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Hello Don Schliesman. I wonder if you would tell us a little bit about your background before you came to Central, and then tell us about all your many roles on campus when you got here.

DS: I’d be happy to. Perhaps we could start with graduation from high school in 1948, when I was 16. Uh – at that time – I came from a family that was not well to do. There were six kids in the family. My older brother was already in college, my sister was in college, so there was no money for me to go to school. Fortunately that year we had a Superintendent who was a former Dean of Faculty at Huron College in South Dakota, and he called each of the graduating seniors, of which there were only eighteen of us, down to his office to talk about what are you going to do after you graduate. Well, when he got me to the office I told him I didn’t know what I was going to do. I’d probably get a job working in Dad’s lumberyard, or someplace else in town. He said, “Well I think you ought to go to school. I think you ought to go on to college.” I said, “Dr. Plocky, we don’t have any money to go to school.” He said, “Well why don’t you go up to Northern?” - at that time, Northern State Teacher’s College in Aberdeen, South Dakota – “And take their ten-week summer session, and start teaching in a country school.” And he said, “Save your money, and then you can go to school full-time.” Which I ended up doing.

So I started teaching in a country school in the fall of 1948, when I was sixteen years old. And it was a school that had, like 12 students in six grades – you know, that kind of thing. It was $180 a month on an eight-month contract. Uh – well the second year I taught again in a country school, only much – uh, quite a promotion. It was – it was only six kids in a school that had – well, it was $200 a month for a nine month contract, and it had a full basement, it had a furnace, it had hot [sounds like “lunch”] stove and indoor toilets – all of those things that were desirable. It even had an organ that I could play, and so we had a Christmas program. Anyhow – so then – um – then – by then I’d saved enough money to go on to college full time, which I continued to do, then, at Northern.

And then the draft board sent me a notice in the summer of 1951, and said “If you’re not in the military by your birthday in September,” – uh – ”you will – we will be drafting you in the Army.” So I enlisted – so I enlisted in the Air Force. And in the Air Force for four years I was what was called an academic instructor. And I worked in an academic instructor training school in – at Lackland – Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, and then later at Parks Air Force Base in California. And for four years, that’s what I did. I was supervising – uh – young men who were preparing to teach academic programs in basic training programs, and I – I would go into the classroom and observe their teaching, and then meet with them afterwards and talk about how things were going, and those kinds of things.

Well then – um – then I – uh, when my four-year enlistment was up, I went back to school at Aberdeen, finished the Bachelor’s degree, and went right on to a Master’s degree at Northern Colorado University at Greeley. And when I was in – during – in the, uh, early spring of 1957 I had a call from the placement office at Greeley ask – telling me that they had just received a notice of an opening at Central Washington College of Education in Ellensburg as a Supervisor of Student Teachers in Yakima. At that time Central was running resident supervisors in the various centers around the state, as they still do in some areas, I
guess. And so – uh – he said, “Come over to the office. We’ll talk about it,” which I did do. And so we talked about it, and he said, “Let’s send your connections out and see what happens.”

Well, we did, and about four or five days later I had a call from the President, Dr. McConnell, and he offered me the job. And – and – and – and I was really kind of – I was really surprised. I had agreed to go to Palm Springs, California to teach at a junior high school, orally – I mean an oral agreement. That later was – after an interview, they would sign a contract. In California, at that time, they were requiring a personal interview before any contracts were signed, and so I had agreed to do it. Well, then I had to break that agreement because I decided to come to Central. And uh, Dr. McConnell – so he offered me an associate professorship at $5400 a year for the nine months, and then one-ninth of that salary for something called September Experience. I had no idea what that was, so I said to the Doctor, “What is September Experience? I’ve never heard of that.” And so he explained it to me a little, and then he said, “Now,” he said, “I’m sure you’ll be going on for an – for the advanced degree – for the Doctorate, won’t you?” And I said, “Oh yes!” even though I had, at that point, no intention of doing that at all. And so I said, “Oh yes.”

Well, so he sent a contract, and I signed it and sent it back, and then I started supervising student teachers in Yakima at Central in the fall of 1957 – and – as an associate professor, and I was in Yakima for three years – four years – actually, three and a half – uh, each summer going back to school at Greeley, my wife and I. And uh – then I took the full year off – uh – of the year of 1960-61, and completed the Doctoral program at Greeley. Uh, and uh, I then – then I was asked to go to Wenatchee, and they – we were expanding in Wenatchee to take in East Wenatchee and Cashmere. And so I went to East Wenatchee, and they hired a second person up there, and so – uh – I was supposed to be directing that center, and develop those two other areas outside of Wenatchee, which we did do.

Then I received a call from Dr. Crum – Wes Crum – who was, at that time, our Dean of Faculty here. Uh, and he said, “I want to come to Wenatchee and talk with you about something.” I said, “Okay, fine.” And I thought, oh my God, I must be in trouble of some kind. I must have done something really bad. Well what he came over to see is if I would come to campus as Assistant Dean of Education. And so I agreed to do that, and started, then, the summer of 1965 on campus as Assistant Dean of Education, working with Wes who was, at that time, the Dean of Education. They were making a change on the campus then – uh, uh – Charles McCann, who had been a former Chair of the English Department and then was taken into the President’s office, and then was made – uh, I think we still called him Dean of Faculty, at that time. I’m not sure. We might have moved to Vice President of Academic Affairs. Anyhow, they were splitting the departments into two groups. They had a Dean of Education, and a Dean of Arts and Sciences, and they just split the departments down the middle, half of the faculty going one way and half in the other, which really made very little sense except that it was a way of managing. So that’s what they did, and that was a temporary arrangement for a few years.

Anyhow, I did that, and then became Associate Dean of Education a few years later, and then, when Ed Harrington came as Vice President of Academic Affairs, he – uh, he – Dr. Brooks made some more changes in the academic administration and developed a position called Dean of Undergraduate Studies. And so Ed asked if I would apply for that, and frankly I was a little reluctant, because I have – I hold an EdD, and I know that there are people on campus who have PhDs, and I thought that people wouldn’t – wouldn’t go on that. Well then – and then - and they had I don’t know how many applications. I never did ask Dr. [inaudible, sounds like “Andy”], but anyhow, he offered me the job, and I made that point to him. I said, “Gosh, Ed, you know, I don’t – I don’t have a PhD.” He said, “Let me worry about that.” And that took care of that. So I was, then, Dean of Undergraduate Studies for quite a few years.

KB: And so that was a new post on campus.

DS: That was a new post – a new post on campus.

KB: And how was it defined? What was this –
DS: It was defined – uh – first of all, there were a number of programs that they had reporting to it, like International Programs, Academic Skills Center, the General Ed program, as a part of the Bachelor’s degree program, then – I – I – I can’t remember. There were some others, also. But the main thing he wanted me to do was help develop programs. Particularly interdisciplinary, interdepartmental programs, because little of that was happening. You know, departments felt they wanted programs in their area, and they really weren’t much interested in – one of the first ones we worked on was Law and Justice, and that program reported to me for. I don’t know, like, three years or four years, something like that, as it was developing, and Bob Jacobs was the first Director of that program. Did an excellent job. Really a great job.

Interesting thing about Bob – uh – Bob had a full beard, and was kind of hippie looking. Well, not really hippie, but kind of. Well we were going around the state, meeting with these Law and Justice people – I mean these law enforcement people, and I tell you, they would raise their eyebrows and look askance at him, and it happened a number of times, and I really got a charge out of that because it didn’t take long and they really warmed up to him, because Bob had a very nice way of talking with these people, and – and did a great job. Actually, he really did a fine job of developing that program. It’s become one of our – one of our – uh, uh, you know – major programs in terms of enrollment. Offered in a number of centers. And – and – those kinds of things. We uh, we then – we were experiencing some enrollment difficulties.

KB: What years are you talking about now?

DS: Now I’m talking about – um –

KB: Is this early Seventies?

DS: It must have been early Seventies – mmmm – early to mid-Seventies. So Ed came to me and asked if I would develop an extended degree program proposal that we could take to the Dean’s Council and to the Faculty Senate. The Dean’s Council was a group of Deans reporting to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Those people that reported to him – Graduate Dean, Undergraduate Dean, and the Dean of School – the School Deans. Uh, and so I did develop that proposal, and uh, we took it to the – uh, uh, - the Dean’s Council, and they made a few suggestions, and we made some changes, and then we took it to the Faculty Senate, and it was finally approved by the Faculty Senate, although I have to say it was not endorsed enthusiastically by the Faculty Senate. A couple of the Senators. But a number of the Senators were very reluctant to start taking programs off campus. They wanted to call it an extension degree, and we didn’t want an extension degree because we’re not going to consider offering it to the correspondence extension program. Rather, we were thinking of it as a degree that would be offered by the department on an extended basis. That was the concept. And – and – we went ahead with it. The faculty then approved it, we took it to the Board of Trustees and they approved, and I think one of the first programs we offered in that was Law and Justice, as I recall. That was the beginning of the Centers. Uh – where we now have what – five, or whatever it is. And beautiful buildings. I don’t know, Karen, whether you’ve seen those buildings – like the one in Lynnwood?

KB: Yes.

DS: Gosh that’s a beauty. I haven’t seen the one at Highline. I’d like to get over and see that one. I’ve seen the one in Yakima, the one in Lynnwood, and then we had the one at Highline, and I thought I heard the President say the other day that they’re now working on another one right in Wenatchee.

KB: I think so.

DS: Is that what it is? Really? As a separate building? Gees, great! Anyhow, that concept of cooperatively building a building was a very interesting one in development. Uh, the President of Edmonds Community College was the first one that I heard pushing it. That program reported to me for a
number of years. Uh, although we were running it through our – uh, our, our – office of – what did we call it at that time?

KB: Continuing Ed?

DS: Continuing Ed! And the reason we did that, Karen, is because we already had the – the – the uh, arrangements there. We were running a very successful Continuing Ed program around the state, and so we had people in place, we had – we had the facility, we had operating procedures, and all of that. So we just went ahead and ran it through that until we – we needed to have the credit hours in order to justify the budget that it would be given. And so we made a stretch from running it through Continuing Ed to running it right directly out of the departments. And – and that was a major change in that program, and I think one of the reasons that our Director of Continuing Ed at that time left. She was very upset about that, and – what she saw happening was – the funds that were being generated from that program were now going to the University general fund, rather than into Continuing Ed.

KB: Could you clarify the difference – uh – in Central’s mind between the Continuing Ed offerings and these extension degrees?

DS: Right. Right. First of all, one of the major – major ideas was that – uh – we didn’t want a degree that was being offered through Continuing Ed because we thought that that degree on many campuses was thought of as a secondary type degree, and not of the quality of those offered by regular department faculty on the campus. And so we said, “But we’ve got to – we’ve got to tap into an enrollment that’s not here, and the enrollment is on the west side.” And so – so – so what we pushed forward, then, was the concept of offering our regular courses with our regular faculty, but rather than on the campus at Ellensburg, we’ll do it in this facility at Edmonds Community College. That was – that was the major underlying difference between those two.

KB: So these professors were commuting?

DS: They were. And then we began to employ resident faculty in those areas, and the first area to do that was Business. The Dean moved – he – over the serious objection of a number of his faculty – he moved, and established the – the – the – the Business program in – in – at Edmonds. And it was primarily in Accounting. And uh – I remember – his name was Dean Ball, and I remember he took some serious criticism from faculty about that, because they didn’t want to – they didn’t want to have faculty – you know, the Chairman didn’t want to have faculty here and over there both, but that’s what – that’s what happened.

KB: I see. So Continuing Ed was offering what kinds of courses at the same time?

DS: They were offering courses that – that were in demand out of the area. Primarily Education course – Teacher Education course – Teacher Education program – program courses. A few of the others, but not a lot. Mostly – uh – mostly courses with the Ed prefix.

KB: Okay.

DS: And at that time we had just – we just had an Ed Department. We didn’t have – I guess they’re back now to one department, huh? You know, they split for a number of years there.

KB: And these were also in Edmonds, or?

DS: They were all over the state, Karen. All over the state. Uh – really, uh – we were running them all the way from the Canadian border, to the Oregon border, to the ocean on the West – probably the biggest Continuing Ed program in the state was offered by Central.
DS: Both. Both. And some were – in the extended degree program we were hiring some adjuncts, also. But those adjuncts – we were pretty careful about those. Those adjuncts had to – had to be approved by the faculty in the department that was offering the program, just like – as if they were being hired to teach here on the campus.

DS: Well, that’s – anyhow – I can’t remember. I uh – during the time I was Dean of Undergraduate Studies – uh – I worked with Dr. Harrington most of the time, who – who – I don’t know whether you’ll get him to talk with you or not. Did you?

DS: Oh, I just – I – I have – I have tremendous respect for Ed Harrington. Ed came to us from San Jose State, where he was Dean of Undergraduate Studies. That’s where he got the idea of that position, and it was a fairly common position in California at that time. Uh – and since then that kind of position, around the nation, has developed as Dean of General Studies, and things like that. But Ed – Ed – uh – he came as a Biologist, and he came as Vice President of Academic Affairs under Dr. Brooks. And, uh –

DS: That’s right. He went as President to Evergreen. Charlie is a very interesting guy, and I – I – I – I liked working for him, also. He was very good. Anyhow, Ed – Ed came, and uh, and at the time Ed came I was Associate Dean of Education. And uh – he was the one that encouraged me to apply for, and then – and then – uh, and then selected me as Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Um – Ed was, uh – a no-nonsense kind of person. He was very concerned about the University, he was very concerned about faculty, he was very concerned about students, he was very concerned about programs – in other words, he was very serious about his job, and I think you’ll see that when you interview him. He’s a very serious man. Not a lot of humor. In fact, he picked up a – he picked up a nickel – nickname, one time called Chuckles, because there wasn’t a lot of humor there, but the nickname Chuckles. Ed lived this institution – uh – through some of the most serious problems in terms of enrollment – uh – and – and reduction in faculty. We went through some budget cuts – uh – that uh – that were pretty serious, and Ed was in the Provost, and primarily responsible for dealing with the faculty. Even though President Garrity and President Brooks were there, it was Ed who had to do much of the dirty work – that is, meeting with the faculty, and meeting with the Deans, and meeting with department chairs and saying “We’re going to cut here, and we’re going to cut there, and we’re going to cut here,” which is not an easy thing to do. So I have tremendous respect for the way he handled that over the years.

DS: Oh right, and he went to Evergreen.

DS: Yes, he’s going to.

DS: You are lucky! You are lucky that he’ll – he’ll do that because there is a man – he will tell you the time of day, the day of the week, the week of the year, and the month that whatever happened. Just phenomenal!

DS: Well tell me about his leadership. What –

DS: McCann.

DS: Who had preceded him? Who had been Vice President of Academic Affairs?

DS: Oh right, and he went to Evergreen.

DS: Who had preceded him? Who had been Vice President of Academic Affairs?

DS: Who had preceded him? Who had been Vice President of Academic Affairs?

DS: Who had preceded him? Who had been Vice President of Academic Affairs?

DS: Who had preceded him? Who had been Vice President of Academic Affairs?
DS: He made a few changes after McCann. We – we – we uh – we released two Deans. Now I’m not sure, Karen, of the relationship between Ed Harrington and Jim Brooks at that time – whether this was primarily Ed Harrington’s initiative, or Dr. Brooks’ initiative. But we released the Dean of Arts and Sciences, Neil Gillam, and we released the Dean of Education, John Greene, and Ed had to handle both of those. Then we also – yes, we did make some changes. Then we developed some other schools. We then – we then developed, you know, the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the School of Arts and Humanities, and so forth. Uh – and of course Ed was very instrumental in employing faculty – in employing the leadership of the faculty – uh – he played a tremendously important role in those whole years there of about, what, eighteen years, or seventeen, or however long he was Provost.

And I would say that – that when – when Dr. Garrity came – Ed was Provost when Dr. Garrity came, and it was my impression that Ed was not very supportive of Don Garrity in his candidacy for the Presidency. Ed was sort of pushing the Provost from Eastern. Uh – Ed knew Dr. Garrity from their work in California, and so Dr. Garrity – however, Dr. Garrity was named President, and I think there was some friction there for a while. Now it was not very obvious, because Ed Harrington used this technique: he would – if he had a difference of opinion about what ought to happen he would go into Dr. Garrity’s office, close the door, and they’d talk it out. And he would come out, and they would – he would either support the position, or the position would be changed. And that’s how he operated all the time. He did not bad mouth people, like some of our subsequent Provosts did. He did not badmouth people behind their back. He was very supportive, and as a result, Karen, they developed a very close working relationship, to the point where I was sitting on the stage at commencement when Don Garrity was announcing to the audience that this was Ed Harrington’s last commencement. Tears came down Don Garrity’s face. And Ed didn’t see that, but I was telling Ed about it later, and he was really moved by that. But that’s the close relationship that developed because – because of their work. They would go into the office, and they would talk over things, and I know there were times when they have very difference of opinion about how to handle things, but they worked them out behind closed doors.

KB: Okay.

DS: And they came out – when they came out in front of the Board of Trustees, or in front of faculty, or in front of the Dean, or whatever, they had a unified front. You never saw an obvious difference in positions.

KB: Well now, when Harrington left and Edington became the new Provost –

DS: Yes.

KB: Uh, the team was different, and you, I suppose, had a vantage point in this, from –

DS: I did. I was asked, along with Owen Pratts – Professor Pratts from Psychology – to make the trip back to New England to interview Bob uh – uh – Edington. Okay? And also I’ve got down we interviewed the Dean that came as – uh – Dean of Continuing Ed. But anyhow, we interviewed Bob Edington. We spent a night in his home back there. I take that back. We were there for dinner. We spent the night at the motel. We – we went around the campus, we met with a lot of people, and when we came back, we gave our recommendation to Dr. Garrity. And there were several candidates at that time. He ended up selecting Bob Edington, which turned out not to be a very good situation.

KB: I take it it wasn’t your top choice.

DS: Uh – I – my position was – we had a candidate from California at that time who I thought was very impressive, and – and so my recommendation to Dr. Garrity was I thought that the guy from California ought to get first choice, and maybe Edington second choice. Now I don’t know what happened – whether Garrity decided not to do that, or whether he offered it and was turned down – was turned down – or I don’t – anyhow, we ended up with – with Edington.
And Edington, I think would have been all right, Karen, except that back in Pennsylvania he was at an institution that was highly unionized – really highly unionized to the point that – that as Provost he communicated with the faculty through the faculty representatives – union representatives. Not with the Deans, not with the Chairs, not with the faculty direct, but through the union representative, which I just – my mouth just went, wuh! One time I – I prepared a memo of some kind. I’ve forgotten what it was. It was something to go out to the faculty. And I ran it by him so that he would know what was going on, and he wrote in the side of the margins just, “Don, don’t you know that you shouldn’t be talking directly to faculty? That you should go through the Deans and the Chair?” And I thought, “My God, Bob, that’s not how we operate at Central. If we want to talk to faculty, we’re going to talk to the faculty!” You know? Now I recognize there are formal lines of communication, but my God, you know, [inaudible].

Anyhow, that got him into real trouble here right away, because he came with that – that mindset of real schism between faculty and administration, and frankly, we weren’t at that point, and I hope never get to that point, although I – I – I fear now. But I – I – I – I hope that we never get to that point.

KB: Okay.

DS: Most administrators are faculty, and many faculty are damned good administrators. It’s just that they happen to choose to do this, or do that.

KB: Well I’d like to talk more about the Garrity years, but while we’re on the topic of Presidential leadership maybe we could back up a moment, and you could give me some impressions about McConnell and Brooks.

DS: McConnell – let me begin at McConnell. He was – he was – uh, uh, to me, very cordial. I did not have much experience working with Dr. McConnell. Very little experience, as a matter of fact. I’ve met with him right aft – he employed me on the telephone. I didn’t interview – I didn’t come to the campus. It was done over the telephone. But when I came, then, I met with him and we visited for a while, and what he talked about mostly was what I would be doing in Yakima supervising student teachers, and that kind of thing. That’s what our conversation was about. And – and – you know, there were lots of rumors around campus about how he operated, but I never experienced those things with him. My experience with him was fairly short, because he left a year or two later, whatever it was, when he took the job in San Francisco. But you know, he had a reputation of being the Great White Father, and that – you know – in order to use a paper clip you had to get his permission, and you know – all of that kind of stuff. Well it is true, we were a very small institution then, and – and – and of course, he controlled a lot of things. I guess – I guess he was a highly controlling kind of administration. For example, we had one automobile at that time – the institution – and now they have, what? Forty, or fifty, or whatever it is over there? They had one automobile, and he – he controlled the keys of that automobile. The President did! Anyhow, uh –

KB: I got the feeling that he wore out his welcome, even though he had been here for so long.

DS: I suspect something like that happened, although I was not on the inside here at that time. I was – you know – a young fellow, a bachelor down in Yakima supervising student teachers and living a good life.

KB: Were you actually living in Yakima?

DS: Yeah, yeah.

KB: And then in Wenatchee?

DS: Mm-hmm.

KB: I see. So you didn’t actually move to campus till your job –
DS: Till '65, that's right. That's right. Came to campus a lot, but no, I was resident – a resident out there. And as a matter of fact, my wife was a member of the first group of students I had as student teachers. She was back earning a second degree, and uh – in English, and uh, then we were married, and then she taught English in Yakima and in Everett. Anyhow, uh – so my relationship with uh, with uh, McConnell was not extensive nor long.

But with Dr. Brooks, oh, I can remember so well when he came to campus as a young, 36 year old, crew cut – really it was – it was – it was great to see him come in, because he represented youth. And I think that there were a few people – a few members of faculty who sort of resented that, and I know there was at least one who thought he would end up being President but was not. But anyhow, Jim Brooks came in with a crew cut, and uh – and uh – Jim – Jim – we had an interim President, Perry Mitchell.

KB: Tell me about him.

DS: Oh my. Well Perry was like Registrar, and they named him – just imagine – they named him interim President from Registrar position, and I just thought – I could hardly believe that. His – his – his leadership – again, I was still off campus then, so it wasn’t as though – I did – I remember going to one meeting in group conference center that uh – that uh, uh, Perry –
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DS: And when it got down to talking about – I don’t know – paper clips, or scotch tape, or something, this one faculty member [inaudible] got up and said, “This is ludicrous!” and he just walked out of the room. Well that’s, I think, the kind of – that represents the kind of thinking of a lot of faculty toward that man at that time. They thought he was a fine Registrar, but he wasn’t somebody to be President. Anyhow, Jim Brooks came in, and when he came in, he did a wise thing, I think. He asked Perry Mitchell to stay on as Assistant to the President for six months while he became acquainted with the faculty and the institution. And that allowed Jim, then, to be free of all of those appointments and things that the President’s called on to do, so that he could – he could become acquainted with the faculty, academic program, and the campus – all the rest of the people. And I thought that was a really smart move on his part.

Jim – I think – Jim also led this institution during some – during some uh – really, uh – growth times. Really fantastic growth, not only in enrollment, but in faculty, and in academic program, and in facilities. You know, it really – it – when one stops and thinks, and looks back at that, that was – that was really – there was a lot of things on his plate as President that he had to handle, and it was – I think he did a good job with them.

KB: I’m told that during the end of the McConnell years, before there was funding for new buildings, that the veterans really filled the campus, and that buildings were deteriorating. Is it true that the –

DS: I think that’s true. But we also had a number of temporary buildings at that time that should have been deteriorating, you know – should have been – like the one across the street here ought to be razed any day. It ought to [inaudible]. But anyhow, we had some of those, and so that’s true. But we also had Barge, and we had Lind Hall, and we had Shaw-Smyser, and so – and those are good, sturdy, good buildings, you know? So there was that mix, that’s true.

Now Jim – Jim’s – Jim, uh, as you probably know, is [was?] quite popular as a President around the state. He served on a number of committees that were appointed by the Governor. As a matter of fact, when we – our first female Governor –

KB: Dixie?
DS: [When] Dixie threw out the Board of Trustees and the President at Yakima Valley College, she named Jim as President. That’s after he was out of the President’s office here. Now he was – and Ed Tumis is – uh – I think – I think – and I think – and I think, Karen, that after he got out of the Presidency, I think he was a very good faculty member. It’s my impression that he was one of the best faculty members in the Department of Geography. He took the job of teaching Geography very seriously, and did a – and I think he was well respected by the students, and liked. But he did – he did – he did reach the point where some of the faculty were resenting him as President. Uh, there was a call for a vote of confidence for him in the Faculty Senate.

KB: Why?

DS: I – I think that – I think that it was primarily because over the years Jim had to say no to – too many times, to people. You know, you can only do that – you can only get – a leadership like that, it seems to me you can only do that so many times before you lose the support of so many – a – a – a sufficient number of people that you lose your job.

KB: But I thought that the funding was pretty generous, the growth and expansion – what would you say no to?

DS: Some promotions. Some – um – um – uh – uh – uh – merit raises – uh, some people who wanted to create programs that were inappropriate, some who wanted to divide up departments – a number of things like this were going on.

KB: And your vantage point at this point was what? What was your title during the Brooks era?

DS: Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

KB: You are. Okay, Okay.

DS: Uh – Helmi Habib was the man who made the pitch in the Faculty Senate – I was there that day, when they called for a vote of confidence – but the Senate did not. It was the AFT that was calling for it. And it was – the Faculty Senate did not – did not react positively to it. But Jim was smart enough – this was my perception, now, okay? Jim was smart enough to know that the handwriting was on the wall. And so shortly thereafter he submitted a letter of resignation eighteen months down the road, which was a wise – on his part – a wise thing to do.

KB: Why?

DS: Because he was able to finish out the year. He was able to finish those initiatives that he had started before he got kicked out. That’s not a very nice way of saying it, but – but –

KB: And what was Helmi Habib’s role in this?

DS: Helmi at that time was a – he was a Chemist, and he was in the AFT.

KB: Okay. So he was pro-union.

DS: At that point.

KB: What a – What about the union story in those early years? We’ve just – uh –
DS: Yeah, yeah – there were initiatives – several initiatives along the way, but not successful. By and large the faculty – most of the faculty did not support it. It wasn’t until more recently that there was support among the faculty for a union.

KB: Did Brooks, then, uh – oppose a union?

DS: Yes. As did Jeri [McIntyre].

KB: Okay.

DS: As did Ed Harrington. I did, too. I – you know, it seemed to me – what I saw happen in Pennsylvania between the – the relationship between faculty and administration – I thought that’s something we did not want.

KB: Well let’s hope it doesn’t happen here. The union contract is about to be announced.

DS: I hope not. I saw in the paper where they – they reached agreement. I’m glad to hear that. But Gees, I hope that it doesn’t get to the point where we can’t even talk to one another. That’s ridiculous! That’s just ridiculous, it seems to me. You know, it – it – well – if you talk about collegiality, what kind of collegiality is that? That’s not!

KB: Well, let’s – um – okay –

DS: I don’t know where you stand on all that, but I’m – I’m just spouting my opinion about things.

KB: Sure. Sure. Early in the Brooks administration, I guess, there was quite a hot controversy over Gus Hall, communist leader coming to speak on campus.

DS: Yes, yes, that’s right. That was scheduled, and I remember this was in February of 1962. Uh – there was a group of us going to Wenatchee: Perry Mitchell, Jim Brooks, Ralph Christensen, Rayne Oakland, and myself. At that time I was supervising student teachers in Yakima, and the reason I was invited to go is because on the way they were going to try to talk me into going to Wenatchee as supervisor of that Center. And they wanted me to meet the Superintendents, and that kind of thing. Well. I thought – but – but – but the primary purpose of going over was that Brooks was going to be speaking to the Rotary Club. He was making a presentation over there. Uh, outside of town, east of town, at Saddle – Saddle whatever it’s called – Saddle mountain, or whatever, we rolled the car over. New car. A new truck. Perry was driving. I was in the middle of the back seat with Early [??] on one side and Gustafson on the other. Jim was in the passenger seat, and Perry driving, and we hit ice. And he wasn’t driving very fast. I don’t think Perry was driving 40 miles an hour, but we hit that ice, and he slammed on the brakes and went right toward – the car, instead of going down the road went right toward the ditch, and the ditch was probably that deep, and about that wide – deep enough so that the car did a flip. I mean, we went all the way over and came back on the wheels.

On that trip, before we got there, Jim was very excited. He had been on TV in Yakima that day talking about why he canceled Gus Hall’s talk. And I’ll never forget that, because he was so excited – you know, hoping that he did the right thing, and defending his decision, and all of that, and – so yes, he did. He said, “No, we’re not going to let him speak on – on this campus. This is State property, it’s not a private campus – this is State property, and he’s not going to come in and – and speak against the government of this country on State property.

KB: Well I understand that it polarized the community. That originally –
DS: I – I think that did. When you say community, you mean the campus? Because I don’t think so much outside of it, because – as you know, this – this community is pretty conservative, and I think he had tremendous support. I think he had support among the Board of Trustees, or he wouldn’t have done it. I think he had support – uh, of – of – of probably leadership in Olympia. I think he had generally, in this Eastern side of the state, there was great support for that decision. They didn’t want any Communist coming in here talking about that! I think on the faculty – right – where – where they’re more – where we’re a little more liberal, I think there were people who were very upset about that. Yes, I think so.

KB: Okay. Well, would you like to talk a little bit about Garrity’s leadership style?

DS: I will. Garrity and I were good friends. We golfed a lot together. Um – I – I – I would say that I think Garrity started off – uh – with a lot of support from the faculty, and other administrators and staff – uh – and certainly the Board of Trustees. I served on the screening committee, and I can remember clearly – we had a Board of Trustee member from Wenatchee, who has since died [sighs] – anyhow, I can remember when we were meeting in the Student Union building and we were talking about – of these candidates – the finalists, who had been here for interviews – which one should be offered the position – which one the committee would recommend to the Board of Trustees to offer a position. And the committee was – was – was very much in support of Don Garrity. And I can remember this board member saying, “Gosh,” she said, “What are we going to do if he doesn’t accept it?” So it was that kind of support that – that - that –

KB: What was attractive about him?

DS: I – I think that – uh – he came with some, uh – with a – with a very open and friendly kind of behavior. He – he – he was very easy to talk with, and he enjoyed talking. He enjoyed being with the faculty. Uh – and I think that – I think they saw in him an articulate – um – leader. And I think he – I think he did have a lot of support, and I think he lost that.

KB: Did he have qualities that Brooks did not have? Were they essentially similar in style?

DS: Uh – I think they were somewhat similar, although I think with Garrity – Garrity was probably a – um – Garrity was probably a little more informal, if that’s the right word. Not that Brooks was terribly formal. Dr. McConnell was quite formal, Brooks less so, Garrity even less so. It did – you know – Garrity would go around the campus and wanted to come in, sit down in your office, and “How are things going?” blah, blah, blah, and this kind of thing. And Jim Brooks may have done some of that, too. I doubt if McConnell ever did any of it, but – but Garrity – I think what – what happened to poor Don was that he lost support of the Board of Trustees – at least about four of those seven members – primarily because of his relationships in Olympia. Those legislators.

Don – Don, uh – as he – as he – as he stayed on, he became more and more bothered by people asking questions. It was interesting to watch this, Karen, because – for example, we had one Board of Trustee member who came from Moses Lake, who would come on the campus without telling Don, and that really bothered Don. “The Bastard! What’s he doing on this campus?” Uh – they – they – they – and the guy – you know, I don’t know what the guy was doing. He was just walking around the campus. He’d go in and talk with faculty, you know, but – but – but – those kinds of things really bothered him more and more as he stayed on the job. And I can remember – there’s a Senator from Vancouver who was – I think he was chair of the Senate Education Committee. Garrity was wanting – I’ve forgotten – something from the legislature. Whether it was – whether it was – whether it was the budget that he was requesting, or a building, or whatever it was, he was wanting something, and this guy was not supporting Garrity on it. And Garrity said – said – apparently said to him something like, “If you don’t support me on this, we’re going to jerk our student teaching center out of Vancouver.” And this guy really – it really made that guy mad. And Don did take it out. He closed the center down there.
And this guy – I remember after Don left, the guy was on the campus – we were in group center for meeting, and he said to me, “Hey whatever happened to that Ga-ratty, or whatever the hell his name was?” So, you know, that – things happened in Olympia between Don and legislators that bothered – bothered our Board of Trustee members. It bothered – one of our Board of Trustee members at that time was a political consultant – runs a – runs a company over in Seattle – Ron – and I think he was instrumental in bringing back to the board the kinds of reactions that – that Don – I think that – I think they began to think that he was ineffective because of that kind of behavior.

KB: If you were a friend of his – of Garrity’s, can you explain what his abruptness with legislators was about?

DS: Yeah. I think that – one of the things – I think that he, uh, probably was very comfortable in getting in his job, and beginning to think that he really shouldn’t be questioned about things. Uh – how – whatever you call that. Uh – and – and – I think – unknown to most of us, I think he was having – experiencing health problems. Cancer. He kept calling it back problems, but it turned out to be cancer, and it killed him.

I can remember hearing very clearly the day that he was canned – uh – my office was in – as his office was, in Bouillon, and there was a conference room in Bouillon. I was out doing something, and when I came back to the office I walked through the reception area, and there was Don, sitting in a chair. The board was meeting in the conference room, and he had – when I left, he was in there with them, and here he was sitting in a chair. And I looked at him, and he looked like he was a little boy sitting in the hallway. I mean, he really looked beat. I mean, he was almost crying, his face was hanging, and he was just – and I said, “What’s the matter?” And he said, “Oh, I’ll tell you later.” And he just pushed me off. And so I went into the office, and – and what had happened was they’d canned him.

And – and – there was a real misunderstanding between Don and the Board at that time. The Board apparently had told Don earlier they wanted him out by the end of the year, okay? Roz Woodhouse, of the Board. He thought they meant the end of the year. They meant the end of the calendar year. So the meeting – this was in December, and they said “We want you out at the end of this month.” He said, “What? You were talking about the end of the calendar year!” Because he had not announced anything. And they held to the end of the calendar year, and they booted him out, which I thought was just foul, awful! I think Roz Woodhouse and that crew, that – well, four of them. There were three of them. There were at least two that did not support that in their discussions, because one of them told me that later. But he said, “We had to show a unified front as a Board, so we agreed to – to get rid of him.”

KB: Well what’s the straw that broke the camel’s back?

DS: My perception is it came out of Olympia. I’m not sure.

KB: What did Edington’s departure have to do with it?

DS: Well Edington – well that one – there were some things that were happening on campus at the same time, and I think the Board thought that Don was losing control of some of that, because Edington – the whole Edington problem happened under that last year, year and a half of Don’s tenure. And we had a Dean of Students who was experiencing Alzheimer’s, and Don didn’t move on that. He was a good friend of Don’s, and Don just couldn’t – I think, just could not bring himself to move on that, and I think the Board didn’t like that. And the Board didn’t like the whole Edington affair. They thought that Don made a real mistake in appointing him, and he never should have been appointed, and he was not competent, and –

KB: There’s a perception on campus that Garrity was surrounded by a circle of good old boys who sort of did as they pleased. Including you.
DS: Well, probably – yeah. And that could very well be. Uh, you know, when you work with somebody as closely as we did, you become good friends – most of the time, not always, of course, but – but good friends. Um – uh, yeah, I uh – I think that uh – you know – that – that there were – there were a group of people, I think, that Don felt more comfortable with than with others, if that’s a decent way of saying it.

KB: Mm-hmm.

DS: There’s the whole Dean Nicholson affair that happened also under Garrity and all, and I think the Board got upset with that. So there were a number of these kind of things accumulating.

KB: How do you explain the Nicholson firing?

DS: I wish I – I’ve never read the correspondence on it, Karen, and I don’t know whether it’s available to you to read, or not. But if you read about it in the book – you probably ought to read that – uh – uh – [sighs] – um – God darn it! Our past – our Black President.

KB: Ivory Nelson?

DS: Ivory! Ivory was sitting in the office talking with me one day, and we got on a little bit of that, and he said, “Look Don,” he said, “I’ve gone back and I’ve read every piece of correspondence that dealt with that,” and he said that Garrity was justified in what happened. So I don’t really know the facts of the case. I can only give you my perception from the outside, and that was that – that – that Dean – uh – unknowingly did things that were a violation of policy and good business sense. For example, he ran the basketball camps, and he was depositing the proceeds from the basketball camp in an account down at the bank in his own name. He used money out of that to do a number of things like – he’d – he’d – he’d – you know, he got one of his players out of jail back in Washington DC because the kid was – stole a car and was heading across country and trying to bring it back. He put up some money out of there for his own kid to repair his car. You know, things like that. He was co-mingling. You cannot co-mingle State dollars with personal – we got rid of a faculty member of Music because of the same thing, you know? You just cannot do that.

And being – you know – he – he put – he – he’s not a – he’s not a malicious guy. He’s just a wonderful, wonderful person and a great coach, and it’s tragic that happened. But I understand that his lawyer told him – in Bouillon, in the conference room – he said, “I think if I were you, you’d better resign and get out of this before you get into more trouble.” He was not reporting any of that income to the IRS, and it was in the bank in his name. So in a way he was luck he got off, but he was so popular around that when that happened, it was just like – it was just like Garrity had taken him out and shot him. So I – I – as I say, I – I have not read the correspondence on it, so whether what I’m saying is – is what really happened, I don’t know for sure.

KB: So you – it sounds like you would guess that it’s an accumulation of problems that –

DS: With Don – I think so. You know, he came in very popular, and I think as the years went on these things just piled and piled to the point where the Board said “We’ve had it.”

KB: Mm-hmm. But it sounds like you feel his style evolved over time to grow shorter with – uh – some people he might have been responsive to?

DS: I – I think – I think that probably happened.

KB: What about the NCATE?
DS:  I –

KB:  I’m sorry. Go ahead.

DS:  I – I would say this – not for your book, but – I remember he called one time when he called one of the board members a little piss ant. Well, you know, if that’s your thinking of one of your bosses – uh – the what?

KB:  The NCATE?

DS:  Oh, NCATE! [Laughs] Um – I think that the problem that we had with NCATE were problems of our own making. Uh, you know, when you – when it – when – when a program undertakes an accreditation, they have to do a self-study, and a self-study should be a serious self-study, and it should involve everybody in that program – all the faculty in the program. Are we doing what we think we’re doing, and are we doing it well, and blah, blah, blah, blah, you know. There’s that whole self-study thing that needs to go on, and in the case of NCATE, and in a lot of others, it takes place for a year in advance. They did not do a good job of self-study. They did a very poor job of self-study. The Dean involved – the Dean released one faculty member to write the report.

KB:  That was Applegate?

DS:  Right. And he had Doris [sounds like “Jockey”] back writing the report. Uh – so that when the visiting team came, they perceived right off the bat that there was – there was no self-study that took place. You know – a lot of the faculty in the department didn’t even know what the hell was in the report. Well, the Chair of the department was not present when the visiting team came. Now you tell me how you expect to get an approved re-accreditation with that kind of thing happening. It was poorly conducted on our part – on our part – and I think we deserved what we got, even though it cost us in terms of public relations. And thank God for people like Libby Street and the gal in English.

KB:  Patsy Callaghan?

DS:  Patsy Callaghan. They’re the ones that pulled our – our –

KB:  Bacon out of the frying pan?

DS:  Yeah, out of the fire. That’s right. They did a great job, those two ladies, in developing, then, the whole – uh, the whole re-study of that program.

KB:  Now I understand in the records that you were visited in 1989 by the Northwest College in Higher Education Accreditation board. They left a list of recommendations that we probably should attend to. And I guess it’s a ten-year review. I’m wondering if they had done a visit ten years before, when Garrity was new and the University status had just arrived in 1977. Were you part of any of those, uh –

DS:  I really wasn’t very much involved in the Teacher Ed accreditation. I was involved in the University accreditation.

KB:  Right, that’s what I’m talking about. Yes. Right. I think – we were visited in ’89. Do you have any recollection? They talked about the need for greater diversity, greater communication, better marketing and media relations, um – no.

DS: I can’t bring much out of the old grey matter.

KB: Okay, all right. Well, now – what was your role on campus when Ivory Nelson arrived in the early Nineties?

DS: I was Interim Provost.

KB: Would you talk – that was in September, ’96? Is that right?

DS: Yes. I started in that when Don Garrity fired Bob Edington. Okay?

KB: Oh – really? Okay.

DS: Then Garrity came in and asked if I would be interim, and so I agreed to do that, and so I was there until Ivory named Tom Moore as the Provost.

KB: Okay. And then, when Tom Moore left –

DS: Incidentally, before we get to that, I should say – the Jim Pappas thing.

KB: Let’s – Okay.

DS: That – that – I was Interim Provost at the time, okay? And when Garrity got canned, he sat in my office and we talked a little about it, and he said, “Now Don,” he said, “The board will want to name an interim President,” and he said, “Are you interested in that?” And I said, “No.” And he said, “Well I’m glad to hear that, because,” he said, “I think we ought to ask, and we ought to have the board name Courtney Jones.” And I said, “I would support that.” Courtney was our Vice President for Business Affairs, and the reason I supported that is because he was well respected by the faculty, okay? But more than anything else, he had a good relationship with Olympia – not only the Office of Fiscal Management, but with legislators over there. So I thought, here would be the logical one on our campus to fill in for that brief period of time.

Uh, I was at home. I had a call from Roz Woodhouse, and she said, “Don,” she said, “The board will be meeting to talk about an interim presidency,” and she said, “Would you be interested in doing that?” And I said, “No.” I said, “I think you ought to name Courtney Jones,” and I said, “For these reasons,” and I talked about that. And she said, “Well thank you very much for that.” She said, “What would you think of Jim Pappas in that role?” And I said, “I think if you named Jim Pappas, you’d have a revolt among the faculty.”

KB: Why?

DS: Because I don’t think he got a lot of respect from the faculty as an academic – as an academician. As a – as a – as a – as a Director of – of – of uh, - as a Registrar, or a Director of Admissions, great. But as an academician? Anyhow, she said, “Well thank you very much for that,” and I got up the next day, or two days later, and they named Jim Pappas. And that also was a controversial thing among the Board, as one of the Board members told me, so.

KB: Well why did you decline?
DS: Because I thought Courtney Jones would do a better job. I didn’t have a relationship with the legislature like Courtney did, or with the Budget Office, and I thought, my God, here’s a guy – he knows the budgets backwards and forwards, and he’s been the Business Manager here for – I don’t know how many years. And it just seemed to me that – that – that that was important for us. We were not into a lot of developing of academic programs at that time, and my God, you know, faculty and Chairs and Deans could run their programs. They don’t need to have a academician sitting in the President’s office. It’s nice if they do, but they don’t need that. Man, I mean, you got good Deans, you’ve got good Chairs, and you’ve got good faculty – you know, that goes on regardless of who’s sitting in the President’s chair. Now I realize that the President can – can – can affect things, but there’s little effect a person can have on what happens in the classroom.

KB: But Pappas wasn’t interim President very long.

DS: No, thank God. Although, you know, I shouldn’t say it that way, because I think that he probably did a pretty good job, considering – you know, thrown into that kind of thing for that period of time.

KB: Well it was only two months.

DS: Yeah. Yeah. So I – you know, I – he probably – you know – I still think Courtney was the one who should have had it, but anyhow –

KB: Did you remain as Interim Provost with Pappas, then?

DS: I – yes, yes.

KB: And what –

DS: Uh-huh.

KB: And any summaries of what those – that two months accomplished?

DS: Um – well, I worked very closely with the Dean’s council, and we didn’t have much to do with him. I mean, you know, it was a short period of time, and he was busy with things in the President’s office, and we were busy with academic programs and things in the academic realm with the Deans, and so we really didn’t – we really didn’t –

KB: I see. And when Ivory Nelson came, did you retain that position?

DS: I did until he named Hal Moore, and I can’t even remember how long that was.

KB: Well that was a year and a half, because Ivory came in March of ’92, and Moore arrived in fall of ’93.

DS: There you go. Yeah.

KB: That’s a long time, a year and a half.

DS: Yeah.

KB: And what role did you have there? Did you make an impact?

(Transcription of Tape 2, Side 1)
KB: Tape begins mid-sentence] for 2006. So you worked as Interim Provost for Ivory Nelson from March ’92 to fall ’93 when Tom Moore came.

DS: Right, that’s right.

KB: And what did you accomplish?

DS: Probably not much. I started to say I got in trouble – uh – with the faculty, at one point. We have a sabbatical leave committee, and the committee makes its recommendation to the Provost, and the Provost makes recommendation to the President, the President makes recommendation to the Board of Trustees to approve or disapprove. Ivory – we – at that time, we were approving like 12 or 13 a year. Ivory thought that was way too many, and we had to cut that back, and he said to me, “I will not accept a recommendation from you with that many.” So he said, “We just aren’t going to approve that many.” So when they came in I did some more screening of the recommendations from the committee, and cut it down some, and sent the recommendations on to Ivory, and then – uh – then, uh – letters – oh, then I had to send out letters saying that this person was being recommended, and this one’s not being recommended, and they – hit the fan. Uh, because that was the first time in my memory that we cut back on sabbatical leaves like that.

KB: I was one of those people who was cut. And when the list was restored to fourteen, I – uh – got my sabbatical, as did James Brennan in History, and Kent Richards, in History. Three of us left the Department that year.

DS: That’s right. That’s right. And – and one of the reasons – I thought that was too many leaving that department. Plus one of them spent more time being away than he did teaching. I should go back and check the letter. Anyhow – but – so Ivory, then – oh, what are we going to do? What are we going to do? So he then talked with Board of Trustees, and the Board said, “Well let’s go ahead and approve them all,” and so that’s what happened. They approved them all. Well, I was called on the carpet, of course, and – and so – you know – they – they – the committee – or some of the faculty were saying, “Look, you had no right making any recommendation to the President.” And I was saying, “What do you mean? The Provost is a potted plant in this whole approval process? That’s crazy!” Uh – but anyhow, uh – there was a grievance filed, and I met with a grievance committee – maybe you were on it, I don’t know.

KB: No.

DS: But on there was Pat O’Shaughnessy, and um – I’ve forgotten who else were all there. I lived through it, and so did other people.

KB: Well, then Moore came in till August 31, 1996, and then Gerry Stacey was Provost for the month of October ’96, and Dauwalder came in as interim shortly after that, but you – they squeezed you back in there for a minute, didn’t they?

DS: Yeah, I’ll tell you what happened. Um –Tom – let’s see if I can remember this correctly now. My plan was to retire at the end of August, I believe it was, and uh – before I retired, Ivory fired Tom. So then Ivory came and asked if I would stay on for another month, and so I stayed until the end of September. Uh – during that time, incidentally, um, Ivory was asking my recommendations for Interim Provost. I was recommending Dauwalder. He named Gerry Stacey. Uh – and – and you probably know what happened, and all that. But then they did name Dauwalder – then he did bring in Dauwalder, and so Dauwalder was Provost, then, for a period of time before, uh – before David came.

KB: Okay. By the way, I just talked to David Dauwalder. He’s leaving California as of June first to teach – no, to be Provost in Connecticut – University of New Haven – a private school.
DS: No! Well good for him! Good for him.

KB: So he was helpful with information about –

DS: I was impressed with David Dauwalder. He had our Dean’s Council and it was on the basis of my relationship with him on that Council that I was making the recommendation to Ivory. And I said, “Dauwalder, in contrast to some of the other members of the Dean’s Council, didn’t talk a lot. But when he made comments they were very helpful, and they were summarizing kinds of comments. They were things that brought us together. They were – he would sit back and he would listen to the various things being said and then – and then make his comment, which was always very helpful in moving the council along toward a decision – whatever we were making. In contrast to people like Pappas, who talked about everything and didn’t make a Goddamn bit of difference – it didn’t mean anything, and nobody paid attention to it. But Dauwalder was not like that, and I – that’s what impressed me. Now I know that he – that there – that – that apparently all of the people in Business didn’t care that much for Dauwalder, but I think that in terms of what my relationship with him, as I saw it, I thought he – uh – he – he had the Dean’s council one of the best ones that I ever could name in there.

KB: Why didn’t Business care for Dauwalder?

DS: Oh, one of the complaints was – well, first of all, his degree was not in Business Administration, okay? The second thing is, they do – they bitched a lot because he sat in his office a lot – didn’t go out and talk to people.

KB: Now we haven’t talked at all about the huge budget cuts that the campus faced under the Garrity years in the early Seventies and the early Eighties.

DS: Talk with Ed about them. He can give you much better information than I can about it.

KB: Well how would you assess the strengths and weaknesses and the stresses on the Garrity years? Which – what was accomplished, and what was not? What should we be proud of, and what are the shortcomings?

DS: I think that – uh – by and large, our academic programs were strengthened. By and large, uh, I think the quality of our faculty was strengthened, and increased, and improved. Um – and thereby, I think the quality of our programs improved. Um –

KB: How could that be true during such severe budget cuts?

DS: Well I think one of the reasons is because we were – I think – Ed – I think we were bringing in well-qualified faculty when we lost faculty. There were budget cuts, and we did – and we did – uh – uh – uh – even earlier, when we cut back on faculty. But you know, when we cut those faculty, were you here at that time when Hebeler was closed?

KB: No. No. Eighty-two was –

DS: Well you see, the people teaching in Hebeler were on faculty – never should have been. They were on faculty. So when you cut faculty, what you’re cutting are third grade teachers. Um – now there was one person who was tenured that we cut at that time.

KB: Two, from the History Department – Gordon Warren, and Ra–

DS: Were they both tenured?
KB: Yes, they were.

DS: Well then there were three. Walter Wensley from Speech Pathology. We cut the program.

KB: Yes.

DS: Because I met with all of those students, and I went to Eastern and I went to Western, reviewed their programs, and I met with all these students and shared information about the programs, and most of them transferred to one or the other, but a few of them transferred into other programs.

KB: I see. Yeah, the History Department –

DS: Were both of those in History tenured?

KB: Yes. But Gordon Warren, and the professor – [both talk at once]

DS: I don’t remember the other name you mentioned.

KB: I’m sorry, I –

DS: I thought there were some that were on probationary status.

KB: No. In some of the other departments that was true. Sociology, I think, lost somebody who did not yet have tenure, and I – I understand that it was a very tense time on this campus.

DS: You’ll be interested in talking with Ed about that, because he was intimately involved in all of that.

KB: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. So was Roscoe Toleman, head of the Faculty Senate at the time.

DS: Yeah.

KB: Um, would you care to name any other people on campus history that made a difference? Deserved to be noted?

DS: Um – Don Cummings. Now you’ve worked with Don Cummings?

KB: He hired me.

DS: Okay. Don and I worked together for many years, and I had, and have a lot of respect for Don. Um – Don did a very good job running our Academic Skills program. We had a writing lab, and then a – then we’d – then we – uh – we – it evolved into what we called the Academic Skills program were they were teaching not only writing, but also math skills, and English as second language, and things like that. And I think Don did a great job at that. Even when he went, then, to the English Department as Chair, and on to the Dean’s position, I think that he was quite successful in those. Now – uh – impact on the institution? I don’t – you know – I – I don’t know, uh, I can’t talk much about what his impact was in – as Chair of the Department, or as Dean, but certainly in running that Skills Center I think he helped a lot of people who were having problems with either math or writing skills. And I think he did a – a tremendous amount of work in that area.

KB: And you – what are you proudest of? You gave how many years to this campus?
KB: Thirty-nine. 

DS: That must be a record. 

DS: I don’t know whether it is or not. Uh – 

KB: Well, what did you accomplish? 

DS: Well, I don’t know. I – I – I think I – I think I worked well with faculty. Um – by that I mean when we were developing interdisciplinary programs, uh – I think I was able to bring them together, and talk about what their discipline could contribute to whatever we were trying to do in the way of putting together a program, taking knowledges from various disciplines. The General Ed program – I worked in the General Ed program, General Ed Committee for – for all the time I was Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and I think we had a fairly good General Ed program, although it came under criticism frequently because we did not have many interdisciplinary courses in General Ed. We had a General Ed program that took courses from the various disciplines, and some people thought that was not the best way to go – that our General Ed program ought to be an interdisciplinary program from beginning to end. And I didn’t think we could accomplish that. 

KB: What – and now you’ve already talked about Law and Justice – what are the other interdisciplinary programs that you had a hand in? 

DS: Um, let’s see – well, you know, the Community Health program, uh, that uh – oh, we developed Aerospace Studies program. Um – it, it – early on it was a Flight Tech. We had one person part-time in it. That, too is – is going to be a fairly significant program. 

KB: Did you have a hand in Ethnic Studies? African American Studies? 

DS: Yes. [Laughs] The Ethnic Studies – yes, that program reported to me, and – and – the young man that was running that – uh, uh, uh – gosh, now I’ve lost his name. I worked with him. Yeah, yeah, I did – I did help work with that. Uh – we had a Liberal Arts degree that we were offering off-campus that Don Cummings chaired the committee – uh – that developed the interdisciplinary courses that were being offered in that program. I don’t know if it’s still being offered or not. We offered it – it was building on Community College General Ed programs. 

I did a lot of work, Karen, representing the institution inter-institutionally. We had something called the Inter-College Relations Commission – ICRC – and the Inter-College Relations Commission was an inter-institutional group – Community College and four-year institutions, public and private, that met like quarterly to talk about the transferability of courses between and among those programs. And I did a lot of work with that. I was President of that for several different years, and we developed transfer guides that would assist counselors in Community Colleges as they were advising students about the transferability of courses from Community College to the various four-year institutions. And we finally got to the point where we got the four-year institutions to accept the Associate Degree for the first two years of Bachelor’s Degree. You know, that didn’t go on – that all had to be developed. Now it’s pretty routine across the state. 

KB: It sure is. You remember when that actually was firmed up? 

DS: Um, yeah, and I don’t know. You can go back to the Senate minutes, I’m sure, because when – I took all those proposals to the Faculty Senate, and of course we had some resistance there, too. Some didn’t want to – at the UW it really was, you know, they were – for a while they were depreciating grades coming in from Community Colleges. If it was a B, they reduced it to a C. [Laughs] Finally the Provost – a lady who since has become a President of a college in California – she was Provost at the UW [Laurel
Wilkening, and she put a stop to it. But business was doing it. I’ve forgotten the other program – there were several programs that were doing it. And of course, the Community Colleges – the Presidents and everybody, because – exploded over that kind of thing.

KB: Mm-hmm. I see.

DS: We weren’t – you know, we weren’t – this is another kind of thing that I worked on. I remember one time Roscoe told me – came to me, and he said, “Don,” he said, “The students that we’re getting from Wenatchee Valley College in Spanish are terrible. They just – they’re supposed to have had two years of Spanish, and they don’t know anything about it.” He said, “What can you do about it?” I said, “What will you work with me on?” I said, “If I call and make an appointment, will you go out and talk with me?” “Sure.” So we did. So he and I went up, and we talked with them – with the Dean of Faculty up there, and – and I think he had one or two – one regular and a – and a adjunct, or something, teaching up there. So we talked with them, and then they came down here, those two – came out and met with the faculty in Spanish, and there was [inaudible], and – and from then on, students were coming well-qualified. Those kinds of things I did a lot of work with. Inter-institutional relationships.

KB: Let’s see – Okay.

DS: I did some of the same stuff going on some of the other disciplines, but I remember that one very clearly.

KB: I see. So between 1957 and 1996, what are the essential changes at this institution?

DS: We became a University – not just in name, like I see, I think, going on around the country. I think we became a University in fact. When I say that, what I mean is we became – we became a school – uh – that, that – and I think we still have a ways to go with the development of University, by the way, Karen. I think we need to reach a point where schools are even more independent in development of programs, and recommending students for degrees, and awarding of degrees. We still pretty much do this at a – at – at the – at the whole school – the whole college level. I wouldn’t mind seeing us get to the point where – where schools have their own commencements, and they award the degree out of that school.

KB: And what’s to be gained by that?

DS: I think it gives to the – I think it gives to the students and faculty a feeling of – a greater feeling of – of belonging to that program. I think, for example, that we have now students who graduate who could care less about what happens to this institution after they graduate, or the program they were in, unless they have a Chair, or a Dean who follows up on them, like Wayne Hertz used to do. Wayne Hertz had a – had a – had a – had a – had a – had a – had a – had a – a whole level of communication with all of his graduates. He knew – he knew what they were going to do, he knew where they were, he knew what they were doing, he would send them newsletters. They felt a close, and – a close and supporting to the music program, and you can see what’s happened. We have a damned good music program that’s well recognized around the state. And I give a lot of that credit to Wayne in establishing that kind of support for the program. But then later with Don White bringing in – bringing in – uh, uh, uh, very skillful performers of music.

KB: You mean his hires?

DS: I don’t know. It just seems to me that – that – that we’ve matured in those 39 years from a – from a – when I came it was like 1400 students. I think it was 90 faculty, or something like that.

KB: It’s bigger now.
DS: We have – and I think – and I think we have much better quality of faculty as a whole today than we had back then. I don’t know whether we have any better teaching, or better learning, but I think we have better qualified people doing the teaching.

KB: Well you know, you raise the question – um – of our teaching load, versus newer demands to publish much more than has been done in the past. Is it realistic to expect our professors to publish and teach?

DS: We were talking about that at coffee yesterday, and one of the retired professors made the remark that he thought that – that young faculty on campus – and I don’t know what that definition is, but young faculty were not nearly as sociable now as they used to be many years ago. And I said, “Don, the young faculty today have all kinds of pressure on them to get their scholar research work done, to get their – their merit raises, to get their promotions, and to get their tenure. And I don’t know that they have time like we did. My promotions to – and award to tenure was – you know – you people would laugh at it today. So – so – so yeah, I think – along with becoming a University comes those kinds of things. When you’re a little old Teacher’s College – nyaaaa –

KB: Yeah. Well, any last thoughts before we turn off the tape recorder?

DS: I don’t think so. I’ll be looking forward to your book.

KB: Well thank you so much for your help. I appreciate it.

DS: How many people have you interviewed?

KB: Many, many, many.

DS: Well you know more about this institution than any – [End of tape]