

Interview with Judy Wanhala

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

**Interviewed on November 30, 1994
University of Minnesota Campus**

Judy Wanhala - JW
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers. I'm interviewing this morning Judy Wanhala who has had a variety of assignments at the University of Minnesota. She was an undergraduate and graduate student here, and taught in General College, Women's Studies, and is of central importance to the Honors Program in the Arts College but also in the university; so, we have lots of things to cover. I'm doing it Wednesday morning, November 30, on a cold, crisp, early winter day. The interview is being conducted in her office in Johnson Hall.

Judy, say something about where you came from. We say, "Where'd you come from?" All right? Intellectually, academically . . .

JW: I came from a family that didn't think higher education was something that people did; so, the idea that I went to college was pretty remarkable. My family has no college-level people in it before me. My parents, neither of them, graduated from high school. I thought I was going to be a secretary. When I went to high school, that was my track.

CAC: Why did you go to college then?

JW: The college part of it really came from friends in high school. When I was a junior in high school, one of my best friends . . . her father was the head of rehabilitation over here. He was Frederick Kotke who ran the program over there. That family was very college oriented.

CAC: What high school were you?

JW: West High School in Minneapolis. Because that seemed like it was important and I was smart—I was always doing well in school but it hadn't connected with continuing for me—that really did grow out of a family environment with one of my best friends.

CAC: What we would call peer advising.

JW: Yes, yes. It was quite interesting to me. When I came to college, it was really not . . .

CAC: Excuse me. Do you have siblings?

JW: I have an older sister who started here, and went for a quarter, and flunked out about fifteen years before I did.

CAC: So, you really are the only college educated . . . ?

JW: Then, I had a younger brother who graduated from here after me. He has since died; so, I'm essentially the one. My nephew and niece, who are also in my family, neither of them went on to college.

CAC: You wouldn't be surprised how often that's been in my interviews. That all the way through college . . . first one in the family, only one in the family.

JW: I don't know that I would have come here. I think that if college had been more in an environment that I would have pursued it, I probably would have looked for other places to go and things that would have been possibilities in terms of school; so, that coming here was really the choice partly because that was the thing that made sense to my family for me to do. If I was going to go to college, then coming to the University of Minnesota was the place to do that.

CAC: So you could live at home?

JW: So I could live at home. It was fairly cheap. Tuition was like less than \$100 a quarter for going to school and that didn't seem like that was making anybody so uncomfortable that they couldn't afford to send their girl off to some school.

CAC: Were you working, however?

JW: I worked all the way through college as a travel counselor for the AAA [Automobile Association of America]. I did that for all of my undergraduate time. I continued to make choices not with some deliberation. When I tell the story to my students, I use a story of Maurice Sendak where there's this character called Hector Protector who just says "No," to everything. I knew that I didn't want to be a teacher. I didn't want to be a nurse. I didn't want to be *the* things that you were supposed to be. My choices were really choices based out of not wanting to do things; so, being an English major, which is completely frivolous as a person from a family with no college in it, was not the choice that made sense to them. They didn't have a way to relate to doing that as a way to have a career, to be somebody who was going to accomplish something.

CAC: If you're going to be in travel, you should have gone into geography?

JW: Yes, I should do something useful. The teaching role, I think, was the one that would have been the one my parents would have been eager for me to do. I just thought, I'm not going to be a teacher. I don't like working with kids. I don't want to be that kind of a person; so, I didn't go to education. That was really where all the girls went was to education. There were two things that pushed me into the English Department. One was this wonderful, wonderful teacher named [Frank] Buckley, who was a retired military person who knew more about literature than the whole world did.

CAC: [laughter]

JW: When I was a sophomore in college, he taught a survey course that was a whole year long, that was just the beginning of literature to the end. It just blew me away.

CAC: Wonderful.

JW: Boy! He was hard. He wasn't at all friendly or approachable; but, he knew everything, just absolutely everything.

CAC: He was probably not much of a publishing scholar?

JW: Probably not because he really did teach. He did. He was just completely dedicated to that whole teaching activity and did it in a way that was just magical. For me, the information that he knew and the kinds of ways he could talk about literature just opened up all kinds of remarkable levels of understanding. It was the information. I knew I wasn't particularly adept at the kind of analytical things I needed to be able to do to relate to the literature directly; so, the tools he gave me in doing that were really very, very much part of the core of my sense of who I was, what it was I could do, how it was I wanted to be in school. It wasn't easy to make a choice because I liked everything.

CAC: Bright kids do.

JW: Yes. Every time I took something, I thought, oh! I'm going to be an Anthropology major. I'm going to be a History major. I'm going to go do Geology. I had these series of courses that I just really liked a lot.

CAC: So, your undergraduate career was really engaging?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Meeting your needs?

JW: Yes, very much so.

CAC: Even though it's a large impersonal university?

JW: Very much so. I think a lot of it really came out of the sense of being a student here as an undergraduate and then continuing some friendships with people from high school but mostly finding a way to feel linked here. For me, the way that it worked was that the people that I worked with when I worked at the AAA were all students here. It's like having a student job but not on campus. Your sense of how the institution works was really expanded by the fact that there were twenty of us probably who were undergraduates here . . .

CAC: Each of you working twelve, fifteen, twenty hours?

JW: Yes, about fifteen to twenty hours a week.

CAC: Did you travel at all on that?

JW: No, no, no. We just drew lines on maps and learned how to make these travel, *triptik* things.

CAC: *Triptik*. [laughter]

JW: Yes. We learned how to [unclear] on maps with red and green pens. In the winter time, they called us in when the roads were bad. They needed extra people to do the telephone answering when they had storms and people needed their cars fixed; so, we were pretty close. This was a pretty tight group of peers.

CAC: You really had a peer group there of all women?

JW: No, it was both, both men and women . . . mostly women.

CAC: If you go there now, it's almost entirely women.

JW: Yes. I think mostly women now; but, we were more mixed I think because we were working nights, and it was working from 5:00 to 11:00 or something like that, and not in the most wonderful neighborhood. That was a real coherent way to have some way to connect here but then to have this other home base, which was really the smaller group of people who were the people that I was working with.

The other person that's the most memorable to me, the person who influenced me as an English major, was the one woman teacher. Sara Youngblood was a faculty woman who was here . . . not for very long as I recall. I don't think she stayed. She went off to be a dean somewhere fairly soon because she wasn't here when I was in Graduate School. She was a wonderful

teacher. She had this very short gray hair. She'd stand up in front and she'd chain smoke cigarettes, chain smoke cigarettes all day, and just say these wonderful things about literature. The idea that a woman was doing that was probably . . .

CAC: This was in the early 1960s?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Was there pre-feminism in her analyses?

JW: I don't remember that part. I just remember her being a wonderful teacher and a woman who was doing it. There really weren't anymore. The other classes that I took didn't really offer that. I think maybe if I had some second language classes, there might have been a woman teaching there. She's really the only woman faculty member that I remember as an undergraduate. There weren't very many. That really wasn't a thing that you could even expect as an influence. Certainly, my consciousness about all of that didn't happen until the late 1960s, after I was in Graduate School and finishing up with the Library Science stuff. Part of what was leading me back to school and the Ph.D. in English was the sense that I was smart enough. I could get a Ph.D. in English. I didn't have to do this other thing which was less threatening because it seemed like it wouldn't be as intellectually risky. I wasn't capable of doing a Ph.D. in . . .

CAC: There was no Honors Program at that time?

JW: There was. This was in the early 1960s when there really was just the beginning of Honors here. They didn't do anything to seek people out. I think that those of us who were feeling fairly modest about our abilities, even though we did pretty well . . . it wouldn't have been something that you would put yourself forward for. There was a lack of confidence about presenting oneself to say, "I really want to do an Honors degree." I remember going to a reception for something called "Mortar Board." At some point in my undergraduate career, they had tried to make that into something again because I had been invited to an afternoon reception and went to it but felt completely out of place. I thought, why did they invite me here? I'm not very good. I'm not very smart. I don't really belong here. There's this kind of imposter way that since I've been doing this a long time . . .

CAC: But, you said three minutes ago that you knew that you could do well academically; and therefore; you could go on to Graduate School . . . both things are true?

JW: Right, both things are true. I think the part about doing graduate work in Library Science—the first time when I decided to do that—was that that wasn't as challenging to me academically; so, I wouldn't have gone to the English Department as a graduate student at that point when I finished an undergraduate degree. I was much too stupid.

CAC: You thought first of an MSL in Library Science?

JW: Yes. Then, once I learned both the fact about getting involved in teaching in General College and the sort of confidence that the Introduction to Feminism really gave me, it brought me a better sense that I could probably do this. I got to it but not as directly as I would have . . .

CAC: Could you say something more about the graduate work you did in Library Science. Was it then a primarily a technician's . . .

JW: A technician's kind of degree. What we were doing mostly was learning resources, ways to do different kinds of bibliographic work. It was the very, very beginning of some of the computerizing things. [Wesley] Simonton used to teach these Introduction to Technology courses that were so elementary. It was learning kind of binary ways of coding information and speculating about what would this mean in the future of Library Science. While we were talking at that level in a fairly simplistic way, we were mostly learning the resources as a bibliographic set of tools and not really doing anything intellectual with them.

CAC: There were some of the faculty who were engaged in non-technical things. I'm thinking of . . . Oh, who was the fellow in Civil Liberties and Freedom of Speech?

JW: [David] Berninghausen.

CAC: Did you work with him?

JW: I did some but not very much. He was mostly working with school library systems. This was my resistance to anything to do with public schools. I stayed focused in the bibliographical tools.

CAC: You thought you were going to be a librarian at a research university or something?

JW: Yes, I really thought I was going to be a reference librarian, this was the thing, in either a public school or a institution of higher learning. That was the stuff that I was good at. I could hold a lot of resources in my head and knew how to use them.

CAC: But, you never practiced? You got the degree and never practiced Library Science?

JW: Only after I'd been at the university for awhile. This sort of checkered kind of career . . . I was finishing the degree in Library Science and started to teach in General College. My roommate in college got married. She was finishing an undergraduate degree and I was in Graduate School. She finished her undergraduate degree at the end of fall quarter and had a position in General College that she wasn't going to keep for the rest of those two quarters

because she left; so, I went to talk to the faculty member she worked for, [J.] Merle Harris, in General College.

CAC: Oh, yes.

JW: He taught Geology . . . a wonderful man. I said, "My roommate just graduated. You probably need somebody to do these labs for you for the winter and spring." He said, "Oh, yes, that'd be fine." There wasn't any . . .

CAC: No search?

JW: Nooo. People just walked in and out of things to do with fairly . . . non-deliberate ways. I took over her job and thought it was good. I liked it. They liked me. I worked for a couple of quarters and, then, the next fall, the person who taught the lecture class was going on leave and they needed somebody to teach this course. They said, "Don't you think you want to do this?" I said, "No, no, no. I can't teach. I can't stand up in front of a classroom and do this." But, Merle Harris had so much confidence in me. It was one of those things where I could absorb. I had such respect for him and the notion that he really thought I could do this, discounted all of my fears somehow. I thought, I don't understand this man. I can't imagine that he could trust me to have this kind of responsibility; so, I spent the summer getting myself terrified to go teach this class, and did it that following year, and just loved it. It was this experience that I thought was so unlike what I expected it to be. I'm a fairly shy and reticent person. I don't talk a lot.

CAC: You overcame that though in time?

JW: I became much more able to express my opinion and be a little more vocal about what it was I was trying to communicate. I had a wonderful time. My first memory was walking into the classroom. This was in the Science classroom building; so I was down at the bottom of this tier of . . .

CAC: Oh, I've had those, right. The amphitheater.

JW: . . . and walked in terrified, absolutely terrified. I thought I was prepared. I turned around and wrote my name on the board, and what the class was, and spelled my name wrong . . .

CAC: [laughter]

JW: . . . so, I started this whole teaching experience with this accident. I said, "That probably isn't right."

CAC: You spelled Judy with two *Ds*?

JW: I spelled my last name wrong. I put an extra *A* in the name. Then I thought, boy! this is interesting. In the first week, I went through the whole quarter's worth of my material because I was just so nervous about it that I kept talking faster and faster and, then, had to go back and do it again. I caught on to the kind of excitement of teaching in that experience. I continued to do that. I went into the place of trying to re-decide what it was I wanted to do. The experience I had teaching the writing courses in General College was the thing that both excited and exhausted me. It was a full time assignment teaching these writing labs for the General College, which was some of the most rewarding teaching I've done. It's just a lot of one-to-one teaching.

CAC: Yes.

JW: It's a lot of coaching students, a lot of first generation students who hadn't really thought about college and were fairly similar to my kind of experience. It just sucked me right in. I thought, this is what I'm meant to do. I did it for a few years and then got really burnt out by it and that's when I went to be a librarian.

CAC: I see.

JW: I went and sort of said, "I'm never coming back. I'm out of here. I'm just going to go be a nice safe, sensible, eight to five librarian type. I went to an advertising agency, Campbell-Mithun, and worked in the library for a couple of years. Then, that's really when all the feminism stuff happens.

CAC: Ahhh.

JW: So, it got me charged up again about thinking, I can do this school thing.

CAC: The story you've told the last five minutes is really . . . we would use the term empowerment, wouldn't we? You were empowered by individuals and by agencies?

JW: Absolutely. Yes. I don't feel like I directed it.

CAC: I understand.

JW: It felt to me like it was one of those things where it depended so much on people giving me that confidence.

CAC: That's an important lesson.

JW: I don't quite know where it comes from because I know that I didn't have it. I certainly know that when Merle Harris . . .

CAC: [unclear] did it come through these men, you see, who were doing it for you. These are all middle-aged men or more.

JW: Yes. They were vital to me in the way that that really did allow me to flourish. It wasn't that they were saying, "Take it or leave it." They were really wanting to encourage this. That's a role that I think isn't as clearly understood. I think the way that someone like Merle Harris would work is not a way that a lot of women I know could do. A lot of women and my own role as a mentor in guiding people along . . . I'm really not intrusive in the lives of either the students or the staff that I do that with.

CAC: That's on purpose?

JW: Yes.

CAC: You hang back?

JW: Yes. You kind of hold back . . .

CAC: Quiet.

JW: . . . and let people make their own choices so that you're not scripting their lives for them. You're really giving them options and not trying to set their patterns for them. It has a negative spin because it means that when people are really needing that pull forward, then I'm not doing that in that directive way.

CAC: Does feminist pedagogy address that kind of dilemma?

JW: I don't think it does. I think it's one of the issues . . . When I think about all of us who were mentored or not mentored or having some relationship with the directiveness of our male mentors in that sense, I don't think we understood how important it was that there was a stronger direction for that. Most of us, I think, acknowledged that we weren't mentored very well, that we didn't have a lot of mentors, as we were pursuing our careers and did it accidentally. It's very important at some of these critical junctures that somebody just gets right in there and sticks with it. If he had been much more in my style, which is to say, "Here's a choice. What do you think?" and not as insistent about it, I don't think I would have done it. I would have said, "He's giving me this as an acknowledgment that I've been here; but, he certainly doesn't think I can do this" because that's how I felt about it. I don't think that's happening. The way that I see the mentoring work is to really provide some of that sort of modeling of behavior; but, I don't think anybody's in there saying, "You do this and go along in this direction."

CAC: What Professor Harris in Geology was saying in General College was, "You can do it."

JW: Yes.

CAC: He wasn't directing you how to do it.

JW: No, no, no.

CAC: It was really a green light and empowering in the sense that he said, "You've got the confidence to do it, now, go do it." Right?

JW: Yes. It was an interesting change for me. I don't think it would have happened otherwise. All the things that follow from that are really from that moment when he said, "This is something you can do." He was such a solid and respectable person, I just kept thinking, I have to hang onto his coattails here. If he's willing to risk something to say that about me, then, I have to listen to that and be more appreciative of what he's trying to do with this.

CAC: That's an engaging story.

JW: Later in my experiences with women on the faculty, when I was in Graduate School and doing English and Women's Studies, there was a much bigger concern about being fair and equal, and treating everybody the same, and having this kind of Affirmative Action stuff where you're really not singling anybody out, and bringing that person along, and setting a path for them that would put them on the track for doing something. You were caught with this notion that Affirmative Action says that you can't privilege anybody that way.

CAC: Ahhh.

JW: You can't give one person this advantage and then feel like you're treating everybody the same way. I think for a lot of the people who were in that role, the dilemma was so difficult to resolve that instead of nurturing people, it really put people off. It was more difficult to figure out how to nurture somebody, how to bring them along, without feeling like that was something that you were betraying in the more access and Affirmative Action way. It's not a simple solution.

CAC: No.

JW: I think it still happens. When I think of women now who have had positions of power, being put in leadership roles, there's a real dilemma about how you bring other women along and do you set somebody to take your place or do you stay unattached to that process so that the next group of people have the same access to this kind of opportunity? I don't think we've figured all that out.

CAC: You used a word a moment ago . . . privilege. Feminists were not unique in using the word; but, in feminist criticism, it's the privilege, given a text, for example. It may be that that word privileged then has meaning in different settings in the teaching as well as in the scholarly apparatus. Wouldn't that make an interesting semantic kind of . . . Maybe, it's been done. Oh!

I hear people talking about privileging all the time . . . very interesting. Now, you're in Campbell-Mithun and you're doing reference work for them. It's at that time, in the late 1960s, that you hear feminism.

JW: Really, yes.

CAC: Where did you hear it?

JW: Actually, the first thing I did was to read *Time* magazine. There was an article in the late 1960s in *Time* magazine that was about this new stuff going on with women. Then, Kate Millet wrote a book.

CAC: Ah!

JW: It was about literature and it was talking about the maleness of literature. That's really what I had done.

CAC: She was a St. Paul woman.

JW: Yes, she was local. It was a moment of those things going on in my head. The accidental part of it was that the person who lived downstairs from me in my apartment building was trying to put a group of women together to be one of these support group types. She asked me. I hardly knew her, and knew her only because she and her husband used to have these wild fights, and I could hear them in my apartment. I thought, this is kind of interesting. There were about six or eight of us who started this support group for women in the later 1960s.

CAC: Well, for yourselves?

JW: Yes, yes. I got involved in that. It was an experience that's just like the way that it happens in all of those stories. We'd get together, and we'd sit up and talk all night long, and go out in the middle of the night and have pancakes. We couldn't stop talking about what it meant to come to the awareness that the world had really been treating us differently because we were women. To have that consciousness raising process work that way . . . it's just right out of those stories and books that were written about that.

CAC: It was usually Betty Friedan they started with; however, you plugged in later [unclear] to Kate Millet?

JW: Yes, I did. Kate Millet is the one who really did it for me. That was the sort of moment.

CAC: She was more fun.

JW: Yes. Plus, she was literary . . . as a kind of literature person.

CAC: Then you begin to get the idea that maybe you should go back to Graduate School?

JW: I could do this, yes. So, then, I did. I decided that if I were really following my truth that would lead me into this Ph.D. program in English. Really what I wanted to do was to finish and teach. When I started doing that, I was doing it in a very engaging . . . I mean, I was really committed to this learning. After having taught and recognizing what learning as a process meant, doing the English and studying literature was a transformative experience for me. As an undergraduate, it was all pretty easy for me and I didn't really have to put everything into it. I could do it but I didn't have to do it. When I started teaching, it really forced me to put everything I had into what I was doing because you can't be teaching with a half attentive mind. The experience of learning with that kind of intensity was part of the excitement of teaching for me. It was that I was learning what it meant, as I was teaching, to really be learning. When I went to Graduate School in English, I just got completely caught up in it and thought, this is the best thing since sliced bread. I was using my head in way that was stretching it everyday and I didn't really even know that and taking classes from people that were magical in some way. Ted Wright, who taught these poetry classes . . . I didn't even like poetry. I wanted to read novels. I wanted to read stories. But, he was so good as a teacher and knew so much.

CAC: This was in seminar?

JW: He used to teach some of the advanced graduate courses that undergraduates could take and graduate students . . . not in seminars at the beginning.

CAC: What are the ingredients, then, of this teaching? What did he do that you hadn't seen before or that you were responding to?

JW: What I think he can do and what good teachers do for me is to make their subjects mine. When they're telling you their story about what the tools are, what you're learning about poetry, or about some kinds of drama, or different kinds literature—more so in Women's Studies— they make that connect to me and my experience and to make my experience richer by learning what that person has to help me understand that. If I'm reading a piece of poetry and relating to it at some level . . . if this man can tell me something about that piece of poetry that makes it mine, there's a kind of magic that happens. Teachers can do that.

CAC: Does that mean that Ted had to know you and *X* and *Y* and *Z* and *A* and *B* and *C*?

JW: No, no, no. I just think it's because he is there with his [unclear].

CAC: It wasn't a matter that he knew your needs or capacities?

JW: No, he didn't know.

CAC: It's the general teaching style.

JW: Yes, it's the teacher in him. Because of the depth of his knowledge and the integrity of the way he did that, it really captured me.

CAC: Were there others?

JW: When I was doing that, at the level of thinking about what I was going to do as a focus in Graduate School, I was really looking towards more contemporary novels and doing things with Twentieth Century literature and there weren't very many people doing that. This was still too current.

CAC: As part of the Nineteenth Century?

JW: Yes, they wanted to keep focused on earlier stuff; so, the courses that I took in Graduate School were a mix of things, both the poetry and the stuff that I was doing with the novels. They didn't really go together very well. I'd do the poetry with Ted Wright, becoming one of his groupies in a sense, taking whatever courses he taught. I did things with him and, then, as I was still linking with this novel and doing the literature, Marty Roth became the person who was providing some direction for that. He was teaching the novels as a set of curricular things.

CAC: He was moving forward chronologically for his own research at that time.

JW: Yes. I really did work with him. Toni McNaron was not—this is one of the parts of this that is so interesting to me—anybody that I knew even was there. My work didn't link with hers. She was still doing the Renaissance stuff, which was not where I wanted to be at all.

CAC: They were assigning her primarily to undergraduate teaching.

JW: Yes. So, I didn't really have any experience with her as a teacher ever. I started knowing her mostly when I started working Women's Studies.

CAC: At that time, there were no other women on the faculty?

JW: Right, there really weren't. Mimi [Madelon] Gokey [Sprenghether] . . . I did a graduate seminar with her later on. I think she was the only other one.

CAC: What supporting fields did you do or minor in?

JW: I did the Women's Studies and Library Science. Those were the two fields.

CAC: Oh, I see, of course. Women's Studies was available to you as a minor?

JW: It was just getting started.

CAC: Most of those courses are one and three.

JW: There was one theory . . . see, EDPs [Educational Development Program] paid for this course at the 5000-level called The Courtship that was a whole year long. It was one of Toni's things. She created this curriculum about studying different kinds of male/female relationships and this courtly love, courtship stuff. It started in the fall, went through the spring. It brought in people from all over campus to talk about it in different areas. There was somebody from dance who came and did the kind of distinction between how people could learn how to do these different courtly dances and somebody from French and Italian. [Gerald] Erickson came and did all the Greek and Roman stuff. It went on for a whole year. That was a pretty solid base for me making this my sub-field. Boy! that wasn't a given. It was this needing the cooperation from the English Department to say that I could claim this because it really wasn't there.

CAC: Do you mean your adviser was skeptical that this was an appropriate course for a minor?

JW: Is this real? It hadn't really gotten a regularity to it. When I was putting my book list together for my Ph.D. exams, I was trying to make a real effort not to fall back on the kind of standard stuff that people would ask me about; so, I worked very hard to make the list really include only the women writers. I didn't want the conversation to just fall back to . . .

CAC: Boy! you were a subversive student.

JW: It was putting together a committee who let me do that. [sigh]

CAC: You knew that you had to work the system?

JW: It was really working the system.

CAC: You're older now . . .

JW: This is this sort of being at the margins and knowing that if they don't say "No" to you, then you can keep moving things forward that you need to move forward. I didn't challenge it. I didn't say, "I have to do it this way or else." I just kept putting this forward as a concern and, then, would explain that I didn't want the conversations for my work to be framed by the relationship to the male writers. I really wanted to clear the space for me to focus on these. They'd kind of go, "Ohhh?"

CAC: It was a passive kind of acceptance. Did you have anybody who caught on to what really you were up to?

JW: i don't think so. I think it was too early. I think it was happening at a time when nobody else was doing this yet.

CAC: But, being academics, they just kind of opened it [unclear]?

JW: Yes. If you get the right committee together, the right committee will let you do . . . Marty Roth was just completely supportive.

CAC: Oh, sure. [unclear]

JW: Yes and isn't a traditional academic anyway. He sort of likes the stuff that doesn't hit right on the center of things and liked the fact that I was moving in these directions. The notion of really doing women's stuff was to say, "If you're going to do contemporary literature, then you have to do all of these things and you can put Virginia Woolf in there." But, you're really doing contemporary literature, Twentieth Century literature, and that's reading all the D.H. Lawrence and [James] Joyce and . . . the strong figures in that are the male figures and doing the women's voices is really just putting these little asides over in the margins. I was trying to move that right into the center of what I was doing and think that it was possible because it wasn't something that . . . I don't think people took it seriously. I think it was being something that . . . this is this woman who works over in Women's Studies with all those other crazies over there and she's never going to get a job anyway . . .

CAC: So, let her do it?

JW: . . . so, let's just let this happen. It wasn't that anybody really wanted to discourage me from it; but, I don't think it was done with the idea that this is an engagement with it. I think if they had thought I was a serious scholar and really pursuing this, they would have cautioned me against it because who's going to get a job if they're going to do this? This was at a time when Women's Studies stuff coming. The job market was no good.

CAC: The years you're talking about are early to mid 1970s?

JW: Yes, mid, late 1970s. I was really through in Women's Studies by 1981. I had done my pre-lims in the mid 1970s. That was when I was doing that.

CAC: You were not only taking courses but you were teaching courses in Women's Studies while you were still not even ABD [All But Dissertation]?

JW: Right.

CAC: You were still taking course work before the pre-lims?

JW: Right.

CAC: Was that unusual?

JW: It was in the sense that there weren't a lot of us doing it because nobody knew how to teach this stuff. There wasn't anyway that we had learned it in a classroom setting. We were discovering it. I'd go to the bookstores and read shelves to find things to read because nobody had given me a bibliography saying, here these are the women writers, read these. That didn't exist.

CAC: What was the first course you taught? You describe this course on courtship that you took.

JW: The first course I taught was a course called The Modern Feminist Novel. It was a collection of women's writings starting at the turn of the century; so, it went from the 1900s up until the mid 1970s. We tried to get some contemporary stuff in there.

CAC: This wasn't all U.S.?

JW: Oh, yes, English and American . . . certainly not much in looking at the kinds of diversity issues. I think there was one African-American novelist.

CAC: But, no French or German?

JW: No, just mostly English and American.

CAC: These were undergraduate students?

JW: Yes.

CAC: How large were the classes?

JW: About twenty-five.

CAC: Oh, you could have real discussions?

JW: Oh, yes, it was wonderful. We'd sit in a circle. I wasn't ever into the lecture mode. This wasn't my favorite way of teaching anyway. I was teaching mostly in the summer and in the evening classes; so, I didn't have to worry about having monster classes in order to keep the numbers up. I really could control it at thirty. We'd all sit in a circle and we'd all do these wonderful discussions. My way to frame it was to really bring in questions. I'd give everybody the sort of syllabus and say, "We're going to read these novels and talk about them." My way of framing the way to look at the work was to give them lists of questions that I had about what this means. What does this do in terms of how you tell the stories about women's lives, and how that relates to what the literature is saying, and how that defines you as a woman, and what the options are and doing this fairly unconventional way of teaching. At that time, this was not the

way that people were being encouraged to do the teaching. The teaching was really that the authority was the teacher and you talk to the students.

CAC: That's all the teaching you'd known?

JW: That was the teaching I had always had. I think for both the people teaching and the students as well, all of us learning together . . .

CAC: Is a real pedagogical . . .

JW: Yes, it was really saying, "I can't be the authority. I don't have the answers."

CAC: Sometimes there's a certain fiction in that because, obviously, the instructor presumably has a few answers.

JW: Yes. There's a certain way that I'm bringing the intellectual experience and the tools of my own literary ability and scholarly work in literature to that. Having the ability to know how to shape the questions, I think, is the teacher part. The consciousness of me as the teacher is really to say, "This is the discussion." If it doesn't go in the direction I want it to go, then, I need to do some reshaping of the way those questions get addressed. Certainly, it's my frame. It's my way of approaching those pieces of literature that works; but, doing it in a way that's very empowering to those students. It's saying, "What do you think of this?" and having it turn for them and how to talk about the way that they understood those works of literature, especially as it related to them as women students . . . mostly women, mostly young undergraduates. Sometimes, in the evening classes, there were some older students who were in their thirties and forties.

CAC: Was there a smattering of men in any of these classes?

JW: Some, but I didn't get very many of them in my classes. I had a few. If I taught two, three times a year, I'd maybe have one or two men in those classes all the way along. They weren't intrusive men. I didn't have classes where they were in there to have a sense of being heard. I think that they were interested in it. I don't remember that being a difficulty for me in the classes. I remember talking about it a lot when we'd meet. Can men teach these courses and can't men teach these courses? Does it have to be restricted to only women?

CAC: Did the staff talk about that question?

JW: The place where most of these conversations happened was mostly in meetings with the Women's Studies Committee. There was this very intense group of faculty women and undergraduates . . .

CAC: You were part of that?

JW: . . . and I was part of that.

CAC: You were elected member as a graduate?

JW: No, I was a staff person. I was the person who was the administrative assistant to the director.

CAC: I see.

JW: When I was doing that, that meant that we were debating these issues constantly. Meetings would go on, and on, and on.

CAC: They really were debates, which I see is a basic solipsistic question. If you aren't one, can you teach it? Right?

JW: Yes. Yes.

CAC: Can you say something about how people would come down on that?

JW: There are really many camps of the kind of political status that someone wanted to put forward. Mostly, the faculty members who were the most tuned in institutionally understood that that really wasn't something that you could raise even as an issue. If you were really promoting the kind of values that the institution promoted, it shouldn't matter if somebody is a man or a woman teaching these courses, that you couldn't legitimate that personal experience as a prerequisite to either teaching, or doing scholarship, or any of that. The kind of standard faculty voice that spoke. . . Toni's voice, and Shirley Clark, and Barbara Knudson, the people who were providing some . . .

CAC: The senior staff, tenured staff.

JW: Senior staff, tenured staff. Andrea Hinding was really involved at that very beginning saying, "No." We understood, I think, at some level that the institution would just throw this program out if it tried to promote some notion that it was segregating women's experiences . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

CAC: . . . committee, and the divisions, and the debates. Have you got more to say about that? That's really very interesting. Some people said that there was also a lesbian/straight division.

JW: I don't think that happened here.

CAC: Okay.

JW: That was the part that was so interesting. It was happening around the country.

CAC: It was perceived by some.

JW: I think other people were looking at us seeing that was more . . . it was an easy explanation for some for some of that stuff; but, I don't think it happened.

CAC: If it didn't happen here, why didn't it?

JW: I think because the way people here were engaged with each other. The person who was the most out lesbian was Toni McNaron and she wasn't out.

CAC: You mean she wasn't out by that time?

JW: We all knew it but it was like that wasn't the thing that anybody wanted to put forward about her because I think there was a real concern that the program wouldn't be identified as a program for lesbians; so, it really didn't surface in any way. The lines didn't divide against the lesbian and straight lines at all. The mix of that didn't represent a way to categorize those groups. The person who supported Gayle Yates was Toni McNaron in one of the moments when Gayle was coming up for tenure and there was some sense that she probably wasn't serving the program as well as the faculty had wanted her to. The faculty, including both lesbians and straight women, who were teaching in the program were saying, "We can't put her forward." But, the support that came for her to go forward really came from Toni, and Shirley Clark, and I think, one other person. I can't remember who it was. Part of what that was had nothing to do with a political identity as either in this camp that's a lesbian camp or a straight camp. I don't think that ever happened. There were certainly more radical and more conservative voices and there were both lesbian and straight women on both sides of those issues; so, it didn't really come forward as *the* thing that split people. I think that was an unusual way for that program to survive some of the turmoil. It didn't have an easy categorization of this straight and lesbian stuff that some programs did. Some programs really did just either disenfranchise all the lesbians or disenfranchise all the straight women. I think in this place, we mixed it up more than that.

CAC: So, the lines of difference were more on the solipsism that we spoke of earlier of whether experience defines and claims a field uniquely?

JW: To some extent. I think that a lot of the sense of perception that was external—the internal sense of how to see all of us speaking with one voice—really forced coalitions about things that might not have felt as much as if they were from the inside.

CAC: Part of this was a need for an annual budget?

JW: Yes, you bet you, you bet you, and boy! do I remember those things. You and Roger Page, in fact, are the two institutional administrative presences. You guys would come to our meetings. When I talk to Roger about this, he doesn't remember either. It's not apparently as memorable. From our side of it, the part of it that seemed really quite remarkable was that you and Roger would come and listen to these things in these meetings. There would be this group of the faculty. There were a couple of men. Harlan Smith was on that committee, and Jim Wertz was on that committee, and Mark Snyder from Psychology for awhile.

CAC: Ed Griffin?

JW: Not as I remember.

CAC: Whoever listens can check it out.

JW: There were the kinds of male participants in these conversations while we were putting some of this stuff together both as policy and as trying to put budgets together; but, it was really you and Roger who would come and be these voices of administration . . . scary voices because you represented the enemy in a sense.

CAC: But, I wasn't in any administrative position, except chair of History.

JW: But, there was some role that you were having. Were you doing some associate deaning?

CAC: No.

JW: Not at all?

CAC: No.

JW: Then, why would you be coming to these meetings? Isn't that interesting?

CAC: When I did these things—I don't have a clear memory of this; this is one of the hazards of oral history—it was as an ally, and volunteer ally, and not one assigned to the duty or the portfolio.

JW: Frank Sorauf was one of the deans that we had to . . .

CAC: He was the dean. You had to prove it to him.

JW: He really needed to be persuaded. He wasn't at all convinced. I think he didn't know what else to do.

CAC: You still got funding?

JW: Oh, yes.

CAC: Some of it from Morrill Hall as well as from [unclear]?

JW: Some of it from Morrill. I think that's what really kept . . .

CAC: Was it Jim Werntz then? Where did the money come from?

JW: Boy! isn't that interesting?

CAC: Was it Educational Development?

JW: Some of it; but that was through . . . maybe that's how that worked. We did get money because Educational Development paid for the courses at that beginning level; but, the proposals were really proposals that Toni did with a couple of other people. She was wonderful at hatching things. One of my things that I learned better than I learned anything else at this institution was that you could just make anything you wanted happen as long as you didn't go up against something else. If there wasn't something there and you wanted to make it happen, all you had to do was do it. It wasn't that you had to go seek somebody's approval to have a Women's Studies program, to have a major, to have these courses.

CAC: But, you had to have a budget?

JW: Right.

CAC: And that required . . .

JW: But, you had to start with the notion that this was something legitimate to do and not go around and seek everybody's approval and say, "Is it okay if we teach this course? Is it okay if we have this major?" You'd start with the assumption that you could do it and, then, you'd build in the resources you needed after you had something in place. It was a strategy I didn't understand. When I first thought about it, I thought, ha! we can't do this! There's no support! We don't have any budget. We don't have any faculty. How are we going to have a major? How can this happen? Toni was just a magnificent strategist about this stuff. She could create it and, then once it was there, you had to get support for it and you had to do the funding stuff. EDP certainly was a critical part of that.

CAC: Were some of your courses borrowed by overtime persons?

JW: Yes. Faculty would get loaned to us, either doing it on overload or we had some . . .

CAC: Or as part of the regular assignment?

JW: Yes. For awhile, there was this thing called Transfer of Effort.

CAC: That's right!

JW: Some departments had to give people away; so, we got given to because that was a place where people wanted . . .

CAC: American Studies, Humanities, Women's Studies.

JW: I think Sara Evans . . .

CAC: In History.

JW: . . . did that.

CAC: Long before her, I think, Anne Boylan did some of this.

JW: Oh, right! Oh! I remember Anne Boylan, yes. So, there was some way that this happened in a piecing it together way. Every year, it was like starting from scratch. There was no hard money in this budget at all. It didn't exist as a hard program for five years, I think. It didn't get approved as a hard money budget item. For the first five years, it was patching little pieces of things here and there. I think [E.W.] Ziebarth gave the first money.

CAC: That's right because Frank Sorauf came in the fall of 1973.

JW: So, the first commitment was a piece of Toni's salary. I think Ziebarth gave it to the program and, then after she started, arranged for the second piece, which was really my position as a half time graduate student. I don't think she got it from Ziebarth; I think she went to Central. Did Ziebarth go from the dean over to Morrill for awhile?

CAC: He was acting president, interim president.

JW: She managed to get a little money that opened cracks in addition to the EDP money.

CAC: I think some of it came through Fred Lukermann when he was associate vice-president. That was before he was dean.

JW: Okay, that might be. It wasn't as if there was this great wealth of support from the resources in the college. It was a terrible time. There was no money in the institution.

CAC: The retrenchments were underway.

JW: Retrenchments were starting. The programs that had started earlier that had been funded with some ease were African-American Studies . . . The money was there. When Roger [Page] talks about his experience as dean, he talks about how wonderful it was to be the dean and support all these things, give money to these places to get these things started. When Women's Studies was started, it was right at the end of all that kind of available resources and things were starting to get tighter. It was a struggle to claim some of those resources for that program.

CAC: Some of the folks at Morrill Hall can say, "From 1957 to 1973 . . ." Those are pretty smeary dates because they do fade off; but, that's not totally inaccurate. For posterity, I should interject one thing into this conversation. I was surprised—maybe I shouldn't have been—to attend a conference the other day on the relationship of Women's Studies and American Studies, as part of the Fiftieth Anniversary of American Studies, and there was a panel of women making this and it was right back to the claim that if you weren't one, you couldn't teach it and it was even wrong for a white man to teach Black women's novels, for example. It was done, perhaps polemically. to make a point; but, I was surprised that that argument in 1994 was still being put forward—not without a contrary view also being expressed. That was interesting . . . and as much along race lines as against gender lines.

JW: It's discouraging that the arguments haven't gotten further along than they have. Because I haven't really been part of that conversation for ten, twelve years, when I participate in it, I'm discouraged that it's the same conversation that it was twenty years ago basically. It's got more bells and whistles to it. There are more ways of describing it and there's all of the apparatus that goes with the cultural, the stuff that happens with the deconstruction, and the language of text and sub text. The kinds of things that are part of the whole effort in culture studies, to look at theory and pull some of the things that are not part of the story but trying to analyze the story so that you get further and further away from the story. A lot of the things that seem to be part of that seem to be a more sophisticated way of saying these things that were part of the conversation in the 1970s. It doesn't surprise me that they still . . . [laughter]

CAC: You're [unclear] than I. What other courses did you teach?

JW: One of the first things that we did was a seminar that was a senior seminar for a couple of graduating seniors. When we put the program together, Toni had written up the description of what the major was and it had gotten through the committee; but, there really hadn't been an established curriculum. One of the capstone experiences for students was the senior seminar that we needed to make as an experience for these students. There were three of us: Toni, and I, and another woman who was a graduate student, Anna Magnuson—I don't know if that was her name. The three of us were working with a group of three or four students in setting this seminar experience together and trying all kinds of different ways of looking at the conversation. We were from very different disciplines and the students were doing Women's Studies from a number of different points of view. We did an exploratory seminar in that first year that the curriculum existed, probably about 1974, 1975. The other course that I taught was a course in single women.

CAC: Ohhh.

JW: My work for my own dissertation was to look at novels about single women by single women; so, I was trying to detach this comparative stuff and just focus on these experiences that women were describing in their own voices of the unattached women. It was a pretty interesting project. Then, I taught it in a course, which was not one of my best experiences. It got very much a kind of lonely hearts course. [laughter] I said, "This is academic. We're talking intellectual kinds of things here." We had lots of sociology we were reading, and we were reading some literary examples, and doing some analyses of the state of singleness; but, what it really brought in was this lonely despair, and stuff about being alone, and how sad it is, kind of a therapeutic thing that wasn't my favorite. It wasn't my favorite teaching experience.

CAC: I'm going to interpose here to say that I did parts of my social work seminar on the deliberate choice of many women professionals, 1890-1930, for career rather than marriage. It opened up the same range but these were social workers not novelists. If you do it, you see, not in a course in Women's Studies but in another setting, then it becomes a different conversation.

JW: Yes, so you really are looking at it not from this personal . . . ? Yes, yes. It was interesting to me as a concept in looking at the literature because so many of the women had succeeded, in their own personal lives, to build careers and have a very full and rich experience wrote about these characters in very shriveled ways.

CAC: Ahhh.

JW: It was as if somehow they're saying, "But, I did it wrong." It's somehow absorbing this notion about what the conventions were really promoting for them and the limitations in the storytelling, that somehow you couldn't tell those stories as affirmations about women's lives because all the happily ever after stories are really about linking up with a man, and having children, and moving to the suburbs, or whatever it is. It was interesting.

CAC: But, you didn't do the dissertation?

JW: No, I didn't. I got too engaged in my life as a . . . The sense of being in Women's Studies at that time was pretty compelling and I'm less of a scholar than I am a participant. I didn't know that so much then. I was really trying to juggle both sides of my experience and do the scholarly work as I was doing the teaching.

CAC: To what degree were you put off by the subject you had chosen and its implications?

JW: I don't think I was.

CAC: You could handle that?

JW: Yes. I think it was the solitude and the sense of doing this work that was always the last thing I got to because there's always some crisis. There's some student who needs you.

CAC: Yes, yes.

JW: The budget is falling apart. The program is in some chaotic state of something or other. My role was really to just fill in the cracks.

CAC: You were doing advising.

JW: I was doing advising.

CAC: And assistant manager or director?

JW: Yes. That was really pretty compelling and engaging.

CAC: These were your early thirties?

JW: Yes, late twenties, early thirties. It just was completely engaging.

CAC: Oh, you bet.

JW: In terms of a career move, it was a terrible thing to do because it just completely . . . I felt like I had to do this. I'm a loyal, and serious, and solid worker. I think, I have to be there. I have to be taking care of this place. My work was never as compelling as the prominence . . .

CAC: You're really speaking of a sense of mission.

JW: Absolutely, absolutely. It was both for me and, then, this circle of colleagues and friends that were doing this together.

CAC: You had a sense of comradeship and collegiality with this group even though the arguments might be severe?

JW: Yes. it was pretty compelling. The position I had towards the end was a stronger one because I had done it for a long time and it was really something that should have been institutionalized as a regular appointment. It continued to be a graduate student appointment even though I had been doing it for seven, eight years. It was clear that if they wanted position, they needed to have a regular position for it.

CAC: Sure.

JW: At the time that that was going on, there was a real resistance to putting more money into administrative costs. In looking at that, the decision was made to eliminate that position. At the time, it really seemed to me that it was a disaster. I saw this role as holding things together.

CAC: Do you mean a disaster for you or for the program?

JW: For me and for the program. There were these things going on that seemed like they needed somebody who was more able to absorb some of the fractiousness of some of that. I was kind of a non-controversial person in that role.

CAC: Which made you the bridge?

JW: Yes, I was the person who could take in all these different divergent points of view, the things that students were concerned about and the faculty and the differences among the faculty.

CAC: You knew that consciously at that time this was your role?

JW: Yes.

CAC: That's a pretty mature perception.

JW: I do that here.

CAC: I know; but, you were younger then.

JW: Yes. But, it's also an awareness that I have that it's something that I'm good at. There's a kind of cushioning that I can do that lets people continue in a way that keeps everything moving forward without accelerating that fractiousness. I thought it was not a good choice for them to get rid of me.

CAC: There you were with nothing to do.

JW: [laughter] There I was.

CAC: Is that when you slipped sideways to Honors?

JW: It is. I took a year and was going to finish my dissertation but spent the year mostly just recovering from this intensity in Women's Studies. I applied for a job in Honors as . . . like a test. I couldn't imagine what it would be like working in Honors because Honors was the center. It was like all of the work I had ever done here was not acknowledged as a centerpiece of the institution.

CAC: General College was . . .

JW: General College was out at the edges. Women's Studies was certainly at the edges. Here I am in the Honors? Good grief! What could that possibly be for me as a person who knows how to work at the margins to come into this central moving . . . into this much more kind of a place of the core of the institution. Right? This is like . . . I can't imagine it. I did it sort of accidentally. I wasn't thinking I would get appointed because it seemed like I was coming from too far from the edges to get into this kind of a position. Glen Holt was a renegade and I think he probably . . .

CAC: He was director at that time?

JW: He was the director.

CAC: How long was he director?

JW: He had been here for about a year before I came.

CAC: And he lasted . . . ?

JW: He left after five altogether.

CAC: You came when Glen was director?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Can you say something about the program then as you perceived it when you came into it?

JW: I didn't actually want to be in Honors because the reputation was not particularly . . . it wasn't a very exciting place to be in the institution. It had faded in its prominence.

CAC: Before Mr. Holt came?

JW: Yes, before he came it had not had much life to it, it seemed to me. It was a program that existed and had been here since the 1960s. I knew that it was an old program; but, it didn't seem very lively. The sense of doing it wasn't very appealing to me. I had colleagues who had worked in other units in the college who had defined it as not a very happy place to work.

CAC: It was usually directed by half time . . .

JW: By a faculty person. I think right before Glen came, there was this decision about whether they were even going to have this program anymore. The person who had been the acting director had been Steven Blake and he was someone who had been an associate director who had been put in this acting role and, then, it had just been left to its own devices. No one had really

given it a lot of attention. I think that the version I had understood when Glen came was that his job was either to make something work here or get rid of it. His charge was to make it happen.

CAC: What year are we talking about? When did Mr. Holt come?

JW: In 1982? I came here in 1983 and I think he was here in 1981 or 1982.

CAC: So, he came under Lukermann?

JW: Yes! Yes, Lukermann hired him.

CAC: And probably gave the green light to do this?

JW: Yes. Lukermann said, in Glen's reports, "Either we're going to make this into something or we're getting rid of it. I don't know which. You figure it out." He came in and just did this transforming . . .

CAC: Glen came from the outside?

JW: He was from St. Louis. He was a faculty member at Washington University who ran their Urban Studies program. When he came here, he, I think, had been feeling very restrained and not given much scope to do what he wanted to do in the Urban Studies program at Washington University. This was a completely different direction for him. Being an administrator in a program for high-ability students was not anything he would have put on a career track for himself. But, he was exactly the perfect person to do that because he was fearless about trying things out and completely savvy about the politics of it and how this institution . . .

CAC: Even though he was an outsider and didn't know the politics?

JW: But, he had just wonderful, wonderful instincts about it. I think your role in this was really critical because he was coming to you with all of the "help me figure this out" kind of stuff. You were chairing that committee.

CAC: I was chairman of the advisory committee.

JW: I think he drew on your expertise always because he could bring to you some of these wild and crazy things he thought and you would either go, "Rrrr," or "Ohhh!" He'd go forward with them. He put a lot of real energy into saying, "If we're going to make this work, we're going to make it work here in this most down to earth way that we can."

CAC: In a populist environment?

JW: Yes, yes. I think he succeeded.

CAC: Did you have a sense that Honors then was perceived as an elitist program in a democratic university?

JW: Of course, of course. If you're going to put resources in something, why would you put it in this instead of providing some services for students who are more at risk and providing services for students who need more help? Why would you privilege . . . ? What would be the reason to do this? It still continues to be an issue. I don't think at that time there was a voice speaking for the Honors program that was either the student voices or the level of faculty participation that said, "Yes, we really want to do this." It's not elitist. It's not doing anything in opposition to this other populist kind of instinct. It's a way of bringing students who are qualified and competent students as populist as you can be by giving them access to these opportunities. It's the most Land-Grant *land-grant* part of what it is we do.

CAC: And Holt spoke this?

JW: He knew this so well and absolutely did not engage in this polemic about the elitism versus the populism. He just went all the way around it, didn't take it on, just kept doing his work. He was really quite extraordinary.

CAC: I should make a footnote here for posterity who is listening to this funny tape that you and I share that admiration and respect.

JW: Really?

CAC: It will have to be discounted in ten years, whatever.

JW: [laughter]

CAC: I've known many administrators—and you've known more—but he did have a knack. A word you just used I would have said. He knew how to get around a problem and not use the divisive rhetoric, just make common sense of it.

JW: He was quite a genius at it. I don't think the program would be here today at all and certainly not at the level of commitment the institution has made to it.

CAC: Yes.

JW: At the time, he was hired and before he got here, they'd lost a full time secretary due to retrenchment. There had been two full time secretaries, clerical people here. Between the time he was hired and when he showed up, one of those positions had been retrenched, just retrenched. He got here and what he started with was really building the recruitment efforts.

His goal wasn't to just say, "I need to build my staff." It was to say, "I need to bring the students here so that I can legitimate the staffing." Instead of coming in and muscling for turf about the support he was getting because of what the staffing was, he set that aside, got on with it, and brought in these freshmen classes that were larger, more engaged, more eager to be part of an Honors experience, Honors community. Matt Dion, who is the director now of Prospective Students in CLA [College of Liberal Arts], was the assistant director in Honors at that time. His role was really to just roll up his sleeves and bring on the students. There was an effort to really be proactively recruiting these students. That hadn't ever been part of the energy or effort of the program. The program had always kind of been here and if students found it, fine; but, there wasn't this great get-them-on-the-phone and talk to them and "Have you heard about the University of Minnesota's Honors program in the College of Liberal Arts?" and talk about it. We were really the only show in town at that time because the stuff that happened with IT [Institute of Technology] and the other colleges didn't happen until sometime in the late 1980s when Ken Keller's Committee to Focus included a component about high-ability recruitment and put together this package, which put resources that colleges could apply for to develop, and start, and extend their Honors program. IT didn't even have one until that happened. The College of Agriculture, and Human Ecology, and programs in the School of Nursing took advantage of the fact that there was this support and, then, developed programs that grew from that effort.

CAC: They had a model in what was here. What other initiatives did he take . . . this reaching out, and really attracting the best students to the program, and what else?

JW: I think \$500,000—it started out—of EDP was really, I think, something that he understood as a way to capture some of that effort for high-ability programming; so, he served on that committee and, then, served on some of the committees with Leslie Cafarelli that were deciding how this money was going to be used. I think he was very instrumental in helping those units figure out how to do this, and put together proposals, and provide some support for having that happen in those units.

CAC: Were there curricular programs that he initiated?

JW: The curricular programs that he worked in, he did one-by-one-by-one. He became very adept at taking a very little amount of money and converting it into something that the departments then could build on. His conversations were really more individualized. Brian Job was here as the director of International Studies and worked a lot with the students who were majors in International Relations. That was a pretty strong interest of high-ability students. What Glen did was to work with Brian Job to figure out if we could just put a little resource right here, would that get some of these faculty members to put some effort into teaching these courses, providing some experience for these students that would give them a feeling of their Honors work in International Relations? Brian Job single-handedly did a lot of that himself because he would take on some of this teaching. The International Relations Seminar that was a seminar funded partly by us supported some graduate student help for him; but, he really was the one who did the teaching and brought these students into the program. Glen's role was really

to nudge some of that along by planting some resources here and there and saying, "Oh, yes, that sounds like a good idea." One of my favorite stories, because it links several of my lives together, was the summer that Janet Spector was going out into the field to do some research. She did an archaeological study in Little Rapids. What she wanted to do was to go out and put together the expertise that she had with some Native American involvement, and historical involvement, bringing students from several different disciplines to this thing. She brought that to Honors as a way to get it funded in the summertime because there just wasn't a way to get funding for this. She came and presented this to Glen. Glen thought it was great because it was one of these real cross-disciplinary programs. It had involvement of faculty that he had a lot of respect for. We helped fund this thing as an Honors seminar that was really going out in the field and doing this research. It ended up being a book. Janet wrote a book about this [*What this Owl Means*].

CAC: Ahhh.

JW: I think it wouldn't have happened as completely as it did if we hadn't, through Glen's planting a few seeds here and there, been able to figure out where to put just a little money to make something happen. He wasn't cautious about that. He was very trusting of his own instincts about it. Oftentimes, it didn't look very doable because it didn't seem as if the resources were there. We never had a very strong budget to do a lot of experimenting with. It was always kind of working at the limits of what we had. He could kind of move some little piece of money from someplace and put it someplace else and, all of a sudden, there is something that can happen with it, and did it in not a bean counter way. It was trusting.

CAC: He was very persuasive and I think a lot of people volunteered. They volunteered because they could teach an undergraduate Honors seminar. which was a real exciting reward for many persons.

JW: Yes.

CAC: I'm thinking of the model of empowerment. He told faculty, that, yes, you go over and do that seminar you always wanted to do on this subject. You won't do it in your own department.

JW: He was so engaging in that process. He really got people to feel very much involved in doing that. One of the things I think he was so valuable to me for was that he never sat down with negativity about anything and said, "We can't do this. It won't work." He always started from, "How do we make this work?" He never gave in to this negative, oh, this is awful. Everything's a mess. It's falling apart. We're all in a turmoil. The continuous life of some of the ways that the institutional dynamics have really evolved are things he just wouldn't . . .

CAC: My guess is in some cases, he worked out partnerships for team teaching also?

JW: And did some of it himself. There are several examples of his own involvement. One of the things that he and Roger Page did was to create some of these other options. When Roger was moving away from doing as much day-to-day work as the associate dean, he had the opportunity to be more involved in Honors. Because he'd done some advising in Honors—he had always had a group of students who were his students as Honors students—he created some of his curricular things that were designed to build a sense of the community of Honors students and do it with faculty members that he could call up on the phone and say, "Don't you want to come and talk to the students in my freshmen seminar?" If you're Roger Page and you're asking somebody this question, of course, they'll say, "Yes." That's just a given, right? You're pretty well established in the community and can make those kinds of requests. What Glen did was to really give Roger the support for doing that in a way that made it all possible for Roger to do it. Roger didn't need money to do that. He just needed a go ahead to say, "Yes, this is a good idea and we can certainly promote that and we can give you our classroom in the fall so that you can spend the fall working with these groups of students and the faculty," and be able to take advantage of what Roger knew how to do, which was really to structurally create some of these opportunities. He could sit down with his piece of paper and write them out and say, "Maybe, we should do this." Then, there would be a program there. There would be this way to have something new happen for these students—and always very cheap.

CAC: And he was having a good time doing it. I think he really was engaged in a kind of token way. Why did he leave? I know he had a very good job offer; but, it was something quite different. It was to be chief of a library system or something in the city of St. Louis.

JW: I think that the part that was complicated for him here was that a lot of what had been building as a set of possibilities started to unravel. There was some sense that more of it was going to get more complicated because the state of the College of Liberal Arts Honors Program versus the University Honors Program became an issue of a conversation that was going on. There was some sense that they were going to move from a collegiate based program to a university-wide program and there was some effort to do that. Then, some of the resources that were supposed to be given to build some of that just vanished overnight. It was a pulling out of support for that that I think got really hard for him to do. He was really, I think, feeling like the value he had brought to the program and to the institution was being undercut by some of the things that seemed like he was having to do battle about. It wasn't the stuff he enjoyed very much. Personally, I don't think he was feeling like he was being valued. They weren't rewarding him with salary things that he thought they ought to be creating as possibilities for him. I don't think he was feeling the support to do the things he wanted to do. Everybody acknowledged that it was happening; but, it didn't seem as if he was given credit for it. I think it was part of the concern that he wanted to have a stronger voice in some of these things as he became more established and because the director of Honors isn't really somebody centrally linked in a position of authority either in the college or in Central Administration, he didn't have a voice that he could put forward. He needed . . .

CAC: On a regular basis?

JW: . . . to have a dean, or an associate dean, or somebody else do it.

CAC: He was not at the table.

JW: He didn't come to the table for some of these conversations. He really felt like he was the one who should be . . .

CAC: We're back to your theme of marginality. Even though it was an exciting program of crucial importance for many students, there was still the sense that he came to . . .

JW: It was, yes, yes. That it really wasn't given that kind of attention or centrality. The job came in St. Louis in an accidental way. He was really just encouraged to apply for this thing and thought this might be a way for him to at least figure out what he might be worth if he were to want to stay here. Then, he got such an offer from them that he couldn't turn it down.

CAC: For a variety of reasons, personal and professional, Glen Holt left and he had five or six years here?

JW: I think four or five. I'm remembering a five-year contract.

CAC: They were pretty impressive.

JW: Yes, they were wonderful years.

CAC: Then, we search for another person who would be like him?

JW: Yes.

CAC: It was not to be a faculty but an outside person who would administer the program?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Do you want to say something about that caper?

JW: Ha! That was a more complicated process. We did find a faculty member and a director of honors from a very small school who seemed to be wanting to move into a larger arena and take on a broader set of responsibilities and brought him here from South Carolina. The culture of this place and the way that he expected things to work were completely in opposition to each other. So, he was here for two or three years, I think. All of the collegial efforts that Glen built were being threatened because he was so disruptive. He was a very angry person and his way, unlike Glen's way of going around it, was very confrontative and very pushing against the system, which isn't a way to get anything done here. In the brief time he was here, I think he was building a lot of antagonistic responses in the college and, then, in the institution at the same

time. I think his goal had been to move the collegiate program into the all-university program and his drive really was to become the University Honors person. All of that vanished fairly quickly; so, he kept doing battle against things that there wasn't anything to battle. I know that he was very disruptive. Part of it was that I think he saw me as a threat in a way that I didn't think felt very collegial somehow; and I thought, it's probably simpler if I'm not there so that if he is doing this antagonism with me, I could just go do something else, which is really then when I moved to the Central program.

CAC: Now, before we move you across the mall, I'm going to make another question. I don't often know the answer; I know the answer. There were two persons on the search committee who were skeptical.

JW: Yes!

CAC: [laughter]

JW: [laughter]

CAC: For posterity, we're laughing because it was the two of us.

JW: Absolutely. Yes. Isn't that something? It wasn't the right choice.

CAC: It didn't work out.

JW: No, it didn't work out.

CAC: Then, they went back to a half-time faculty person.

JW: That's what, I think, has been effective about it is that it really has been possible to build the structure that's the original structure . . .

CAC: Yes, the one that Bill McDonald started in the early 1960s.

JW: Yes, yes. It's a very solid one. I don't think that I would argue that you could do what we did when Glen Holt was here if it hadn't been for Glen Holt. That's it's a given . . .

CAC: Sui generis.

JW: Yes. I think this is a system that . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: We're going to move across the mall from Johnston to Morrill Hall and the university program. Now, the year is what?

JW: I don't know . . . late 1980s? When did I go to EDP? Here, 1988.

CAC: Okay, so now it's 1988 to 1990 that you're across the mall?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Say something about that program then.

JW: This is right into the heart of Academic Affairs. Of course, this is the vulnerable part of Academic Affairs. It had always been clear to me, even before I went there, that this was a program that was being reevaluated under Commitment to Focus as something that might not continue. But, because it had always been here—it had been here since Women's Studies started, before Women's Studies, since the 1960s—I thought they can't possibly get rid of this program. When I went there, it was really with the notion that we were going to build this more centralized role for the Honors high-ability part of it and, then, I was also working on some of the teaching and learning Educational Developmental things. We had no grant money anymore to give money to support curricular developments and things that were a part of the old EDP existence. It really did function primarily as a teaching and learning center for providing support for TAs [teaching assistant] and faculty members who wanted to learn new teaching strategies and things like that. We did a lot of work with that and, then, brought in as a piece of . . .

CAC: To whom were you reporting?

JW: Leslie Cafarelli was the director of that program. She reported to John Wallace.

CAC: He reported to the vice-president.

JW: He reported to [Roger] Benjamin, I think. Before I had gotten there, she had been the person who had been managing this high-ability recruitment project. The money that was being filtered in from Central to the colleges was being filtered from Educational Development to the colleges. She was the person who was making sure that all of the paperwork was done, everybody's proposals were complete, and the evaluations of those things were being done. I still have some of those files because I don't know where to archive them. I've not wanted to throw them away and I didn't want to send them to archives because they were part of Honors. I don't know where they need to be. They're here. There was a fair amount of activity; but, it seemed to me what was clear is that the resources were gone, that Educational Development resources that were there were identified centrally as a lot of money that could be put someplace else. I think the sense of wanting to do things at a central level, to do Educational Development, seemed

like it was probably not something that the institution could afford to do anymore. For the two years that I was there, we were continuously threatened by being closed down. That was the expectation. Then, there was a search for a new vice-president, and things changed, and it seemed like we were on our way to . . .

CAC: I think there are five vice-presidents in seven years in that time.

JW: Yes, and everything was in upheaval, almost continuously; so, you'd read signals. It's almost like reading tea leaves. Does the fact that we were given this document mean that we're going to continue for another year? Does it not? It was a pretty unstable time. It was not an easy time to be thinking about program building because it was all being pulled out in funny ways from being supported. I think that Leslie's way of responding to that was a combative way somehow. She wasn't a bridge builder.

CAC: She was head of Classics, wasn't she?

JW: Yes. She wasn't somebody who builds support by making links among different things. She really wanted to run the show. Instead of finding ways to be cooperative and collaborative about things that could have continued to provide some support for Educational Development, I think she really wanted to put boundaries out there. I think that wasn't an effective tool. Carol Carrier came as the person who was going to be the associate vice-president and part of her function was to take on some of the things that we had been doing with the teaching awards and sabbaticals. Things that had been part of EDP forever were things that were being transferred into defining that job because that wasn't a regular job for the time. It didn't have a job. She was being given a job.

CAC: Did the Bush money come into this program you're talking about? Did that begin to give out or not?

JW: No, she took the Bush money away. She went with it to the Private College Council . . . not the Bush sabbatical money but the Bush Foundation money that was the development money really was stuff that came to her. Humphrey Doermann thought that she was the person who needed to be managing that; so, he took that collaboration project and put it out of here.

CAC: You were privy to that? You were on staff . . . ?

JW: Part of what I think happened and the way that those conversations happened about transferring some of that stuff—things that . . . EDP responsibility—over to this new associate vice-president . . . It was clear that Leslie didn't want to give up the control of it and so rather than finding a way to be cooperative and become part of another approach to doing Educational Development, I think she pushed it into saying, "It's this or this." Essentially, Educational Development lost in that process.

CAC: So, once again, you were without a position or portfolio?

JW: That was the interesting part. Yes. It was the moment at which I was in the most centralized place of power, Academic Affairs. You can't get in a more centralized place of power. Absolutely having it pulled out almost overnight . . . In fact, the story was a startling one to me. As a unit, we were kind of the last thought in a lot of the conversations about what was going on; so, we never got really clear signals about where we were.

CAC: So, you weren't at the table either anymore than Glen had been?

JW: No, no. No, we were not at the table. We'd been reading these signals and finally decided that they were going to continue us for another year because we had received the budget. Centrally, they had produced the budget for us for the following year. We thought, fine, we're in great shape. We know we've got a whole year here to go. Leslie went in to meet with then vice-president [Lynn] Kuhi on a Friday afternoon. She was going in to ask for a medical leave because she had to have some surgery done and she didn't want to do that over the phone or in writing. Her setting up a meeting with him was to go and explain that she needed to be gone for this medical leave. He got her in there and sat her down and said, "We're closing your program" . . . just out of nowhere. She called me at home that night and she was just hysterical because we had not had any clue that that was going to happen in that way.

CAC: Any explanation?

JW: No! What he had said to her was . . .

CAC: Of course, Kuhi himself was out very soon thereafter.

JW: Yes . . . that these things had been sitting on his desk for awhile, and that he had been asked to make a decision about them, and he hadn't been making a decision. It was somehow her coming to see him that triggered this decision making . . . that it was going to be done. All of his cohorts were encouraging him to make this decision and I think he wasn't sure. It just pushed it. It was teetering, and then just pushed it over, and we were done! We were done! We were shut down over night almost! It was so shocking. Whoa!

CAC: A person like yourself, you don't have a tenure . . . or do you?

JW: I had a six month appointment.

CAC: Did you stagger from one timed contract after another through all these stories you've been telling?

JW: Yes.

CAC: You never had tenure within the university?

JW: No.

CAC: So, every time something like this happens, you've got to pay the rent?

JW: Sure, sure. But, doing it was a funny timing because we had finished . . . This was in the spring and, then, because they had to give me a contract based on how many years I've been here, I had an appointment that went through the following December; so, they had to give me a terminal appointment to do that. I did it—and closed the program. Basically what we did was this disestablishment process. We moved all of our stuff to different places. The Undergraduate Research Opportunities program went to Anne Hopkins. She took over that responsibility. The person who was doing that in EDP was reassigned to her office. The staff people in Educational Development . . . two of them went to Academic Affairs, and one worked for [Ettore] Infante, and one was working in some of the budgeting administrative stuff in Academic Affairs. All of the parts of what we were doing just got dispersed and most of the things that had been different projects that we'd worked on, I passed on to Bob Kvavik. He's the person I delivered these folders to and said, "These are the pieces of the projects that need something to happen." Mostly nothing did. Some of it has been recreated now out of some of the things with the TA Development Program and some of the things that are part of the UROP stuff.

CAC: What's UROP?

JW: The Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program. Because that went to Anne Hopkins's office, it has continued to thrive and flourish. It's not much of a growing activity but pretty stable in what it's doing. The centralized Honors part of it has just been put into some kind of eclipse. There really wasn't any way to sustain it without some resources, and I think Anne Hopkins came in and said, "That's not my priority," and let it go. The collegiate programs are still pretty strong and some of the things that bring the collegiate programs together primarily revolve around recruitment issues so that we're in conversation and working more collectively that way. But, we don't have an umbrella of university perspective on Honors right now. It's really college-based.

CAC: I'm going to make a statement that has a question mark at the end; although, it may not appear so. My voice will not inflect at the end. It seems to me that Honors programs have to be implemented in the provinces of the college and the departments.

JW: Yes, yes.

CAC: Isn't there a systemic problem? That's the question.

JW: I think that is the question because the sense of being able to bring together resources centrally and have a unified Honors program seemed like it had some appeal because it would

be not resource rich. It would be serving all the colleges with less resources than having each of these colleges have structures of their own. That seemed like a good idea. In fact, it turns out that there isn't anything there because it's the faculty and the students in the colleges that drive the program.

CAC: Sure.

JW: It isn't some external structure that does it.

CAC: So that the failure may really be a systemic one? Do you know much about the programs in other colleges and whether they parallel what the Arts College does?

JW: To some degree. The biggest one that's most successful in sustaining an activity at the collegiate level is the Institute of Technology. Their program serves primarily as a freshman, sophomore program. The students who come in in cohorts of 100 are taken through a core curriculum for the Institute of Technology together. They, then, do that for the first two years. After those two years, they're moved into the departments and different departments have more or less levels of commitment to doing Honors in those departments. The core of the IT experience is a curricular one. The students are taking these three Honors courses together through the first two years as a curricular cohort; so, they're taking math, and chemistry, and physics as Honors together in a core experience. That's the basis of that program. Then, faculty members are working with those cohorts because they're teaching in those core courses, those Honors courses, for them.

CAC: But, that model is a bit different from the Arts College?

JW: Yes. The liberal arts version is a much more option open version of doing Honors. The curricular choices are there both departmentally and through some of the curriculum that the program offers by having special seminars and colloquium for credit for the freshmen, sophomores, or juniors and seniors; but, the choices are really more up to the individual student. It's to present a menu of opportunities and say, "You can do some of these things." Then, they choose which of those things they want to do, not that there's a core, everybody has to do the same set of things. Because this program really manages very diverse Honors programs in departments, it has a flexibility in the way that we function for different departments depending on what the department's depth of commitment to Honors is. For some, we're just the conduit. All we do is get the student on track in a major and most of the things they do that relate to Honors relates to how they do that in their major.

CAC: Although, there are the all college junior and senior seminars.

JW: Yes, as an option . . .

CAC: They don't have to take those?

JW: No.

CAC: I see. How many do? What proportion?

JW: Quite a number. I don't know the proportion of them. We do about fifteen of them a year and they're always filled . . . so, however many of those students are using those as part of their outside of the major Honors experience, which is expected of them, too.

CAC: How many students are there in the arts program the last couple of years?

JW: About 1400.

CAC: [gasp] Fourteen hundred?

JW: Yes. The graduation rate is still like 8 or 9 percent of the students in the College of Liberal Arts that graduate with honors. We bring in a little higher number than that partly because the first and second year students leave to go to other colleges. They'll leave to go to Biological Sciences or the School of Management. To keep that proportion up, we usually have a few more students in the program than actually will graduate.

CAC: For the record, you came back from Johnston then and came back to the position you'd left?

JW: Essentially, except they recreated it. When I left it was the full time director and then a full time assistant director. In the discussions about what to do after the person who left was asked to leave . . .

CAC: That person has a name.

JW: Yes.

CAC: What was it?

JW: Rue Godow was his name. He was here for three years.

CAC: That's for the record. The pattern then was a half time faculty director and a full time assistant director, which you were?

JW: Right. Then, that's where they reinstated this other version of it. That's the version, I think, that's worked pretty effectively. I'm confident that that's a stable and a strong way to keep a program, which is peripheral to the institutional role. We have no tenured faculty. We have no tenured lines.

CAC: Not even yours?

JW: No, I'm a year-by-year contract appointment.

CAC: Are you P&A [Professional and Administrative] then?

JW: Yes, I'm a P&A appointment . . . have been forever. [laughter]

CAC: Okay. Don't they extend those for more than one year?

JW: Not in CLA. No, they only do year-by-year appointments. Some colleges do three-year contracts. My appointment in EDP was a contract appointment; but, CLA doesn't like to make commitments like that.

CAC: Now, these are half time faculty. What proportion of their time do you think they really devote to Honors and what to their other . . . ?

JW: I think you have to see 150 percent time position because it's not possible to see this as something you only do half time. I think the role of the administrative role, the curriculum development role, the recruitment role, the things we're being asked to do to represent Honors in the institution and in the college . . . It's not something you could do in half your time.

CAC: Again, the university is taking advantage of time volunteered beyond 100 percent expectation?

JW: Yes. I think there's a real expectation that that's the natural thing to do. I have talked to faculty members who have wanted to think about doing the director of Honors and have been pretty frank with them saying, "Is this something you think you can do and control your time so that you can concentrate on your research more? I think you have to be real careful because it isn't that kind of job." There's not a way that you have enough control saying, "I'm only going to be here ten or twenty hours a week." It takes over. If you're running a scholarship competition that's a national scholarship competition and the deadlines are all within a week of when all the papers have to be put together, you can't say, "I'm not there this week because I'm off doing my research," some of the things that make you think you could have more control. There just isn't any.

CAC: It's an interesting observation . . . the number of persons that really throughout this sprawling university work more than 100 percent and the university doesn't really credit that or arrange for it systemically or structurally in any way.

JW: Yes. I think the people who are the best citizens are the people who do that without even thinking about it. That's where the sense of—when you were talking earlier with Gordon Hirsch—the research faculty versus the faculty that were citizens in the institution. We've really

rewarded this faculty life but not acknowledged what the costs are. The research faculty does their commitment, probably 150 percent commitment, to their research but not to the institution. The institution doesn't get that service from them, that sense of being the chair, serving on committees, working with undergraduate students, doing almost all the good citizen things, the sense of what faculty life has consisted of.

CAC: Have you seen a change of that order in twenty, umpteen, years that you've been here?

JW: Absolutely. Absolutely.

CAC: Tell me about that.

JW: My sense of how we have encouraged young scholars . . . My generation of scholars who got hired as faculty members were research scholars not teacher scholars. They were scholars who were brought in with the notion to establish credentials as researchers, which is what they do. They're wonderful at it. They're excellent.

CAC: Well, they may be excellent or less excellent but at least that's the commitment.

JW: That's the commitment they make.

CAC: Yes.

JW: The teaching commitments that they make aren't very strong. The commitments to students aren't very strong. Their commitment to the institution isn't very strong. My sense of the loyal citizens is a generation of faculty members who are now mostly getting ready to retire or retiring and, then, there's this group of faculty members who are in their forties and fifties, some of whom haven't had a moment of their commitment to the institution take precedence over their commitment to their research or personal life.

CAC: Why did that happen or how?

JW: There was this moment at which the people who went out to be faculty members, the people who had the strongest credentials to be faculty members, were the research faculty members and not the teachers; so, the sense of being able to establish your career by being as broadly based in teaching and research as you could be wasn't anybody's goal. Their goal was really to say, "We've got all these people who are teachers. We really need people who can muscle in and do research."

CAC: Where did this come from? Where did this new philosophy, if you wish, or principle come from? How was it implemented?

JW: When you look at the way that value gets attached to institutions and departments, it's attached by the celebrities on the faculty. What you do is you look at a program like the one at George Mason where there was this mediocre school. What they did was to hire away all these brilliant faculty members from all over the country to come and be part of that faculty. That faculty now is one of the strongest in the country in a number of areas. Literature, some of the student development things, the psychology fields that I am familiar with have these resident faculty members all at George Mason University, which was not even anything anybody knew existed; but, they hired stars. What your goal was as an academic was to make yourself a star.

CAC: How does that play out in Minnesota though?

JW: I think the people who are here and stay are people who have made roots here and we're lucky that they have; but, a number of them would probably, if they hadn't done that, have been hired away by one of these other places at bigger bucks and greater research opportunities.

CAC: I'm pressing you on this point because it's a theme I've heard elsewhere. I'm really trying to clarify for whomever is listening to this. Are there things in Central Administration or college administrations that promote that or retard it?

JW: I think the devaluing of teaching and the devaluing of service has contributed to that. I've talked to . . .

CAC: How does that happen?

JW: . . . a number of young faculty members who are told, "Don't get on committees. Don't work with undergraduates. Just focus on your research. Till you get tenure, all you can do is your research," . . . nurturing that component.

CAC: Who tells them to tell those juniors that? I'm trying to figure whether this is a conscious kind of shift in priorities or whether it just kind of drifts?

JW: I don't know. That's a good question. It isn't just here. It's happened in a national arena. Part of it, I think, has also evolved from this notion you were talking about earlier, the specialization of scholars, where the loyalty that people feel isn't departmental or institutional. It's to their subspecialty in a field and because of technology and an electronic life, their loyalties to each other are much stronger than they are to the web of the department or the institution. There wouldn't have been a way twenty years ago for those scholars to isolate themselves so completely because the technology wouldn't have allowed that.

CAC: Right.

JW: I think now with all the conferencing that goes on, and people flying here and there, and being able to link together with these very particularized research agendas, the rest of it fades in the background in a way that it wouldn't have in earlier generations of scholarship.

CAC: How does the Honors program attract the faculty who still wish to participate in the seminars and other curricular activities?

JW: Through the students mostly. What we've identified as a good funnel for us is to find some faculty members who have, not intentionally necessarily, worked with our students in some way through a course they've taught, a lecture course they've taught in the department, or working on an individualized project with students. You learn some names of some of the younger faculty who are thinking about these things, interested, engaged. Once they start working with the students, there's a stronger sense about wanting to do more of it. We have a pretty strong faculty voice right now in pretty broadly based departments and more younger than older. I think part of it is because they've had good experiences with the students and have liked doing it.

CAC: Does the director or the associate director implement this?

JW: Gordon's role . . .

CAC: This is Gordon Hirsch?

JW: Gordon Hirsch who is the director now did a very strong and powerful shift in thinking about this commitment to Honors as an overload versus something that's part of a regular rewarded system. What he was able to do was to bring some resources in to buy time from faculty so that they're not having to give it to us as overtime. As they teach for us . . .

CAC: I'm sorry. Do they give it directly to relieve someone from a course or is it this teaching assistant that is given? That's my memory of it.

JW: Right; but, I think it can be either.

CAC: I see.

JW: I think it depends. Each department negotiates for it differently. For some, it replaces a piece of the regular teaching load and then we just pay in to the department, giving them the money that's equivalent to a teaching assistant. For others, there's a way that the faculty members are—they don't get the money on top of their regular salary—getting a way to use that either to support some of their research function or to do something where they can use that money at a different time.

CAC: It's not cannibalized by the department? Although, sometimes it must be.

JW: Maybe. I think it could be. It depends on how strong the department is and how clearly they're supporting what they want them to do for us.

CAC: Now, you think the faculty do get involved . . . is there a sense of collegiality and identification on their part with Honors or is this a passing thing . . . that they'll do a seminar this year and the next and then they drop out for awhile, etcetera?

JW: I can't tell. It seems like there is a stronger commitment; but, it's not clear, given the tension right now that I'm aware of as the institution is trying to build stronger experiences for all undergraduates . . . the sense of resources going to provide access to improve large classes to give students more core experience through the new liberal education. The things that are being invested in, that are being supported in departments, are really very strongly things that are about providing access for students across the board. Undergraduates, I think, are getting the benefit of that.

CAC: So, you think things are being reversed at the present, that trends are being reversed, that there is a new way that policy, centrally decided, can move commitments a bit back toward teaching, and counseling, and advising?

JW: I think what's happened is that in the effort to do that and improve that for all the students, it's putting a tension on what that means for Honors. There's a limited number of faculty members and if what they're being asked to do is to offer more courses at certain levels, then, those faculty members can't be doing Honors as well and the money is going with them to do these kinds of experiences that are the more general ones as opposed to the more specialized ones for Honors. There's a tension about that the institution doesn't want to address straight on. It's accelerated, I think, in the last few years because departments have been asked and have been given resources to teach more courses for undergraduates, more 1000- and 3000-level courses; so, faculty are being drawn into providing more of that teaching. The new liberal education criterion includes a statement about faculty taught courses. They don't want those courses being taught by graduate students or teaching assistants. The faculty commitments to teaching, I think, are stronger; but, there aren't enough faculty members, in a sense, that there then can be this other strong group of faculty members who are putting their efforts in teaching and Honors. There just isn't a big enough faculty to do everything. If there's an individual faculty member, that person is making a choice, do I go where the resources are? Do I put my efforts into teaching these courses because that's what's being supported centrally or do I teach this Honors course and get involved in doing this Honors program stuff, which may or may not be supported centrally? That really is demanding a departmental and a collegiate commitment that may or may not be there. What's driving it right now is the Central mission to improve access, to improve the quality of undergraduate experience . . . things I am totally in support of.

CAC: Sure.

JW: It's got a great sense of momentum to do that; but, while it's doing that, it's putting a lot of pressure on what's available for Honors because the resources don't follow. The new money is coming from Central to support these access things. The old money is in the colleges; but, that money is dwindling because departments don't have the resources. If they're going to teach five courses in a year and know they're going to get Central money to teach this course, do you think they're going to teach an Honors course instead?

CAC: You've found that to be the case the last few years? You've had more difficulty?

JW: I think it's starting to happen. It's been pretty clear in the way that . . . When you look at departments that are smaller departments and where they're having to restrict the sense of where they're making commitments and where they're putting their Honors teaching, it's much narrower in some ways than it would have been in some of the other years because that's not where the money comes. If they're going to teach something, they're going to teach the courses that fill and overflow because that's where they're going to get more money to teach then.

CAC: Sure. Can you say something about the sense of identification with your Honors students with the Honors program? Do they think of themselves as being in Anthropology, or History, or English, or whatever, or do they think of themselves as really being part of a sub college? Do they have a home here? If so, how do they define it?

JW: The students in the sense of their place here, start with the notion that this is their home.

CAC: When they're coming in as freshmen?

JW: When they come in as freshmen, they identify this as the place. They do that in a funny way because this isn't really a place. This is just an office in a building.

CAC: But, they see each other in freshmen Honors classes?

JW: They see each other in classes. One of the things that builds a sense of who they are as Honors students is really the fact that we have this curriculum for them and we have provided them with this experience that lets them take some classes with other students together. That, then, gets them an identity here as an Honors student. Now, most of these students when they're out in the world don't identify themselves as Honors students. The student leaders and the students who are running things around here are mostly Honors students; but, they're not publicly Honors students. I think it's part of the Minnesota modesty thing. There are two parts working, the Minnesota not want to toot your own horn . . .

CAC: *Minnesota nice?*

JW: . . . at the same that there's this kind of Honors geek stuff that they don't want to be labeled as Honors because that's a risky role. Most of what I'm aware of as the person who is the

administrative voice in this Honors experience is that those students really feel this is a home and they just go out and do all these other things. They come back around and see us as a place to sort of serve as a base for a lot of that and provide some sense of how to link up with some of these other things that they do. The students who have the best experience here as students are the students who get linked in a department with the faculty because that's the place where their experience can soar. If they're using this as a kind of base for the understanding of the institution, filtering out things that they need to know, and when they need to know, and how to set them up for opportunities to study abroad, and apply for national scholarships, and do things like that. The experience that they have that's the experience that gives them their passion about this place is what happens to them in those departments with those faculty members. There's absolutely no doubt in my mind that that's the thing.

CAC: But, that may lead them to identify with a good program in a department rather than with the Honors program itself?

JW: Yes. I think that's just fine. Part of what we're teaching them is really how to do that. How do you get yourself linked up so that you don't just go vanish into a department and not take advantage of the experience that it has to offer you? Some of our skills are really getting faculty members to be interested in these students, providing some structural ways that that happens by some of these curricular things, but also identifying faculty members that we know will help these students, will work with these students, who are good teachers, who are strongly committed to the undergraduate experience.

CAC: This is where the advising role can play a major part?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Have you found any change over time in the composition, the motive, the intent, the perceptions of the undergraduate Honors students?

JW: I'm very happy right now because so many of the students who, in the 1980s, thought that this was the ticket to money, and power, and fame, seem to have shifted to a much stronger sense of this as a responsibility in building some service and an agenda about change, an agenda about wanting to take on a role that's got a very strong social service orientation. These students want to change the world. It's not like they want to go off and make a big pile of money—and that's very different. In the last ten years they've shifted.

CAC: How do they express that to you? How do you know that?

JW: They talk about wanting to do something that will make a difference . . . not the sort of uncertainly about what they're going to do with lives. It isn't so much, which is the most strategic thing to do to make the most money, and to have the best career, and be president of a corporation or whatever. It's really to figure out, where is it I can go that I'm doing the thing

that's the most meaningful, where I can make the best contribution to helping some other people? There's a much stronger interest in social work. Social work wasn't even on the table five years ago, six, seven, eight years ago, as something to do. That wasn't a fast track to anything. It was not perceived by the students in Honors as something to do. They were going to go to graduate school, law school, medical school. That's less true. It's still true that we have those people who are going to go to law school. That's not ever going to go away. They're doing it, I think, more deliberately and more intentionally because it's not quite as automatic to do that stuff anymore. What it's forcing them to do is to really think about who they are and what kind of lives they want to have. A lot of our students are involved in building a rich service experience. I just think that's amazing.

CAC: Where do they pick that up?

JW: I don't know.

CAC: Does Honors provide those opportunities?

JW: Not so directly. We do some little things through our student association. One of the best places the students get involved here is the YMCA [Young Men's Christian Association]. The programs at the "Y" . . . it's like a funnel. Our students are over there doing immersion programs, and project motivation, and Big Brother, Little Sister.

CAC: Do you think that program at the "Y" attracts disproportionately Honors students?

JW: I don't know. I know about them a lot because they're students that I have a lot contact with. I know that they're all doing this stuff. Some of it is that they bring each other along; so, I would assume that some of that's word of mouth. Those activities, I think, sometimes, in order to be effective, have to go one-by-one-by-one. You can't put an ad in the *Daily* to get somebody to do them as well as you can just say, "Gee, my roommate is doing this."

CAC: It's word of mouth. It's sideways conversation.

JW: And I think our student advisers . . . I have a group of ten students who are serving as the advisers for the freshmen.

CAC: Peer advisers?

JW: Peer advisers. That group of students is very much involved in kinds of service and awareness, that that's a piece of who they are, that they're encouraging those first year students to develop. It's a very interesting phenomenon, very different.

CAC: But, Judy, what you're describing, given the political and social climate of the entire country, is a real counterculture, not in the sense of the 1960s of drugs and so forth; but, it's a

real counterculture. It's running against the values which apparently seem to be in the majority authority now. If that's the case, how do you account for a counterculture—if that isn't too strong a word to use?

JW: I don't know what that culture is anymore. That's the shocking thing to me about the way that the political climate has changed in the last few years. That is the culture; but, that's not the culture I'm aware of.

CAC: Oh, but you see evidence of it everywhere. It's not only in party politics.

JW: No, no.

CAC: It's everywhere. It's in the Op-Ed [opinion and editorial] pages. It's in Letters to the Editor.

JW: Are those the parents of these students? Are those these students except they're not telling me that that's who they are? I don't know. I don't get it. It isn't apparent to me that the undergraduate student body is preparing itself to become that generation of leaders. It's a very committed group who want to do things to fix the sense of what we've done in terms of people who are homeless. They are looking at issues about cultural diversity. They're looking at multicultural kinds of issues, issues of violence, the kinds of social issues that they are aware of and care about. They have a very complicated way of understanding that that isn't this kind of Rush Limbaugh stuff. I don't know who those people are. I don't know why.

CAC: Fair enough, okay. But, you do get a sense, with the Honors students at least, that a very significant number of them are engaged in defining their lives and their careers in this different way?

JW: I do. I don't think I'm just picking out exceptional students.

CAC: I understand. You talk to these folks all the time.

JW: Yes. It's finding them. One of our best students last year, who was a finalist for the Rhodes Scholarship and is a Truman Scholar, is a young woman who probably could have done anything. She went to Yale Law School. The people at the Truman Foundation were worrying that all she was going to do was go be a corporate lawyer; so, they were not wanting to be real encouraging of her to go to law school. In getting to know this young woman, it's real clear that her goal isn't to be a lawyer. She wants to be a judicial person because she wants to be somebody who can translate the law to people who are like her, who are people who are female, who are people of color, who are people who don't think they have access to the law. Her whole sense of the judicial system isn't about getting in there and making a pile of money and being a wealthy lawyer. It's saying, "I want to make this contribution. I really want to have this voice

that's going to bring this community together to understand this as a positive place for them to get their concerns addressed."

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

JW: . . . be involved in one of the programs at the "Y." As he was doing that, he thought that the International Relations part of his life wasn't as important as this hands-on work he was doing with these young children; so, when he graduated, he got a job working at a homeless shelter. He was a coordinator of volunteers who worked with the children of the families in the homeless shelters and had been doing that for awhile. He is now a program director at the "Y." He's coming back to school and doing a graduate degree in social work. This is a non-status thing in terms of a male career path. His degree in International Relations should have sent him off into doing public policy, graduate school, law school, one of those policy level ways of addressing these issues but way far away from the hands-on stuff.

CAC: He's in that program now? Have you talked with him?

JW: No, he's not started it yet. He is, this year, finishing up his work he's doing as director of the "Y" and hasn't started it yet.

CAC: I taught a master's program for eighteen, twenty years, and over that entire period and with increasing sharpness, I had a feeling that the school here of social work, as other schools, were really offering a therapeutically, clinically oriented program and that the graduate students, like the one you're describing, were interested in how you change systems. They had to look awfully hard to find courses and places where they could learn what they thought it was they wanted to do.

JW: Very interesting. So, where would you do that then? What do you tell these young people who want to change the world? That's helpful to hear; but, it's not helpful in the sense . . .

CAC: Of course, what I'm saying is not entirely true. There are individual professors in the School of Social Work who are radical and would like to change systems; but, what they teach and what they train their students for are agency jobs that are primarily therapeutic.

JW: That's very interesting. I really see that as a place where students can learn those techniques and strategies, very unlike what they've learned in a policy school.

CAC: Here or there they will.

JW: Yes. I think they are searching for this.

CAC: I think so.

JW: My sense of where students are looking for meaning is in finding something that they can do that will provide them with the tools that will fix it. It isn't that they just want things to go on the way it's going on. They want to get it to the place where they can change it.

CAC: And they are not yet cynical or alienated?

JW: No. No. I think that's real exciting.

CAC: Does their enthusiasm then support you in your own personal attitude toward these matters?

JW: Of course! Oh, absolutely.

CAC: So, you, as a person, are more hopeful than I am. [laughter]

JW: I am now. I am now.

CAC: Bravo!

JW: It's taken more conscious effort I think to do it. I can't not be. If I just really give in to that sense of the gloominess of it and the prospects for what that can mean in the future, I don't think I can keep doing my job. I think part of what working with students is giving me is that sense that they do energize that.

CAC: Fair enough. I had an interview with a senior faculty member who would share many of the political, social, cultural values and principles that you and I do; and he spoke of the melancholy of the professoriate on this very point. You don't find your students melancholy?

JW: No. They aren't as glibly . . .

CAC: But you would see many of us as . . . not melancholy in the sense of being droopy and sad but really seeing a terrible, terrible dilemma there.

JW: Yes, yes. I think there was a peaking of this culture studies stuff where they were really being hip, and cynical, and glib, and detached from everything. That seems to have peaked a couple of years ago. I don't think that's got the same currency right now. The students who are struggling are struggling with meaning in a way that says, I need to know that there's a meaningful way to live my life and something of value that I can give to this community.

CAC: To what degree is that point of view existential rather than reform pragmatic . . . if that makes any sense?

JW: I don't know. I don't know. I think they're having trouble making the link to what it has to do with that. The ways that you can make a difference are very limited in looking through the educational opportunities to pursue that. There's not a credential that you can get that's a . . .

CAC: Sure.

JW: . . . I'm going to get this credential and go change the world.

CAC: It's hard to find someplace in the outside community, world, who will hire you.

JW: To do that, yes. I listen very closely to the stories that students tell me about how they get to do what they're doing. One of the stories about one of the students this year who, when she was here as an undergraduate did a management degree and had the most serious commitment to making her life useful of almost any of the students I talk to . . . This was three or four years ago and that seemed dissident to me to get the management degree to go with that; so, I talked to her a lot about it. A lot of it came out of a strong religious faith that she had and she was very committed to building that. She left and went and got a job in the corporate world; and her strategy had always been that she was going to learn these skills and take these tools from the corporate world so that then she could come back into the non-profit world with those skills and be able to use that to make a difference, in making her contribution in the non-profit world. Essentially what she did was she went and worked for National Cash Register, some big corporation, doing some sales development thing for a couple of years. Consciously while she was doing that, she was trying to figure out how to define those skills so that when she started to look for these non-profit jobs, they would look at this as valuable experience for her to bring to this non-profit thing. Now, she works in Chicago for Little Brothers . . .

CAC: Heavens.

JW: . . . and has a role of role of coordinating some program in that non-profit organization that she's just excited about. She makes less money. She has no sense of the allure of the jet set, fancy kind of life. She says it's the most meaningful thing she's ever done.

CAC: She keeps in touch with you?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Which means that she has an identification with the program as well as with you as an individual.

JW: Yes. Yes. This program was good to her. We were helpful to her in doing a lot of the things she wanted to do, clearing the way for some of the combined things she was doing

because the management stuff didn't fit so well with some of these other things she was trying to keep as ongoing commitments.

CAC: There's a word you've used several times the last ten, fifteen minutes, that is, multicultural. To what degree has Honors been able to be that. When we say multicultural, we really mean multi-racial, don't we? It's Hispanic, African-American, Indian. To what degree has that been successful?

JW: I think it's better. When I first started here, there was a real strong effort not to compete for students of color with the Martin Luther King [MLK] program. When I was first here, we really didn't pursue high-ability students of color because it seemed like we would . . .

CAC: Drain off.

JW: . . . drain off some of the MLK students. We didn't want to push a competition for students. As the university has become more conscientious about recruiting students of color who are at the high end of the levels of ability, I think we've become more engaged in being more fully part of that. We're working more closely with the Martin Luther King program so that the students of color who are high-ability students can actually choose to either have some identification with both of us or one or the other . . .

CAC: Do they?

JW: . . . and will do that.

CAC: Do they in significant numbers identify with Honors?

JW: Actually, we get a better representation of the students of color who are high-ability students because we've been pretty proactive about making this a welcoming place for them. We have tried very hard. One of the things that I have pushed, one of my own agendas in thinking about where my expertise needs to go, is working with multicultural issues so that my sense of unbalance always and thinking how do you do this well, how do you be inclusive, and how do you bring students of color in and make them feel welcome, when we're primarily a staff and program of white male and female individuals, is trying to do that in a way that means both that I'm responsible for that as well as bringing in students and staff who are responsible for that. I work very hard to identify students of color that we can bring in as part of our student advising staff so that those are students that other students will see, and work with, and know that we're not just trying to do this in a way that's not taking into account their experience.

CAC: How do you make these lines with Hispanic, for example, and Native American students? The MLK is primarily African-American, is it not?

JW: Right. Our biggest group of students of color really is Asian-American students because they're the ones who are most likely the students that are most likely to find us. The students that are the ones that we see in greater number are students from Asian-American communities. The students of color who are Hispanic, and Native American, and African-American . . . we're recruiting them from high schools by providing them with information about who we are and what we're trying to do. Some of it involves some curricular things. Some of it is in scholarship opportunities. Some of it's in saying, "We really want you to participate in Honors as a way to enrich your experience at this institution; but, we don't want you to do it if you sacrifice your identity in a way that attends your racial background or your concerns. I think that awareness helps them see that we're trying to see them as whole people and not just one or the other. I think a lot of the students of color that we have really been working with the best are students who have come to us because some of their friends have said, "You really should go and get acquainted with some of the opportunities in Honors and some of the things that those advisers can help you with." We have a pretty good reputation with the students of color. It's a fine line between recruiting students of color because they're students of color and recruiting students who are students who are strong and that you want to encourage to be part of it as a way to recognize their ability and not put them in a category that says, "You are a student of color." That's a fairly complicated line to make.

CAC: Oh, you bet it is.

JW: I think we're better at that than a simple way of numbers counting would suggest. Personally, we've made commitments to being attentive to issues about multicultural students; and I think because it's not large numbers of students, we can be attentive individually to students in a way that probably wouldn't be true if we had a lot more students to deal with. One of the things that I think is the biggest challenge and the biggest opportunity that we have as a program is to identify ways to strengthen and provide some direction for doing that. Because we're primarily a white staff, the responsibility is that much greater on us to do that. I don't want it to be only something that we can do . . . it's the same business about only women can do Women's Studies.

CAC: Yes, yes.

JW: I don't want it to seem like the only way to do this is by having a staff of color. I think if the staff that you have is sensitive, and sophisticated, and knows how to make those issues, and relates to students in ways that respect those students, and doesn't categorize them, then whether you're white, or whether you're Hispanic, or whether you're African-American isn't such an issue with those students. You have to go one-on-one with students to do that. You have to prove your credentials every day.

CAC: When you have staff turnover or new advisers, it's part of your responsibility to socialize them?

JW: And to make that clear that we're not . . . It's not like there's a packaged way of doing any of it. It's just something you really have to be very attentive about in individualizing.

CAC: How much of your own job description involves training of staff persons here, and monitoring, and encouraging, and workshopping?

JW: A lot of what it is. A lot of what I do is really providing that kind of direction for the staff. Depending on what the experience of the staff is, it's more or less an ongoing activity. This year, my responsibilities are less because one of my senior advisers, who just finished her Ph.D. last year, is wanting some experience doing more supervisory things; so, I've turned over to her a lot of the responsibility for the student advisers. She wants to be able to build some experience with that.

CAC: Sure. You're empowering her.

JW: Giving her some of that access is part of where I think I'm effective as a leader with these students. It really does mean that I do it by example. I do it by coaching and encouraging. It's the long hard way! It's no simple solutions. The thing I think about being an administrator is that I admire people who can just issue orders and have them be the things that happen and think, I could get a lot more done if I could do that; but, I really am right in there one student at a time, one adviser at a time. I spend a lot of time paying attention to what's going on out here and putting myself in positions where I can model and direct it.

CAC: Do you stagger year-to-year with a one-year P & A appointment?

JW: Yes. It's one of those things which doesn't seem particularly threatening to me anymore. I started out years ago having a quarter-time, one-quarter appointment in Women's Studies that lasted for almost ten years. These jobs that I've been doing since then have all been one-year appointments; but, if it seems like that's not a job that needs to be done or that I shouldn't be doing it, then it's not going to be there. My levels of job security are not attached to knowing that the institution has an obligation to me. It's knowing that the work I'm doing is meaningful and valuable and that that's something that I'll continue to do. If it isn't, then it won't matter.

CAC: This might be another model for tenure . . . as you're describing it.

JW: When I talk to my colleagues who get really worked up about this annual appointment business . . . Knowing I can do this forever in some kind of abstract way is not what's keeping me doing this job. It's really the fact that every year I make a commitment to saying, is there something you can still do in this job that's meaningful for you and that helps what's going on here? I'm very deliberate about that. Roger Page is the person who tells me, almost every week, that you have to make these choices deliberately.

CAC: Ahhh.

JW: You can't just drift into this kind of life. He brings me ads from the *Chronicle [of Higher Education]* and says, "Are you looking? Make these choices deliberately. You do this."

CAC: He continues in retirement to mentor you?

JW: You bet he does! You bet he does!

CAC: How wonderful.

JW: In fact, he's out there waiting for me to have lunch with me. He's someone I see fairly regularly.

CAC: We shouldn't keep him waiting. I have one irreverent question though.

JW: [laughter]

CAC: I circled it. I see that you gave a paper once on "Is [unclear] a Feminist Novel?"

JW: Indeed, indeed!

CAC: [laughter]

JW: Yes, it was quite wonderful, very lively. I think it's a piece of junk and no, it isn't a feminist novel. Other people think it is.

CAC: It's a declaration of women's sexuality and the claiming of . . .

JW: It's claiming a behavior that's really replicating boy behavior. Sexuality is conquering in a way that I think isn't really part of the way most women define their sexuality; so, it's saying that women can go out and put notches on a gun just as much as men can and that doesn't seem like it's making a very strong statement about women's sexuality—but . . . [gasp] [laughter]

CAC: It's a frivolous questions but it leads really to a more important one. Are we holding Roger up?

JW: No, he's fine. He's waiting out there.

CAC: All right. I think we have maybe five or seven minutes, no more than that. One of the expectations that some persons had in the, oh, let's say, the 1970s and into 1980s was that there might develop, might evolve over time, a feminist or a woman's model of management and administration. I'm an outsider, you understand. Do you think that can be defined? If so, the way you've been talking about your career . . . has that been in some implicit way a feminist strategy or philosophy managing?

JW: Oh, boy. I think the patterns about what it means to be successful and what it means to be effective can be very different if what you do is put aside some linear sense that you're getting a model that's moving you from *A* to *B* and that's going up this hierarchy, and the more power you get and the more status you get . . . that approach is being challenged. Some of us have really defined a different pattern for doing that. The levels of satisfaction and the levels of engagement with that are offering students different models. They are offering, certainly, my younger colleagues different models for having careers and being successful. There's a couple of books by a woman who is an anthropologist, the daughter of Margaret Mead, Mary Catherine Bateson. Do you know who she is? She's written two books that both address this. One is called *Composing a Life*, which uses a model of career development that's like jazz improvisation. What you're doing is creating some patterns that take advantage of different skills at different times. The most recent one is a book called *Peripheral Visions*, which is saying that instead of focusing always right here, you have to pay attention to all these other things. I'm very aware that some of these things have been absorbed as part of an institutional design, or a pedagogical technique, a way of thinking administratively. When you look at some of the models for the way that work gets done, there are many more models than there used to be. I was part of a total quality management group that existed a couple years ago. This right out of the heavy duty marketing management stuff, right? They're using all this feminist stuff. It's all the stuff about collaboration, and talking, and building relationships with people. I thought, wow! I better get into this more fully. It didn't seem to me that what they were saying was that remarkable, except that the context in which they were saying it seemed astonishing to me . . . that this was about making money. and being productive, and managing. It was quite remarkable.

CAC: Have you found that model within the university? Have you found women administrators who have a different model, a different style, a different strategy for managing?

JW: Yes, I think some. I think some are very good at it. Some aren't.

CAC: Within this university, who is pulling it off well?

JW: Who has pulled it off well? I think Sara Evans pulls it off well. I think Janet Spector pulls it off well. I think Carol Carrier pulls it off well. I think that if Shirley Clark had been here longer, she would have been somebody who could have done that in a way that would have been more engaging. I don't think that Anne Hopkins does it so well. I think she's used a different model and I don't think it's given her the kind of support she could have had.

CAC: Do you think there are men who can use this model?

JW: I do think there are. I don't know as fully how that works. I know that my colleagues who are in student services have some of those skills as models. The people that I know who run programs that are the support programs in colleges . . . Earl Nolting in CE & E [Continuing Education and Extension] is pretty good at this kind of a collaborative approach and really gives

lots of power to his staff about doing things and does it in a consultative way. Central Administration . . .

CAC: It's harder to pull off . .

JW: It's harder to see and harder to make happen. I think Peter Reed does some of that. He seems pretty collaborative to me in the way he does some of that. I don't really see that in departmental ways. Craig Swan was a genius at it.

CAC: [whispered] Ahhh.

JW: He is just brilliant at that and he's the economist! He's running one of the most male departments in this college. Boy! was he good at that. He was very, very good at that. I really thought he should have been dean. He could do that. He really tuned in.

CAC: And Roger Page before all this thing broke. He goes back to the 1950s. He really was anticipating some of these things, in my judgment.

JW: Absolutely, absolutely. He really gets it. One of my favorite stories . . . he tells about the way that he saw the students in this building and how they would use this building in relationship to the dean's offices was to make sure that there was this office up on the second floor where all the students had to go because that's where the deans were and the deans had to see the students and be . . . This man gets it. It's just spacial almost to say that you had to not separate this administrative staff from where the students were. You're right, he does get it.

CAC: You and I have covered a lot of pretty basic things the last two and a half hours.

JW: [laughter] Boy! it's fun talking to you.

CAC: At this point, I often say, "Are there any further reflections?"

JW: [laughter]

CAC: I asked that of one person and the next morning I got a full page memorandum of things we hadn't talked about and he'd like to come back.

JW: Wow! It's fun to think about it in a long picture.

CAC: In a reflective way, right.

JW: Yes. There's not a way to do that very frequently.

CAC: If you'd like to come back, write me a memo, write me a note. This has been extraordinary and I thank you very much.

JW: It was my pleasure. It's just been delightful to talk to you, just delightful.

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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