

Maynard Reynolds

- Youth and education 1-2
 - Moorhead State, 1939-42 1
 - University of Minnesota Graduate School, 1946 1
 - Ph.D., 1950 2
- Reynolds returns to the University of Minnesota, 1951 3
 - clinic for remedial pupils 3
 - College of Education, 1951 4
 - teacher training 5
 - governance 6
 - Edwards, Marcia 5-6
 - Peik Hall built 7
 - governance reform 8
 - Bureau of Institutional Research 8
 - Bureau of Educational Research 8
 - college outreach 10-12
 - Institute of Child Development 12
 - Anderson, John E. 12
 - Harris, Dale 13
 - Special education 13-14
 - Andersen, Elmer and Special Education 15-17
 - congressional appropriations 18
 - funding 18-21
 - societal pressures 21-23
 - other educational institutes pick up teacher training 24-25
 - fragmentation of college 26
 - specialization 27-28
 - growth in faculty numbers 29-30
- Reynolds - University of Minnesota committees 31-33
- Faculty Consultative Committee 32-34, 36
- Committee on Committees 34-35
- Champion, Hale 37
- University College 37-
- College of Education faculty and university governance 38-39
- State legislature and the University of Minnesota 40

Interview with Maynard Reynolds

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

**Interviewed on July 20, 1994
at the Home of Clarke Chambers**

Maynard Reynolds - MR
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: It's Wednesday the 20th of July. The interview is taking place in the dining room of the person doing the interviewing, Clarke Chambers. I'm here talking with Maynard Reynolds who came to the University of Minnesota in 1951—the same year I did—and was on staff for a long period, since the centennial. The centennial year was 1951.

Maynard, I would kind of like to start with something about your educational background, how you got interested in education as a field of study and teaching, a little bit about your graduate professional training, and then we'll come to the University of Minnesota in 1951, and see what things looked like at that point. So, tell us a little about yourself.

MR: A good part of my childhood was spent in Moorhead, Minnesota, up on the Red River just across from Fargo, [North Dakota]. We were poor as everybody else was, or almost everybody else in the 1930s. We had a little teachers college in the town—it's not so little anymore. It was Moorhead State Teachers College at that time. I finished high school in 1939, went over to the college, and went through there. The war was coming along pretty obviously; so I rushed along a finished up in three years in 1942, just in time to go into the military service. I was there for three and a half years. I got out of service in December of 1945 and started Graduate School at the University of Minnesota in January 1946.

CAC: That's calling it pretty close.

MR: I didn't quite know what I wanted to do. I took courses in several different fields, all sort of educationally related because I had a teaching certificate. I had quite a lot in the bank in the

Interview with Maynard Reynolds

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

**Interviewed on July 20, 1994
at the Home of Clarke Chambers
St. Paul, Minnesota**

Maynard Reynolds - MR
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: It's Wednesday the 20th of July. The interview is taking place in the dining room of the person doing the interviewing, Clarke Chambers. I'm here talking with Maynard Reynolds who came to the University of Minnesota in 1951—the same year I did—and was on staff for a long period, since the centennial. The centennial year was 1951.

Maynard, I would kind of like to start with something about your educational background, how you got interested in education as a field of study and teaching, a little bit about your graduate professional training, and then we'll come to the University of Minnesota in 1951, and see what things looked like at that point. So, tell us a little about yourself.

MR: A good part of my childhood was spent in Moorhead, Minnesota, up on the Red River just across from Fargo, [North Dakota]. We were poor as everybody else was, or almost everybody else in the 1930s. We had a little teachers college in the town—it's not so little anymore. It was Moorhead State Teachers College at that time. I finished high school in 1939, went over to the college, and went through there. The war was coming along pretty obviously; so I rushed along and finished up in three years in 1942, just in time to go into the military service. I was there for three and a half years. I got out of service in December of 1945 and started Graduate School at the University of Minnesota in January 1946.

CAC: That's calling it pretty close.

MR: I didn't quite know what I wanted to do. I took courses in several different fields, all sort of educationally related because I had a teaching certificate. I had quite a lot in the bank in the

field of teacher education. I knew I was not going to take one of those jobs long range, short radius around Moorhead in teaching. I had an older sister who did that. Among other things when I was in college back in 1939 to 1942, I used to play with a regional dance band; and I made twice as much money while I was going to college as the teachers were making.

CAC: [laughter] You played the traps?

MR: Yes. It just didn't appeal to me to go out to Ada, or whatever, which my sister did to teach for \$1600 a year. But I did have quite a lot in the bank in the field of education and I was quite interested in it.

CAC: And you had the GI [Government Issue] Bill?

MR: Right. GI Bill and I had a half time assistantship. I did master's degree. Then I went off to teach down at what is now the University of Northern Iowa for a year. Then I came back and finished the Ph.D. in 1950 and took a job in Long Beach at the just-opening California State University-Long Beach for one year. Then they invited me to come back. Is that enough? That's a quick run through.

CAC: So you were familiar with the structure and the missions of the college when you came back because you'd spent four, five years here?

MR: I wouldn't say I was terribly familiar.

CAC: Well, you know graduate students don't always pick everything up we think they are.

MR: Yes, I think that's true. I really don't think I had a terrible lot of awareness about the university as a whole. I knew a little bit about that one corner of the university. The inter-play or the availability of instruction across psychology, child development, education, and some other fields was much greater than it is later. I took a series of courses in philosophy with [Herbert] Feigl, and [Alvin] Sellers, and Mr. Elliott for whom the Psychology Building was named. I took several classes with him.

CAC: This was more of a liberal education at the graduate level at that time?

MR: Could be. I sort of felt that way.

CAC: Sure. It sounds that way to me.

MR: Yes. Then I came to know John Anderson, a very famous psychologist who was head of the Institute of Child Development. I always appreciated that Mr. Elliott used to say, "Hello" to me walking across the campus. That was a great honor to have somebody recognize that you

were in his class. He was very well known all over the place. I doubt that graduate students have quite that same experience these days.

CAC: Yes. In a sense it's far more specialized . . . came to be in the 1970s and 1980s.

MR: Yes. I was a terribly serious student; that is, I think a lot of that built up during the war. I just got so sick and tired of that kind of life that one had to put up with—not that I resented it. I was quite willing to be part of [unclear].

CAC: What service were you in?

MR: I ended up in the 13th Air Force. But I was in the Service Command. They had very interesting work there but boy! did I build up a lot of motivation to do some other things.

CAC: You're describing our generation.

MR: I think so.

CAC: Take our four years and boy! we were eager.

MR: When the professor made an assignment, or suggestion to read something, I did it.

CAC: Yes, most of us did. Right. Bravo. What kind of assignment did you have when you came back then the fall of 1951?

MR: When I was in Graduate School, I did a bit of work . . . an assistantship for that . . . in a brand new clinic. It was called the Psycho-Educational Clinic. It was headed by a young man named Harold Delp who'd come from the University of Nebraska. I think the university and Mr. Delp agreed to part ways along about 1951; and they invited me to come back, and to head that up. So, I came back in 1951. I think I was the second director. That clinic was only I think two or three years old at that time; and it served as a kind of practical setting for students who were interested in remedial teaching, and the school psychology, special ed—except none of those specialities really existed at that time exactly. We didn't have a formal school psyche program. We had a lot of students . . . well, some students who had gone through in psychology, or educational psychology, and child development, took jobs [unclear]; but we didn't have a formal program. Neither did we have a formal program in special education. But there were people around who wanted some experience sort of pointing to marginal situations out there in the school, kids who were in marginal situations, and needed study, and weren't behaving well, and weren't learning. So we had a variety of people who needed a practical station. We had to have that at the university because there wasn't much available out in the schools yet.

CAC: You bet. So that the field of Special Education, which as it came to be defined, didn't exist in 1951?

MR: It really didn't. There was a significant beginning in the field of speech and hearing. People like Bryng Bryngelson had been training people to work with stutterers and things like that but except small programs in the very obvious areas like for deaf children and for blind children, there wasn't much out there.

CAC: For the severely disabled but not special . . .

MR: Well, for the distinctly disabled, I would say, rather than severely disabled.

CAC: Yes, that's better.

MR: Right. So there wasn't much there.

CAC: You here in Minnesota really were on the ground floor of developing that speciality and presumably this kind of evolution was going on elsewhere in the educational field?

MR: Yes, I think we were right in step with what was beginning to happen all across the country.

CAC: Did Minnesota play a particular leadership role then on that?

MR: I think we came to exercise some leadership . . . in probably by the 1960s and into the 1970s, we were up there. Then a bit later on, our program in some ratings was number one or number two of the whole country.

CAC: Let's come back to Special Ed because that was your career and we want to talk about that at more length. Could you say something more about the College of Education that you came into . . . its mission, its structure, its governance, how it behaved at that time?

MR: Okay. The College of Education in the 1950s—I'm sort of going back to 1951 . . .

CAC: Oh, that's great.

MR: . . . 1951 was one big amorphous kind of structure. There were no departments. The budget was managed out of the dean's office. Wesley Peik was dean when I first came but he passed away, I think, in my very first year.

CAC: There were no departments? You were all faculty of the College of Education?

MR: Right. There were clusters of faculty that met around certain programs; but there was no separate budgetary arrangement, and there was no machinery set up to handle various functions such as promotions and all that sort of thing at the department level. There was an associate

dean at that time, Marcia Edwards, a quite remarkable woman. She stayed on for years and years and was the interim dean several times . . .

CAC: Sure.

MR: . . . when there changes to be made. But it was one big, seems to me, kind of formless, at least from the perspective that we developed at a later time.

CAC: That matches your comment about the general education that you got as a graduate student, that it wasn't highly specialized.

MR: Well, I think that was true. That kind of general education, of that reaching out, is something that I really value. I think there is something about a habit of kind of reaching out that might have been established for many of us who were in school at that time. I think things got kind of cramped and kind of narrow for many students a bit later on.

CAC: What was the approximate size of the full time faculty staff at that time?

MR: I can't tell you what the number was but it must have been pretty small. The college at that time had, I think, a relatively small faculty but it was kind of a star system. There was one person in Mathematics Education, Leo Brueckner, and he was just a powerhouse; really one person in Reading, Guy Bond; and one person in Child Literature and English, Dora V. Smith. Stan Kegler came along a bit later.

CAC: Yes.

MR: And one person in Social Studies, [Edgar Bruce] Wesley. They were all text book writers. They all produced materials for students in schools. I think that was the outreach mechanism really that was available at that time. That was before . . .

CAC: You mean writing of text books?

MR: The writing of text books both for professional purposes . . . college text, university text . . . but also children's material. Guy Bond became rich with all the books he wrote and I'm sure Leo Brueckner did very well in mathematics. I'm not saying that it was their aim.

CAC: Sure.

MR: They were very serious and highly productive people but that's what they did.

CAC: But their chief mission was really teacher training then?

MR: Oh, yes. They were very much involved in that and they had, in that period of the 1950s, very large classes. The university, the College of Education, faced the problem of the baby boom. The veterans coming back home in 1945 and 1946 started having babies and they hit kindergarten about the same time I hit the university.

CAC: [laughter]

MR: As you know, just wave like that school population went way up; so the Guy Bonds, the Leo Brueckners, the Dora Smiths, the Wesleys, and some others found their classes growing, growing, growing. I think a lot of the graduate students at that time sort of filled in around them. Graduate students—many of them quite mature, many of the men at least, and there were more men in those days, I think proportionately than there are now—performed functions that perhaps would be performed by union level faculty a little bit later on. When I think back to it, it is just amazing me what Leo Brueckner did all by himself in Math Ed, and what Guy Bond did in Reading, and what Dora V. Smith did in Children's Literature.

CAC: When you met as a college, it was a plenary session of all the faculty?

MR: Right. That didn't happen too often. [laughter]

CAC: I say that you can't govern very well that way. That meant that there were government by committee or really by chair and cluster of administrative officers?

MR: Oh, the college was governed mostly by informal consultation in Marcia Edwards' little office off to the side of the dean's office.

CAC: Well, she was forever associate dean but never, except for acting, she never became dean. She was never asked to be the top person.

MR: Yes. She was a terribly nice person. No one has ever existed who was more loyal, committed to the University of Minnesota than Marcia Edwards.

CAC: And it was known in other parts of university. I knew her teaching history in the arts college.

MR: Sure. I'm not sure that I ever remember the faculty being convened for anything. There was one big issue. It was about in the very early period of my employment at the university that the big question came up about building a new university high school.

CAC: All right.

MR: They existed in an old building which is now part of [unclear]. But the possibility came to build a brand new high school and that was quite controversial.

CAC: Which came to be Peik Hall?

MR: Yes. That's it.

CAC: What was the nature of the controversy? Why should it be . . .

MR: There were a lot of people who—including yours truly—thought that maybe there were other things that were more important than doing that, building that new school. There was a leadership in that school, a guy named Winard Stout, who later became president of the University of Nevada . . . extremely powerful. He was one of those guys who won tremendous loyalty in an internal sense, that is the people within university high school, many of them graduate students; but they were teaching the classes in mathematics, or history, or English, or whatever . . . were just tremendously loyal because he delivered. He was a very powerful, persuasive person. He managed resources and he managed to get through the plan to build that high school.

CAC: He had to go through Central Administration and then to the legislature?

MR: I guess he did. He was the guy who knew how to do that kind of thing. The only general meeting of the College of Education that I recall was concerned with that issue. There wasn't anything in the way of constitution that defined who the faculty were.

CAC: I see.

MR: So, one of the things that happened was that all these graduate students who taught in University High School came to the meeting and voted.

CAC: Ah!

MR: There's no question that that vote would have lost if the vote had been done by those senior faculty members that I mentioned a few . . .

CAC: Was their citizenship challenged by anyone there?

MR: I think it was. I had a feeling that it needed to be challenged. It became aware that we had no rules about these matters, who had votes and even why should you take a vote. There was an overwhelming vote by that temporary kind of faculty person from out of the University High School and they got it. Then in a fairly short period afterward, that all had to be undone, as you perhaps know. It worked out the relationship with Marshall High School. It became Marshall University High School. I think that the college came together for a decision on that simply because it was such a controversial issue that the dean's office felt very uncomfortable just making that kind of decision. Almost everything else was . . .

CAC: Was finessed and arranged?

MR: Yes, right.

CAC: That's a remarkable story. I'm sure there are parallels elsewhere in the university in the 1950s.

MR: Yes.

CAC: It begins to tighten up later in the 1960s?

MR: You mean . . . ?

CAC: The constitution, the procedures?

MR: Oh, yes. It really did. I'm not sure exactly when it reached peak, but the formality of processes for making decisions increased remarkably; and I think may still be going on as far I know. It must have reached a peak along in the 1960s and 1970s. A lot of that was complicated by the development of external supports through federal government mainly, for research and some other things.

CAC: Let's come back to that later because I think that's a development of extraordinary importance for your college and many others. I know, and we've conversed about this, that there were also a lot of freestanding, or seemed to be reasonably freestanding, bureaus and research areas: the Bureau of Institutional Research, the Statewide Testing Bureau, and so forth. Could you say something about . . . They were all there when you came in 1951, in place, most of them?

MR: Yes, I think that's true.

CAC: Even though you weren't connected directly you were familiar. Let's lay out the territory here. Can you say something about this Bureau of Institutional Research which I think was a unique institution. It faded in the late 1970s, I think.

MR: Yes. I don't know the full history of those but even when I was a graduate student the Bureau of Institutional Research and the Bureau of Educational Research existed. Those two bureaus were twins, in effect, and sometimes I think had a shared leadership. I associate Ruth Eckert's name very importantly with the Bureau of Institutional Research and then a quickly following person who came into leadership in the bureau was Bob Keller who finished his degree . . .

CAC: And Stecklein?

MR: A bit later.

CAC: Okay.

MR: Yes.

CAC: Now, they were doing research for the institution itself? Was that [unclear] university?

MR: Somebody else will have to tell you the details of that but my impression is that they did research for the university and that there was a . . .

CAC: An [unclear] university?

MR: . . . a significant contact with the president's office. It's also true that the university performed certain functions back in those days that later were dropped; for example, the university performed an accreditation function for private schools.

CAC: Private secondary?

MR: Private secondary schools, I'm sorry. Yes. I think it was the Bureau of Institutional Research. It was Bob Keller that used to manage that. That sort of thing would come before the University Senate for final clearance but I think in a way that was a responsibility of the president's office perhaps.

CAC: Bore on admissions to the university, among other things.

MR: He managed that.

CAC: That consumed a lot of time, and money, and effort by persons in the College of Education.

MR: I don't know a lot. I don't have that impression that it consumed a lot.

CAC: Okay.

MR: Then there was the Bureau of Educational Research and that operated pretty much before the whole pattern of external supports operated. The Bureau of Educational Research was extremely useful to Ph.D. candidates and others who needed a bit of help. They had equipment, for example, such as one might need to perform statistical analysis.

CAC: I see.

MR: It didn't amount to much as you compare it with what's available now. In fact, it's really a joke when you think about what had to be done, but even a Marchand electric calculator or a bench with a set of those on it was a problem back in those days, and the Bureau of Educational Research was where all that existed; so you could go there. A name associated more with that side of things was that of Cyril J. Hoyt. Hoyt made some quite important contributions in the areas of measurement. I think of him as kind of a junior member of a quite distinguished team of people in research really headed by Palmer Johnson who taught statistics, and researched his own in the college; and I think Cyril Hoyt was one of his students at one time. He headed that and Hoyt and Keller would have been kind of heads of those twin organizations. The other bureau you mentioned, Field Studies, was somewhat distinct from those and that was run out of the Educational Administration group.

CAC: And their mission?

MR: For a long period, that was headed by a fellow named Otto Domian. They had important linkages with school systems, usually school superintendents or the administrators, and would do studies on demographics, anticipated changes in student enrollment. They worked with many school systems through problems of reorganization, mergers that were taking place, formed combined districts, and all those sorts of things.

CAC: They didn't lack for business because the demographic changes and the mergers of secondary and elementary schools in the State of Minnesota in the 1960-1970 would have given them a major mandate.

MR: That was an enormous amount of work. They used to just turn out report for one school district after another. I remember having the feeling that some of that got to be kind of routine; that is, there weren't an awful lot of new techniques being discovered.

CAC: It was a service to the larger community.

MR: It was very definitely a service.

CAC: When we think about outreach at the university, so often it's put in technology, it's computers, or it's taconite, and it's medicine, right? But the theater, I learned the other day, is out in the community in the 1950s and 1960s in a big way, going to high schools; and this service would be to a different kind of constituency. We talk about teaching scholarship and service for the community and that was a major one for the College of Education.

MR: Yes. I hadn't thought about it for a long time but there was an interesting aspect of that. We had a professor there for a brief time after I came on board. . . Boy! I'm almost blocking on his name now but I think it was Brandl—unrelated to the Professor Brandl in the Economics and the Humphrey Institute—who was involved in some outreach activities up in the Iron Range someplace. He was very liberal in his political outlook—some would say far too far to the

left—and got involved in some activities up there that some people thought associated with the wrong side in the Cold War split, if you will. I was just barely aware of some of the conflict that developed about that. He left the University of Minnesota . . . must have been in the early 1950s . . . and became a very distinguished philosopher at I think it was New York University. He gave a lot of leadership. Some of that outreach was a bit controversial.

CAC: Of course. Later on the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, right? The outreach is so complicated to the university and most citizens and most people who are at the university know nothing about that.

MR: Yes.

CAC: And I think historians tend to miss that. We think of Ag Extension, and sure enough that's important, but the College of Education was extended, too, in the same sense. How about the Institute of Child Development . . .

MR: Before you get to that, may I just say one brief thing with regard to outreach? I suppose over the first decade that I was at the University of Minnesota, we used to teach Saturday classes quite regularly.

CAC: These were designed for teachers and principals?

MR: Teachers, right. When you talk about outreach, there was a scheduling of classes in quite an extraordinary way and to a rather high degree . . .

CAC: These were persons seeking, for example, M.A.s if they were teaching . . . ?

MR: Well, very often they were just seeking a bachelor's degree. It was not uncommon at that time that teachers would have gotten started with only two years of college preparation.

CAC: I see.

MR: The College of Education used to operate programs that say 1-A for those who'd go straight through the four-year college program and get a teaching certificate. Then there would be 1-B which would be for people who had started teaching on the basis of a two-year certificate, often obtained at Mankato State, or St. Cloud State, or somewhere; and they were coming back. So large numbers of these students were coming back on Saturday mornings, and late afternoons, and trying to move toward their baccalaureate degree. Now, it's also true that many of us were involved in extension teaching. We had little patterns where faculty members would take turns going out for a week. You'd go up toward Duluth. You might cut across to Grand Rapids and make a little circuit. Then next week . . .

CAC: And give little workshops then in your own subject, your own speciality?

MR: Right but you would over a period of a quarter, you would combine maybe eight or ten different faculty members offering something or other.

CAC: And you did this. You participated?

MR: Oh, yes, I participated in that.

CAC: These are high school teachers, elementary school teachers that you worked with then?

MR: Both.

CAC: Those were your students . . . the teachers?

MR: Right. There was a tremendous . . .

CAC: That must have been a rewarding kind of work to do.

MR: Well, it was rewarding and I think it was kind of exhausting, too. It was a period in which people just worked six days a week and sometimes in the evenings as well. It was a very busy period.

CAC: We'll get to it later but I can anticipate . . . I mean the rapidity with which changes came internally to the missions and the way they were performed in the College of Education is really quite remarkable in 1950 to 1990.

MR: Yes.

CAC: Say something about the Institute of Child Development, although again this was not your primary base but it was part of the college, pertained to be.

MR: The Institute of Child Development when I came to the University of Minnesota was a distinct, separate institute and it reported directly to the president's office. It was located very near the Central Offices and faculty offices of the College of Education. There was quite a lot of interaction there. It was a very distinguished operation. John E. Anderson headed it in that period, in the 1950s and 1960s. He had been president of the American Psychological Association. I always think of him as one of the first Americans to appreciate the work of the Swiss psychologist, [Jean] Piaget. He knew about Piaget long before other people seemed to know about him. He not only ran a program that involved a lot of research and scholarly leadership but a very strong outreach program. They had a parent consultation service, for example, where parents could come if they were very concerned about their children. A couple of my important colleagues, like Harriet Blodgett and Evelyn Deno, sort of grew up in the Institute of Child Development and worked in that parent consultation service. When I became had of the Psycho-Educational Clinic, that was kind of a companion piece over there; and

sometimes we'd have a very complicated two year old with cerebral palsy. The parents were concerned about how they make educational plans, but they were also concerned about how they would manage this child themselves in the home; and so sometimes Harriet Blodgett would see the family, and I would also see the family, or someone in the clinic that I had would see them.

CAC: It gave people in research and teaching a hands-on experience and I should think would have deepened your capacity, your skills in having that hands-on experience.

MR: Yes. We used to work quite a bit at that time also with child psychiatry over in the Medical School, a bit with Physical Medicine in the Medical School and hospital set up. But the Institute of Child Development was very important. It had a history of leadership in a somewhat competitive way with a very strong comparable unit at the University of Iowa. We had a woman who retired just about the time I came on board named Florence Goodenough. She had made a tremendous record as a faculty member over there. And then a kind of junior level person coming along at that time was Dale Harris.

CAC: Oh, yes.

MR: Dale headed the institute when John retired a bit later. Early in the history of that institute, they were rather broadly framed as far as areas of scholarship were concerned. They had demographers and sociologists . . .

CAC: So it was a cross-disciplinary group?

MR: Right but it increasingly became a psychology unit.

CAC: I see.

MR: I think you would have to describe it now—and I don't mean this as a criticism—but it's really a Department of Child Psychology now, a very distinguished one but it narrowed down [unclear].

CAC: Does it mean that this movement was Midwestern in any way or was it a national movement?

MR: The leadership in Child Development?

CAC: Well, I mean as a phenomenon within the profession?

MR: I think there was something about the Midwest. Kansas had a very strong program, and Iowa, and Minnesota in a pretty special way. Michigan did some special things, too. I'm not a leading observer or theoretician about that but I'm very much aware of certain important work that was shared and there were big arguments. There was a tendency, for example, for the

University of Minnesota people to be I think much more kind of oriented to the heredity side concerning human abilities. In Iowa, the group was much more open on that. They did studies where they took kids who were in institutions for the mentally retarded, and they would place them out; and they found that these kids began to show characteristics that were quite closely associated with the adoptive parents.

CAC: I see.

MR: That became somewhat of an argument with the Minnesota people.

CAC: Sure.

MR: Florence Goodenough and others who were oriented a bit differently . . .

CAC: So, this anticipates mainstreaming?

MR: Well, in a way, I guess it does. I think we came to a much more open view about human capacities over the years.

CAC: Well, that's part of your contributions themselves in a way.

MR: Yes, I've been linked into some of that. When I got into the clinic work, and later in Special Education, I often used the term two boxes, kind of a two boxes theory. There was a tendency to kind of categorize, to put kids in little boxes; and the beginning step was to put them into two boxes, either you were normal or you weren't.

CAC: I see.

MR: Or you were disabled and you belonged in some special place. It always seemed to me that that was too simple a way of looking at it and it didn't adequately recognize the varieties of arrangements that could be made on the administrative or organizational side to deal with human differences. That's continued to be a big struggle. Can't we deal a little more openly with human differences rather than to let everything fall into kind of simplistic categories? Then let that become the basis for structuring everything, teacher education, the way you set up schools. Then pretty soon you got systems that kind of isolate people and deal in simplistic ways with categorizing of human beings. Some of that becomes stigmatic and quite a problem.

CAC: We're leading naturally into your speciality which comes to be an accelerated process I gather in the 1960s and 1970s?

MR: In 1952, along with Walter Cook who at that time became the dean of education . . . He was interested in this kind of thing so I sort of appealed to him for some leadership on this. We called a meeting of all the parent groups that were forming. That was a period when the parents

of kids with problems were just coming out of the woodwork. The National Association for Retarded Children was formed in Minneapolis in 1950.

CAC: I see.

MR: There were at that time quite a few state associations and then there were a number of local associations . . . similarly in cerebral palsy and then others. We had thirty nine different parent groups that came to a meeting in 1952 at the university.

CAC: Good grief.

MR: There was a quite remarkable leader in the community. His name was Wilco Schoenbohm. He was the fellow who developed Courage Center.

CAC: Yes. Heavens!

MR: He and I became working partners.

CAC: It starts that early?

MR: In 1952, we called that meeting.

CAC: Yes.

MR: There was a structure that came out of that. It was called the Minnesota Special Education Council, I think it was called. They wanted some things done politically.

CAC: So it was a policy as well as a research . . . ?

MR: Early on, it was very much a policy group.

CAC: Okay.

MR: They secured the formation of the legislative interim commission in 1955. That was headed by Elmer Andersen, Andersen with an "e", later the governor, and later the chairman of the regents of the university.

CAC: Yes.

MR: The legislative commission . . .

CAC: He was just a corporate executive at that time?

MR: But he was a senator.

CAC: Okay.

MR: He was on the Senate side and a leading figure from the House was [Albert] Quie.

CAC: Both of them became governors.

MR: Right. Quie went on to the House of Representatives for a period. He also came from a district that included Faribault and the several state residential schools for handicapped kids down there. Quie became quite a leader in the national scene a bit later.

CAC: You were in direct communication with this senator and this legislator on this issue?

MR: Yes, beginning in 1955 with that legislative commission. I worked quite closely with them for a period, I sometimes think almost like a staff member; that is, I was really there a lot.

CAC: Doing the kind of research that would lead to policy application?

MR: Yes. They employed a staff but those people had no particular background. They did a terrific job but they had no background on the special ed, or children, or psychology in schools, and so on. There was really an opportunity to put in ideas. I really appreciated that opportunity.

CAC: And you were fortunate to work with two very sensitive and intelligent persons.

MR: Weren't they something? They really were. One of the many wise things that I think Elmer Andersen has done over the years was right from the beginning with that interim commission . . . What he did was he structured the whole work in terms of sub-legislation. "We're going to draw up some laws." So right at the beginning, he started structuring it; so that for a two year period, it was just a matter of refinement. You had to work through these things. If you were going to increase the state special subsidies for programs, How would you do that? Would you get money per child? Would you get money per teacher? Would you get money per program? Would you have people keep track of costs and reimburse that? You had big issues. Then you had big issues about Who are we going to cover? What categories, or do we have to deal with categories? How can we acknowledge that a lot of the world operates with categories and still leave it kind of open? Issue after issue had to be worked through on what we're going to try to do, how we will use special funding, what kinds of programs, and so on.

CAC: Once these two legislators became governors, did that give them a special interest in this field?

MR: I think they still had a special interest in it.

CAC: But as governors they were able to advance an agenda along these lines?

MR: Yes. But others were, too. The work of that legislative interim commission came to fruition in 1957 in the legislative session and then they passed very important legislation in the field. They also created a special appropriation. The legislature did that and I guess they still do. If they have particular interests that they would like to see the university give some leadership to, they can express that, and then put a little money on it. I think it always ends up as kind of a delicate negotiation because the university wants to protect its independence; at the same time, I think it's only fair to say that there need to be means for transmitting needs, and special interests, and the legislature can be one of those voices.

CAC: That's what's become known as legislative specials.

MR: Right. Then I think very often those are later—if they seem to be working out at all well—they can be kind of folded in to the more general appropriation or the general operation of the university. Anyway that happened in 1957.

CAC: Let me interrupt you for just one second here. It seems to me this is an example of the way in which enlightened leadership, effective leadership, in state government does indeed change the agenda or support a new agenda and new initiatives within the university which it would not have had internally?

MR: Yes.

CAC: I mean the internal resources would not have been there in this instance.

MR: Yes. I think that's true. I think there are very important lessons for us to learn, to keep working through, at least if you sort of accept the Land Grant tradition; that is, that a university ought to be useful. It ought to judge itself successful partly in terms of whether the areas it serves seem to be advancing in certain ways. The schools of the College of Education cannot judge itself to be truly successful if the schools in the region are bad. I would say the same in medical services and I would say the same in most all fields.

CAC: All professional fields particularly.

MR: Yes. You don't want to turn the university into just a subcontracting system to other voices outside. On the other hand, it's very important to learn to listen.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

MR: . . . we wouldn't have used the term department but new programs at that time and then turned the clinic over to a young man who was emerging, during the completion of his Ph.D. program—that would be Bruce Balow. Bruce was at the clinic and then in my role as heading the development of these special ed programs under new special appropriation work, we worked closely together.

CAC: And very soon—that is if this happens in 1957—the 1960s, then there's another level of funding that comes from the federal government to make all this possible?

MR: Yes, almost at the same time, the U. S. Office of Education—I think it was an office at that time not a department . . . The Congress passed what was called the Cooperative Research Program Act. Interestingly, three-fourths of the money for research in the very first year of that program was dedicated to study problems of mental retardation. And the reason for that was that the primary force in getting that Cooperative Research Program through was the NARC, the National Association for Retarded Children, which had been formed in Minneapolis. They wanted research. They pushed it through in a general form but at least in the first years when the appropriations were relatively small . . . the very first year three-fourths of the money went to research on mental retardation.

CAC: Now to get the chronology straight, this is the Kennedy Administration, is it?

MR: No, in 1957 . . . ?

CAC: Oh, it comes that early . . . in 1957? That's late Eisenhower.

MR: Yes.

CAC: Okay, thank you.

MR: Yes. That came about the same time. I applied for one of those grants regarding mental retardation and I think I was in the first wave of that . . .

CAC: That's something.

MR: . . . coming out of the federal government; and also that was kind of a beginning of something new at the University of Minnesota, because I think that was sort of a start in what has become a very large pattern of federal supports for research, and then also training grants coming out of the federal government to the College of Education. That opens up a whole new track. I don't know if you want to talk about that or not, but in my life there were two things happening almost at once. There was the special appropriation which was mainly for training teachers. The parents' groups were very insistent. They were quite aggressive. "We want

teachers for our children. What are you doing just sitting around? Get on with it." We didn't fight that. We sort of worked with it. In the various fields—mental retardation, area of the deaf, the area of the blind, and then gradually in other fields—there was a desire for special teachers. The state was enabled through this new program that Governor Andersen—at that time Senator Andersen—and others got through to promote a lot of special subsidies . . . were available to school systems . . . had moved on this.

CAC: But now suddenly you have the resources to do the kind of job you'd hoped to be able to do.

MR: Yes.

CAC: The resource is funding.

MR: The research side came almost at the same time, so we had a chance to move on that as well. It became possible of course for us to add faculty.

CAC: And research associates, assistants?

MR: Right. There's a whole pattern there of build up. I think we reached the point where it peaked when I was there. We had more than 200 people employed.

CAC: Good heavens! Including research associates and support staff?

MR: Yes. They weren't all full time but secretaries, and professors, and research associates, and assistants.

CAC: So you were really managing a research budget of very substantial proportions within the college?

MR: We got up to the point where according to one analysis, we had the fourth largest amount of money coming in from the outside for one unit within the whole university.

CAC: That's remarkable.

MR: I think the Medical School, the Agricultural Research Station, and maybe it was the Science Center over in IT [Institute of Technology] . . .

CAC: Natural Science.

MR: . . . were ahead of us. It became pretty large. It probably doesn't seem so high right now but I think we were up around \$4,000,000 a year.

CAC: Oh, for the 1960s and 1970s that's extraordinary.

MR: Yes.

CAC: That was more than the budget in most departments, most large departments.

MR: Yes. We were up around 85-90 percent I'm just sure, more than 90 percent occasionally, of the money that we spent was from the outside. I remember I used to have kind of the feeling once in awhile that . . . You know the college was still kind of amorphous.

CAC: Okay. I'll come back to that.

MR: Their budget was kind of controlled centrally but these special budgets were controlled out there, you know. I had a signature card and all that. What they did with 10 percent of our operation might move a little bit but it wasn't all that big a deal.

CAC: Now, was the same thing happening in other specialities within the college?

MR: Yes, although much less so.

CAC: Okay. What were some of the other initiatives then?

MR: There was quite a lot that came in in the . . . The Institute of Child Development was moved into the College of Education somewhere along the line.

CAC: The mid-sixties.

MR: And they had quite a bit of external money. We were fairly close to the Psychology Department. They had quite a lot. They got in a little bit earlier however, because there was money through the Veterans Administration for quite a few programs that had started earlier. I think the National Institute of Mental Health or the precursor units there gave support, so that there was some over there. In the College of Education—I can't give you the calendar, the timing on this—the field of vocational education came in fairly early. They may had some grants pretty early on. There were some federal supports even before the period that we're talking about now.

CAC: So there's a Vo-Tech unit within the College of Education that grows for the same reasons, not as spectacularly but in the same fashion?

MR: Right. There were resources over there.

CAC: How long did these resources persist, into and through the 1970s, up into the 1980s?

MR: Oh, they still exist.

CAC: Okay.

MR: One of the people that I brought on board early on was Bob Bruininks who is now the dean of the College of Education. In addition to being dean, he has a whole lot other projects, the whole building in fact is filled with projects that he has going now. He must have three or four million dollars going on just by himself . . . or more, today.

CAC: How many of these have implications for the classroom, regular faculty in the College of Education?

MR: You're thinking now not just of the specialists but the whole range?

CAC: Yes. Does it have an impact upon the educational mission, the teaching mission that all of us have?

MR: Yes, it does. However, I think the struggle that has been doing on out in the schools—that is to kind of break out of these narrow categorization systems and the tendency to place children in special places for special instruction . . . which is kind of overdone in my view—the same kind of struggle that's going on out there in schools is replicated within the university. So that the people who are interested, let's say, in a social studies education within the university, or teaching of English, or teaching of mathematics, don't necessarily fall dead, you know, when somebody in Special Ed comes by and says, "Hey, we think your teachers ought to know a little bit more about atypical kids. You ought to stretch these people out to the margins and have them take a look out there once in awhile. Don't imagine that all these kids are gifted. We're also holding you responsible for tossing out some of these kids. I mean, you are a little too happy to get rid of some of these kids and send them off to special places." You've got exactly the same kind of arguments I think internally as you have going on out in the schools. That has come only gradually and . . .

CAC: But I tell you it comes quickly. You say gradually but in ten years, as history goes, that's a wink of the eye. That comes pretty fast.

MR: I guess that's true.

CAC: In the process, it certainly must change the structure and the relationships and the governance within the college?

MR: Yes. You've got a heck of a problem there though, Clarke. A lot of special things come along. Like people decide that all teachers should know something about tobacco education, alcohol education, drug education, sex education, dealing with atypical children, minority children. We need to have specialized sensitivity training and all these things. Well, there's a little tendency when you first encounter these things to deal with them in a kind of set aside way. So you have a little piece that you give to drug education. You have a little piece you give to

minority sensitivity, and a little piece to retarded kids, and to blind kids, and the deaf kids, and to speech problems. Then you realize that there's a terrible disjointedness that enters into what you're trying to do or what you're doing. So you need to move if you can to some more highly infuse, find ways of dealing with these specialized topics that become entered into your general program. Well, at that point, then you're negotiating with these other faculty members who really manage the classes on ed-psych for teachers or mathematics education for teachers. Then somebody will say, "But we got to get the drug education and the alcohol education and the exceptional kids in there." I expect there may be somewhat similar things occur in the College of Liberal Arts where you spent a lot of time. It's not an easy matter to work through all those curriculum issues.

CAC: Particularly because eventually one has to deal with persons outside the University of Minnesota, the school systems in the state.

MR: Yes. You've not only the problem of designing and installing something now, you've got the problem of making sure that it's sustained. I think we're continuing in kind of an awkward struggle with that kind of problem right now. The schools—here I'm thinking of just schools in general—I think especially since the 1954 Brown [*Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*] decision have made a move to include all children in schools. It's getting much tougher to suspend and exclude or expel kids. Everybody wants everybody to graduate from high school. We aren't up there yet but there's a tremendous push to be more inclusive. There's also this push to be more inclusive in the sense of not segregating kids by special category. So that whole decision in Brown that segregated schools are "inherently unequal" has come to be extended to other categories as well.

CAC: I see.

MR: We've had to struggle with that, and still are out in the schools, and we're still struggling with it within the universities.

CAC: But this all comes piling in on you as a faculty member in the College of Education with Special Ed as a speciality fast . . . I mean from the mid-late 1950s through the 1960s. All these things come piling in and a lot of them originate as you've pointed out outside the university.

MR: Yes.

CAC: The pressures.

MR: Yes. That's true. That's so true. It makes life kind of interesting to be part of that kind of struggle.

CAC: Oh, it's exciting.

MR: There are some clearly moral aspects to this thing, At least for me, the first test to be made about many of these things is a moral test; that is, What kind of decisions are you willing to make in the schools or elsewhere about labeling, setting people aside? Then you get a lot of kind of quite crisp legislative and legal mandates that come in alongside there. For example, laws were written saying that the schools must deal with children, in terms of the concept of the least restrictive environment—the same as mental health. Your first obligation is to try to create an environment in which this child can be well served. It's not your first obligation to move the kid aside. You create a special environment . . . the same as in mental health. You don't authorize a public figure to move on an individual and take them off to a mental hospital. No way. Your first obligation is to try to recreate or to refashion, to be helpful let's say, in the natural or the ordinary environment of that person, work with the family, work with the neighbors, work with the local grocery store, work with the employers, make it possible to support these people who may have special problems and special needs but without displacement.

CAC: So you as a professor had to learn how to respond to these pressures and values and they were not traditional values? These are changing values within the larger society.

MR: Oh, yes. I really think that the 1954 Brown decision and all ramifications of it and the history—of course, there were precursors to that—following that just by category by category, section by section . . . We've had pressures developing in the schools, and within the universities, and in teacher preparations, and so on, to deal with the problems of human differences in more inclusive ways, in more helpful ways. You've got the most severe accountability tests way out there at the margins. The thing that you're likely to get hauled into court about is not about an average kid. The thing that's likely to take your school superintendent to court if not to jail is what they did with that disabled kid or the minority kid who was perhaps not diagnosed very carefully and was sent off to some special program. We've just been full of the kind of legal side of these things. One thing that makes it a little more difficult I think in the university environment is that we're one step removed from a lot of those legal imperatives. Those run mostly to in fact how the children are handled. Let's say, if I'm a university . . .

CAC: But they're your ultimate clients and constituents?

MR: Right. Within the university structure, the way you make decisions and so on, the professors aren't being taken into court.

CAC: Yes.

MR: Let's say if I'm in Special Education and I want to influence the curriculum and teacher training, I can't go over to professor so-and-so in curriculum instruction and play hard ball with him in the same way that somebody could out in the public schools who just got a court order.

CAC: Sure. You're describing very rapid change. It may have seemed incremental to you but you're also clearly indicating that it came fast and in a variety of places. What did that do with the more traditional missions, and styles, and programs that the College of Education had in 1950? You started out by saying that it's the teaching of composition, of English, of mathematics, and science, and social studies, and reading, etcetera. What happened to those programs because they must have been buffeted by what you're talking about now?

MR: Yes, I guess so. Out in the community, one of the things that was happening was that the press to be more inclusive and to try to hold all kids at school resulted in just more and more set aside programs. A lot of people just came to expect that we were going to invent more specialized programs. We only have seven or eight varieties now. Well, next year we'll have ten and the next year we'll have twelve. It was very easy to kind of set these programs aside so that there's been a lot of tension and it's been quite a struggle to work through in all aspects the matter of being more inclusive. I think within the university that that has been and is still a big struggle. Now, the college as a whole I think was enabled to pull back from the large teacher training programs . . .

CAC: Okay.

MR: . . . because beginning in the very early 1970s, the child enrollment began to drop back. The baby boom was over. In the period from about the middle 1970s to the middle 1980s, the K-12, kindergarten through twelfth grade, population in the public schools of the nation dropped from about fifty-one or fifty-two million down to about forty-four. Actually, a lot of teachers were losing jobs.

CAC: A lot of teachers were already in the system so there wasn't the same demand for new teachers.

MR: What I'm saying is that even those who were out on the job, a lot of them, lost their job; so there wasn't this tremendous demand for new teachers. Practically all the teachers who had been in those 2-A, 1-A, or the 2-B programs, these certificate programs, that had been pretty much cleaned up. I can't give you the details on it; but locally I think it's also true that places like Hamline, Macalester, Concordia, a lot of the private colleges, also had gotten into the teacher education business.

CAC: And they got out again?

MR: No. They were actually building up programs in that period. If you go back to the 1950s, I think we were virtually on our own.

CAC: But how about the old teachers colleges that become the state university system, Mankato, St. Cloud, Moorhead, etcetera? Do they persist in training K-12 teachers?

MR: Oh, yes. But the demand was much smaller. The point I was coming to was that the demand on the University of Minnesota because these other colleges in the metropolitan area had gotten into teacher training . . . that was part of the story of why the College of Education would cut back on this teacher training. The demand was way down so that the College of Education I think increasingly emphasized graduate programs, more master's degree programs, and even more advanced it's Ph.D. programs. I think that's still continuing. You also got into a pattern of retrenchment where the size of the college was trimmed back very substantially.

CAC: Ah!

MR: We've increasingly gotten into advanced programs where all of the issues about basic teacher training were cooled just a little bit. I think it's true now . . .

CAC: Forgive me for interrupting. By this token, the giants in the field of teaching math, history, etcetera, they are not successors to those giants that you describe earlier who had been writing text books and writing text books for use in the K-12 system.

MR: That whole pattern changed and the people who became the leading figures in more recent years are those who were doing research rather than writing the text books and those who were giving leadership to professional organizations in these various fields. If you go over to math education now, there are several people over there but I don't think they're in the same ballpark with a Leo Brueckner as far as turning out text books or materials; but some of them would very substantial leaders in the national associations of mathematics educators, and they would be doing research. They would be helping to explore recent developments in cognitive psychology and what that might have to do with mathematics education.

CAC: That means that the people on faculty in the College of Education have to be trained in quite different ways and have different skills?

MR: Yes.

CAC: But then again, that happens fast. This is in your lifetime. It's 1950 to 1980 that these changes all come in on you.

MR: Yes. You know you described a few minutes ago the changes that were occurring as fast but also as incremental. That perhaps is correct. On the other hand, I think if you contrast incremental and structural changes, it might be fair to say that some of the changes are almost basically structural. For example, the numbers of children who are sent off to residential institutions has come down practically to zero. We just don't send children off to institutions for the mentally retarded anymore. The numbers of the students who are blind who are sent off is way down. The whole setting in which teachers work with those children has changed. In the mean, they've come back into the community even severely handicapped because they are dealt with there.

CAC: So the task that the classroom teacher as K-12, boy! I tell you, that's something different, isn't it?

MR: It really is. I think the setting in which people work, the relationships with, let's say, the specialist, their relationships with the regular school people, their relationships with parents and others, has changed so radically that I think one would almost say that somehow or other some of these incremental changes amount to a basic structural change.

CAC: And it changes structurally the nature of the College of Education. When it comes to point, you've got a larger budget than the college.

MR: I don't know how that would compare right now but boy! the outside funds must be right up there with . . .

CAC: It says something about tails of dogs, doesn't it?

MR: It could very well, yes. That causes its own problems. You get people who feel terribly independent. You also get to some extent a bit of conflict. You know there are some fields in the College of Education which have no money, and there are other fields that have a lot of money; and they live in somewhat different worlds, and sometimes it gets to be a little bit competitive.

CAC: I'm deducing from this conversation—not just the most recent but all—the factors you've mentioned as changing the nature of the basic missions of the college leads to a kind of fragmentation of the college? Does it not? That's a question not a conclusion. You spoke when you came here of there being a college faculty. I'm wondering the degree to which the course of specialization—with its complicated roots as you've noted and the funds that are there to make it possible—don't in fact lead to a kind of methodological fragmentation, and therefore a bureaucratic fragmentation of the way in which the college came to operate.

MR: Yes, I think that's true and I think—if I'm understanding you—there was an awful lot of kind of separation in many different forms, administratively, budgetarily, sources of support. You had at the same time that this was happening in the College of Education a lot of other things happening on the outside. We talked some about that. There was also the development of an enormous increase in the number of journals that were published.

CAC: Oh!

MR: They tended to be kind of narrowly framed.

CAC: Specialized.

MR: Specialized. If you were into a certain aspect of learning problems, you got a certain set of journals and they aren't read very widely by the people outside that little circle. You get professional organizations . . .

CAC: That came in turn to bankrupt libraries. They couldn't afford to buy all these journals.
[laughter]

MR: Some of the problem from my view point—the history of this would be interesting to trace out—but I think there's also a movement along the line there of kind of systematizing teacher training and other things where you're sort of expected to set out your objectives fairly clearly for your courses.

CAC: I see.

MR: When you do that, then you get more rigid about the expectations of what course you will take first, and what course you will take second; and then pretty soon you've got a Counselor of Education Program training counselors that nobody else can get into because they've got . . .

CAC: All the prerequisites.

MR: You don't have the prerequisites, yes. I think we're beginning to undo some of that. I think that kind of approach to teaching and instruction also forced a kind of separateness. It's part of why I think even young assistant professors these days and graduate students don't have the same kind of fluid movement across the Psychology Department . . .

CAC: You spoke of this in the beginning.

MR: I felt frustrated very often in advising my own students that sometimes I couldn't get them into these programs that I wanted to get them into . . .

CAC: Yes.

MR: . . . because they'd moved to a whole sequence of things that just fit their own little narrow band of students and you couldn't get in there.

CAC: I'm going to interrupt a second. I'm thinking of Robert Beck, regents professor of the History and Philosophy of Education. That would have been one of the few places, and a colleague close to him, that would have been holistic, cutting across the whole field.

MR: I think that's right.

CAC: He would have been one of the last generalists?

MR: I think that's true. If you go way back to the period when I was a graduate student and when I was first on the faculty, there would have been three or four such areas that really touched on the whole college.

CAC: And they would have been?

MR: One would have been the whole area of measurement.

CAC: I see. Everybody had to do measurement.

MR: Everybody who was in the College of Education would have had some orientation of what it means to give a test, to interpret a test, to make a quantitative approach to assessment. Everybody would have had that. And everybody would have had something in common on the psychology of learning. What do you know about learning and instruction? And there would have been another piece that related to kind of the beginning approaches in psychology, sort of on the mental health side. What does it mean to deal with the more personal side of student behavior? How do we operate in a way that enhances human adjustment and kids' understanding of themselves and what's happening in their development? Then there would be the philosophy piece. I think you're correct. We lost all those other pieces really. Beck's operation—he and a few of his colleagues—remained the one kind of general element. Almost everybody took his course on School in Society. [laughter]

CAC: This primarily at the doctoral level?

MR: No. That was even for the undergraduate students.

CAC: I see.

MR: In fact, I think they ran a big enrollment of undergraduate students.

CAC: You spoke earlier of retrenchment. This begins in the early 1970s and then gets more severe. It came to be Retrenchment and Reallocation, R&R. You were suggesting that the College of Education suffered more retrenchment and enjoyed less reallocation than other major units. Say something about that.

MR: Yes. I can't give you the details of that.

CAC: It's there in the printed records?

MR: Yes.

CAC: The spoken word can't do it?

MR: Right. I think the College of Education built up to the point where it was one of the largest colleges of education anywhere in the country. So when we talk about retrenchment, it was from a pretty large base.

CAC: But a lot of that base came with external funding? Question mark.

MR: I'm thinking here even of the basic faculty that was . . .

CAC: Okay. Core faculty.

MR: . . . on the regular funds . . . Our faculty must have built up over 200, something like that.

CAC: Oh, my.

MR: I'm pretty sure that would have been true. I'm guessing right now it may be down to 140, something like that. It was cut back. It's still a substantially large College of Education. Now its functions have been trimmed back.

CAC: Oh and changed!

MR: Yes and changed a lot and it's also true that we've had—kind of unevenly across different units—quite a lot of external funding come in. That has been a big problem. It's not only a matter of retrenchment. It's a matter of how well you handle it. We had building up in this same period a batch of political processes and decision processes in which the voices of the faculty became larger. The dean pretty soon has his own consultative committee and . . .

CAC: Elected by the faculty?

MR: Yes. Those have changed . . .

CAC: Would the same be true of your tenure, promotion, and merit committees? Would you have had a committee structure for that be introduced?

MR: And very formalized.

CAC: When did that happen roughly?

MR: Oh, boy! I'm guessing that that was becoming pretty substantial by the mid 1970s, maybe a bit earlier. It was kind of gradual build up. I don't think that was all bad. I remember one time, I went into Marcia Edwards' office—I may have told you about that. She had a very small office. I think she took the smallest office in order to avoid arguments with people about the space, or whatever.

CAC: [laughter]

MR: You could hardly get in that office. If you did get in, there was only one chair; and it was pushed up against her desk so that there wasn't any room in there. She had the rest of it full of file cabinets. I remember she had a big fat folder on top of a file cabinet. I was in there one day and she handed it to me. I think it was when Ned Flanders left the faculty whenever that was.

CAC: Okay.

MR: She wanted to employ a certain person. I even remember who it was. She just asked me . . . I was just standing . . . I wasn't sitting. "What do you think. Take a look at this folder." I looked at it. That's about the way faculty got employed. But I went back to my office and I said, "No, that's not satisfactory." So I wrote her a long memo and I told her I didn't think that's the way that it should be done. I think she probably didn't like that. She was very nice and she wouldn't have become punitive about this. But I'm pretty sure she was upset when she got that memo from me—and perhaps there were others.

CAC: To say nothing about the fact that you can't have an affirmative action search by that kind of older procedure.

MR: Oh, yes. I mean we hadn't even heard of the words like affirmative action at that time. There was a very strong tendency to employ University of Minnesota people, to employ people that she knew, or others. If you were sort of head of a cluster of faculty in some area, you could kind of walk into her office. Guy Bond who was sort of the leader of the Elementary Education had his office down the hall just a little ways and he stood up most of the time. He didn't sit at his desk. Then whenever he had a decision to make, he didn't even have to get up off the chair. He'd just walk up the hall in Marcia's office and they'd settle on everything. Bill Dugan was sort of the head of Ed-Psych faculty and he would have walked into Marcia Edwards' office and they decided to hire this guy. Anyway that was coming along. But I think there were voices like mine who said, "That's not quite satisfactory." At that same time, I would have to admit, I had no idea what all this was leading to, how formal, and how detailed this was going to get, and how painful it was going to get. It was going to become painful in a little different way.

CAC: Did the college have an open budget at that time? Did faculty members have access to how the money was being spent and where it came from?

MR: Oh, I don't know.

CAC: Did it come to . . . did you ever have an open budget in your tenure?

MR: To an open budget?

CAC: Yes. Where a faculty member knew what the budget had, what the salary lines were, and what the support systems were, etcetera?

MR: I don't think it ever came to that.

CAC: Okay.

MR: It got a little bit more that way when the college reorganized instead of departments with departmental budgets. If you wanted to know a lot about the budget, think what you'd have to do . . . wander over to the library and get the gray book and look in it. I never did that but I hear it was possible and I know people who did it.

CAC: If you didn't want to be seen, you went over to the state capitol and got the budget..

MR: It might be. There was kind of an atmosphere around the situation. It was kind of paternalistic, I guess to put it mildly; that is, the administrators and so on did all these things. They are operating your behalf and it would be judged mildly impolite to ask to see . . .

CAC: It's now downright subversive in some places in the university.

MR: Yes.

CAC: Tell me a little about your work in the university committees because this leads logically. You were concerned with procedures within the College of Education but you also served on the senate and on several committees including the Consultative Committee.

MR: Yes. I wasn't really big in my concerns about these matters.

CAC: But that is part of the story.

MR: It's a part of the story, and I think a lot of other people were concerned about it, and participated in various ways. I think it's on that resume there someplace but there was a period when I got somewhat involved, quite deeply involved in university . . .

CAC: You became involved because of your own interest or did people outside spot you as a person who would be a good . . .

MR: A little bit of both. I somehow or other got appointed to the Committee on Committees and then I became chairman of the Committee on Committees. I became aware that we were recommending people for all these committees but there wasn't any place where there was a statement of what these committees were for.

CAC: I know that. [laughter] Yes.

MR: It wasn't done.

CAC: The title of the committee was supposed to be self explanatory.

MR: That bothered me a little bit. I'm not really a terrible obsessive compulsive type. I did as chair of that committee give quite a lot of time. We would write all this down. Let's decide what this committee is for. Then there were no rules. There was one committee . . . I almost feel like telling you the name but I guess I shouldn't.

CAC: That's all right. Fine.

MR: There was a committee that had to do with . . . [Elio D.] Monachesi had headed that committee forever and ever. It was just like he owned that committee. Now, what little I knew about him, I really liked him. I'm sure he did a great job. But there weren't any rules about how long you could serve on one of these committees or how long you could serve as chair. We not only wrote out what these committees were for with lots of opportunities for interaction, we created some new committees. For example, there was a whole thing operating over at Northrup with respect to the programs that they would . . . At that time, I think they had more speakers, musicals groups . . .

CAC: Concerts.

MR: The faculty and the students had no voice in that. They were employing a new guy. I think his name was Smith.

CAC: Yes.

MR: We proposed, "You ought to have an Advisory Committee. You ought not to just run that all by yourself." So we created some committees, some new ones. We wrote some rules . . . that is, your appointment would three years, not forever and you could not serve more than two terms and so on. The senate adopted all that stuff. I remember one night . . .

CAC: For future students, this was in the 1970s?

MR: Yes.

CAC: If it isn't 1972, it's 1974.

MR: It was either in the late 1960s or 1970s because . . . I rather think it might have been the late 1960s. I got a call from Monachesi—I'm mentioning his name—and I think he probably had a good supply of gin; and he really lambasted me because he wasn't nominated for the committee, and that meant he was no longer going to be chairman. I had some sensitivity as relevant to young faculty member, "Hey, the new faculty around here aren't getting in on this."

Some of these old timers would just kind of "Oh, no, we've got to open it up." I didn't respond to him because I really liked him and I kind of understood. But we had decided that there should be some changes, so it just had to be done. We did that. I got on the Consultative Committee and that was kind of interesting. That was in the period when [Malcolm] Moos was president.

CAC: Okay.

MR: And Jack Darley was just the continuing chair of the Consultative Committee.

CAC: Was Jack chair of Psychology at that time or associate dean of the graduates . . . maybe both?

MR: I'm not sure but I think he was head of the Psychology Department at that time. Once I got on the Consultative Committee, I sort of concluded it didn't amount to a damn. They weren't really doing anything. The agenda for the senate meetings for example, were not planned by anybody. The way the agendas got set was who sent things into Mr. B. If some group sent him something, it would get on the agenda; so sometimes you'd have a big, long agenda that made no sense, and the next meeting you'd have nothing. It seemed to me that there was almost the same kind of lack of structure, of planning, for some of that stuff as there was on the committees.

CAC: Who made the agenda of the Consultative Committee?

MR: Jack Darley . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

MR: . . . Consultative Committee didn't amount to much.

CAC: Now who came in that Jack would invite in, vice-presidents, presidents? Who talked to you?

MR: The person who met with the Consultative Committee most regularly was Don Smith.

CAC: He was vice-president for administration or something like that?

MR: Yes. I don't think Mr. [Malcolm] Moos ever felt comfortable dealing with the faculty.

CAC: But he did come?

MR: He would come occasionally. It just didn't amount to a heck of a lot.

CAC: Don Smith was using it to inform the faculty more than to consult with the faculty. Would that be fair?

MR: Let's see. I don't have awfully good memories about that but whatever we'd be talking about, Don Smith seemed to be there to provide information and also to listen in. My memories about this are going to be biased. One of the things I think I helped do was . . . He had published a little memo years earlier, one time, with a concept about an internal foundation. The university ought to have some set aside funds that it could use for experimental purposes . . .

CAC: I see.

MR: . . . almost to give grants to people who wanted to work on projects on curriculum, revisions, and so on, and nothing happened. I'd always been interested in that so on the Consultative Committee at some point, I brought that up and he was very interested in that. Of course . . .

CAC: Because you knew . . . [laughter]

MR: He's the one who first advance the idea.

CAC: Right.

MR: There were several things like that that I felt some companionship with him. Anyway, we advanced that idea, and we took it to the University Senate, and it was passed. We got that program . . .

CAC: Educational Development.

MR: Yes, Educational Development Program. I thought it was kind of washed down because what they did finally was to almost force it into a pattern where everybody got the same percentage. You know, the colleges were to get and then the departments were getting . . .

CAC: Yes.

MR: My feeling was that you should give that away in relative large chunks. Don't get it . . .

CAC: Diluted.

MR: There would be important work to be done for a period of time in a certain area. Recognize that. Put real money into it. Then it ends up like, well . . .

CAC: Politically, that's difficult in a large institute.

MR: I know. So that I was disappointed about that. We got the thing through the senate. I wanted a little bit more money. There was quite a lot of opposition. One of the other things that I had worked on when I was on the Committee on Committees was getting students in the senate. That was very controversial. I remember Auerbach, later my good friend, he really opposed that. This would have gone back to the 1960s when we needed a voice for students through that Vietnam period. There were some real struggles even at senate meetings where students would come in, and kind of cause a little fuss, and I saw Don Smith's temper one time there. He had a real temper and he would kind of lose control a little bit.

CAC: Well, and Mac Moos—to interrupt the story for a moment—was spending a lot of his time in 1969-1970-1971 trying to keep that open to students.

MR: Yes.

CAC: So the president was not unsympathetic at that point.

MR: Right. I really was in a lead position on that as a chair of the Committee on Committees and when we were defining all these functions of the committees, we separated the University Senate and then the campus level.

CAC: Campus Assembly.

MR: Campus Assembly and the University Senate.

CAC: Right.

MR: As a compromise with Auerbach and those, we created a kind of a separate faculty structure. There were some issues like faculty welfare issues that should be handled just by the faculty and not by students. The only reason we got that development fund through I think was because the students . . . you could just see it . . . the students voted 100 percent. [laughter] Probably if it were a strictly faculty vote, we might have lost. That kind of thing was of interest to me. Another thing, they used to print the agenda for the senate. Do you remember those dockets they used to print separately?

CAC: Sure.

MR: It would just reflect the order that stuff came into Mr. Beatty's office. He made no judgments about the agenda. He just printed the stuff that came in. We worked on it and we got that change where the Consultative Committee became responsible for the agenda. We also shifted it so that it could be printed overnight . . .

CAC: Ah!

MR: . . . in the *University Daily*.

CAC: I see.

MR: That was my idea.

CAC: Good.

MR: They used to have a system whereby they had to have this stuff three weeks ahead of time. There was a lot of stuff that was still developing, you know. You had to have a faster turn around. I remember also there would often be reference to important documents and we arranged a system—I don't know how much of it was used—but at that time there was a reserve room in the library. Do you remember that . . . on the second floor?

CAC: Sure. You bet.

MR: There was a reserve desk so we started using that for faculty; that is, if you wanted to see this report or this background stuff, you could go there to a faculty member, and you could sit there and read it. I may have told you before but one of the key experiences for me was one day there was a noon luncheon meeting at the Campus Club and this was to be consultation on the university budget. Elmer Andersen was then chair of the regents, and Mr. Moos, and I'm sure Don Smith was there. He was always . . . he was the one who was there. This committee met and this was to be the consultation on the budget. There wasn't one piece of paper handed out. They had a nice lunch, and they talked for a few minutes, and the categories of the budget were about four or five just indicating roughly what those figures were, and a brief discussion, and then that was it. The next meeting of the University Senate, Jack Darley said something about, "Yes, there was consultation on the budget." I don't remember for sure . . . but I called him on it one way or the other. I said, "That was a farce. There was no consultation." He used to get kind of discouraged with me. My impression was that the Consultative Committee amounted to very little. Jack Darley was a great guy and he's very smart but he used to just be used by Moos, as far as I can see, just to kind of put fires out here, there and the other . . . He's very articulate. Moos and Darley didn't want that Consultative Committee, didn't want it to amount to very much. It was kind of a hazard. I remember one time I talked with Jack Darley and I said, "Jack, you must get really sick of me. This gets kind of bloody at times, and I would confess that I'm not always right, and I'm sometimes wrong." And he said to me. "No, you're not always wrong." I really appreciated that.

CAC: [laughter]

MR: To some extent, I think it was an interesting period, and I don't mean to be claiming a lot here but it was in a period when it was kind of awkward, and when the faculty voice was coming along in Central Offices and central functions the same as it was in other places. In my case,

that really needed to happen. I'll tell you one other little anecdote. Jack Darley was out of town one time. They were interviewing . . . was it F. Ward Champion [Hale Champion]?

CAC: There was such a person.

MR: . . . who became vice-president?

CAC: Vice-president of finance.

MR: He'd been at Harvard?

CAC: Yes, went back to Harvard.

MR: He was quite a guy. He was being interviewed. He was brought on campus to consider whether or not he would take the job as vice-president. I think I was vice-chairman of the Consultative Committee so they invited me to this meeting. Mr. [Gerry] Shepherd was there. Mr. Moos was there. Several of the regents and whatever. Anyway, the question came up, "How well organized is the university faculty structure?" I said, "It's in bad disrepair." I just said, "It's in disrepair and needs to be worked on." I think Shepherd's face just dropped. I know what they wanted to do was just impress this guy. I didn't really care a lot whether they wanted to impress him or not. It seemed to me if he was worth his salt, what he probably wanted was a very honest expression. I remember Shepherd, "What do you mean, disrepair?" I said several things like, "The agenda for University Senate is set by a clerk." He said, "That's an insult to Mr. Beatty." I said, "No, that's no insult to Mr. Beatty. In that function, he's performing as a clerk. And there's nobody in charge of that agenda." And I went on to two or three other things and I was right . . . I think . . . pretty sure. I think they probably wouldn't invite me to very many meetings of that sort because of that kind of thing. But I look back at it as something that I'm almost proud of. It was kind of interesting to me to find that situation in such disrepair and then these people weren't either aware of it, or they wouldn't admit, or they kind of liked it that way, or maybe a little of all of those things. So anyway that was kind of interesting.

CAC: You were active also in University College for awhile?

MR: Yes, I got on that and I served as chairman for awhile. That was in the period when [Kenneth] Keller was president. That was kind of interesting to me. That used to get me involved in some interactions with Keller and Central Administration that otherwise I might not have had because on general planning and budgetary stuff . . . You were active in that. You would know that the chair of that group whatever it was called . . . that managed those several programs in University College . . .

CAC: [unclear] a budget like that. I mean it wasn't a very big deal.

MR: Yes.

CAC: I think it was important. It hit nooks and crannies that needed to be attended to.

MR: Even though it was small, you still got involved.

CAC: Sure.

MR: In the same sense, I think our various colleges got involved. I had some doubts about some of those programs but I also kind of liked the innovative kind of spirit about that place.

CAC: Well, that's its chief function.

MR: You could try some things.

CAC: Yes.

MR: I had a feeling there, as I did in the Consultative Committee and elsewhere, that the university wasn't attending very well to its own development, and wasn't really investing in innovation, and it was overly protective of the way things used to be.

CAC: We are structured as a feudal society . . . the provinces. The lords in the provinces traditionally had to create autonomy and it's difficult to move a large university for that reason.

MR: It's very important to respect what is old and what comes out of the long history. So finding a proper balance there is quite a challenge but I felt that there just wasn't enough arrangement for innovation. I thought the University College was interesting there. It could also be taken advantage of. I mean there was some possibility if it wasn't watched very carefully. The system of assessment that they used for example—for students who design their own programs—you could rip it off. I guess there's always that problem . . .

CAC: With experimental work, it always happens, I'm sure.

MR: Yes.

CAC: The College of Education contributed during the years you were there, I won't say disproportionately, but in a very substantial way to Central Administration. Stan Kegler was on leave from the college to be the chief lobbyist. Frank Wilderson becomes dean of students. Paul Cashman . . . wasn't he out of . . .

MR: No.

CAC: Okay. Shirley Clark becomes many things but eventually Academic Affairs. Do have anything to . . . why that would have been the case or if that's ad hominem kind of things. These

were persons who were likely to become visible and active? Jack Mervin played a large part for the university . . .

MR: He surely did, not in a formal administrative role but I think he contributed an awful lot. I don't really have an awful lot to say about that, Clarke. I think it's probably true that in the College of Education you get a fair number of people who have to think about organizational issues . . .

CAC: I see.

MR: . . . within educational structures and think pretty hard about matters of purpose, and structure, and so on. It's probably true that people like some of those that you named, that they think about from a kind of sociological perspective—let's say in the case of Shirley—about the schools. She probably has some notions about what might be relevant to thinking about the issues of higher education as well. I don't know how to account for it other than that. As far as the individuals are concerned, I can say some things but I don't think you want a lot of that. I always thought that Stan Kegler who taught in the area of English and who did that very well I guess . . . He could sit down and play poker with the roughest crowd you ever imagined, and he could also put a hat on that would work with a rough and tumble politician. He just had an enormous capacity to appreciate varieties of human motivation and orientation. He's a very fast learner. I think somehow or other he could appreciate Shakespeare, and John Donne, and others, and then he could go over to the legislature, and he could wrestle with those guys who like to wrestle.

CAC: [laughter] That speaks well.

MR: He's quite a remarkable person.

CAC: Pretty nimble. I will interview him down the line.

MR: Good.

CAC: Maynard, this is remarkable. We've covered lots of important subjects.

MR: There's one other thing.

CAC: All right.

MR: May I take . . .

CAC: Oh, please do.

MR: When I was involved in that special appropriation way back when, in 1957. [James L.] Morrill was president.

CAC: Yes.

MR: I used to be invited to go over and sit with a group of university people many hours in the legislature just in case they would raise a question about the special appropriation where I was involved. I guess I would be there to answer. That made it possible for me to listen in on a lot of other things. There are a couple of things that I would just like to mention to you that really . . . I've never forgotten. I remember sitting in on one conversation over there where a bunch of legislators representing I think farmers in the main brought up the subject, We need better grass at mid-level in Minnesota. They said that to the university people and the university was very responsive to that. A group of the people out of the agricultural sciences were brought in. They sort of imagined what might be done. Now, I can't tell you the whole story but it was, We need better grass at mid-level in Minnesota, and they turned to the university, and something happened. It's a little bit like that story of our own special but the kind of communication that went on was interesting.

There was another point where the federal government had established some new regulations about interstate shipment of turkeys; and we had to have in Minnesota an arrangement that would involve some people with technical expertise to inspect turkeys, and make sure that the turkeys raised in Minnesota could be shipped in other states. That issue was brought up and lo and behold! the university responded to that and they built up these turkey experimental stations where they would go and inspect and so on.

And I remember also there was a period when there was a lot of unemployment up in the 8th district, the Iron Range area. And lo and behold! this university group got faced with that. They said, "How come you haven't done anything for us lately? You had some people who did all that taconite stuff but you've been neglectful." In a way that was a criticism of the university but in another important way, it was a great compliment. Because what they were saying is, "We think that research, and the kind of planning, and the kind of talents that you people have over there are relevant to what happens to a whole section . . ."

CAC: We're back to the Land Grant?

MR: Yes. "Why don't you get on with it?" Anyway those kinds of experiences just sitting there . . . I think often about that and how the university Land Grant notion and how the exchange of information takes place in part over there and many other ways as well. And I don't think the strictly human related enterprises know that story. They don't know it nearly as well as the agricultural scientists and some others know that. I wish we could learn it better!

CAC: They call it technology and business, you see.

MR: Right.

CAC: I mean exercise the same [unclear].

MR: That's true. That's the one little piece that I . . .

CAC: Fine. Well, we've covered a lot of ground and a lot of issues that are really crucial to understanding this institution over a thirty or forty year period. Do you have any final thoughts or can we draw down?

MR: I think we can draw down.

CAC: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR: It's been nice talking with you.

CAC: Posterity will be rewarded.

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[End of Interview]

Transcribed by:

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