional deans, 1964 46
 Turnbull, John - Ziebarth's chief of staff 46
Student Intermediary Board 50-53
Honors 53
 McDonald, William 54
General Studies, 1944-57 57-65
 interdisciplinary 57
Council on Liberal Studies 66-
Cross-Disciplinary Studies, 1972 67
Bachelor of Elected Studies 70
OSLO (Office for Special Learning Opportunities) 70
Grading system 73

Interview with Roger Page

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

Interviewed on August 15, 1984

Roger Page - RP
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers having a conversation this morning with Roger Page, whose career at the University of Minnesota in the Arts College goes way back to the end of the second world war. He's been in the central office of the college ever since 1946, 1947. We are conducting the conversation in my office, which is 833 Social Science on the west campus of the Twin Cities, the University of Minnesota. It is, today, August 15, 1984.

Roger, why don't we start with just a few personal comments on why psychology, why the University of Minnesota? How did you get into the trade? Then, we'll pick up your career at Minnesota and the Arts College through your perception.

[telephone rings - break in the interview]

RP: That's a wonderful question because that was the question that Donald G. Patterson asked me to open my Ph.D. pre-lims.

CAC: Are you a Patterson Ph.D.?

RP: Yes.

CAC: One of 100. [laughter]

RP: I'll mention him several times during my comments because he certainly is the father, if not the grandfather, of the Student Personnel program at the university. I suppose, I went into psychology as an undergraduate—it was my undergraduate major at the University of Richmond in Virginia—for the reason a lot of people went into psychology . . . it justifies the notion of

psychologists being a bunch of loonies. Because I was concerned about myself and thought I'd learn more about myself, I studied psychology. I think that's the reason. I don't really know. Why Minnesota? I sent out applications to eight or ten places from that little teeny college in Virginia, the University of Richmond—I had no sophistication at all about graduate education—and got back some offers from places. I had to have some support to go. I'd been under Roosevelt's support program as an undergraduate student at Richmond.

CAC: Were you an NYA [National Youth Administration]?

RP: Yes.

CAC: Isn't that something?

RP: I cut down trees on the campus so I could go . . .

CAC: Bravo!

RP: . . . and then I moved into food service work. I was head waiter in the dormitory. [laughter]

CAC: I picked up four or five people now who have had that experience.

RP: Really?

CAC: Right.

RP: FERA [Federal Emergency Relief Administration], the first year and, then, it was changed to NYA. One of the offers came from Minnesota and one from Wisconsin. Wisconsin was about 300 miles closer to Richmond. They offered me five dollars more a month, fifty dollars instead of forty-five. I was in love with a young woman that was going to stay in Virginia; so, I went to Wisconsin for graduate work in education, in psychology, my first year. Then, I came to Minnesota for two reasons. One is I learned—I developed a little bit of experience—that Minnesota was a considerably stronger department than Wisconsin, though they were both good; two, a man named Jack Darley came through the University of Wisconsin. He had friends there; so, they invited him in to make a presentation at some seminar that was already scheduled. I met Jack Darley in that sense and also heard of a little book that he and a man named [Edmund] Williamson had written called *Student Personnel Work*.

CAC: Heavens.

RP: I realized really that's what I wanted to do was to go into student personnel work. It was consistent with my extracurricular participation when I was in college and I still was [unclear] a graduate, an undergraduate student myself. I was only twenty-one in my first year of graduate

work. So, the next year, I moved to Minnesota. I've been very happy. I've been here ever since. That was the fall of 1939.

CAC: And started right in with Patterson?

RP: Yes, Patterson was my adviser. He was also Williamson's adviser and Darley's adviser.

CAC: That's true.

RP: I think that somebody studying the history of Minnesota ought to try to figure out, if they can, Donald G. Patterson's contributions. I think they were significant, not just through students. Of course, I'm not talking about myself here so much as Williamson and Darley who were national figures in the field. Patterson apparently was a confidante of [John Black] Johnston. Johnston is Johnston of Johnston Hall. Johnston was the long term dean of the Arts College who really set the style, I think. He was dean for probably twenty years—I haven't looked it up.

CAC: These were the 1920s and 1930s.

RP: These were the days when deans were deans.

CAC: Oh, you bet. Guy Stanton Ford was dean for twenty-five years at the same time.

RP: Incidentally, Johnston was a neurologist. It's just amazing that the dean of the Arts College, who I think set the style and tone for the college which carried on for a long, long time, was a professor of Neurology. Patterson was very influential with him. Patterson, who, by the way, never got a Ph.D. himself, was brought to the campus by Mike Elliott [unclear] sort of founded and established this wonderful Psych Department we've got. He came to the campus out of testing work in World War II. He was a practical, nitty-gritty, experimental kind of guy and testing and individual differences were his fields. The University of Minnesota probably did more testing of students than any college, certainly of its size, in the 1930s and 1940s in the country. It was largely Donald G. Patterson. Well, that's how I got here.

CAC: Just for people who are listening to this later on . . . the Lloyd Lofquist interview has a long section on Patterson that details some of these things but not as connected with Johnston; so, it's fun to pick them up in several places.

RP: Yes. Lloyd and I were co-graduate students.

CAC: He must have been just a person of surpassing influence on that whole area and on the college?

RP: I think so. He trained Williamson. Williamson, his first assignment at the university that I know of, was head of the University Testing Bureau, it was called. It was later changed to the

Student Counseling Bureau because they got calls from people who wanted water samples tested and this, that, and the other thing.

CAC: I see. [laughter]

RP: The testing referred, of course, was psychological testing.

CAC: Right.

RP: Then, when Williamson moved on to a larger role in Student Services, as we now call them . . . I'll use those terms probably interchangeably.

CAC: Okay.

RP: For thirty years, Student Personnel was the label that was used. Just about the last ten, now, the label has been changed. Williamson went on to be first coordinator of Student Personnel waiting for a dean to retire. Then, he became dean of students. Darley followed him and was the long time director of the Student Counseling Bureau. I had an internship with the Counseling Bureau [unclear]. My first job in CLA [College of Liberal Arts] grew out of Patterson. I essentially finished my degree, except my thesis, before World War II struck. I, fortunately—somewhat through Patterson's influence . . . at least he made the suggestion—had the good fortune to be an officer in the navy in the hospital corps, which is where they put the psychologists in the Naval Aviation Program.

CAC: Of course.

RP: So, I was really a training officer, an educational psychologist, in the Naval Aviation Program for four years. When I came back, my intention was simply to put full time on my thesis. I'd collected the data before I left but i hadn't . . . it just hadn't worked out.

CAC: Sure.

RP: We always had this wonderful joke about Pat, that he was the most directive counselor there ever was. This was the time of Carl Rogers and non-directive counseling was coming into the fore.

CAC: [laughter]

RP: Patterson was thought of as the epitome of the opposition. He just told his graduate students what they were supposed to do. He was training me to be a rehabilitation counselor. He got me an internship—I now happen to remember . . . irrelevant to the university but important to me—with the National Tuberculosis Association one summer. He sent me to the counseling bureau, to the counselor. I was supposed to go into rehabilitation counseling but

when I came back to the campus, just before Christmas of 1945, having got out of the service in Pensacola, Florida, with my wife and two children, Pat said, "I've got a job for you." [laughter] I didn't want a job. I wanted to devote full time to my thesis. I still had about two months salary coming to me on accumulated leave in the navy but Pat told me I was going to take this job; so, I did it. I started January 1st, 1946. I'd just been back for a week and one-half. The label we finally decided on . . . You'd be interested in who the *we* was. Patterson and [T.R.] McConnell, who was dean of the college—he was the man who formally offered me the job—and Russell Cooper, whom I'll elaborate on in a moment, and Williamson sat down and decided on an appropriate title. We decided on coordinator of faculty counseling. So, that was the label that I moved in under as an administrative person in the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts [SLA], in what was then called the Junior College—a funny situation. The first two years were called Junior College. The second two years were called Senior College. They were both subsections of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts. We later changed that. In the little chronology I've got here, if this interview permits me to be chronological . . .

CAC: [laughter] For an historian, no better.

RP: . . . I'll tell you when we changed that. Russell Cooper was the assistant dean for the Junior College and I was placed under him because the counseling referred to was the counseling of this enormous bulge of returning veterans—of whom, of course, I was one, too—that we knew were coming. A committee chaired by Donald Patterson had written out a kind of format, an organization, to accommodate this. We knew that the faculty/student ratio was going to be very unfavorable. We couldn't possibly counsel in the way we had in the past in this college and we needed a set of junior, cheaper is what we mean, staff to deal with this enormous influx of new students, the pent up demands of the four years of the war. They were looking for some young graduate student, or post graduate student, like myself to organize this and head it up; so, that was my first assignment. We started in a classroom in Folwell Hall, converted into a room with little semi-partitions, and a bunch of people we hired very quickly.

CAC: So, you had to hire staff very fast?

RP: Yes. Graduate students, some of them undergraduates, who were quite . . .

CAC: [unclear] on account of the war [unclear].

RP: [unclear] years old but they were undergraduates. We, then, braced ourselves to start seeing and registering this great influx of students.

I ought to talk a little bit about Student Personnel in the college, which is the topic I feel best prepared to help somebody later understand. It was the thing I was most identified with for twenty-five years, not so much the last ten but for the first twenty-five years I was here. Let me say a few sort of general things about that. I've already mentioned Patterson and Johnston because it's my perception—I don't have good hard evidence on this that an historian ought to

have—is that the basic spirit of this college that prevailed for a decade or two after I came and I found when I arrived was enormously directed toward students, the differences among students. IDs, it was called . . . the course in Psychology that Patterson taught.

CAC: Individual Differences?

RP: Individual Differences. Johnston, I think, was caught up in this. I found letters to the faculty from Johnston because I had an interest in looking through things when I moved into the college. I found some letters to the faculty from Johnston as the dean. They nearly always centered on students, and student problems, and the difficulties that students had. I think that the fact that [Lotus] Coffman was president of the university for a long time was relevant, too, because he came from education and was a student-oriented person, in my judgment.

CAC: At the same time, Dean [Clyde] Bailey on the St. Paul campus had that same kind of commitment to the students.

RP: You picked that up, I suppose, from Keith McFarland?

CAC: Yes.

RP: I think it's true. I knew Bailey only . . .

CAC: Things begin to piece together . . .

RP: And then T. R. McConnell, the dean who hired me, who was dean for maybe five, six, seven years, came from education, too. He was an educational psychologist, as you probably know, and he brought that spirit and that interest in the student to the college. No person with an interest in student personnel beginning his career, as I was, could have had a happier circumstance than the one that I, by chance, moved into in January of 1946.

CAC: Now, you don't know all universities but this is really a different focus at Minnesota? It would exist elsewhere but in a larger degree because of this leadership?

RP: Clarke, I'm limited. I'm parochial. My whole career has been here . . . my whole career; so, I don't have the perspective I would like to have had and that somebody would need to make the assertions with confidence that you just make, but that is my belief.

CAC: Sure.

RP: That is my belief. There certainly is some evidence that I've seen in the literature that we were the bellwether institution in a whole range of things: our orientation program, our attention to students in career development, that end of things, the general education movement as it was reflected in students. Because of my interest in student personnel, in a sense early on, more than

my interest in what one might more formally call liberal education, I've always thought that Williamson was the man that made Minnesota a national institution in this regard . . . McConnell and Russell Cooper to some extent in their general education leadership. I really want to pile up the evidence about the attention that we gave students—I think it has changed over the years—while it was high and maintained high. Especially more recently in a period you're not going to be talking to me about, I think we've drifted from it significantly. Let me talk about the three assistant deans who immediately preceded the three assistant deans whom I met and one of whom I became within two years. There was a man named [Joseph] Thomas—Dean Tommy, he was called—who was a professor of English and Dean [William H.] Bussey, who was a professor of Mathematics. Thomas was the dean of the Senior College and Bussey was the dean of the Junior College. What happened is that the college offices then were just attached to wherever this man was the assistant dean; so, the Upper Division or the Senior College was attached to the English Department because Tommy was in English. Then, when J. W. Buchta became the dean of the ~~Junior~~ ^{Senior} College, a couple of years before I came so he was the one I met, he was in Physics; so, then the Upper Division or the Senior College was the outer office of the Physics Department. Here we were so small only—quote, unquote—6,000 students and, I guess, 4,000 during World War II but we were getting ready for this new bulge, which is [unclear] into the scene.

CAC: I understand.

RP: A man named Russell Cooper, Political Science, replaced Bussey as the assistant dean for the Junior College and he moved into Bussey's office, which was sort of a little corner in the class reservations office where students had to come to reserve their classes. It was the classroom next to his office that we took over to make into a counseling office. The third assistant dean was a man by the wonderful name of Royal R. Shumway. He looked like an enormous bullfrog. I met him in his last two years. He was a delightful gruff old guy, sort of the stereotype of the dean who dealt with students. He was from Math, as it happened, but his office was attached to the dean's office; so, he was at the other end of the office where Dean McConnell was the dean in the administration building, 219 Administration, now Morrill Hall. The significant thing, the point I wanted to make, is all three of these people—I'll leave out Thomas and Bussey because I didn't know them and they were earlier than the period you are studying now—Buchta, and Cooper, and Shumway, most of their duties, their predominant duties, as officers of the college were the students. They didn't do faculty personnel matters. They didn't do curriculum matters. They didn't do grant getting and research stuff, this enormous apparatus we've built up—and I don't want to sound negative about that because times have changed. All three of them were officers of the college to serve students. Russell spent probably a third of his time seeing students. Buchta, who was also by the way chair of the Physics Department . . .

CAC: At the same time?

RP: At the same time.

CAC: Boy!

RP: . . . probably spent a third of his time his time seeing students and Shumway spent all of his time seeing students. This was the [unclear] wheel within wheels. The only staff person in the college when I came in, other than these three assistant deans—it was the year before I came, as a matter of fact—was Jack Darley, who was a graduate assistant to Shumway to help Shumway see the students. Our first break out of three assistant deans who spent much of their time seeing students was Darley.

CAC: Heavens.

RP: I've always thought that was wonderful that he was the first person—there were two or three others later—to help Shumway see students. I claim that Buchta, and Cooper, and Shumway, preceded by Thomas and Bussey, represented this phenomenon—I'd like somebody to study this sometime; it's a personal, casual observation on my part—the first thing a dean does is to get an assistant to see the students. I don't think it means that deans don't want to see students but students are so numerous and seeing them takes so much time.

CAC: It's overwhelming.

RP: I'm guessing that Johnston appointed Bussey, and Shumway, and Thomas to see the students so he could spend some time being dean. The point is, all three of the dean spent a significant percentage of their time seeing students and way, later on, if we get that far in three days, excuse me, three hours, I'll comment on the time when we could no longer get the associate deans. The titles got inflated a few years later and an assistant dean wasn't good enough; everybody was an associate dean but in those days everyone was an assistant. We didn't have any associate deans. The associate deans didn't see students anymore. I'm not critical of them but it just was a change.

CAC: This whole thing happens when you're getting all that GI bulge and you go from 4,000 to 16,000, I would guess, pretty fast.

RP: In this case, if you're suggesting that the associate deans later on stopped seeing students because of the bulge, I would say, "Not so." It was after the bulge bulged.

CAC: Okay.

RP We appointed people with different interests to different purposes. That had different assignments.

CAC: The sheer numbers, 1946 to 1952, must have just been staggering for any college personnel system to handle?

RP: A couple of other things about the setting when I came in . . . The constitution of the college at that time, which was dated 1941, and while I don't know this for fact, I'm guessing, from what I knew of McConnell and what I read in the constitution, that he played a significant role in it. It had a Student Personnel Council, for example, along with the three other councils which we called divisional councils: Social Sciences, Humanities, the Natural Sciences Council, and Student Personnel Council. Student Personnel was one of the four concerns of the college represented in the constitution. The central committee of the college in those days was called the Dean's Advisory Committee and those members were elected, not directly by the faculty—that came in a change in the constitution ten years later—but were elected by the three divisional councils and the Student Personnel Council; so, another symbol that student concerns were recognized in the college. The college constitution also included what was called a Students Work Committee. There were only those councils, and that one committee, and the Dean's Advisory Committee mentioned in the constitution; so, that was another symbol of the significance of student concerns in the college, that the constitution included both a Student Personnel Council and what was called a Students Work Committee. That needs some explanation. Sort of a little fun aside . . . when I first heard of that, I figured it was a committee in charge of finding work for students but it turns out that the work referred to was the student's academic work and it was the committee on student's academic work. One of the first things I did three or four years later when I became chair of that committee was to change its name to the Committee on Students Scholastic Standing, arguing that that communicated more quickly to the uninitiated what the committee was about. It was so funny when I heard of the Students Work Committee. What I thought first would be what a lot of people thought first and I thought it was a bad name.

CAC: I think you were right. I misunderstood it.

RP: Let me say one other general thing and, then, ask your advice as to whether you want me to sort of trace the Student Personnel line, [unclear] through the college . . .

CAC: Okay, sure.

RP: . . . which I've done a little preparation for for this discussion if you want it done. The other general thing to comment on is the enormous amount of testing that we did of our students. Minnesota has preceded this by quite a bit. My understanding is we had the first statewide testing program of high school seniors . . .

CAC: Heavens.

RP: . . . under the leadership of Johnston, and Williamson, and Patterson using that as a basis, in part, for college admission. It's routine now, of course, and has been in general in higher

education for decades now. My understanding is that Minnesota was the first state to have a statewide testing program for tests that Patterson helped develop. We did a lot of testing in our college. We tested freshmen . . . these names are wonderful . . . you would understand it. One time we tested all entering freshmen on the MMPI, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

CAC: Oh, you bet . . . another great contribution of Minnesota.

RP: Yes, [Starke] Hathaway, it's chief author just died, you know, within the last month or two.

CAC: Yes.

RP: We tested all of our students on the Strong Vocational Interest Test. Minnesota has now become, and has been for years, the focal point of the research on that. The National Center for the Strong Vocational Interest Test is Minnesota. Strong—that's a man's name not a word describing strength—was from Stanford but all of his records were transferred here. Darley was one of the early chief researchers on the Strong and so was Ralph Birdie. Ralph Birdie married Strong's daughter who came here as a graduate student in the late 1930s, I guess . . . Frances Strong Birdie. We used the Strong. We had writing samples from all of our students and classified them in three levels of Freshman Composition . . . again, a routine thing now but we did it quite early on. As a matter of fact, one of the big tensions in our orientation program of new students was the attention to the time taken for testing because with all this Patterson influence we wanted to find out about these kids and the time taken to teach the students about the college and the university . . .

CAC: The results of these tests then went into the confidential personnel files of each student?

RP: Yes . . . My hesitation that you sense is *confidential*. They certainly weren't public information but they were used by the . . .

CAC: Counselors had access?

RP: . . . advisers and counselors. In fact, one of the things the Counseling Bureau contributed in that day was what was called the Faculty Student Contact Desk. It was a telephone number that a faculty member or any other authorized person could call and get test scores on students—a Williamson and Darley contribution. They certainly weren't as confidential as they are now. You know, all the recent [unclear] about confidentiality.

CAC: Oh, boy! I remember when I came here in 1951 myself and was advising undergraduates in History that this kind of information was often in that file.

RP: That's right.

CAC: Most of us, I speak for myself, didn't know what to do with it.

RP: I know. That's a mark of the failure of our attempt to train, if I may use the work with faculty, at least to inform faculty. We did have a system for doing that but it was a not perfect system. In recent years that I've gotten away from that myself and have been in the role really of being a faculty adviser, I've been getting things in folders from the Honors Division that I don't understand either. [laughter] While I always knew it theoretically that we didn't give our faculty enough information . . . Well, that's not fair to say, Clarke. We gave it to them and I think if I could dig it up, I could find that we sent you information on this but you were busy being an historian and I'm not . . .

CAC: And the MMPI is a pretty [unclear].

RP: We didn't send the MMPI.

CAC: Didn't I see those or was it the Strong?

RP: I hope not. The Strong . . . you would have.

CAC: Okay.

RP: Part of moving into the Senior College, by the way, was to take a test called the Sophomore Culture Test.

CAC: Oh, yes.

RP: A pretentious name but for years part of our graduation requirement was a certain minimum score on this Sophomore Culture . . .

CAC: Like a GRE [Graduate Record Examination]?

RP: Yes, exactly so though it was pitched at the sophomore year and it was our attempt to validate the general education background of students at the time they moved from the first two years to the second two years.

CAC: Other scholars . . . are these records preserved somewhere at the university so people doing research could access test scores and then performance against them? With computers, there are millions of things you could do.

RP: They've been richly researched . . . the Patterson, Williamson, Darley influence, the Psych Department, the Educational Psych Department, and hundreds of graduate students they've turned out over the years. There's been a lot of that kind of research done already. My suspicion is that somebody interested these days likely wouldn't go to a record that old. But, the answer to your

question, I just would be much amazed if these records weren't well preserved in the Student Counseling Bureau.

CAC: My, oh, my. I'll interview some people over there before I'm through.

RP: You might want to talk to Theda Hagenah or Bernie Dodd . . . well, Darley.

CAC: He's next on my list.

RP: Good, because he'll know all these things, plus lots of other things. Shall I do a little chronology now or not . . .

CAC: Why don't we stick to student personnel . . . just carry that through?

RP: . . . on the Student Personnel?

CAC: Okay. March right along.

RP: My first listing in the college bulletin as an officer, and the first time they list anybody other than the assistant deans, was in 1947. I was called administrative assistant and coordinator of faculty counseling. Oh, it's a detail but it was an important decision at the time . . . We assigned all of our freshmen to faculty members and this group of graduate students . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

RP: . . . and senior undergraduates that we accumulated as staff people in what was called JCCO, the Junior College Counseling Office. Naturally, after Roosevelt, we had to convert [unclear]. [laughter] They did two things. They helped register these students and, then, they saw the sophomores who wanted advice but we persisted in what had been a practice in the college under Patterson's leadership of assigning the freshmen to faculty advisers. We thought freshmen needed help more than sophomores; so, the system that I inherited when I came in was that freshmen were assigned to faculty and we used this new junior staff to orient them and register them initially but then to see sophomores rather than freshmen. After about two years, we reversed that because we still agreed with the principle that freshmen needed more assistance than sophomores but we had learned that the staff, though they were only graduate students and some of them undergraduate students, could give better help than the faculty could. It was a sad realization on my part but the faculty had other concerns.

CAC: And other skills.

RP: And other skills and things were changing so fast. I didn't have up-to-date information. Besides that, it was sort of a continuous process. When I joined the college, orientation was in what was called Freshman Week and all the students were registered in one week. We brought the faculty in, and used classrooms, and had them sit down and do a four-hour stint some morning or a three-hour stint in the afternoon, and we registered all the students in one week. Well, the students were too numerous for that and we began to move the beginning of fall registration and other registrations back, and back, and back; so, eventually, it was started two months before the quarter began.

CAC: Of course.

RP: We couldn't conveniently call on faculty under those circumstances; so, this junior staff registered these students and we began our orientation program way back in August. Though the program lasts that long, a given student came only for two days.

CAC: Right.

RP: This was another contribution that Minnesota made, I think, to student services. Across the nation, we had the first, to my knowledge, formal extended orientation program and students came to the campus for two full days, much of it, as I said earlier, spent in testing and the rest of it, most of it, spent in being oriented, told about the university, told about the college, told about extracurricular opportunities—this was the Williamson influence—and eventually, told, of course, about the college requirements and demands, and about courses, and registered in their courses. Then, they went back to their summer employment and didn't, in fact, come to college for some time.

CAC: In late September. In the meantime, the counselors that you were drawing on were, for the most part, graduate students by then and various [unclear] . . .

RP: Yes.

CAC: . . . so, it really became a way to subsidize graduate education for a certain large number of [unclear]?

RP: It became that. That was not our objective.

CAC: I understand that.

RP: Our objective was to serve our students but there's no question about that. Incidentally, we very self-consciously, from the beginning, chose graduate students from all the disciplines. That was one thing that, in a sense, we did contrary to the Patterson/Williamson tradition where they thought that the proper training for people was in psychology. Mine was in psychology. I must admit, I sort of agreed with them . . . but I didn't agree with them. I was of two minds and I

think it was Russell Cooper who played some part probably, and Buchta, and I in thinking that this staff ought to represent the faculty. They were really substitutes for the faculty. The faculty had been the people who had done this. We would prefer that the faculty did it but circumstances didn't permit that; so, they ought to be little faculty, junior faculty.

CAC: Sure.

RP: We did recruit broadly. Of course, all departments were rich in chances for hiring graduate students in those days; so, it was a competitive situation. Though this was more pronounced later on, we tended to get a few more students from units which didn't have as many opportunities for their own graduate students, notably American Studies, and from departments which had cut-off dates beyond which they wouldn't keep students, notably the History Department. [laughter]

CAC: Right.

RP: Those two particularly. We continued, by the way, to have a good number of graduate students in Psych and Ed-Psych. I didn't want to imply that we excluded them. Our leadership by and large, at least in the early years, came from that. We had junior leaders, too. The staff eventually became quite extensive . . . thirty people, I suppose. We had a hierarchy, and a break down, and senior advisors, and so forth. The senior ones quite often, not by design but by interest and staying there longer, were in Psychology and Education. A lot of people—I wish I could recount them—who went on to careers at least of note in Psych and Education started with us in that department. You might make a note in your record here that someone interested in that . . . I'd share it. It's a simple matter of just going through and looking at the payrolls. You could find some distinguished names in Psychology and Education who started in the Junior College Counseling office.

CAC: Wonderful.

RP: Locally, on the campus, Bob Jones, who became the director of the School of Journalism and Jim Jenkins, our wonderful Psych [unclear] were there. Well, back to chronology. I was saying this administrative decision was fairly significant, that we stopped having faculty see freshmen and have the faculty see the sophomores, since the sophomores already knew a fair amount of the nitty-gritty and could take advantage of faculty contributions on sensible decisions and what education was all about . . . but the freshman year.

CAC: Do you have a sense that when the sophomores were then assigned to faculty in departments that the burden of that, the opportunity would fall on the lower, the junior faculty [unclear] department? It certainly was true in my department.

RP: It did, Clarke. As a matter of fact, it was sort of self-conscious that we thought of the faculty as entering the student advising work in the university first with the sophomores. In fact, we had some rules of thumb that you weren't supposed to advise any students your first year or

two. That collapsed a little bit later on under the pressure of numbers but at least the policy was we didn't commit you to advise early on. Then, you would advise freshmen and sophomores and you were invited at least to orientation programs for advising, which I ran. That's where I met so many of the people who later became my faculty friends. That's where I met Reuben Hill, by the way . . .

CAC: Heavens.

RP: . . . our Regents professor of Sociology. That's where I met Cecil Wood. Just any number of people who later became my good friends and colleagues, I met as beginning faculty people becoming eligible to advise sophomores and coming to our preparatory program to learn—quote, unquote—how to do that.

CAC: My memory may be distorted but I recall being very much the junior in a very elderly department when I came in 1951 . . .

RP: You probably got lots of sophomores.

CAC: . . . and by 1953, I think I had forty or fifty, which was just unconscionable.

RP: Well, that's too high.

CAC: I may be exaggerating but it was a large number.

RP: I hope it wasn't that large.

CAC: [laughter] It may not have been.

RP: We had a system. We sent out to chairs, each spring, a request for them to identify who should advise sophomores. The sophomores were supposed to be, by and large, students who had declared their major for that unit and how many students that adviser should have, in the context of how many advisees the student adviser had of Upper Division students, if that adviser had any Upper Division students, and how many graduate students; so, we had, I claim, a good system but imperfectly administered.

CAC: Sure.

RP: The maximum number of students we had after anyone's name, I thought, was twenty. I thought that was a kind of rule of thumb.

CAC: I may be adding majors, you see. I had juniors and seniors.

RP: Yes, well, we didn't control that.

CAC: I understand.

RP: Some departments did indeed, not true of yours, assign their advising very heavily to just a more limited number of people. They were good at it or they liked to do it or . . .

CAC: They were very junior.

RP: Yes, I suppose that was the case; although, you and I would know what bad judgment that would be. McConnell, by the way—I haven't mentioned him very much—thought every member of the faculty should be an adviser to undergraduate students, just as a matter of policy, because of what the faculty person would learn . . .

CAC: Sure.

RP: . . . not to [unclear] the student but because of what the faculty person would learn.

CAC: That's a true perception.

RP: Oh, yes. I later was so impressed with that. It was just a rule when I inherited it and I administered it but I later realized how important it was. By the way, the best thing that every happened in our attempt to get faculty people to advise students was when one of those faculty persons finally got to the point where his or her, mostly his in those days, son or daughter went to college . . .

CAC: Ahhh!

RP: . . . especially if they came here. Then, the interest they had more or less just picked right up.

CAC: [laughter]

RP: Happily for us, lots of them were too junior to have sons and daughters entering our college. One other thing . . . I guess it's kind of administrative. I've been chiefly an administrator; so, I suppose it's not surprising that my observations are from that point of view. From the beginning—the beginning for me was January 1946—we did assign our freshmen entering our college who were headed toward professional schools later on that didn't require baccalaureates—this was heavily in the Health Sciences, Medical Technology, Occupational Therapy [OT], Physical Therapy [PT], Nursing—to advisers from those departments. So, here was Borghild Hansen—I won't forget it for obvious reasons; it's such a wonderful name—who was head of the OT program. She advised freshmen in CLA who were heading toward OT.

CAC: Very good.

RP: That was the beginning of a system that is still in existence though now it's represented by the transfer of money rather than the transfer of time. It persisted though in the Health Sciences. I think maybe in Med-Tech and OT and PT, it's still going on but not in Nursing and not in Medicine and Dentistry. They give us money now that we pour in for junior staff who advise students who are heading in that direction. I take some pride, I guess is the word, in this because I think it's a for instance of what I think has characterized our college and that's good working relations with the other colleges of the university. That's so important in an arts college which is, I like to believe, the center, the focus, of higher education and it's certainly true curricularly. All programs, no matter how specialized, require work in liberal education. This is another example of the advising relationship, which we also worked out in a coordinated fashion rather than doing it all ourselves.

CAC: In the meantime, McConnell is recognizing the crucial importance of this whole system that you're describing and found the funds to do it?

RP: Yes, they weren't hard to find then, of course.

CAC: Because of the tuition with all the students?

RP: Money was flowing into the university.

CAC: Okay. But still, he had to make budget decisions?

RP: Yes. I was naive about such matters. I didn't know anything about that. I indicated what we needed. I don't mean that it was pie in the sky. You had to make requests one by one. I need one more half time adviser because our enrollment is 250 students more than we had expected. But it always was yes, if I could present the information. McConnell was a hard data kind of guy and that was fine. My instincts, even termed loosely, were the same. My training was the same; so, if I presented the evidence, he presented the money and he did it. He and Anne Murphy. Anne Murphy was a lady who sat outside his door and she was his secretary but she kept the budget and the books of this college.

CAC: That's another tradition [unclear].

RP: She was all there was. [laughter]

CAC: We may have to come back to that. I mean . . . we're thinking of Betty Jo [Points]. For a long time, she did the same thing [unclear].

RP: By the time Betty Jo came along though, she had an office and had a staff.

CAC: Yes.

RP: Betty Jo kind of followed . . . Anne Murphy lasted a long, long time. She went through several deans, as the saying going. Then, Betty [Elizabeth] Gilkinson followed her.

CAC: Of course.

RP: Then, Betty Jo but Betty Jo was, in fact, an accountant, and had a staff, and an office, and a big budget book. Before her, it was a one person operation.

CAC: That's a distraction. Let's get back to Student Personnel.

RP: Yes, but that's a fun thing to give out.

CAC: Right.

RP: Trying to be chronological . . . All of this by the way, I was reminded of in the college bulletins of 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948. So, that's how far I've gotten to [unclear] 1974 but I'll talk . . .

CAC: We're going to be longer than three years, Roger. [laughter]

RP: But I said three hours. [laughter]

[telephone rings - break in the interview]

RP: Things will go more quickly because I've said a lot of the sort of basic spirit things, and atmosphere, and [unclear] moves right along. When Dean Shumway retired, I was put in his place. That was 1948, I guess. So, then, the three assistant deans were Buchta, Cooper, and Page. I'll talk more about Russell Cooper later on when I talk about curricular things and general education.

CAC: Good.

RP: We were the three assistants deans. We comprised the Committee on Students Work, which was then changed in 1952 to the Committee on Students Scholastic Standing. This leads me to say a couple of other general things. One is that the only time in those days the officers, the three assistant deans of the college, got together . . . they got together as the Committee on Students Scholastic Standing. We met on student problems, not on budget problems, not on curricular problems, except as curricular problems maybe became evident as we talked about student problems. I say this in contrast to later decades when the then associate deans came together under different headings and for different purposes. But at that time, reinforcing what I said a bit ago, the officers of the college, other than the dean, met chiefly on student problems. They met under that heading. We took a great deal of pride in our college over the years—I still hope it's true—in the individualization of our education, even though we were a very numerous

college. We're a very large college and certainly it's been true over the years. We were the largest liberal arts college in the United States. I don't know the current figure and I don't know it exactly in 1950 but for most of the time, we've been one of the largest colleges in the United States. That's largely, by the way, because we're the only Land-Grant and state university combined that's in an urban center.

CAC: Sure.

RP: This is bound to come up in your conversations with other people. I consider it the most distinctive thing about the University of Minnesota. It's conditioned so many things in our history. One of the things it conditioned was that we were an enormously large college. We had enormously large classes but our spirit, our intentions always were that we would individualize things. It's the old Patterson individual differences. The name we put on the procedure in our college and our university was petitioning. The student would petition for an exception to this, that, or the other, or when the student had some kind of problem that he or she wanted to explain, the student would fill out a petition. The Student Scholastic Standing Committee was the authority for acting on petitions. We acted favorably on, I suppose over the decades, thousands of them. We individualized things. The rules of the college, you know, are the ways we think are best for most people. The faculty sits down as committees, and then as an assembly, and votes a requirement on a procedure in good conscience, to the best of their judgment. When you like those things, that's what we think we ought to do usually. But people are various. We thought that those, not the requirements so much but those procedures needed to be individualized. We had students working forty hours a week even in those days. Everybody thinks that's a new phenomenon. We had it then. We had students, especially veterans, older with family responsibilities. We had the female side of that in college, not so much then but we had it. These people really can't attain their educational objectives following the usual rules and the usual procedures; and they don't always find it best to take the prescribed courses but some other courses that, one can make a judgment, are just as good. The individualization of education, I've always considered, was the chief assignment of the Student Scholastic Standing Committee; although, I suppose, when one looks at in the bulletin and compares it's name with similar kinds of things at other colleges, by and large, people think, well, that's the enforcing committee.

CAC: Ahhh, I see.

RP: That's the one that kicks students out of school and says who may be admitted and, indeed, it did those things. I can remember, talking about individualization, that Christmas time was always a time when Russell Cooper, and J. Buchta, and I were up till midnight three or four nights during our Christmas break saying what students shouldn't be permitted to return to school the next quarter. Painful as that procedure was, we thought that the students were entitled to the information as soon as possible and not after the quarter begins; so, we always had the target of getting these horrible letters out to students after Christmas but before the new quarter began.

CAC: Before New Years.

RP: It was the same thing at the break between winter and spring. This is sort of a joking aside, my young children being asked by their contemporaries what their daddy did . . . "He drops students."

CAC: [laughter]

RP: They, apparently—they told me only recently—had the vision of me [unclear] dropped and all laying there [unclear]. [laughter]

CAC: Right. [unclear]

RP: It's the individualization thing that I wanted to emphasize. From my little preview of college bulletins, which helps give me this chronology, it was the 1953-1955 bulletin which first had two people listed in the administration of the college other than the deans and the assistant dean. At that time, the first two additional names were W.C. Stevens and Mabel Katherine Powers.

CAC: Oh, good.

RP: They were Student Personnel people. Bill Stevens was the Lower Division Student Personnel officer and Mabel Powers, the Upper Division Student Personnel officer. So, we still were carrying on public recognition of the significance of student services. I suppose one could be a little less glowy about it and claim, well, you ought to put in the bulletin the names of staff that students have to see but I want to look at it more optimistically, that it was a signal of our interest in students.

CAC: Sure.

RP: My assignment of things I'll say from here on to years will have to be conditioned by the fact that the bulletins were two-year bulletins and I picked things up from bulletins; so, I'll just say the first year of the bulletin but it could have been the second year or it could have been the year before, a minor point.

CAC: I'm glad to have somebody who has done his homework for an interview.

RP: [laughter] By then, by the way, the 1953 bulletin, we were in Johnston Hall. We moved, then, into Johnston. We'd been scattered. The administration of the college, the dean, and I had been in the administration building, now called Morrill Hall. The Lower Division still carried over in Folwell where Dean Tommy had been in the English Department but we also were extensive in TSF, Temporary South of Folwell . . .

CAC: Oh, yes.

RP: Those wonderful temporary buildings . . .

CAC: Barracks.

RP: . . . some of which are still standing on our campus. [laughter]

CAC: After forty years, they're still here.

RP: The Upper Division was in the Physics Building because that's where Buchta was. We helped design Johnston Hall for our purposes. It was called a classroom building and it was predominately a classroom building but we had much of the second floor. We moved into it and that's where we were with private offices for our counselors with partitions that went to the ceiling . . . enormous luxury.

CAC: For acoustical privacy.

RP: Yes, for privacy. We rationalized that we got privacy because there were so many students. It was such bedlam that they'd never listen to someone on the other side of the partition. Incidentally, I'm sad to report that this happy state of affairs lasted all of about five or six years and we were expanding again.

CAC: Oh, boy.

RP: We're using semi-partitions to this very day. In any event, Power's and Steven's names appeared. In 1955, two year jumps, the next thing I feel it's appropriate to say is that the Student Intermediary Board appears in our constitution. I want to drop back and make a comment about the Student Intermediary Board . . .

CAC: Very good.

RP: . . . which is the Student Council of our college later on, and sort of summarize it. It appeared in our constitution. I'd be surprised if any other college constitution in a university even now, and certainly not in 1955, mentions the student organization, the student council.

CAC: It's part of the regular constitutional structure?

RP: Yes. I'll talk about why later on.

CAC: Okay, we'll come back to that.

RP: I don't seem to have anything else to comment on about Student Personnel, as we still called it. In 1955-1957, we finally got rid of that Junior College, Senior College as subdivisions of a college, which always was pretty illogical and we started calling it Lower Division and Upper Division, just as a more satisfactory name.

CAC: Sure.

RP: In 1963, we began expanding out of the space that we'd arranged—that was almost ten years; I'm surprised it lasted that long—and added another Lower Division office at the other end of Johnston Hall. The Placement Office, what we call our service to students helping them get jobs—which by the way went way back in our description of our services to 1947—had a separate physical location for the office starting in 1963 . . . partly it was space concerns. A man named Maxwell Alvord, Max Alvord, was not the first but the first full time director of our Placement services and the only one up until the current one; so, he played a role in that and I wanted to mention him. By 1964, another year, we had yet another Lower Division office. We'd expanded into another one in Johnston Hall and this was the time we began decentralizing our Upper Division offices. It was partly the press of numbers. We just couldn't accommodate them in a single office but it had another reason, too. I thought it was important, to use the first person singular, I did think it was important but we agreed that we ought not to have so many people coming to one place. It's just dehumanizing to have all this line and that sort of thing; so, we moved the division offices sort of out to where the departments were and the Humanities Division office went back to Folwell, so to speak, and that was the Humanities office. We established a Social Science—this is just for the Upper Division students—on the West Bank, as you well know, where it still is. Later on, because of numbers, we established another Upper Division office trying to keep the numbers down, trying to hope, at least, that when a student came to see someone, the student would see the same receptionist person he'd or she'd seen before. and not one of the three, and the same professional staff person. That, by the way, is collapsing a little bit now under the budgetary forces and it's less efficient. We knew it was less efficient but we thought it was more humane. While I have always thought efficiency is a god—I never thought it was *the* god—there are other gods that we . . . I don't know why I'm in this metaphor. [laughter] [unclear] we should worship. The humanness of the thing . . . You know, with 17,000 students, it's not very human at best. The least we could do is have a number of somewhat small offices. That's all they were. They were still bigger than many other colleges here on the campus. Looking through the bulletin, seeing when locations appear, I find that it was in 1964 that we did this, probably a bit before, that we expanded our offices so we had three Upper Division offices and three Lower Division offices.

In 1966, was the first time we had listed somebody as director of honors. While I'll talk about honors separately later on, time permitting, I think of it as related to student services because that was a further . . . It's individual differences. It's a Patterson thing in a sense; although, I can't hold him responsible for our having an Honors Program but it was setting up another office to serve another subset of students; so, there'll be fewer of them. It was about in this time, too, by

the way—I'll speak to this more when I talk about the history of the administration of the college and its changes—that the Scholastic Standing Committee began to change and the now associate deans—all the deans were associate deans now; they'd been promoted in title though no real change—were appointed really for other purposes and had other concerns. Those of us interested in student personnel began to lose the attention of the associate deans in student affairs. It's not negative about them. I don't want to be misunderstood about that. They had other things they were attending to.

CAC: Yes.

RP: The central student personnel services of the college by this time in 1966-1968 tended to be more junior people than represented by the deanship [unclear]. I was the associate dean for Student Personnel and I had a number of assistants but I didn't have associate deans playing a part.

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

RP: I've been talking about student things and talking about Student Personnel. The next thing I picked up in my review of the college bulletins was that in 1968, we had five students added to each of our divisional councils. I'll talk about divisional councils later. They were the basic curricula authorities of the college and they had between twenty-five or thirty, and maybe forty-five—they varied in size—faculty members. They had five undergraduate students and one graduate student on each. We had student participation before—I'll talk about that later, too—but this was a fairly significant leap forward. That's a pretty respectable percentage, I think, for a big research type university to have six student voices in a curriculum council of twenty-five people. That was 1968. I've just got a few more things and I'll be up to your breaking point of 1974.

In 1970, we started the Student Ombudsmen Service, which had the wonderful acronym of SOS, which was a signal of what it was for. It's a student supported, student funded group of students who help other students . . . ombudsmen . . . you know the term from Scandinavia. It was a spinoff from the Student Intermediary Board but set up separately and is now a university-wide service funded by university-wide fees but it was set up by the Student Intermediary Board.

I guess, the next thing—I'm tuned in now with more on student services—was in 1974. I stopped being the associate dean, then called, for undergraduate studies, stopped having the Student Personnel functions. A woman named Carol Pazandak became the assistant dean for Student Personnel. By this time, as I will tell you later, Cooper had left, Buchta had left, and now I left that particular type of activity and a new person came in.

CAC: Kay Powers is still there to provide continuity?

RP: She was there for just one year overlapping with Carol.

CAC: I see. Then retired?

RP: This moves a little beyond your period but we began then under Carol to try to stop doing this divisualization. Under me, I guess it's fair to say, that there was the Upper Division and the Lower Division, and each had good leadership, and that's the way we organized the things we did. There were some other things on the side. Placement was on the side. Reservations was a service we ran on the side. But the basic delivery of student services—Student Personnel functions were under Mabel Powers, Upper Division, Bill Stevens and others, John Buchanan. There was more turnover there in the Lower Division but with my departure, Carol's coming in, and Mabel's departure—this all in good spirit by the way . . . In fact, I just saw her yesterday; she's ill, as you know. I was complimenting her on this very thing, that she helped, in a sense, disestablish a system that she'd run for many years. That's hard work for people to do. The thing we disestablished was trying to do away with having everything organized in the Lower-Division and Upper Division but then by the functions, orientation, registration, records, counseling, and have leadership for each of them throughout the years under functional leaders under Carol. Incidentally, that was 1974 . . . it's 1984 now . . . we're drifting back to the divisional thing. It seems not to have been working but, in any event, that was what we did then.

One other thing I'll say, though it is a couple of years later, that in 1976 with another large change in our constitution, they stopped having the Student Personnel Council, which had been one of the basic councils of the college, and substituted something called a Student Services Committee. It may seem to you a minor thing but it was a signal of something different. It was no longer one of the basic councils of the college; it was a committee. The Student Scholastic Standing Committee which had appeared in the constitution as a constitutional committee was eliminated. It's a declaration of less attention to this sort of thing. I say with some . . . you can see that I'm smiling. I was on leave. My one leave in the college was over the six months of the spring of 1976. [laughter] My good friend, Jack Webb, associate dean for the Social Sciences, a hard-nosed guy from England with no sense of student services, in my opinion—though a good friend of mine—was the chief architect of the constitutional changes. I wrote several memoranda from my leave position and argued the case. Whether it would have different if I'd been here, I don't know. But in any event, I took it as a signal of some defeat of things that I believed in strongly, a symbolic defeat . . .

CAC: Sure.

RP: . . . that the old Student Personnel Council was replaced by a committee. It had the same functions but it was in a hierarchy that reported to a higher level. It was no longer a Student Personnel Council; so, that's a kind of formal symbol of the thing that I said earlier on, that there has been a change in our attention to students.

I won't talk about faculty personnel, and promotion, and tenure because I've never been close to that but I can bring it in incidentally. You were reminding me . . .

CAC: Other people will pick that up.

RP: Yes. The emphasis on research and scholarship, which I like to believe we always had in the University of Minnesota, has become so self-conscious recently, as you well know.

CAC: I have a sense—let me test it against you—that 1971 is a turning point in many of these affairs; and it's occasioned by the first college and university retrenchment, May of 1971. Then, it takes awhile for things to happen but from that flows the first All-College Promotion and Tenure Committee?

RP: That's true.

CAC: And from that flows the [Henry] Koffler/[Warren] Ibele memorandum and so forth?

RP: Yes.

CAC: In the early to mid 1970s is when a lot of those things begin to shift emphasis?

RP: Yes. You've thought about it more than I. I immediately just say, yes, yes, yes. I'm sure that's true. I knew in a general way it was related to retrenchment and those pressures. I hadn't tied it up with the starting of retrenchment. You've picked that up and had it in your mind. It was 1971, 1972.

CAC: Partly, it's that committee report you sent me a copy of the other day and there was outlined a good number of those things.

RP: Yes.

CAC: Let's get back to your story.

RP: That's my story on Student Personnel. Maybe, it raises some questions you want to push me on?

CAC: I want to come back to students and talk about different student generations, and the mood, and temper, and interests, and capacities, and styles of different student generations but let's reserve that for later.

RP: I'll disappoint you there, by the way. I'm frequently asked this. How are students on campus today . . . ? If this is asked me by a reporter, I'll say, "I'll wait till I read your story and

then I'll tell you. All I know is what I read in the papers." I've never been one to respond easily to the question of, What are students like?

CAC: They may be the best answer.

RP: [laughter] I think they aren't as different—I'll make this comment— . . .

CAC: I kind of share that myself; so, go ahead.

RP: . . . from time to time as everybody says they are. It feeds on itself.

CAC: Absolutely.

RP: There's some article in *Newsweek*, and then somebody else picks it up, and they go and ask somebody and ask leading questions . . . I believe—I was trained by Patterson—you ought to do questionnaires. You ought to do formal surveys and so forth. Some of that has been done and, let me be fair to our friends in the media, there is some evidence. The percentage of students who come to college to get a job is up a little bit. It was always up! The chief interest of students entering this liberal arts college from the day I was here has always been to improve their lot economically. This is a Midwest urban university.

CAC: Bravo. That's an objective not to be despised or made fun of . . .

RP: No, of course not . . . of course not.

CAC: . . . although, frequently that's implied.

RP: I know. I know. You see I seem to get emotional about questions like this rather than helpful. [laughter]

CAC: Right, well, that's the most revealing kind of evidence. It becomes anecdotal kind of evidence. We remember seminars and, certainly, remember the strikes. That made a difference in my department, in my students. No question. Beyond the few who were actively involved, it really made a difference.

RP: I can think of one little anecdote that shows that there is a difference in the times. I probably wouldn't have brought this up. I'd like you to know that I was the coach of the faculty football team that . . .

CAC: Touch football for SLA . . . the *slā* days.

RP: Right! the slayers and the slaves. The wonderful 1960s—shall I put it that way?—when [Errett W.] McDiarmid was dean, who was a kind of an informal guy . . .

CAC: Early 1960s.

RP: . . . and the spirit seemed to permit it that we had an SLA Week, taking off from Engineers Day and Forestry Day. We were bigger and better; so, we had a week and we were the college of Science, Literature, and the Arts. We had a contest . . . Dean for a Day. All of this seems so frivolous now. I guess I think we probably couldn't do that this year. In a sense, I'm criticizing myself, saying there are some differences.

CAC: You couldn't get me to do it in those years. I remember being invited to be on that touch football team. I'm an athlete of very small powers and great anxieties . . .

RP: [laughter]

CAC: . . . and I thought it was a lot of bull shit and I wouldn't do it.

RP: I see.

CAC: That was 1962, 1963.

RP: You're the kind of guy we were fighting then but now that I am sixty-two and sixty-three—not in 1962, 1963—I don't think I'd be up to it either.

CAC: [laughter]

RP: It was fun. You were smart to stay out, by the way, because Bob Jones, who did say, "yes," the director of the School of Journalism, broke his arm playing.

CAC: He got a decoration . . . Best in the Field, or something like that.

RP: Yes. We did play football against our students in fun. Later, by the way, we played frisbee against them. We had a Dean for a Day in which the person who presented the most money collected in a penny-pot, which we gave to some good cause, became Dean for a Day, and went and sat in the dean's office, and had his or her picture taken—or its picture. One year, it was a St. Bernard . . .

CAC: [laughter]

RP: . . . of a fraternity. We couldn't do that this year.

CAC: I'll bet not.

RP: But . . . well.

CAC: Let's shift our conversational base then and, maybe, we can pick up some other things with Student Personnel but I think this leads logically into central organization, administration of the college.

RP: Okay. Let me talk about that a little bit then. The constitution in 1944—I'm thinking of when you were thinking of starting this—was a constitution dated 1941. Maybe, I'll do the constitution first. Maybe, it's dull but it says some things, I think. The 1941 constitution had a general assembly, which was the final authority of the college. It was the total faculty. It wasn't an elected group. Every member of the faculty was a member of the general assembly. I was interested in the fact that the quorum rule was 10 percent. [laughter]

CAC: Realistic . . . god!

RP: That suggests what kind of participation you got. It also said, by the way, "and representatives from units offering courses in the college." This is again a signal of what I had come at earlier on about our cooperative relationship in the university.

CAC: I see.

RP: Units that offered courses in our college—there were numerous units—were also represented in the assembly. There was a Dean's Advisory Committee. It was the central committee of the college. It consisted of eight faculty people, two chosen by each of the three divisional councils and the Student Personnel Council, and the dean of the college served as its chair. It was the final curricula authority of the college, by the way.

CAC: Heavens.

RP: It approved courses. I sat with that committee, was its secretary for awhile. Dean McConnell asked me to do that. It worked, it seemed to me. I was, of course, quite young. These were really the distinguished members of the faculty—don't ask me to name them—sitting around helping the dean decide the important issues. It was really the only standing, continuing committee in the college. Now, we did have divisional councils then. I was surprised when I looked up the constitution and found that out because I thought they had come later. I'm convinced that they were a McConnell contribution but they didn't have final authority. They had the authority to consider curricula and other issues. We didn't have deans with divisional titles. They were said to be chaired by the dean or his designate and I know that McConnell—of course, I didn't know this until 1946 when I was there—appointed members of the faculty to chair it. I don't know much about them, frankly. I didn't attend the meetings. I don't know how often they met. But they didn't have any authority; they were discussion groups. There was the Executive Committee listed in the constitution. It consisted of the dean and the assistant deans. That was the general organizational format.

We did another constitution in 1958 but it was really not a substantive change—it was a tidying up—except that the Advisory Committee was elected directly by the faculty rather than by the divisional councils. The Student Intermediary Board appeared in the constitution.

CAC: Do you have any sense, living in the central office in the 1950s, for example, or in the early 1960s, did this Advisory Committee meet regularly? Did it have quarterly meetings?

RP: No, more often than quarterly. I thought it met every other week.

CAC: And called by the dean?

RP: I remember it under McConnell because, as I say, I was secretary and I remember it under McDiarmid.

CAC: You may forget it under [E.W - "Easy"] Ziebarth because I was on that committee and we were called, maybe, once a year.

RP: Well, it wasn't the Dean's Advisory Committee then.

CAC: Ahhh. Okay, we'll get to that later.

RP: We'll get to that and I will comment . . . really validating what you just said.

CAC: Okay.

RP: Under McConnell, it seemed to me that it met fairly often and under McDiarmid, it did meet often. I can remember some acrimonious discussions, and some votes, and some minority opinions under McDiarmid more than under McConnell.

CAC: Probably on general studies, among other things . . .

RP: Yes, no question.

CAC: . . . which we'll get to later.

RP: It was a curriculum authority. The next significant draft . . . the change in the constitution was 1966. Here, we did away with the assembly, the all-faculty governing group, about the time, I think by the way, the Senate also did away with the rule.

CAC: I think you're right.

RP: It was smart to do away with it. People think of it as de-democratization. The very opposite is the case because in a total assembly you get the people who come and under a

representative assembly, people—at least in theory and I think it's true—feel more responsible. If the election is based on a good kind of representation, you get their participation.

CAC: James Madison would be proud of you.

RP: I see.

CAC: That's good republican [unclear].

RP: I learned this from Horace Morse . . .

CAC: Oh, my, yes.

RP: . . . that wonderful dean of the General College because he was the one that fought it through the Senate. I remember the arguments . . . well then, we'll lose our vote! Zilch might lose his vote, Professor Zilch, but the faculty will be in a better vote.

CAC: Isn't that wonderful? I mean, that is all in the Federalist Papers of 1788.

RP: I probably had to read those in high school . . .

CAC: I hope so.

RP: . . . or in college but I didn't know I was being influenced. I just claim its logic. [laughter] It stands to reason. We went to an All-College Council rather than the assembly. The All-College Council consisted of the three divisional councils meeting. The divisional councils were elected, from the beginning, by the departments. They were departmental representatives; so, the representation was a little bit indirect and generally proportionate but not strictly proportionate because we had a maximum of five representatives from any one department. After that, we didn't have many departments that needed more but after that we stopped giving representation. Everyone was guaranteed one and five was the maximum but the range of membership in a department was more than the ratio of one to five; so, smaller departments were over-represented and very large departments—maybe, two or three—were under-represented in the divisional councils.

CAC: I should add a bit of folklore on that that at some point departments, such as History, who straddled the divisions, were asked administratively for this purpose to say whether they were Social Science or Humanities and Herbert Heaton was chairman. I remember the meeting because it was a great cynical joy that we voted unanimously to go to the Social Sciences because English would out vote us in the Humanities.

RP: Ahhh! I had never heard that. It doesn't surprise me a bit but I'd never heard that.

CAC: But, really, we were humanists but for political purposes, we would say we were social scientists. Gosh!

RP: Well, that's been a kind of sad commentary on the college.

CAC: It is sad.

RP: Women's Studies, you know, chose to be in the Social Sciences because it was thought to be the stronger department. One contribution of our recent administration has been de-divisionalization of the college but it's been a long, long time in coming. We adapted a little bit, by the way, to that problem of where you should be represented because, while I didn't pick it up in studying the constitution, we eventually did permit a department, which was entitled to more than one representative, to have a representative in more than one division; so, while they may be in a division administratively, you could say that legislatively, they had choices. We had up to one-half dozen departments, I suppose, at least three or four, that had representation in more than one divisional council if they were large enough.

CAC: I understand.

RP: In 1966, we went to an All-College Council instead of an assembly. We went to an Educational Policy Committee [EPC] instead of the Dean's Advisory Committee and the Educational Policy Committee was elected by the divisional councils rather than by the faculty at large. There was also an Executive Committee which consisted of the deans and people appointed by the dean from the divisional councils; and we specified there should always be somebody from the professional schools. This is the recognition of that—quote—power—unquote—that CLA has had until recently at least . . . three or four units that were called professional schools. We recognize them in our constitution in 1966.

CAC: At that time—just for the record—it would be Journalism, Social Work, Public Affairs?

RP: And library.

CAC: Library . . . Science, okay.

RP: They were the ones. The divisional councils were given final curricula authority. They hadn't had it; so, this was an attempt to strengthen the role of the divisional councils, among other things because they now elected the Educational Policy Committee, which was a central committee of the college. The division of councils had final curricula authority that was divisionalized. Now, when it came to a college-wide issue, we would have to go to All-College Council, which was all the councils meeting jointly. But, of course, changes and majors, departmental things, were handled within a division. That was an advance. I think also, it was a weakness, by the way. Frankly, I've spent fifteen or twenty years trying to get the curricula

authority back at the college level, which in a liberal arts college particularly, it seems to me, it ought to be.

CAC: Yes.

RP: It is there now but this was a movement in the other direction where the emphasis was on trying to make the divisional councils have more oomph; so, they were given curricula authority. It may have been a wise . . .

CAC: It reflects then the divisional associate deans rather than the Upper Division or Lower-Division?

RP: Yes, exactly so. You commented earlier about your membership on the Educational Policy Committee. It is true that it didn't meet often in one of the administrations and very seldom voted. In fact, I don't know whether it will come up other wise or not . . . yes, it will come up and I will comment on administrative style a little bit. We're talking really about the formal organization and this made sense. It was okay. Any formal organization is subject to abuse, disuse, and non-use if the people in it don't do that.

CAC: The dean to whom you refer is Mr. Ziebarth, for whom I have the greatest affection and admiration and was on that committee several years. It was called rarely and always "Easy" waltzed around the room . . .

RP: [laughter]

CAC: . . . in the most beautiful . . . and nothing was done at all. It's not really to fault him extravagantly but I don't think he wanted advice very much. I can say that . . . you don't have to.

RP: Okay. The next change of any consequence in the constitution was the 1973 constitution. Here, we added a Consultative Committee in the college.

CAC: Too bad.

RP: I have thought that, in retrospect, probably a mistake, by the way; although, I was enthusiastic about it at that time. The model was the Senate, the university level Consultative Committee. In the college it moved into a context where there were lots of committees could have done what the Consultative Committee was called upon to do. You would know a lot about this because you helped us a lot by chairing it in its first three years.

CAC: I was its initial chairman. I was, also I think, one of the architects of that. It spun off of the lack of that kind of consultation in the later Ziebarth years.

RP: I see.

CAC: It was a very direct and explicit . . . and Mr. Ziebarth knew it and didn't like it. Of course, by then, he was interim president and on to other things.

RP: He had to deal with, over one summer, the Senate Consultative Committee.

CAC: Right.

RP: I liked the idea myself. Maybe, it's still a good idea but I contend it hasn't really functioned very well because we had had other committees that had been . . .

CAC: You bet.

RP: Faculty has to have a mechanism through which it can exercise its authority—no question about that. The question is simply, What's the best arrangement under the circumstances? I think that your experience on EPC justified our setting up a committee that wasn't chaired by the dean; so, I think it was a good thing to have done and, maybe, there'll be years in which it's helpful. It's been a little helpful the last couple of years, by the way, I think. In 1973, the change in the constitution . . . added the Consultative Committee, did away with the Executive Committee. The Educational Policy Committee continued but it was strengthened? I don't know. It was increased in size by having added to it the chairs of five or six standing committees. The dean could also appoint some people but they weren't voting members. So, this was a reflection—it's happy in a sense—for this record that you had the experience you had because it illustrates, we were trying to improve things that hadn't worked and this was the way we'd try to do it. You gave the reasons we were trying to do it. The other standing committees . . . we'd had committees in these areas for the most part but the first time they were entered into the constitution was 1973. The Committee on Instruction . . . We had a Curriculum Committee, by the way, but it didn't have curriculum authority. That sounds funny but it was study committee to look at the curriculum as a whole. The curricula authority in the college was still in the divisional councils. We had a Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee for the first time in the constitution, though we'd had one for a year or two before the constitution, a Long Range Planning Committee, a Committee on Physical Facilities, an Appeals Committee, and a Community Advisory Committee, which was never put into operation.

CAC: Heavens. That was out of the momentum of the communi university idea from [Malcolm] Moos's office, I'll bet.

RP: I'm quite disappointed that it's never become operative. It's still not operative.

CAC: No.

RP: In fact, we dropped it from this recent revision in the constitution. I thought it was a mistake. I'll put it positively . . . I thought we should have had one in there and I think we should have done about it, but we didn't.

CAC: Sure.

RP: Incidentally, I want to say this. Two of these committees had civil service members. That was new. I think it was the Physical Facilities Committee and the Long Range Planning Committee that had some service representation. That was new in the college. That's the last constitutional change in this time period that you referred to. Let me squeeze in the 1976 constitution. May I do that?

CAC: Sure, oh, yes.

RP: Because it was a fairly significant change, I think. We moved back to an assembly. You know, the great wheel turns. Nothing is new. [laughter] But some things work better at sometimes than other and sometimes things work better because you think they'll work better. It's necessary to do them again . . .

CAC: Or you have other deans who are administering them?

RP: Sure. We went to an assembly again instead of the All-College Council because the All-College Council, you see, had been elected out of departments and, perhaps, more subject to some parochialism from that point of view; and they certainly were subject to the fact that some departments—I think to their great discredit—just identified some guy who was absent from the meeting or some junior faculty person and that sort of thing. We didn't get across the board the best faculty. We got lots of good faculty but not across the board. So, in 1976, we try and redress that. By the way, in all these changes, the objectives always, I think, were right. We were trying to have instruments of faculty control where it was justified, which is almost everywhere. Administration, in my judgment, is a service occupation and the dean and his associates—[unclear] so far—have opportunities to exert leadership because of the position they're in and, of course, to the budgetary control, which is administrative and is legitimately a deanly function—it is enormous—but the basic decisions of a college have to be made by the faculty. In 1976, we went back to an assembly elected by the faculty but divisionalized; that is, a number of spots were assigned to each division proportionate to the faculty representation. So, somebody in the Humanities faculty didn't get to vote for someone on the assembly who wasn't from the Humanities but they were elected by the faculty at large and not elected or appointed by departments. We also changed our basic organization to a Council on Policy and Planning and a Council on Curriculum, Instruction, and Advising . . . two basic councils and that's all. There are some subsets of things. The constitution then had these two councils and they, by the way, were elected from the assembly by the assembly. I consider this . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

RP: . . . by the way, a very pretty constitution. I think it was well-conceived and except for its divisionalization, which we got rid of in 1983, I consider it the best that we've had, in theory, in the way it's set up. It seemed to me it had greater potential of working well.

CAC: I like that aesthetic word, pretty.

RP: [laughter]

CAC: It's a good one.

RP: It's a neat constitution. This wheels within wheels thing, which has always characterized our constitutions, was in a sense to get rid of the long ballot; that is, we called upon the faculty to a basic election but then we asked the people elected that way to do the other elections on the notion we'd get more thoughtful thinking because we're a large faculty . . .

CAC: Oh, my, yes.

RP: . . . and most faculty will still have to vote for people they don't really know. I consider this just very neat. We face here, by the way, for the first time, the problem of the proportional representation to give to this enormous expansion in the Sciences, which weren't administratively in the college. I'll come to that when I drop back to talk about the organizational history of the college . . . but just a little preview so you'll understand why I'm commenting here.

CAC: Sure.

RP: The Physical and Biological Sciences moved administratively out of the Arts College but over a ten year period. Of course, we're a college of arts and sciences because a liberal arts college is a college of arts and sciences; so, these faculties, these departments, are still in this college in a functional sense. They are in on our assembly. They are in our committees. They vote on our various decisions and play a part but this was the first time we had to work out the difficult thing that some of these departments were expanding enormously; and we would be dominantly a Science faculty if every scientist whose unit was represented in our department had the same vote that every humanist and social scientist had. It's a delicate kind of problem. One might argue that ought to be true but *we*, those of us closer to it and working in it everyday who are social scientists and humanists, thought, no, that shouldn't be true. So, we came out—it's arbitrary to be sure—with really a one-third vote, is what it amounts to, so that the vote of the people in . . . It was represented here not by the one-third vote thing but by our setting the size of the number of people elected to the assembly by the natural scientists in such a way that they turned out to be, by the way, about one-third of our college but if they'd been given full votes, they would have been three times that size.

CAC: The constitution itself of the United States had the famous three-fifths compromise.

RP: Okay.

CAC: We're back to Madison again.

RP: This is the same constitution that did end, from my point of view, the Student Personnel Council but it made this great advance. I don't know whether Jack Webb is properly credited with this or not. I know he played a heavy role centrally in this particular [unclear] of the constitution. Your friend—I forget his name . . . he died of cancer—the former chair . . .

CAC: Oh, Stuart Hoyt.

RP: . . . Stuart White chaired one of these constitution [unclear].

CAC: I'm sure he did. That would have been the 1966?

RP: Yes, it was. A few other comments about the constitution . . . Two basic councils elected out of the assembly membership and by the assembly membership—the assembly membership having been elected by the faculty by divisions and I consider that the best resolution of these [unclear] these constitutions had addressed. Incidentally, there was no Scholastic Standing Committee mentioned—I mentioned that earlier—it is a change in the constitution. Student Personnel matters were reduced to a committee structure. The compromise we worked out there—everything is a compromise—by memorandum from my leave status is the council which was going to called the Curriculum Council, we got changed to the Council for Curriculum, Instruction, and Advising and we put into its duties attention to student personnel matters. But, it wasn't likely, I believed and it's turned out to be the case, that a council concerned with curriculum was ever going to find a lot of time to devote [unclear] attention, at least, to student affairs. But those are handled through the Student Services Committee that [unclear] constitution. I was reasonably satisfied with it but symbolically it was down the drain.

CAC: Sure, right.

RP: We also added a Budget Advisory Committee, which had not been previously in existence.

CAC: That was in 1976?

RP: In 1976. The dean had consulted with, to the extent he had consulted, EPC about budget matters and subsets of EPC addressed budget concerns and the 1971 one retrenchments, the first ones you see were under the old 1966 constitution. We used subsets of EPC and called it a Committee on Retrenchment, R&R . . .

CAC: Ohhh, I remember those marathon meetings.

RP: John Turnbull chaired the first one. I chaired one of those myself.

CAC: And Nils [Hasselmo] did one.

RP: Nils later on. Later on, it was always the executive officer of the college but we didn't have an executive officer. I guess I was forced into that because Turnbull was acting dean. It was when "Easy" was incapacitated.

CAC: Oh, yes.

RP: The Budget Advisory Committee was formalized and added to the constitution. The Cross Disciplinary Studies [CDS] committee was added to the constitution and the Honors Committee—though we'd had a committee dealing with Honors, it hadn't been constitutionalized—and a Committee on Professional Schools was . . . I can't believe that was new in 1976. I think my research is inadequate here. There was one but I don't believe it was new then. That's a little bit beyond your time span but that's my constitutional thing, which says some . . .

CAC: Very helpful.

RP: I don't know whether you have questions about that before I talk about administration?

CAC: I think one of the really nice things about oral history is that a person seriously interested in this now has one perception of a major outline and can go to the documents and can then do traditional kinds of study.

RP: If I can get these documents into the file. I have the only copy of the 1941 constitution.

CAC: Oh, we're going to talk about that later. We must talk about that.

RP: I think mine's the only file where I have them [unclear]. I've always been interested in this.

CAC: Oh! One of the spinoffs of most oral history is the gathering of documentary material.

RP: I haven't thought of that but it makes sense.

CAC: People get interested and they do, some of them, the kind of research that you have and then it's together and they say, "Why don't you deposit it? Fine, I'll clear my files."

This may bring us to how this thing really functioned, how the Central Administration worked under different deans. Is that a logical next step to talk about?

RP: You may have to press me on that but I'll say the things that I am prepared to say about the administration and organization. There'll probably be a little bit of that. Well, 1944 . . . McConnell was the dean. Incidentally, McConnell was the associate dean originally. When Johnston retired—the story goes . . . this is oral history for me— . . .

CAC: Oh, good.

RP: . . . they looked around and by far the most popular distinguished—everybody thought he'd be great—chair was [John T.] Tate of Physics. Tate became the dean of the college and McConnell was the associate dean.

CAC: I see.

RP: He was probably named by Tate. I doubt that they searched or anything in those days, you know. So, McConnell was the associate dean and Tate went off to Washington because there was a war on. He was a physicist. My understanding is that he almost never served as dean. I don't have the dates on this. When he became dean, I don't know. I know, McConnell, I had in class as a teacher in 1940 or 1941 in Educational Psychology. He was not an administrative officer then. I was so surprised to come back and find him dean. Tate was the dean and McConnell was the associate dean and then the acting dean. Then, I don't know whether Tate died or whether he didn't come back for some other reason. In any event, McConnell became dean. Whether the College of Liberal Arts would have elected an educational psychologist, somebody—quote—from Education—unquote—dean . . . well, one would be skeptical but McConnell, of course, was a superior human being and an able administrator. Being brought in as associate dean, I guess he displayed his wares; so, he was the dean of the college. He's the man that hired me . . . at less salary, by the way, than I was making as a lieutenant in the navy. Nobody should take a cut in salary. I was totally naive. I didn't know you shouldn't take a cut in salary. I thought I was overpaid in the navy anyway. Remember, I came to Minnesota for \$45 a month.

CAC: Right. [laughter]

RP: So, McConnell was the dean and the three assistant deans, as I've said earlier, it seemed to me—now, there was a lot I didn't know—they devoted their attention chiefly to student affairs. Buchta is bound to have devoted some attention to the department; he was chair of his department. Buchta was a phenomenal guy, by the way. Two years later, I moved into a house that was down the street from his. On that rare occasion when I got up a four o'clock in the morning—I must have been ill because I wouldn't ordinarily do that—I could look down the street and see his light on. He taught classes. He chaired his department. He saw students. He was just a wonderful human being.

CAC: He must have had a good body chemistry, good metabolism.

RP: Yes. He was grading papers usually at four and five in the morning. He was a very popular teacher. He taught the pre-meds—this is oral history so we can share these things; it has nothing to do with the administration of the college—Physics. Of course, he got some of the best students in the university because that's where students were going in those days. He was a wonderful teacher. I'm very fond of J. W. Buchta.

CAC: That's just so widely shared.

RP: Russell Cooper was brought here by McConnell. Cooper was a political scientist, trained, I believe, at Columbia. He was in Cornell College in Iowa, a little liberal arts college in Iowa, and how he and McConnell got to know each other I don't know but McConnell brought him here to head up the General Education program. One of, certainly, McConnell's central contributions to the college, it seems to, was the General Education Movement as it was called. Now, I'm going to talk about that a little bit separately.

CAC: I'll bring you back to it.

RP: Russell did spend a lot of time on that. He spent less time on students than Buchta did, that is, personally seeing students. That was his other assignment. Shumway didn't have any other assignment. He just saw students . . . oh, in and out, five minutes a piece. They'd come in and he'd diagnose them and send them out. [laughter] I was added to the administrative staff that year, in 1948. I was made assistant dean replacing Shumway. Of course, one's perceptions change as one changes himself or herself and I was twenty-eight years or whatever I was at that time . . . twenty-nine and these all seemed like giants around me. Those on the Dean's Advisory Committee were men, always were men [unclear].

CAC: The first committee I served on when I came in 1951 was chaired by Stuart Chapin . . . a towering figure in the whole nation.

RP: Ah! McConnell did consult with this committee and it met regularly. I would like to believe there are minutes of it for someone who wants to know what kinds of things it considered. Since it was the only standing continuing committee in the college, it must have been the committee that considered everything. Now, of course, we were running over with money. It wasn't that we didn't have an enormous amount to do, but at least I got the impression that the money was there. The students were coming in. I told you earlier—it would have been more appropriate at this time—that the administrative staff consisted of Anne Murphy, the secretary who sat outside McConnell's office, and she did the budget of the college. Now, I'm sure there was some budget kept [unclear]. I'm glad I said that, heard myself say it, because that may be the answer to this, that the colleges had less budgetary . . .

CAC: You mean the bureaucratic part?

RP: Yes, the bureaucratic part of it. I don't doubt they had the control . . .

CAC: They wouldn't have had payroll? They wouldn't have had that sort of control?

RP: No. In a sense, they don't have that now.

CAC: Right.

RP: There was a budget. She had the budget. She kept the budget. In a sense, Central Administration, of course, was even smaller though. [Malcolm] Willey, I suppose, whatever title he had at that time, was the only central administrator, wasn't he?

CAC: [Bill] Middlebrook ran down the financial side.

RP: Middlebrook and he ran the university, we thought.

CAC: That was often said.

RP: I can't seem to think of anything else to say except that I consider McConnell a great man. I think his instincts were all right. He was democratic. He was autocratic in a sense; that is, he seemed stiff and formal and he made pronouncements that sort of, I think, gave that impression but his instincts were democratic.

CAC: He went on . . .

RP: He went on to be president at the University of Buffalo and he regretted it. [laughter] It was so funny—we laughed—somebody sent back a picture, his first fall there, showing McConnell out looking at the football team. I don't think he knew which end of a football was up but as president, he had to go . . .

CAC: At least, they didn't have him looking at Niagara Falls.

RP: [laughter] His problem was that—not that the career came down—Buffalo was a private institution, you know . . .

CAC: Then.

RP: . . . and he ran into financial difficulties. I don't know much about him after that. He left to head the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley, I think. He's still alive and made distinguished contributions on the study of higher education. McDiarmid followed him. Mac, he was called . . . Mac McDiarmid. He had been brought to the university, I think, from Illinois to be the university librarian and director of the school—at that time they were combined—by a committee, so I understand. I have to cross my fingers because I could be proved wrong but my understanding is that the committee that brought him here was chaired by

[Theodore] Blegen. The committee that recommended the deanship to the president was chaired by Blegen and this makes some sense that . . .

CAC: It's a plausible story and I've heard it, sure.

RP: . . . he liked McDiarmid when he brought him here, he liked McDiarmid as the dean, [unclear] dean. I remember walking across the—it's so funny I should remember this—campus with Mac from the rehearsal for graduation. Graduation, in those days, was a university-wide affair in the stadium, the only place big enough for it. There was a rehearsal on some day before where a few officials came over and sort of figured out where they were supposed to go and do. I went with the representative of the Arts College. I walked back across the campus with Mac, whom I called—I was just getting to know him—Mac. I remember wondering aloud to him—it was June . . . the regents were meeting—"I wonder who's going to be the dean of the Arts College." I was curious. It meant a lot to me. He said, "It will be interesting to see."

CAC: [laughter]

RP: Then, two days later, I learned he was and I started calling him Dean McDiarmid. I was so stiff and formal with my southern background, you know.

CAC: Mac was always so prudent, wasn't he? He would not have tipped it by any wink of the eye.

RP: It's strange to say that I don't remember much about Dean McDiarmid as the dean of the college. I just don't. I didn't deal with him. I was running the student services. They were expanding like mad. It was a full time job. I asked for money now and then and ordinarily, as I remember, got it. My office was right outside his office. I had what now is the executive office's office; so, I'd see him on a personal basis. I do remember sitting in the Dean's Advisory Committee with him. I don't know how he swung that because, of course, I wasn't a member. He was just a nice quiet person whom I didn't interact with much in a business way, with the exception that I'll talk about when I talk about Honors because he and I did do something in Honors, which I consider important to the college.

CAC: He was a dean that had bad luck. He ran into that separation in Sciences out of the . . . and the disestablishment of General Studies and, I think, these were very difficult controversial subjects.

RP: Yes. I remember a guy named Brown, whose first name I've forgotten, from Botany.

CAC: Botany, you bet.

RP: He was a tough kind of guy.

CAC: Yes, he was.

RP: I remember him. It seemed to me, he was just insulting McDiarmid to his face in the Dean's Advisory Committee and I felt so uncomfortable. I have trouble with controversy. But Mac never revealed anything of a hurt. I can't tell you much about that.

My next note of anything was that in 1959-1961, we had changed, as I told you, the names of the divisions from Junior College, Senior College to Lower Division, Upper Division. Cooper had left by then. General Studies had been disestablished as a full department. We had some other arrangements that you probably understand better than I do. McDiarmid was still the dean, and Buchta was still here, and I was here, and there was no Cooper. My next note is 1963. The bulletin of 1963 showed McDiarmid and Page. I was amazed when I found this. There must have been some period in which those were the only administrative officers, plus Mabel as the Upper Division . . . It was 1963, the first bulletin, that showed the College of Liberal Arts as a label.

CAC: Let me interpose just for a second. When [Meredith] Wilson came here in 1960 as president, he quickly said that the University of Minnesota, in all of its colleges, was a university more under-administered than any he had ever known of. That may be partly a reflection of that.

RP: We looked pretty lean that year.

CAC: He's faulted for bringing in administrative structures and he always said, "We're just catching up and barely doing that." Go ahead.

RP: Between 1961 and 1963 is when we changed the name of the college to the College of Liberal Arts. Now, that may have been a mistake; although, it may have been necessary. I sought to play a part in that. I thought that Science, Literature, and the Arts was a funny name for a college dealing with students, dealing with prospective students, dealing with parents. We always said, "SLA . . . We're the college of Science, Literature, and the Arts." That's the liberal arts college of a university, you know, like Carleton or Macalester. We always had to elaborate on it; so, why not make it the College of Liberal Arts? The reason it was, maybe, a mistake is because of the misconception that so many people have that a college of liberal arts does not include sciences; and since it coincided with the time that the physical sciences left the college, people were sort of reinforced in the notion that the sciences weren't in the liberal arts anymore.

[telephone rings - break in the interview]

RP: I remember "Easy" explaining this to an alumni meeting that fall—you know a lot about "Easy's" style—sort of trying to persuade them that it didn't really mean that we'd given up the sciences, and it didn't, and shouldn't have. That was the year we changed it to the College of the Liberal Arts. It is a better label except for the misunderstanding about liberal arts not including the sciences. I've been recently, over the last few years, talking about the College of

Arts and Sciences. We are a college of arts and sciences but the truth of the matter is—maybe this is a good time to talk about it . . . it's rather through here—our relationship with the sciences has always required a lot of attention. Frank Sorauf called me a month or two ago because he was going off to advise some buddy of his who is now president of some university in the East, which was thinking of splitting up its arts college into a college of science. Frank, though he knew all this, wanted a reminder of how we'd been working at this. We worked at it in a number of ways. I consider this important in the history of the college. We did lose the Science Departments administratively. We lost the Physical Sciences first because Al Nier, among others—he was the chief spokesman—and John Williams thought that Physics would fare better in IT [Institute of Technology] budgetarily. Geology went along and Mathematics went along and we couldn't do anything about it. [Athelstan] Spilhaus was the dean then, a dramatic and powerful dean; although, so far as I know in fairness to him, I don't think he did any courting. In any event, they were determined to leave administratively and they did. They stayed in our college, in our assemblies, in our committee structure. Later on, the Biological Sciences left because somebody decided that we might fare better in getting grants and improving our biological situation if we had a separate college. So, those moves were at separate times and in a sense for separate purposes . . . well, really for the same purpose. Both of the purposes were, we'll do better. We'll get more money. Incidentally, I've, in my later years, begun to understand some of that and think there's some truth in it. If you have a certain disciplinary background and feel with certain kinds of things, you feel certain ways. The Physics Departments require a different kind of money. They've got these elaborate laboratories. Their research structures require funding that, you know, somebody in English can't comprehend. So, I have to say there was some legitimacy to the interest in moving; although, there are science departments in arts colleges all across the country, so it could be solved some other way.

CAC: Yes, sure

RP: We didn't at that time have leadership in science that wanted to stay in the Arts College. About the last year or so that Buchta was here, he, of course, demurred in this but he wasn't strong enough to hold out.

CAC: I think the initiative for CBS, the College of Biological Sciences, was partly financial and a very substantial part of it was changes in the biological sciences in the 1960s. They were so revolutionary.

RP: Good point.

CAC: Met Wilson took an initiative of the highest level in promoting a cluster that would put those [unclear] together.

RP: That's right. It was [unclear]. You knew more than I knew. I didn't know just where it personally originated.

CAC: It came from many places but I know that Met played a major role in that decision.

RP: Incidentally, that department, at least that college, at least under [Richard] Caldecott who was no longer the dean then, had always called itself a department of CLA; and they always mimicked us—I guess that's the word—in their student services and everything, probably because Norman Kerr was so active in the Arts College.

CAC: A perfect liaison person.

RP: I'm glad you used that term, "perfect liaison person" because a lot depends on whether there are people in both camps who want to keep the thing alive. Interestingly enough, there haven't always been people in the Arts College who cared much about it. I'm not being very personal in this story but I guess I will say that I have kept trying to keep the dean of the Arts College, whoever it was, alert to what I consider the . . . I can't say the necessity . . . but the desirability of maintaining those contacts, of doing things, of consulting or calling and setting up arrangements formal and informal that keep emphasizing that we're a college of arts and sciences. If we've had good reciprocators on the other side, it makes it easier but it's our responsibility. We have had good ones. Walter Johnson has been a good one.

CAC: [gasp] Oh, my yes!

RP: He was the associate dean and then acting dean. He's always been an arts college person in his spirit. Norman Kerr and I think Caldecott helped over there; so, it's gone reasonably well, I'd say, up until the last few years when there's just . . . Incidentally, the wonderful physicist who became dean of IT, who went into Chicago . . . it began with a C and I can't remember his name . . . he kept it up, too, and [Frank] Verbrugge was pretty good.

CAC: Oh, yes.

RP: It's worked tolerably well when you think that the payroll for all of those guys and gals over there is signed somewhere else. When you get down to it—the famous cliché which I hate—this bottom line business, it does make a difference. We can't get members of the Physics Department to do things now that we could have gotten them to do fifteen years ago because they don't work for us.

CAC: Sure.

RP: Everything short of that, we've tried very hard to keep the way it was. We've put them on our committees. We send them the materials we send our faculty about grades and how to handle students. We behave as though they are full members of the college. We had a bi-weekly meeting of administrative people over the years, which I'll get to in a minute . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[Tape 3, Side 1]

RP: I was saying that we had this bi-weekly meeting of administrative people that started under Ziebarth, though really under Turnbull. We always included the administrators from the Natural Sciences there. Back to my chronology . . . by 1964, we had a little richer administrative staff because [unclear] Ziebarth [unclear]. That was the first year in which we had divisional associate deans. See, when Cooper left and then later Buchta left, that did away with this Upper Division, Lower Division terminology; and I had the title of associate dean, assistant dean, whichever it was, for Student Scholastic Standing. In 1964, we appointed our first divisional associate deans. The divisional associate dean for Humanities was Dennis ^UHurrell from English, who is still with us, and John Turnbull from Economics for the Social Sciences. To get some kind of symmetry or understanding in the titles, my title then was called assistant dean for Student Personnel, which was a new title for me.

CAC: Sure. ^UHurrell and Turnbull were the first divisional associate deans?

RP: The other people—to get back to this bulletin thing—were Mabel Powers and Jim ~~Priece~~ ^{Preus,}

CAC: Okay.

RP: So, still the Student Personnel [unclear]. I can recount, anytime you want, who, in order, were the divisional associate deans. I know if you want that on your record or not?

CAC: It might be useful. Why not just do it quickly . . . because it will take somebody two hours to run that down.

RP: I ran it down. Dennis Hurrell was the first of Humanities and then he was followed by Gerhardt Weiss of German, Virginia Fredericks of Theatre Arts, Sidney Simon of Art History, Arturo Madrid of Spanish & Portuguese—though he served for only one year . . . moving into another position—and Marilyn Schneider was the last, and the last, because we didn't have divisional associate deans . . .

CAC: They may come back.

RP: John Turnbull was the first. You'd be interested in what's happened to each of these Social Science divisional associate deans.

CAC: They all went upstairs and the others all didn't. None of the others did except Madrid.

RP: Well, you put it more bluntly than I.

CAC: [laughter]

RP: John Turnbull was the first and he, then, became the first executive officer of the college. Fred Lukermann was the second and he served, I think, only shortly and he became an assistant vice-president. Lloyd Lofquist was the third and he became associate academic vice-president. Jack Webb was both the fourth and the sixth . . . he's a two-term man . . . he was the fourth. Then, John Howe was the associate dean for Social Sciences and, then, Jack Webb again and, then, the final one was John Clark. Webb went on, as you know, to be the dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences, I guess is the label, of SUNY [State University-New York] . . . Albany? . . . and John Howe—as Jesse Jackson says—God is not yet finished with John Howe.

CAC: [laughter]

RP: He's continuing to contribute to the university as chair of the Consultative Committee this last year. That's what's happened to those guys.

CAC: That is a remarkable listing. Yes.

RP: Well, 1964-1965 was our first divisional associate dean. There wasn't any recognition in our bulletin in that year, by the way, of the Natural Sciences, in this front of the bulletin where we list administrative people. By 1966, we had corrected that; I consider it a correction. The 1966 had Turnbull listed as the executive officer. We didn't call him executive officer. He was just the associate dean in the dean's office. You could tell by where his office was that he was the executive officer but that was new in the college organization under Ziebarth. We listed in the bulletin, Frank Verbrugge as director of the division of Mathematics and Physical Sciences, the label that we put on him. He was listed in our bulletin in the front where we list the officers of the college.

CAC: One can assume in functional terms that Turnbull, when he entered that position as you're describing it, really becomes chief of staff in a military sense?

RP: Very good! It is so appropriate because he began a meeting of the staff that involved the associate deans. We had never had that before. Now, Ziebarth never attended these meetings but John would write him a little memo. It was often cute, you know, little funny asides. They were serious but they were funnily done—if I can use such a word as an adverb. We called this—this is fun, too—the ADDER, as in adder, as in snake—my contribution to higher education, by the way—Associate Deans Discussion for Evading Responsibility.

CAC: [laughter] Marvelous.

RP: All of our decisions went up through Turnbull to Ziebarth and what Ziebarth did with them, I guess I never really knew. This was the time, by the way, when the associate deans stopped really playing much part in the Student Scholastic Standing. They were still on but they didn't come to meetings. I remember setting up an awards system that I would give to those who came to two consecutive meetings and so forth. That's the first bulletin in which there was a director

of Honors listed and that's Bill McDonald. In the next bulletin—the thing that occurs to me to say . . . the names change but I've already given you all of the names—there we listed two people from Natural Science. [Morton] Hamermesh is director of Mathematical and Physical Sciences. See, the Biological Sciences were still in CLA then. We listed Jim Wertz as chair of the Natural Science Council and that was the way we handled it thereafter. We listed the chairman of the Natural Science Council; so, we seemed symmetrical . . . the divisional associate deans, and the chair of the Natural Science Council, and the associate dean for Student Personnel. You asked about administrative style. "Easy" was dean also with whom I didn't have a lot of contact. My contacts were with John Turnbull. That turned out to turn partly on the fact, perhaps, that John became just a very close and dear personal friend going out of this professional relationship. We played squash every week. I formally saw him for an hour every week and so forth. But "Easy" . . . again, my job was to run the student services program and I didn't get involved in much of anything else. What else was going on, I don't know. I remember one little anecdote that will be helpful about this and Frank Sorauf may have told you because I think I heard it from him that they remembered one fall . . . it was a day or two before classes were to start and John Turnbull called up whoever was chair of Political Science and said, "I've got money for another assistant professorship here. Could you use it?" That's what was happening in those days.

CAC: That's one thing "Easy" kept in his pocket or in his drawer . . .

RP: He must have.

CAC: . . . and he should have. These are the days of enormous growth in faculty.

RP: And in a sense, [unclear] much faculty participation at the college level, in departments that had good leadership or were otherwise strong or probably forged ahead but those that didn't have much chance except by accident to get any better because they weren't being . . .

CAC: There was no regular assessment. The assessment doesn't come until the down slide in 1971. Then, it happens. It's so interesting.

RP: I have 1972-1973 as a retrenchment period and a sort of increase in centralization and authority both in the college and within the university. On a personal matter, but going by this bulletin, that was the year in which my title was changed to associate dean for Undergraduate Studies to represent somewhat broader responsibility than I'd had hitherto. Now, your time period stops with Sorauf but I want to comment about that.

CAC: Oh, please do. No, no. I have said, as kind of a benchmark, 1974, because of the president. See, we changed from Moos and, I thought, in courtesy, it was best to go through the Moos Administration. Many persons I've interviewed have talked about their own department well into the 1970s and that's perfectly appropriate.

RP: In the 1974 bulletin, I didn't have any title after my name, except associate dean; so, my functions are much fuzzier then. A man named Wallace Russell had been through the college as associate dean and, I think, only for one year; it may have been for two years. "Easy" was sick, as you recall, and unavailable, and Turnbull became the acting dean, and Gerry Shepherd, the academic vice-president—from what I heard—just took the initiative and said, "You can't do that by yourself, John. We'll get somebody else for you," and between the two of them, they picked up Wallace Russell. You know, we didn't search in those days and that's fine because Wallace Russell was great. He was brought over to help out until "Easy" came back. Turnbull was never called acting dean out of respect for "Easy's" sensitivities but he was the dean and Wally was assisting. Wally was called just associate dean for administration. He did, I guess, some of the things that John used to do but one of the things he did—I'll come to this under Curriculum and General Studies—is he chaired a committee that brought forth a report out of which the Cross Disciplinary Studies school was started. He was undoubtedly scheduled to head that up but he left us and went off to Ames to be the dean of the arts college there. On very short notice, as you know, I was asked to do the kind of administrative stuff that Wally would likely have done in CBS and you were asked to chair the Policy Council in order to give the leadership role. When "Easy" asked me to do this and to take over the things that Wally had been doing, including also the chief officer for the staffing of committees and that sort of thing, up until then I'd just been saying, "Yes," to all the new things. When Russell left, I became the assistant dean for the Lower Division as well as the other thing. When Buchta left, then I had the responsibility in the Upper Division. But there was a point of diminishing return. [laughter]

CAC: Started gaining portfolios.

RP: So, this was the first time I kind of formally gave us something; so, I gave up being the Student Personnel officer of the college . . .

CAC: I see.

RP: . . . and became an associate dean for administration, or sort of without portfolio, largely because of this history that I just told you with Wally Russell's leaving. We brought over Carol Pazandak because she had been in Admissions and Records. She'd been on our staff. She's a woman, by the way, of considerable talent in my opinion . . . coming back to college late, six children—I can never believe this when I see her—getting her degree in her mid-years, so to speak, and had been on our staff as a junior person, and then moved over to Admissions and Records for a bit, and we brought her back to be the assistant dean for Student Personnel. This all happened under Frank Sorauf; although, I believe the decision on Carol was made formally by "Easy,"— it was essentially by me.

CAC: Sure.

RP: I was shaking in my boots when I heard that Frank Sorauf was going to be dean of our college because I knew Frank at a distance and as a chair of Political Science. He seemed like a pretty tough cookie to me. [laughter] I was much concerned about whether he gave a fig about students. I'd heard some of the very negative remarks he'd made about University College. He'd been on their council for awhile [unclear].

CAC: Indeed, he had. When I was chairing it, he was on it . . . outspoken.

RP: I was worried but I've never been more wrong about anybody in my life . . . not that he wasn't a tough cookie and wasn't critical and hard-nosed about things but he's so bright, and quick, and perceptive. I think the picture of him as, maybe, autocratic is too strong a word, but as a very strong, independent decision maker maybe persisted throughout his deanship. He operated with the cabinet administration, and the first one in my experience, and he used the Educational Policy Committee. They had votes in the Educational Policy Committee for the first time. He brought to the Educational Policy Committee the basic policy issues of the college, and had them discussed, and voted on them. As you can see, I was delighted with the deanship of Frank Sorauf.

CAC: I think both things were true: he did have a sense of controlling an agenda and he was very open to participation and encouraged it.

RP: And he could change his mind.

CAC: Yes.

RP: He had an opinion rather quickly on most things but he could absorb new information and change his mind. I used to, in my young naive days, think it was a sign of immaturity if somebody changed their mind but I've learned better. It's the man or woman who can change their minds that we need. [laughter] Incidentally, he also did all he could to make the divisional associate dean system work. It had never worked. Everybody came to the dean's office because that's where the money was. They came to "Easy" personally and to Turnbull. They just passed right over the associate deans.

CAC: You bet.

RP: Frank tried very, very hard to make that work. He was modestly successful. I think it worked better under him than anybody else.

CAC: By then there's a Budget Advisory Committee on new positions, on retrenchment, so that that become regularized?

RP: True, yes. Those are my comments about the administration of the college that occurred from doing this rather mundane task of going through the college bulletins. [laughter]

CAC: You start out formally and end up with a set of annotations that are very useful. As I look at our agenda here, why don't we reserve General Studies and really talk about the Student Intermediary Board because that kind of sticks closer to the . . .

RP: All right. I pointed out each time that the students entered into the constitution or there was some formal change in their committee participation. I don't have a lot to add but let me say the following. I credited Dean McConnell with starting the board. It's a little confused in my mind though I've talked with some early members of it. When I came back from the war and was given the assignment I had, there was a woman president of the board. She later became one of our advisers, Sis Strauss-Ravits, married to Harold Ravits, the St. Paul dermatologist. I continue to see her now and then. There was some confusion in those days between the university student structure and the college student structure. The college was so big and, as you know, university student structures are dominated by arts college people anyway. It appeared to me from all the written records I could find—I never talked with McConnell about this—and from talking with Sis Strauss-Ravits, and a couple other people, that T. R. McConnell called together a group of students sometime during the war and asked them to meet regularly with him about things in the college. Then, later, they met on their own. He asked me 1947 to be the adviser to the . . . This is why I know so much about it. I was the only non-student member. As the constitution was constituted, I was a member, not really the adviser and I always took some pride in that. I was, as the years went on, conspicuously different from the other members by my age, if not my maturity. I was the adviser to the Student Intermediary Board from 1947 until 1974 when I finally decided I'd burned out on that and gave it up. First, McConnell originated it and McDiarmid was very encouraging to this sort of thing. As I described him earlier, he was a kind and gentle man, and free and open to things, and liked students, I think; so, he encouraged me in my work with them.

A couple little things that I suppose seem very mundane for a record like this but of interest to student personnel workers . . . The board was very good and made lots of significant contributions to the college because of some little teeny things. One is, they got a regular meeting time. That may seem just asinine to mention but they agreed on a time, and it was the time, and nobody sought membership on the board who wasn't free at that time. After a few years, it was an evening meeting . . . Tuesday nights; so, everybody knew that. You didn't get a new group of students together, that is new to each other, and say, "When can we meet?" "We'll meet at this time." "That leaves out this person if we meet at that time." Faculty have the same trouble. It got a regular meeting time. It got a place. It was, first, 205 of Westbrook Hall. I remember the number only because it's now a meeting room for some other purpose. When we moved into Johnston Hall, it became 101 Johnston Hall. It's the first office that you come into when you come up to this, then, new building. It is an adequate office in terms of size. It's conspicuous. It's a declaration of the importance of the group. And it wasn't in the Union.

CAC: Ahhh.

RP: This is not an anti-union statement but it's the Coffman Memorial Union.

CAC: Sure, sure.

RP: It wasn't where all the other student organizations were. It was different. It was closer to the college physically and psychologically. Those two simple things . . . and, then, it got a good membership and, then, it perpetuated itself. It hasn't fared so well in recent years. I can personalize this because one of its student members, who was at that time, a twenty-six or twenty-seven year old person and is by now a thirty-three or thirty-four year old person was a student named Steven Carlson.

CAC: I know him.

RP: He joined the board about seven years ago. He almost single-handedly has almost wrecked that because he was so impossible. I'm not talking about his particular views, some of which I consider quite sensible. In any event, it got good members. David Lebedoff was president of the board. He's now a regent of the university. James Johnson, who is Mondale's chief person . . .

CAC: Heavens!

RP: . . . was the president of the board. Eric Nathanson, you may not know because he's not so conspicuous, but he was Don Fraser's chief of staff in Washington for many years. Keith Ford, an alderman and one Governor Perpich's chief aides, was president of the board. A great number of them went on to academic and medical careers.

CAC: Would John French have been another example?

RP: John French was president of the board.

CAC: A very influential person.

RP: Yes, yes.

CAC: Chuck Moelke?

RP: Yes! Yes! Chuck Moelke. I had forgotten about him. Yes.

CAC: That's a pretty select group.

RP: This political scientist who is doing so well . . . a guy who his brother started up the college board thing which we did so well recently . . . what's his name? . . . it will come to me

. . . he's just an example . . . Norman Uphoff. I don't know whether you've ever had any contact with him?

CAC: Oh, yes.

RP: Just lots of people who were president and members of the board . . . chiefly the presidents—I've remembered them—have gone on most of them to academic careers and a fair number of them to medicine where, of course, we don't hear of them so much because a lot of them are of that ilk. I told you a little bit about the playful era when we had Dean for a Day and football games. The board sponsored that. The board spawned the Student Ombudsman Service, which I consider a neat idea that's kept going and is now separate.

CAC: Were they not the origins of the Distinguished Teacher Program?

RP: Exactly so. You should not have to remind me of that; I should have remembered it. They did start that. They did recognize faculty first and then we brought in the Alumni Association and formalized it otherwise. They are the chief instrument through which students serve on committees. While that's routine these days in higher education, it wasn't at the time it was done through the board. I wish I had a year on this but I don't. Scott ~~Means~~ of Economics . . .

Means

CAC: Oh, yes.

RP: . . . the ~~Means~~ *Means* Committee, which . . . I still remember it's the time I met John Clark. He was on the committee. We set down for three or four meetings and developed some notion of how many students there ought to be on each committee of the college. There was no committee of the college on which we didn't have students. We had some rationale that one student is always at a disadvantage because then, What do students think? Just two is more than doubled. Two quadruples the impact and destroys the notion that you could ask *a* student what students think about things. Those numbers have changed over the years but it was our first formal attempt to determine how many students there should be on each committee of the college.

CAC: I'll give you an old Mexican metaphor referring to having eggs for breakfast . . . I can't say it in Spanish but it is, "You order those of which three is too many and one is too few."

RP: Yes. That's not very much about the board. I chiefly wanted to call it to the attention of any historically oriented person.

CAC: Oh, absolutely.

RP: Incidentally, it's not in this history but I'm going to have the pleasure of going back to working with the board this fall.

CAC: Oh, good.

RP: The situation, from what I heard, sounded as though it might be appropriate and I seem to have the time and I'm unburned out now after ten years away from it; so, I'm going to have fun the next four years working with them.

CAC: Very good.

RP: We've taken them seriously, I think that's the reason they've done well. We've encouraged them to be, not scholarly, that's too pretentious a term, but careful in what they did and not sit down one night and make a resolution but study the situation, get some information, and come up with a sensible proposal. It may not be one that faculty, ten, and twenty, and thirty their senior, agree to but it's a sensible thing that has to be dealt with.

CAC: Another thing that you mentioned earlier, and this may the point to turn to it, is the Honors Program, which becomes part of the structure of the college.

RP: Okay. Honors at Minnesota, like honors most everywhere else, was chiefly recognition and that's still true in lots of colleges, by the way. If you get good grades, you graduate with honors and that's all we had. I don't have dates on this, Clarke. I'm sorry I didn't study it that much. I'm thinking it's the 1960s. It was partly a national phenomenon of considerably more attention to honors. I know I went to Boulder twice to conferences. Whoever was dean then—it must have been McDiarmid—tapped me to learn something about honors across the country. A man named Joe CoyneSM, in Philosophy, headed some funding support to bring people in. So, we got thinking about honors for than just recognition. I think that Buchta should be chiefly credited with making our Upper Division Program a program of honor students do different things, take different courses. It's what it's doing now but that wasn't true in those days. There likely was a committee that Buchta was not the chair of that brought in the recommendations but I can't believe he didn't play a significant role in it. That was Upper Division. There's this thing I said sometime ago I wanted to comment about McDiarmid. Mac and I, for two or three years, identified, as best we could, the top twenty freshmen entering the college using all this testing stuff that Minnesota was so famous for, plus their performance in high school, which we always knew was a good predictor, and wrote them letters, and asked them if they wanted to join the Ninety-nine Club, I think we called it one year, the Ninety-nine-Ninety-nine Club, we called it another year. Then, I think we called it the Ninety-five Plus Club.

CAC: Oh, my.

RP: This related to their performance on tests . . .

CAC: I understand.

RP: . . . and high school rank. He and I together met with these students weekly in a colloquy type thing and I know that we ended it in a spring by going to his home for the last meeting. We used the guest approach. This is the background for this thing [unclear].

CAC: Sure.

RP: This, I think, it's fair to say, though it wasn't called by that label, and wasn't formalized, and it was discontinued briefly . . . when Mac stopped being dean? I don't know what stopped it. We learned that three-quarters was too long to hold groups together and dropped back to two. This was the kind of background for what later became the Freshman Honors Colloquy. Combined with having students in the Ninety-nine Club—I'll use just one of the labels—we also assigned them from the beginning to faculty advisers. In other words, we always recognized that what we were doing through our college offices and this junior [unclear], we were a substitute for faculty. We'd rather do the faculty and we figured we could get their interest if we gave them these superior students; so, we recruited advisers from the disciplines and, incidentally, from medicine and dentistry so a pre-med freshman who was in this Ninety-nine Club would get an adviser through medicine. We crossed our fingers about that. We don't think that a freshman saying she wants to go to—although then, it was chiefly a he—into medicine ought to be roped into that. I was very careful in talking with the medical faculty person—we just had two or three of them and I think it was [unclear] early on—don't lock this kid into medicine for life. But, we wanted to recognize a student's serious interest in this. I did want you to know we were alert to that possibility . . . the same thing for the guy who said he wanted to go into history, by the way.

CAC: Sure, sure. What was the size of this? How many people were involved with the Ninety-nine Club?

RP: Twenty or so.

CAC: Okay.

RP: Now, maybe more qualified and some turned us down or we stopped after we got enough.

CAC: So, it was manageable?

RP: Yes. It was a single [unclear].

CAC: Right.

RP: We used the standards that gave us the number we wanted or we stopped with the number. The two things we did was (1) bring together a very small subset and have them together with distinguished faculty in a colloquy, visitation type thing and (2) we assigned them to faculty advisers from the beginning. My memory fails and I couldn't find any record about just how this phased in to the formal program that began when . . . Director of Honors, Bill McDonald . . . first in the 1966 bulletin. That could be late; it could be that McDonald served in 1960. You could get this from other . . . started in 1965. You know, the bulletin is always a little bit out-of-date. In any event, the corps of the new Honors Program, besides pulling these students

aside and serving them through a separate office, was the counseling and something for freshman and sophomores. The Upper Division program was greatly upgraded but it was following a model that had been in place. Of course, our Honors Program is predominately where the department has a good program. You know, probably, more about this than any of us because of your working with it, especially recently. The thing that was most different was attempts to reach the freshmen and sophomores. Then, we started the colloquy which were more numerous and had specific topics. Bill McDonald was the first director. He came into the role with enormous, and enthusiasm, and energy but totally inexperienced in any administrative roles; so, I had the opportunity to work with him . . .

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

[Tape 3, Side 2]

RP: . . . and joined in his staff meetings over the whole time that he served as director. That was a lot of fun. He's followed by Burnham Terrell who had been a department chair . . . less need for outside assistance. My own part in Honors drifted aside after that. You'd be interested in one of the problems that . . . I want to make sure that our listeners understand that the Honors Program is a program for students of a certain quality to do certain things that they can do because of their potential that they otherwise wouldn't be called upon to do. It's not just saying, "Gee, you done good. Here are your honors." That's the corps of our Honors Program and while it's no longer unique, and it certainly wasn't the first in the country, it was early on and it's an important thing about Honors. Across the university, by the way, that's just now catching on that Honors Programs are being made into programs and not just recognition programs. One of the things we were concerned about is making sure that the Honors students weren't some elite group over here on the side somewhere. That's a criticism of Honors that always come up. You can't bring in a group of twenty faculty in which there isn't at least one person who's very hostile to the whole idea of Honors because, Isn't that elitism? Well, that criticism is legitimate in the sense that there is always that potential and we were very self-conscious about it. First, we never agreed to the notion that it should be off in some place somewhere. Bethel College was available then.

CAC: Oh.

RP: There was some talk about . . .

CAC: . . . having a real Honors college?

RP: . . . buying one of the professional fraternity houses over on this side of the campus and having that. We resisted that self-consciously. We were afraid of what might happen. It would have been better for those kids in a certain way . . . we thought not good for society. That's sort of a pretentious statement but we thought it was the best.

CAC: Sure.

RP: So, we resisted that kind of thing. We also said that the only authority that Bill McDonald had to change a regulation or do something for a student other than the Honors rules was by virtue of his membership on the Scholastic Standing Committee. In other words, when he acted on the request of an Honors student to be exempt from this, that, or the other, he did it as a member of the Scholastic Committee. We've always had the director of Honors as a member of the Scholastic Committee. Beyond that—I can't call it surreptitious . . . I think Bill and his successors knew it—we tried to make sure that the staff assistants that they took on were people who had had service in one of the other student service offices; so, we kept that kind of integration. The woman—it was always a woman—there in charge of records, the DPA, Degree Program Adviser, was someone and, later, her successor were someones, who had been trained in the college. It was a very self-conscious kind of thing to fight this elitism thing, which I consider a legitimate criticism but one that I think can be answered. We still serve them differently because we serve them better because we've got a better staff/student ration there than we have anywhere else in the college and that's great. For awhile, until we got this wonderful Glen Holt here, almost the chief thing we were doing in the college office—a lot was being done was being done in classes and departments—was giving these students a better home than most students had through the friendly attitude and orientation that they received when they got there. These are the things that occur to me to say about Honors, the things that I thought . . . well, I don't have to justify them.

CAC: No, no. Let's slip briefly into OSLO [Office for Special Learning Opportunities], Bachelor of Elected Studies [BES], grading changes. These came as a cluster, didn't they and again relate to the student program . . . I mean, chronologically?

RP: Yes. I'm trying to decide whether they fall better . . . it's a timing thing, isn't it?

[break in the interview]

CAC: Roger, you mentioned earlier General Studies and that has been a recurring commitment that has evidenced itself, manifested itself in various ways over many years. You were here when General Studies, and McConnell, and Cooper really got underway. Before you start, let me say that I did interview Dan Cooperman.

RP: Oh, you did?

CAC: In his, there are the most wonderful personal recollections of the people who were in that program at that time.

RP: I made a few notes myself.

CAC: Good! What a remarkable group that was. This is for people using the tape and they get a cross reference . . . see Dan Cooperman's tape. What do you remember of General Studies and where it came from, what it was up to?

RP: I'd be glad to address that. I'll also use this particular chronology theme on General Studies to bring in major curricular changes, which interacted with General Studies but weren't just General Studies. I'll probably end with a comment on Cross Disciplinary Studies and the Office of Special Learning Opportunities, which I think are the sort of modern day versions of the same effort. This tension in education t seems to me to have been forever between . . .

CAC: At least on this campus.

RP: Yes.

CAC: I've asked this before. You don't have any idea whether that tension is in the same way elsewhere?

RP: I just can't believe it isn't. General Studies was, of course, a national movement.

CAC: Sure.

RP: It wasn't a Minnesota movement. The argument about interdisciplinary work and how to accomplish it is surely a national, intellectual problem; so, this is a local manifestation of it. You remember that I prepared to chat with you by looking through college bulletins . . . a pretty dull thing to do but at least it gave me a little chronology. I found, in the 1947-1948 bulletin on either the first or second page—this is the college bulletin—a whole page of what were called the Objectives of General Education, which reminded me how central they were. We didn't have anything about the general objectives of the College of Liberal Arts, which we now have in the bulletin. In those days, we started with this list. They were enumerated, twelve or fifteen of them, suggesting the significance that they had in the eyes of the bulletin editor. The bulletin editor was Russell Cooper whom I've mentioned before. General Education was a name given to one of the liberal education movements really following World War II. Most people know the famous [James Bryant] Conant book, *General Education in a Free Society*—the little red book, it was called—indicating how Harvard College went about it. McConnell must have been much caught up in this. These fifteen or so objectives that appeared in our bulletin were, in fact, the objectives that came out of a Senate committee report of a committee that McConnell chaired. Whether he was dean at the time, I don't know. It preceded—I ran down the date—it was two or three years before this that it had been endorsed by our Senate as worthy objectives. They weren't mandated the way the CLE stuff was . . .

CAC: Later.

RP: . . . fifteen, or so, years later but they were stated as worthy objectives.

CAC: Let me interpose. CLE is Council on Liberal Education.

RP: I keep forgetting these letters may not mean anything to some people. I can't recite them; I'm just citing them for people to look up if they want to but they did have a kind of utilitarian flare and they were a little how-to-doish. They talked in behavioral terms and I took it this grew out of the fact that McConnell was an educational psychologist. In any event, there they were stated as objectives. As I think I mentioned a bit ago, McConnell brought Russell Cooper here to head up a department then to be called—it just started in about 1945 or so—the Department of General Studies. It had six subsets. It was really a big holding company. It had a division, a unit, called Humanities, one called Natural Sciences, one called Social Sciences—those are pretty standard and well-known. The other three were Family Studies, Communication, and Personal Orientation.

CAC: Heavens, I'd forgotten that.

RP: The ones we know the most about, that were the biggest and most distinguished, were those first three I named. You might be interested in the people—I was—who were teaching in the Natural Science general, broad, interdisciplinary courses. By and large, these courses were interdisciplinary. It was a mechanism for having interdisciplinary courses in the colleges.

CAC: And for the most part introductory?

RP: Yes.

CAC: These were freshmen and sophomores . . . ?

RP: No question . . . for the most part introductory. They were never, at our college, adopted as *the* requirements. They were always simply in competition with disciplinary courses. That's important, I think, because in some institutions they brought in the courses and then mandated them for students. The people teaching in the two or three broad Natural Science survey courses were J. W. Buchta, whom I've mentioned before, chairman of Physics, George Thiel . . .

CAC: Oh, my!

RP: . . . who was chairman of Geology, and Dwight Minnick, who was chairman of Zoology, and Orville Dahl . . .

CAC: [gasp]

RP: . . . who was chairman of Botany.

CAC: The four major figures in their own fields! God!

RP: So, it showed the kind of people whose attention were being brought to this kind of teaching. The Humanities lists—I cited the names over a couple of years here, and some of these names you'll know, and some are really quite distinguished: Mary Shaw, that wonderful teacher in Philosophy; Herb McCloskey who went on, I think, to the East West Center [University of Hawaii] . . . I know he's made quite a name for himself . . . he was a political scientist; John Bowditch, a colleague of yours who was chairman here and then went to be chairman of history at the University of Michigan. I'll tick off the other historians right now: Alice Tyler taught in it; John Wolf . . .

CAC: John B. Wolf was a towering figure.

RP: Yes . . . he was teaching in the Humanities, by the way.

CAC: Oh, you bet.

RP: The original course—a sad, sad commentary, in a way—is that the original course was *the* course for almost ten or fifteen years and while I'm sure different people brought different perspectives to it, it turned out eventually, I think, to be a limitation. The chief author—so I understood, I have to put it that way—was Alburey Castell.

CAC: I talked to John Wolf a long time ago and he always credited Alburey Castell.

RP: I thought that . . .

CAC: John wouldn't credit anybody unless it were really true—I mean, anybody else other than himself.

RP: [laughter] You mean he'd credit himself and it wasn't really true? Aubry didn't stay very long after the thing got underway. He went to Oregon or Washington.

CAC: Oregon.

RP: Saul Bellow, by the way, was one of our instructors in Humanities, the reasonably well-know local boy who went on to other things. Joseph Warren Beach taught in and was the distinguished chair of the English Department. John Clark, later chair of the English Department, Huntington Brown, Mary Turpie, those names, among others . . . The Social Science people both then and a few years later were Arthur Naftalin, Mulford Sibley, Max Kapelman, who's done something . . .

CAC: Oh, yes [unclear] politics.

RP: Yes. Orin Levy . . . Forest Wiggins, by the way, was a Black man— . . .

CAC: Oh, yes.

RP: . . . we probably to show our respect in those days called him a Negro—who was in Anthropology and left us fairly soon after that, I think, to head the department at either Oregon or Washington but he taught in the department, too. The general point is that it picked . . .

CAC: And Ben Nelson? Oh, my, what an interesting figure he was.

RP: By the way, at the premier of ^{Greece}~~Greece~~, Andy [Andreas George] Papandreou was a young instructor teaching in that [unclear] . . .

CAC: Helped write a basic text.

RP: . . . and Ted Hornburger chairman of English, sort of American Studies type English, was he not?

CAC: I hope people who hear this tape many years after will appreciate that what you're really saying is that these were towering figures in their own discipline, in terms of scholarship, and charisma, and teaching capacity.

RP: That often is the case, of course, when an exciting program begins and, later on, as you know and as I hope I'll reveal as I talk about it a little bit more, they dropped off, and we hired junior people, and didn't quite keep up the early promise. But the promise was there and it did extremely well. It had enormous student following. We had enormous numbers of students. This is one way, I think, that it got underway so easily without the kind of really prohibition you might have expected to encounter in the disciplinary departments. That comes up later.

CAC: You mean because there was lots of students?

RP: There were more students than anybody could handle. If somebody could teach them, no matter, and early on it had the interest of these leaders in the disciplines. That was the way it got underway. For several years, as I looked at the bulletins, the General Education objectives were still prominently displayed in the first page or two of the bulletin, indicating the significance that the college attached to that kind of education but never directed, always in competition with other kinds of courses for following the same objectives. Family Studies, by the way, later went on to be a kind of independent program and is no longer in the College of Liberal Arts.

CAC: This doesn't feed into Family Social Science later?

RP: Yes, it does.

CAC: Oh, I see, okay.

RP: In fact, that's where the remnants of it were transferred years later.

CAC: Oh, for heavens sakes.

RP: Jerry Neubeck later eventually became the senior person and he was moved or moved to the College of Home Economics. The Communication Program . . . we surely should mention that Harold Allen is the man who founded it, and fathered it, and mothered it, and stayed with it for years, and years, and years. That was a "competition," in quotation marks, with Freshman Composition, a different way of teaching the basic communication skills. That was its sole objective and it never went on to do more than that. Incidentally, the Social Science Program, by and large, was a series of courses, as you indicated initially, most of them Lower Division but eventually some of them for juniors and seniors also. It was only in Humanities where they eventually developed a major. It was only in Humanities where they eventually got a staff of their own—I'll mention some of those names later—and it's only Humanities that still exists in this college as a liberal arts program.

CAC: American Studies was not part of that cluster you're talking about?

RP: No, I think it was part of the same spirit.

CAC: Although, it would have been born at the same time, 1944 . . . Tremaine McDowell starts that and Mary Turpie, whom you mentioned, was part of that original group?.

RP: Yes. I had always thought it was part of the same notion . . .

CAC: I had.

RP: . . . and I guess I do think so but its labels never got visited upon our General Education objectives and our graduation requirements. A very little thing—maybe this is the administrative point of view again—one of our requirements for graduation about that time was called Humanities. Students don't read very far, you know. A Humanities requirement . . . what should you take to fulfill it? Well, the bulletin listed probably a dozen departments but one of the areas was Humanities and those enrollments just boomed.

CAC: [laughter]

RP: Once they boomed and because they were very good, they sort of perpetuated themselves. I told people this years ago and they thought I was kidding. I'm serious . . . I may be wrong but I claim that that label made a great deal of difference to the faculty in the fact that we had a continuing Humanities program and still have one while none of the other programs really still exists. Communication went out of existence just a year or two ago and this is 1984, as you know. All the others have gone down the drain.

CAC: Except for American Studies, which was not part of the six but it was a parallel movement?

RP: What else can I say about General Studies, sort of chronologically. Let me look at my notes here. In 1953-1955, I noted that the General Education objectives were still listed first in the bulletin as objectives for students in the college.

CAC: And with the same language as in . . . ?

RP: The same language. The language never changes, as a matter of fact. Here are some people who were teaching there then: Phil Siegelman from Political Science; Donald K. Smith, who had been the chair of the Speech Department, and went on to be our vice-president, and the first vice-president of the Wisconsin systems; Frank Wood from German; Joe Kwiat who was also from American Studies; David Noble, your colleague; Amberg whose first name I never can remember but one of Minnesota's earliest efforts at trying to do something about film work . . . This is where Ben Nelson's name came up and Ralph Ross who headed the Humanities program for some years; and Leo Marx, by the way, also taught in it; and Jack Levenson, both of those from English.

CAC: Oh, my . . . who were also central to the American Studies mission, both Leo and Jack Levenson?

RP: Yes. There was a lot of interaction.

CAC: Joe Kwiat, too, yes.

RP: I said earlier that I would depart from talking about General Studies specifically and talk a little bit about general graduation requirements.

CAC: Now before that . . . how was the Personal Orientation?

RP: I'm sorry. I suppose I repressed that because I was the chair of Personal Orientation.

CAC: [laughter]

RP: As a matter of fact, that was one reason I was a party to the cabinet meetings that Russell Cooper held at General Studies and the reason I picked up much of this information. That was a little how-to-do-it program. I considered it important but not in the same class as the Social Sciences and Humanities. It was a course on how to study and a course on, what we called at that time, Choosing a Vocation. Both these things this university is still doing. The how to study work was given off without credit but we've continued to have a credit course trying to help students be more successful students and trying to help students make sensible decisions about their educational, vocational . . .

CAC: At this very time, 1945, 1955, 1960, on the St. Paul campus, it's the Rhetoric Department that does that . . . those kinds of courses. They wouldn't have called them Personal Orientation but they involved some of the same objectives and techniques.

RP: My notes are failing me on the date but around . . . no here it is. In 1947, 1948, the Liberal Arts College's graduation requirements had two plans: Plan I and Plan II. This was a McConnell/Cooper contribution doing away with or putting an alternative to the single graduation plan that we'd had, which had in it around twenty credits of foreign language, and nine credits in Social Science, nine credits in Natural Science, and this two-year foreign language requirement. The college came forward . . . I call it Cooper and McConnell's contribution and, of course, it had to be approved by the faculty, and come through committee structure, and all the rest. That Plan I continued but an alternative was available to students, which didn't have a foreign language in it. So, the Arts College in the 1947, 1948 era had a graduation requirement for the Bachelor of Arts [BA] degree that didn't require a foreign language but it increased enormously the amount of work required in Social Science from nine to eighteen credits, and in Natural Science from nine to eighteen credits, and a new requirement called Humanities of eighteen credits; so, apparently the faculty was willing to trade off the requirement that had foreign language in it and not, you would say, a great deal of [unclear], just three courses in each of these broad divisions for a plan that required twice that much work in two divisions and eighteen credits in a division which we had never recognized before called Humanities. This ties in with what I said earlier about the fact that the requirement was called Humanities and it attracted the attention of students to the Humanities program. That was the general graduation plan.

CAC: Do you have a sense, once that was in place, what percents of our persons earning their baccalaureate at one way or the other?

RP: I always hate to answer questions that have good hard evidence somewhere . . .

CAC: Don't mind then.

RP: . . . that I just don't happen to know.

CAC: Well, whoever is listening to it . . . Go find out.

RP: [laughter] Being not forced to answer but being willing to say . . . I would say it was between half and half, and maybe a somewhat higher percentage in the Plan II, but not as dramatic . . .

CAC: So, half were still taking a language?

RP: Yes. Language counted, by the way, in the Humanities division then . . . that was a loose definition. The next comment I think to make about General Studies is it went on, it fared well

with students, it had enormous enrollments but it began not to fare so well with the faculty and you know a lot about this. A couple of committees, the [David] Berninghouse report, two of them . . . there was eventually a [Clarke] Chambers report on Interdisciplinary Studies.

CAC: On Humanities, yes.

RP: The earlier ones, not yours so much, were essentially trying to limit the capacity of this department of General Studies. The name was changed from General Studies to Interdisciplinary Courses and General Education and, later, it was changed to Interdisciplinary Programs . . . each time a sort of step in a direction of withdrawing support. We changed the graduation requirements in 1959-1961 to a single distribution plan. That's the way we distinguished it from Plan I, Plan II, we called it the Single Plan. This was kind of a compromise of the two that had been in force. Foreign language came in as now a requirement for all B.A. degrees but only fifteen credits, one college year. The requirements in Social Science were changed from eighteen to fifteen, and in Natural Science from eighteen to fifteen, and in Humanities from eighteen to fifteen. That new Humanities idea stuck in. A broader requirement of distribution stayed because it never went back to just a one-year course. Foreign language came back in.

CAC: My guess would be, Roger, that if someone seriously pursuing this were to look at the persons offering those courses in the General Studies areas . . . that the distinction of the list that you recited from 1945 to 1950—I think it had momentum beyond that—and if one were to look at the same list in the late 1950s that it would be, by most criteria of the academic world, a lesser group of persons?

RP: No question. No question about it.

CAC: I mean the Dwight Minnicks were lost to the program. It came down to Mark Graubard . . .

RP: Mark Graubard in Natural Science.

CAC: . . . for whatever talents he had was not a great scientist.

RP: Only Humanities kept some people, most of them in their own employ. I think they weren't of the stature that we ticked off from across the whole college. They also did a very high percentage of their teaching with graduate students.

CAC: Right.

RP: No, it changed. There's no question about that.

CAC: That in itself is an indication of the commitment that a faculty within departmental structures were willing to make. What year was General Studies disestablished? There was a

famous meeting in Nicholson Hall auditorium with the whole assembly in which . . . Do you have that?

RP: I'm willing to guess at that because I do have the record that Russell Cooper was no longer listed in the faculty in 1959-1961. He left after staying a year or two to fill the obligations—he was a man of great integrity— . . .

CAC: Yes.

RP: . . . to the staff that he'd brought here and do the best he could for them but, in a sense, his program had been booted out. He didn't appear in the 1959-1961 bulletin; so, we'd have to guess 1958, 1957, something like that.

CAC: That would be a good guess. I was at that meeting and memories are not as fresh as your recitation reminding yourself from the documents but I remember my colleague from Ancient History, Tom Jones who carried a certain authority—he was not yet a Regents Professor but he was well-known—was very negative toward all of this . . . oh, my! . . . representing that specialized departmental discipline commitment. I remember him saying, "General Studies, general stuff."

RP: [laughter]

CAC: And to great applause.

RP: It got voted out. It still hung on. Humanities had some tenured people then. It was a major in the college, and it still exists, and I think it's quite strong now, by the way. New directions, new leadership . . . later than the time period you're studying . . . it survived. The Interdisciplinary and Natural Sciences courses, one or two of them, continue to survive. Buchta was still here. Some other people continued to be interested in them. As you mentioned, Mark Graubard was a chief teacher of one of the courses. One of them, by the way, was a course in Biology and we didn't have courses in Biology then. We had a course in Zoology, and a course in Botany, and, eventually, when we established a college of Biological Sciences, it started offering the course in Biology; so, it was a forerunner of that.

Just for the record, the college adopted the possibility of a Bachelor of Science degree in 1964-1966. Up until that time, we'd had just the Bachelor of Arts degree. This was to give the departments which were just in CLA a chance to offer a more specialized degree if they wanted to. The Natural Science departments had that opportunity because they were located in other colleges and could offer the Bachelor of Science degree or a [unclear] degree there but the social Sciences and humanistic departments, by and large, don't have a disposition and haven't had a disposition to do this but it was an option that was provided them. Now, in 1984, we probably have a half a dozen departments of CLA which offer bachelor of Science degrees and the option became available first in 1964-1966.

I skip now up to 1968-1970 when our graduation requirements again changed, following really a university leadership under what was called—you brought it up earlier . . . I'll at least elaborate on what it was—the Council on Liberal Education. This was a university-wide council headed by this Donald K. Smith, whom I mentioned some time ago, as a teacher in the old Humanities program, now a vice-president of the university chairing a Senate council on liberal education.

CAC: Excuse me. I'm just certain on the initiative of Met Wilson. I think Met came with a certain agenda and from the presidential office, he wanted that base line established. That's not to say that Don Smith was his instrument but . . .

RP: I think that's okay to say that.

CAC: . . . to some degree it was.

RP: Then, as you know, the university adopted some graduation requirements for every baccalaureate degree. I've always been proud of the University of Minnesota when it said every baccalaureate candidate here had to satisfy certain liberal education requirements but this is the 1960s of the 1940s. It's that battle that's ongoing. This didn't affect the College of Liberal Arts very much. Our requirements were already greatly in excess. It affected people in Medical Technology. It affected people in the Institute of Technology . . . not Education very much because they'd always had a General Education requirement and Business Administration had a reasonable one . . . chiefly those limited professional programs.

CAC: Keith McFarland was saying that ah! the St. Paul campus was there before, too. I think in a way that was true. They had the baseline in most of their programs, in Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics.

RP: I'm glad you talked to Keith because that's the part of the university I guess I know the least about. I wouldn't have said that and . . .

CAC: Well, it may not be [unclear] true . . .

RP: . . . somebody ought to really [unclear] . . . somebody should check the records.

CAC: [laughter]

RP: The St. Paul part of the Twin Cities campus was what, three miles away by trolley car in those days? This led to their establishing some—quote—liberal education—unquote—efforts on their own. Those of us in the College of Liberal Arts, at this end of the . . .

[End of Tape 3, Side 2]

[Tape 4, Side 1]

RP: . . . full-fledged departments of literature. We were a department with a rather limited objective. I guess I think the quality couldn't have been the same. It may be that the St. Paul campus did have some requirements in its colleges for General Education but, by and large, they were satisfied through those instruments rather than through the basic instruments here.

CAC: Right. I'll just interpose . . . you said that you were so proud that the university would do that. In my interview with Met Wilson—see his tape—he takes pride, not alone in that, but that was one of the things he wanted to talk about.

RP: I'm sorry, I didn't remember to put it in terms of Wilson first because I did know what you reminded me of. I knew Smith personally, and served on the council with him, and knew that he did the writing, and, of course, was all for it. I'd forgotten that it really was President Wilson who brought it along and Don Smith who helped him carry it off.

In 1970-1972, we authorized a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in the college to permit our three Fine Arts Departments to offer a more specialized degree if they wanted to—all three of them did. A year or two later, we changed our graduation requirements yet again continuing with the Single Plan but saying that the language requirement could be satisfied through a Route I or a Route II. Route I was taking just a foreign language but Route II opened the option for students who, after one year of language which was required, could take a second year and somewhat more than a full second year in courses taught sometimes by the Language Department but sometimes by the History Department, or the Geography Department, or the Political Science Department, courses that bore on the culture where the language was the primary language. That has been the approach of this college toward the foreign language requirement up until quite recent times, as you know. The other requirements weren't changed particularly. At this time, we created what was called—over my objections; I don't like the word school as a subdivision of a college—the School of Cross Disciplinary Studies.

CAC: At this time . . . you mean . . . ?

RP: Sorry, 1972-1974. Again, it's hard to credit anything like this to any one person but the committee that wrote the report was chaired by a man named Wallace Russell, whom I had mentioned earlier. He was associate dean of the college then and brought in because of Ziebarth's temporary illness. the other members of that committee who wrote that that summer were May Brodbeck, later dean of the Graduate School and later vice-president for Academic Affairs . . .

[telephone rings - break in the interview]

RP: . . . at the University of Iowa; and Ted Wright, certainly one of our strongest English people; and two students, by the way . . . a committee of five, two of them students. I bring this up from time to time, as you know, because I've been so happy about the participation of students in the serious decisions in the college. They spent the summer writing a report that was then adopted over the next year, which proposed a program in Cross Disciplinary Studies. That was the 1972-1974 version of interdisciplinary things and how are we going to tackle that. Let me just quickly identify the three sub-programs in Cross Disciplinary Studies.

CAC: Let me interpose and remind the listener that this was also a response to retrenchment and reassignment . . . of funds? It was one way the Arts College got money back from the Central Administration to meet new educational needs?

RP: That certainly was true and when you call it a response to retrenchment, that's an interesting idea and suggests the possibility that maybe Gerry Shepherd, the academic vice-president, and others on his staff played a role in this that I never really appreciated.

CAC: Oh, I think so. I don't think they initiated it but I think that they were, at an early stage . . . they let their positive receptivity be known; so, it was encouraging signals that came early. I'm quite certain about that. I'll be talking with others about this.

RP: Lofquist might have said something about that.

CAC: He may have.

RP: He was in the vice-president's office at that time. In any event, it does remind me to say something I might not otherwise have said and that is that we were obligated, which we were happy to field the obligation for, to make this a university program, to make this open to students everywhere—of course, that's always been true of all of our courses so it was no big deal—but more especially to use the faculty from across the campus. As you know—as I'll say in a moment and tell listeners that you played a part in this—we were very self-conscious about trying to get people, especially from the St. Paul campus as a matter of fact, to take part. The Cross Disciplinary Studies effort had three subdivisions. One was, it was a mechanism for experimental courses. Now, we'd had experimental courses for a long, long time but they'd been sort of free-floating and not under any identifiable leadership; so, they were put in the Cross Disciplinary Studies. Some budget money was there for faculty people to come forward with proposals for experimental courses, especially interdisciplinary ones, and for students, by the way, to come forward, not to teach the courses as was done on some campuses in those days but at least to propose the courses. This also was the place that we, then, put two or three interdepartmental major programs and where we gave birth to two or three others. They again, some of them, had been in existence but they hadn't had a home. It was called a *home* for interdepartmental programs where we thought they'd get better attention and . . .

CAC: Nurture.

RP: . . . better nurture. Urban Studies, Religious Studies . . . Women's Studies started there . . . Latin American Studies. The interdepartmental major, which this college had had in the 1970s, for twenty-five years, also was put there as a logical place to put it. So, the various, rather small, by and large, in terms of number of the students . . . no faculty other than advisers; that is, it wasn't a curricula program. It was a degree planning program and it made a lot of sense from an economic point of view—your mentioning retrenchment is a reminder of that—to put them in an office where at least they'd have a secretary who could serve all of them. The other thing, and the thing that attracted the most attention and was the most different, was what we called Special Sequences for Lower Division students in which we—I started to use the word packaged which I don't like as a term but I'll use it; it communicates well, I guess—packaged courses that could interact with each other and gave students the opportunity to register in this package of courses rather than just any old course. No courses—I'm certain of this—were new . . . well, maybe one or two of them were but most of them were regular courses and most of them were multi-section courses in which we chose, with the instructor's active cooperation, his or her section of let's say American Government, and one section of Sociology, and one or two sections of Freshman Composition. A student would register in these three courses together so that—lo! and behold, on our campus this was a contribution—students would see their same classmates when they went to another class. In my little college, you couldn't see anybody but your classmates but at the University of Minnesota, you didn't have classmates. You know, it was a curricula attack on a serious sociological problem of what kind of college we've got. I was very excited about it. The teachers who took part in it were very excited about it. It worked extremely well for the few students we got into it. We tried it for three or four years. Eventually, it collapsed. We didn't seem to have the capacity to communicate it adequately to the students. They had to register their first quarter. They didn't know what a credit was. They didn't know when the first hour was. We were loading them with information and, then on top of that, we tried to tell them about this special opportunity. I guess, I'd call it a failure. Interestingly enough, Wally Russell, who went on to Ames, Iowa, to be the dean of the arts college there, did the same thing there; and we've gotten inquiries and sent out booklets lots of places in the country about this exciting idea of having students in companion courses. Incidentally, the courses were called upon to relate to each other. We brought the instructors together ahead of time. In the ideal circumstances, they knew the schedule of their co-teachers in other courses. We put labels on some of these collections of courses, too, even though the courses were regular courses. We had one for people especially interested in law. We had a sequence for people whose interests were particularly humanistic; although, it didn't include just Humanities courses. As you can see, I can get excited just talking about it.

CAC: There's one with an environmental . . . ?

RP: Yes.

CAC: There was one, I think, we called American Ways of Life, or something like that?

RP: Yes. You're able to recall this because, as I was going to say just sort of on the administrative side, the first year or two—frankly, I forget whether it was one or two years—Russell suddenly departed just as this thing was to start, and I was called upon to do the sort of administrative work, and you were urged and were willing to be the chair of the Oversight Committee and to give the kind of intellectual and academic leadership that it needed. We had two or three very good, I might say, graduate students, whose names I wish I could record for the record and I can't off the top of my head, who just helped enormously, especially on the Special Sequences thing.

CAC: There were real logistical problems, and problems of communication, and problems, I would guess, of students, as you say entering freshman, who thought of themselves as moving toward some major and they really wanted to take a traditional . . . it was a logical, natural thing to do.

RP: I think logistical is the key word here for people probably, if they're going to have some sense of our university and its problems of size and commuting populations, that sort of thing, to know how a logistical problem is a serious problem. I don't want to end on a negative note here. I think it was very successful. I think the concept is basically very sound and for those students who joined in, there was no question about their enthusiasm and their benefit—and for the instructors, too, by the way. Some little suggestion, I think that I heard last year—was it in Honors? . . . you would know if it was in Honors—somebody make some noises about this . . . not to revive this; they don't know about this . . . they think that would be a good idea and I say, "Yes, it would be a great idea. Let's try it again."

CAC: I would like to add to this that—seeing I had mentioned the retrenchment earlier—the various colleges were taxed, so to speak, during that early retrenchment. Then, there was a reassignment of funds and the Arts College's major reassignment of funds after that first retrenchment was to this program; so, it was one way to enrich. In that case, I am certain from firsthand knowledge, that it was Shepherd and Lofquist who helped support and nurture that kind of reassignment.

RP: That probably was why it was called a school, too, since Gerry Shepherd came from IT where they use that label.

CAC: Yes.

RP: We never made that public. It kept appearing in the budget book year after year but we never called it the School of Cross Disciplinary Studies. A couple of other things at this time . . . This was also the year, about that time, when we started the Bachelor of Elected Studies and also the time when we started the Office of Special Learning Opportunities. You've emphasized that CDS was a response, in part, to the central stimulation on the retrenchment. OSLO, as we called the Office of Special Learning Opportunities, and the BES degree were really this college's

response to that Vietnam war business and the student protests. At the university level, there had been established under University College, a Living Learning Center, LLC, which—in the opinion of many of my colleagues and to some extent of myself; although, I was on their advisory board—was doing kind of outrageous things. There also was an Experimental College founded under University College, which, again, lots of colleagues thought was doing outrageous things. I think it was doing both of these things . . . some good things. It was certainly stirring up a lot of things but they weren't done, we thought, in the proper way; so, we started a Bachelor of Elected Studies, later, it became Individualized Studies, which I guess, somebody looking at it from the outside would say, "That's sort of what an arts college faculty in a research university would be willing to do along the same line." Our Office of Special Learning Opportunities was what an arts college under faculty supervision and with good strong academic leadership would do analogous to a Living Learning Center. It's immodest, I suppose, for me to say it but I claim we did pick up the ideas and the excitement of those two programs, which were launched with central university support and encouragement—I guess, to shake us all up a bit. Don Smith was instrumental here. Jim Werntz was instrumental here. Then, we came along and did get excited and said, "Well, we can't have our students doing that kind of stuff over there." But some of those things that they are doing—notice the change in term—were good and under the kind of supervision we thought they ought to have. We picked them up . . .

CAC: Now, OSLO involved apprenticeships or internships?

RP: Both of those and independent study.

CAC: What other kinds of things?

RP: Chiefly, things like that. Chiefly, student directed or individual student projects. None of that, by the way, was new to our college.

CAC: Here the parallel is very close to University Without Walls [UWW] and University College is also, where you have an individualized . . .

RP: Yes.

CAC: . . . and accreditation of apprenticeship work or internship work.

RP: I claim they picked that up from us.

CAC: I see. Chronologically, would that be the case, that UWW follows OSLO?

RP: OSLO preceded UWW.

CAC: Okay.

RP: It didn't precede Experimental College.

CAC: Okay.

RP: You know this, Clarke . . . you've been a professor of History for a long, long time and I'm sure you had your students forever doing independent assignments . . .

CAC: Oh, sure.

RP: . . . in this very good kind [unclear]. In fact, good classes had independent work in them, too. Maybe, some of my resentment is showing up here that everybody thought this was such a wild idea and gee! isn't it exciting? The problem with Experimental College and with the Living Learning Center is they always felt it necessary before they blew their own horn to step a few hard steps on traditional teaching, and regular requirements, and that sort of thing.

CAC: And to claim novelty where it wasn't always justified?

RP: Yes. These developments in individualized degree, which didn't follow the BA requirements in every respect, and an encouragement—that's really all it was—of making more easy the independent study, and internships, and field work, and helping find some of those opportunities was our response to the student movement. In general, what I think Minnesota did, by the way, in response to the student movement is we didn't change our requirements and our standards the way lots of colleges did . . . wipe out this, that . . . we posed alternatives. We kept the old requirements and then students had the choices and some chose the new but, actually, most students never chose these things. The Experimental College was never very large and our BES program was never very large, though the debates in the faculty when it was endorsed suggested a great fear that all the students would go and take what was—quote—easy—unquote.

CAC: [unclear]

RP: Two things . . . one is, it wasn't especially easy and second, I don't believe that about students. Students are like people . . . some students take things that are easy but most students want a good education.

CAC: You spoke earlier of the long momentum of traditional expectations of our undergraduate body here at Minnesota.

RP: Yes. Well, in some ways, this was the tail end of the General Studies movement. That's a little stretching it, I suppose, but it showed, in the 1970s, the people who weren't quite happy, the faculty, with things as they are were doing to have alternative things. We used Cross Disciplinary Studies instead of General Studies, and we used the Office of Special Learning Opportunities instead of the Living Learning Center, and we used the Bachelor of Elected Studies in the College of Liberal Arts instead of an Experimental College degree under University

College. The one other thing that I wanted to comment on, stimulating myself by talking about the university's response to the—quote—student movement—unquote—is we made a reasonably radical change in our grading system in the university at about this time. Let me talk just a little bit about it. I was involved in it by chance of chairing the Ad Hoc Committee. It was a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Committee on Student Scholastic Standing charged with looking at the grading system. We weren't necessarily charged with doing anything about it but usually if a committee is set up, it means something ought to be looked at. I have to confess now, ten years later, that by chance, I suppose, of the membership on the committee and, maybe, caught up in the spirit of the movement and the things that were happening then, we did come forward with some changes, which gradually—it's taken ten years or a falling by the wayside—we eliminated, for example, the failing grade from the repertoire of grades at this university and said, instead, that a student who didn't succeed the work should receive no credit and an *N* should be put on the record. It's a semantic game but it had significance, I thought. We did away with the grade point average. We eliminated a formal university procedure for calculating a grade point average [GPA] and took no position on whether there should be one but knowing bureaucratically that it was pretty hard to have one if you didn't have agreement on how to calculate it. Our friends in the registrar's office, of course, had trouble with this and during much of this period, GPAs, as they were called, continued to appear on student's records but they had no validity because there was no university agreement on how they should be calculated.

CAC: Let me tell you that Phi Beta Kappa had a hard time.

RP: Right. [laughter] Oh, we caused trouble for everybody. Our notion was that a man or a woman shouldn't be evaluated with a number. We shouldn't be able to say he's a 3.25 or a 3.8.

CAC: [laughter]

RP: We thought that people interested in the quality of a student's record ought to look at the record and see that they got an *A* in English but they got only a *C* in History and think about it more. It was terribly idealistic, it's true.

CAC: Again, logistical problems . . . When you sit down with 400 records of people potential for Phi Beta Kappa and try to make a judgment in committee about those individual records that's . . .

RP: You had to develop some other system. There were some other ways of thinking about it. I never have been able to decide whether I am proud of this little episode in my life or not. I was at the time. I knew it wouldn't last. You can't do this in just two or three institutions. The whole system closes in on you and when your student tries to transfer from here to a local college, Macalester or to the University of Illinois, they want to know what's his GPA or what's here GPA? We made it tough on them. [laughter] We made them think about the grades.

CAC: You made it tough on our own Honors Program?

RP: Oh, boy! you keep coming back to that?

CAC: Yes.

RP: We also, at this time, instituted an alternative grading system to the *A, B, C, D, N* system, namely the satisfactory *N* system to encourage students to enter into the fields, venture into fields they might not enter into where they get a *real* grade. They had to do satisfactory work and we left that to instructors to decide but the general idealistic notion was that a student who might never be willing really to take a course in whatever, might be willing to do it under these circumstances. The number of credits a student could present toward a degree under this rubric was limited and students couldn't do it in their major. There were lots of restrictions on it but it did open up some possibilities and it was kind of fun. I have a little note here about OSLO, which is sort of amusing. We tried to think of a name to identify this office we were setting up for students where we were going to encourage independent study, and field work, and that sort of thing, internships. One of the things we came up with was the College of Arts' New Divisional Office. This turns out, if you think real quick, to be CAN-DO.

CAC: [laughter]

RP: I'm so glad we didn't do that. [laughter] We didn't seriously consider it. Now, on this campus, when people say OSLO, they know they're not talking about some Scandinavian capitol but a local office that's been quite successful on very modest support and budgeting.

CAC: Let me interpose here, too, that University College, in these years, drew very heavily on arts college persons to create what they called them a surrogate faculty because University College did not have a faculty of its own in surveiling and governing the parallel programs of UWW, Experimental College that you were mentioning earlier.

RP: Yes.

CAC: So for example, Frank Sorauf and I, in some ways quite traditional, were effective members of that governing board. I chaired the governing board of University College while these things were being done; so, there was a borrowing. Jim Werntz, of course, was a good liaison person.

RP: You mean, you permitted Experimental College to be founded?

CAC: I was not there at the founding.

RP: [laughter]

CAC: I was brought in to help . . .

RP: Salvage.

CAC: . . . render some order out of chaos. I think both Frank and I were salvagers in several projects. The point is that they did borrow Arts College people who had some visibility, and experience, and seniority to come in and to render some order out of chaos in those programs. The one that survived best was UWW, in the long run.

RP: Yes. I sounded more critical than I was or than I am. I'm glad we had Experimental College. I think it was necessary to move us in a certain direction and I'm happy about the Living Learning Center, where, as I said earlier, I served on their board of whatever it was called. Those were fine things. I didn't have in mind talking about University College and I won't at length but I really thought of University College as a CLA subsidiary because the man who operated it out of his vest pocket for twenty years was J. W. Buchta.

CAC: Yes.

RP: Then Mabel Powers, when the students became too numerous, used to see a lot of them for him. It's had other leadership since and it's been bureaucratized and extended as the times required but during the time that you're talking about, almost up until the end of it and certainly through the 1940s and 1950s, it was J. Buchta's. He was chairman of University College committee and that was all the bureaucracy that existed. As chairman of the committee, he saw all the students himself, and helped plan their courses, and went over them. The individualized major in CLA was the intra-CLA program that was like University College. Students within our own college had some limitations, though they weren't extensive, on how much work they could take in other colleges; so, if they were satisfied with the kinds of courses that were available within CLA, they took the degree within CLA but if they wanted to trade heavily on something in medicine, or technology, or the St. Paul campus, then they went to University College. Since, Buchta headed both the Upper Division for CLA and the University College, the student was served as the student needed serving in the single office without having to go somewhere else.

CAC: I spoke of borrowing Arts College faculty for that purpose. Just last year, I chaired a committee to find a new director for University Without Walls. Members of the committee came from the General Extension Division, from the College of Education, the College of Home Economics, and the Arts College so that it's an outreach kind of program now and kind of settled in.

RP: Well, I am done, sir, unless you have something.

[break in the interview]

RP: . . . that has a special kind of poignancy because I'm visiting Mabel Powers everyday.

CAC: Yes.

RP: She's just had both her legs amputated. I mentioned her because I've worked with her for so long. I was able to tell her I put her on the record, the oral record.

CAC: Ah, good for you!

RP: She was pleased at that.

CAC: There would be no point in my trying to see her now?

RP: Well, yes, there would be a point. She is pleased if people see her and she's quite seeable. She's in the rehabilitation floor over there, sitting in a chair often, wheeling herself around with no legs. She has lots of visitors. She has an enormous number of friends, especially at Newman Center.

CAC: Very good.

RP: She's been active there for a long time.

CAC: Yes, I know that she was networked there.

RP: She seems touched by anyone—who wouldn't be—who remembers her. I think she'd be delighted if you came by and spent an minute. It doesn't turn out to have an awkwardness. It just seems like Mabel presiding in a social situation except she doesn't have any legs.

CAC: She was a remarkable person in the arts.

RP: She's very tough. She is in some pain upon occasion, probably more than on occasion, but for the most part she doesn't let it interfere with her being civil and sociable. Yes, she'd be delighted.

CAC: Well, this has been a very useful interview. It's a temptation for me to make a very large personal commitment because I'm having such a good time. [laughter]

RP: I would think so. Yes. The things you are learning . . . the things people will tell you.

CAC: Yes. There's been a willingness on almost everybody's part to be candid and yet to be ladies and gentlemen in the observations, which I think speaks well of our community generally. Again, I thank you very much. This will go into the archives forever.

RP: Right!

[End of Tape 4, Side 1]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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