

Marsha Puro, School of Business
Transcript of Interview for the History SIUE Oral History Project
Interviewed by Ellen Nore-Nordhauser
February 22, 2006

MP: And late afternoon I think would be best.

EN: Okay. It's, it's March 20th, 2006. I'm interviewing Dr. Marsha Puro. For the 50th Anniversary History of SIUE. This is Ellen Nore. [Recording stops] It picks up everything. It's very, very smooth. So don't worry. So, I usually start out with asking how you happen to come to SIUE and um...

MP: Well I...

EN: And why you stayed after you became a notable scholar and, and curricular innovator?

MP: I came, um, I guess, because Bud [Maurice] Hirsch initiated the contact. He was ah, Bud was an alum of the, the, ah, Ph.D. program at Washington University. And that's where I did my um, Accounting PhD. And um, his, his wife is a crazy Bruce Springsteen fan. [EN laughs] And my brother is Bruce Springsteen's agent.

EN: That's right.

MP: You know so. Bud got in touch with me about Bruce Springsteen tickets.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And we got to know each other that way. And eventually um, he, he was acting chair for a semester, or a quarter at that time. And he asked me to come and interview. I've always thought that I got the job because of Bruce Springsteen. [EN laughs] Ah, but...

EN: Doubt it.

MP: [MP laughs] But anyway, he, he initiated the contact, and um, you know, and eventually the offer was made. And I was pretty much decided that I was going to stay in the St. Louis area, because um, my husband is tenured in St. Louis U [SLU, Saint Louis University] and the job market in his field was a little iffy.

EN: Yes.

MP: So, I had, you know, I had offers from the other schools in St. Louis, and I decided I would go to SIU.

EN: Well.

MP: And why I stay? Well, part of it is that um, the job market in the, in Political Science remained iffy. So Steve did not have ah, any real ways to move on. And there were there were parts of, there were things about the university that I liked very much.

EN: That's what you read my mind. That's what I was going to ask you.

MP: Yeah. And the, the, the most important thing for me was the um, student body.

EN: Yeah.

MP: The, the, the fact that there were so many students who had um, didn't have any background in, with college education- they're parents weren't educated. They came to the University kind of wet behind the ears. And especially in accounting, you could see them really mature. They came in, really not knowing what it meant to be a professional. And in that program, they came out professionals. And it was, it was a good feeling. I mean, it was the kind of experience that I had had myself as an undergraduate in New York City, and ah, it carried me a long way. Making that kind of, you know, helping to make that kind of an impact on, on those students. So, I would say that was the principal reason, from my own point of view, why, You know, what I liked the most.

EN: And you came in when? 1978 or...?

MP: 1983.

EN: '83. Okay.

MP: 1983.

EN: I couldn't remember when ah, Bud Hirsch came?

MP: Bud came in the late '70s.

EN: Okay.

MP: Bud was, yeah, Bud came in the late '70s. And it, he and I were very atypical accountants. [MP laughs]

EN: Uh-huh. [EN laughs]

MP: In that ah, the things that we wanted to accomplish with the students went beyond just teaching them rules. And so having the two of us in the department was, was very helpful. My background in the liberal arts led me to be interested in the, in [loud background ringing] things that um, weren't necessarily typical of um, of business school faculty, and um, I don't know exactly where Bud got this passion for teaching, writing and making sure that students literacy levels were, um, were good. And he, he was very interested in that, you know, from, from early on. So, both of us work hard in a lot of different ways to, to broaden the education of the, of our business school students. And um and having

both of us in the same department was helpful. And then eventually, Bud, of course, went upstairs to the Dean's office. That was helpful too, because then he had some authority to [Man whispering] Um...

EN: We can turn off the tape recording. [Pause] We, so he went upstairs to the Deans office and...

MP: To the Deans office and, kinda getting ahead of the story, but, but then he had more authority, obviously to, to enforce some of the things that we had done in, in curriculum development.

EN: Oh, you um. I was wondering about the development of GBA. Was that during this period, or was that later? Is that a later, later development?

MP: No, the, the development of GBA. Well, that's so I guess a pretty long story. That started in the mid-'80s.

EN: Okay.

MP: Um, I had this bright idea that we should be seeing what we could do to work more closely with people in the liberal arts, and see, see if we could find some ways to work together. And so, I called some people that I knew from governance. And we put together a group that came to be known as the, "Gang of Six." [EN laughs] Okay, um, which included three people from business and three from the liberal arts. The people from business were Don Strickland, Don Elliot, and myself. And from liberal arts, Norm Nordhauser. John Danley, and Don Cape [phonetic]. And um, the people from business, were also people who had liberal arts backgrounds. So, they had had what, well Strickland had an undergraduate degree in um, Sociology, I guess, and taught management. And Elliott is in the Business School, but he's an economist, so he's sort of a quasi-liberal-arts person, anyway. And then I had a background in Political Science. So we had Business School appointments and an interest, but we also had, we also had some firm grounding in liberal arts. And the six of us, well, we wrote an EUE [Excellence in Undergraduate Education] grant. Is there still EUE?

EN: Yes, yes.

MP: [MP laughs] We wrote an EUE grant to ah, spend a summer in conversations about cooperation amongst the disciplines. And um, which was pretty open ended, and as I understand the direction of much of the EUE stuff, it's not, it probably wouldn't be funded.

EN: Yeah.

MP: Because it's become kind of what can I buy? And what am I, stated outcomes and, you know, and all that kind of stuff and much more structure. But at that time, it was funded. It probably didn't hurt that I was the chair of the committee. And even though I do...

EN: You were chair of EUE? The coordinator?

MP: I was at that time, the EUE committee was the Faculty Senate Planning Council.

EN: Yes.

MP: Which I don't think is a council anymore.

EN: No.

MP: But in any event, I was chairing the Faculty Senate Planning Council. And when they had their discussions about the proposal, I left the room [EN laughs] and did all the, you know, appropriate things. But, um I think they trusted me not to waste their money. And so it did get funded. But in any event, we spent the first summer getting to know something about one another's disciplines and one another's interests. And while the Business School faculty knew a fair amount about the disciplines in the Liberal Arts, Liberal Arts faculty didn't know anything about the business disciplines.

EN: Right.

MP: So we spent just a fair amount of time thinking about places where we could do things together. Um, and ah, started to develop some ideas about curriculum. And, and then we did the set - with this, we got another one funded the following summer, which resulted in us putting together a full set of curricular recommendations that included what came to be GBA 300. Now simultaneously, David Werner appointed a committee in the Business School, to look at the curriculum. And think about ways that the business school curriculum could be upgraded, or, I don't, I say upgraded, but I don't know that that's what he would have said. But the way, what he, what he would've done... Now he was Dean at this time.

EN: Yes. He was a Provost.

MP: Right.

EN: July '86. [EN and MP laugh]

MP: Well, he was Dean and he um, he wanted the Business School curriculum to be carefully examined. And um, and he appointed Bud Hirsch as chair of that committee. And so there were two processes going on kind of side-by-side there. Was this extra-legal...

EN: Yes.

MP: ...You know, EUE funded, "Gang of Six." And there was Bud in his committee looking at the curriculum. And I don't know a whole lot about what went on in that committee. But I do know that they had some trouble thinking through how they wanted to broaden that, that they wanted to broaden the curriculum. But they weren't sure, just about how to go about it. And meanwhile, we were having these conversations in our group about, well, how do we get to be part of the official process?

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: So eventually, what happened was we kind of passed on our recommendations to Bud's committee, and they liked them, and adopted them. And in the curricular revision, that that committee recommended

to the Business School faculty, was GBA 300. And there were there were some other things going on that I didn't pay too much attention to, but changes in, in Business School requirements...

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: ...That were incorporated into that as well. And so eventually, what, what we had recommended in terms of the GBA stuff was that there be a class at the end of sophomore year. That would um, presumably happen after most of the required liberal arts courses were taken. And which could be a bridge into... and it's interesting that there's now a bridge [MP laughs].

EN: Yes.

MP: A bridge process going on at the University [referring to Building Research Initiatives to Develop Grant Excellence between SIUE and other Regional Universities in biomedical and behavioral sciences]. But anyway, this could be a bridge to the Business School and that we would have faculty from business and liberal arts, talking about how the liberal arts underpinnings needed to be made explicit for students so that they could see the connections between what they had done in liberal arts and, and what their business school education required. And then, that was supposed to be part of the three-core sequence which GBA 300 would begin. And then there was already a course in place for upperclassmen in the business school which was "Business and Society." And that was, became GBA 400. And there was a strategy course at the very end, that was supposed to be the kind of the wrapper upper.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: But the problem with the seq... with its ever becoming a sequence- which it never did, never became a sequence- was that GBA 300 was a new course. So, you could do whatever you wanted with it, you could invent it as you went along.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: But, but the other two courses was existing courses with faculty who had ownership in those classes.

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: And they didn't have any interest really, in changing what they were doing.

EN: I see.

MP: So that those courses never really became part of the three-course sequence. So, so it was three, so it was 300. And when we talk about GBA, it's pretty much 300 that we're talking about. We're not talking about the other courses that were meant to be integrated, because they, they never were. And there were particular faculty members who were very resistant to, to um, to change. And unfortunately, they were um, took a long time to retire [MP laughs]. And by the time that they retired, particularly in 400, the, the impetus for integration had kind of gone away.

EN: Oh, okay.

MP: So, in fact, the, you know, by that time, the just the survival of 300 was in question.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: So, but anyway, that's how that started. And, and, and what we did was we had, we didn't try to make 300 something that just covered everything in liberal arts that...

EN: Yes.

MP: ...that, you know, could possibly be of relevance. We started out with three themes that were important to business schools and, and could make use of liberal arts methodology and, and um, and training, I guess that's it, to open up the conversations.

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: And we had the faculty meet, I guess weekly. We met, we met weekly, the team of faculty that was teaching the class, met weekly, so that we can, could continue to educate one another about what our disciplines had to say about the subject at hand. And um, the course could have been, in many ways, year to year, pretty much anything. I mean, it wasn't, but it could have been, because as the faculty changed, the themes could have changed. But I don't believe that happened. So there were...

EN: It's still, it's still part of the curriculum, isn't it?

MP: It is still part of the curriculum, but it's um... I haven't kept very close touch of what's going on, because it's for me, it's pretty painful.

EN: Yes. [EN and MP laugh]

MP: But the, my understanding is that the cooperation between the Business School and the Arts faculty is breaking down.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: That the, that the arts faculty remains interested in teaching it, but that the Business School faculty does not. And that ah, that the, what we had, had feared is, has, in some ways come to happen. And that is that the Business School faculty is, is increasingly technocratic. And so they have become, what we didn't want our students to be. [MP laughs]

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: So, and they object to, to working with the Liberal Arts faculty on grounds that I don't fully understand. But I also think that what's been true throughout is that the course requires a fair amount of time and thought and commitment.

EN: Team meetings are essential. I know from IS [Interdisciplinary Studies] you have to have all the team meetings regularly.

MP: Right. Yeah, you absolutely have to. And, and I, and, and it's not what you were trained to teach, because nobody trains anybody to teach what we were doing. So there's a lot of time and intellectual effort that goes into it. And um, and no reward. No disciplinary reward. My chair never understood why I wanted to do it. And um, and...

EN: Tom Carver [Phonetic]

MP: No. and know what um...um. Um, [Mike] Costigan.

EN: King?

MP: Well, King. King was okay, King was ah...

EN: You've exhausted my knowledge... [MP laughs]

MP: Yeah, right. King was okay, King had no problem with it. But Mike Costigan...

EN: Oh, yeah.

MP: ...who was his successor, didn't I mean, really didn't appreciate it at all.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And um, the, when I stopped teaching in it, and Al Ortegren tried it, tried to teach in it, and it just made him crazy, because it was too unstructured. It was not what he was used to doing.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And so, as I understand it, there was nobody in accounting that was participating in it, or is participating in it.

EN: Okay.

MP: And, and nobody in authority cares about that. It's not like there are any sanctions for not participating. So... and that wasn't just my department. That was, you know, that was pretty widespread.

EN: Yeah. Uh-huh.

MP: And there were some departments that just never participated, to my knowledge. I mean, like Management Information Systems- I don't think there was ever anybody from that department in it. And so, it, it's kind of, I think it's days are winding down.

EN: Okay.

MP: But for curriculum development, or I suppose in non-traditional way to last as long as it did, which is what now 20 years?

EN: Yeah.

MP: It's hard to believe. [MP laughs]

EN: That's long.

MP: Yeah, it's, uh, you know, it was pretty good. And it had, you know, it had some, you could see effects on students. You could see them asking different kinds of questions. And Bud Hirsch talked about his students in, in Management Accounting, where he would, his stuff was pretty largely case based, and he would ask students, "Well..."and they were juniors, "What problems did this company face?" And he said before GBA 300, they would try to come up with some arithmetic problem. Whereas, as soon as GBA 300 went into place, they started to talk about problems in regulation, which one of the issues that we covered.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And he was so pleased [EN laughs] to find out that something that actually carried over. And ah, so we, we did start to see changes in perspective, of broadening of perspective. So, it wasn't the students whose perspective did not broaden.

EN: Mm-hmm. Well, that's a really interesting history on that course, which is so famous.

MP: [MP laughs] Well, you know it won national awards.

EN: Yes, I know. I remember, it looks like you read my mind. I was thinking of that.

MP: Yeah. It won national awards. But that, as strange as it is, that doesn't affect faculty at all, because it doesn't translate into their own um, incentive structure.

EN: But you don't think it's an influence, its success does influence some later innovators?

MP: At the University?

EN: At our, at our university, that they know that they can make innovations, and that will have a national impact. You don't think that GBA wasn't a kind of first and a sort of model for other later faculty?

MP: Well, I would be delighted if I thought that were true. I mean, I don't know. I mean, I don't, I, when I know about GBA is what is the way it kind of worked its way through the faculty mind and the Business School. But I don't know how people think about it in the Liberal Arts.

EN: No, I was thinking about how, I was thinking about the Business School because they have innovators here now with these international courses and things. And it seems, it seems to me as an outsider that that was in some way that there was something GBA-ish about it. And that, and ah, I guess it's a woman, Kathryn Martell who's done a lot of it too, and I was wondering what...

MP: Uh-huh. Well she's gone...

EN: No, I didn't know that.

MP: Yeah, she's been gone a few years.

EN: Oh.

MP: Yeah, she um...

EN: The records I've been able to go through because the rest aren't cataloged stop in 2001, when she was still here. Bob Carver's extravagant reports of the Business School. [MP and EN laugh] So that's where I, where my knowledge really ends.

MP: Yeah, yeah, well, she's gone, now. You know, what, what happens, and I, I shouldn't really be saying this. I'm talking out of school, because I know so little about the current faculty, you know, the turnover in business is no different than.... We can turn off the tape recorder then. Did you...?
[Recording stops]

EN: Was what impressed me. I asked this, in your questions, "Is the role of leadership in the School of Business," which it's, I guess that's why I wonder if that's going to change because they've been throughout the history of the university, just such, just, so essential to the...

MP: Oh, you mean, this the school's leadership of the, the rest on the campus?

EN: On the university, on the rest of the campus that, that studies by the Department of Economics and Gilbert Rutman?

MP: Well.

EN: You. David Werner, you know, and, and David Ault, you know, organizing all this form. I mean, they've just been tremendous continuity of excellence there.

MP: Well, I, to tell you the truth, I think, part of, and I, in fact, I think part of the, of the change in the role of the Business School is the role of the Arts and Sciences. And that is once there was a College of Arts and Sciences, then the leadership of the faculty was where it belonged, which was in the College of Arts and Sciences. And the professional schools were really more tangential. So I um, I think, structurally, that made a big change. The, I think the personalities in the Business School... Let's see. How do I put this? Lemme think about this. Also are changing. And that is, again, for a very idiosyncratic reasons, there were faculty in the Business School from early on, who you wouldn't expect

to be at a, at a, at a regional state university. Bud for example, had family business here and I had a husband who couldn't move on.

EN: That's right.

MP: And Don Strickland had an ill son who needed to be here for medical purposes and etcetera. I mean, there were there was a whole bunch of that kind of thing. And, and they were people who gave, who provided a lot of the visibility for the school. Now the school is, you know, is recruiting in national markets and so it's different. The people they come up with a different.

EN: That's interesting.

MP: And I also think that the... Well, I think, this is, this is, I guess, the change in like, for example, in the way the Business School thought about the Faculty Senate, when at one time, going to the Faculty Senate, being elected to the Faculty Senate from the Business School, was a mark of some, for someone who had already achieved some leadership role in the in the Business School. At some point, I think, during [David] Ault's deanship, it became something that every junior faculty person should do in order to move along. And that changed the nature of what those people could contribute once they got there. They didn't know anything. No, they didn't know how the school worked. And it was just something that you went through...

EN: That's interesting.

MP: You know, that, you know, you went through it, you got it over with, you never thought that it was something you wanted to do for a long period of time. And then it was done. And so, the other thing was that there was a time- I don't know if I should reveal the secret- but there was a time when the when the business, when the Accounting department, and the Economics department would get together and decide what we were going to vote for. And make sure that it was somebody that we wanted, who would respect, who would be a respectable figure, and that people in the university could respect and that the Business School would be respected. And once we decided who we were going to vote for the word went out and voted in those departments. And that was enough. Well, that cooperation went way during Ault's deanship. And um, that whole perspective that, you know, we wanted to make sure that it was someone who would provide leadership.

EN: Uh-huh. That's really interesting.

MP: That went away too. So ah, and my impression now is that the business school is not taking on a leadership role in the Senate. And that, that whole enterprise of faculty service in that sense, has been diminished. And service became by the time I left, I know service was just kind of counting up committees. It wasn't looking at whether a person did anything of any value on committees. But I don't remember. I guess we also had fewer representatives... once the Liberal Arts got its act together.

EN: Yes, uh-huh.

MP: And that made a difference too, but it was the nature of the beast was just different. The representative was different.

EN: That's interesting. I have an, I have an interview scheduled with David Ault. I said to Norbert [Nordhauser] on the way, "Boy am I glad we're interviewing Marsha before I interview David Ault." [MP laughs] I said, "I think I'll be much better prepared." You know, but I don't know him either really.

MP: He's very hard to talk to.

EN: I've always found it hard to chat, to chat [unintelligible] [EN and MP laugh]. Anyway, he did agree though. Well anyway, we'll see. But anyway, that's my perception. John Navin is just become a member of something in Glen Carbon now. So I think that's an example of the old style.

MP: Yes, John. Yeah. John Navin is of the old style, and ah...

EN: Uh-huh. A great guy.

MP: Yeah, yeah, John Navin is of the old style. But there aren't many others. And, and he, he, of course was socialized by the old style economists. But I don't know how much of the leadership role he has in the Business School. Although he's, he's a, he's a very good guy.

EN: Yeah. I think he has a role there. I don't know anything really about the business school. Well, I wanted to, we... There's a huge thing now, as your role as a leader of the faculty, especially during the time of Earl Lazerson.

MP: You don't want to talk about the Deans?

EN: Yeah, I'd like to talk about the Deans. Actually, I would like to talk about the Deans.

MP: Before we get to Earl?

EN: Yeah, let's do. Let's do that.

MP: Okay. Well, [MP clears throat] the Dean that hired me was David Werner. And he was a spectacular Dean. He, he has a way with people that is, I think, extraordinary. And he built a Business School that was five times better than it had any right to be [MP laughs].

EN: Yeah.

MP: I mean, I mean it, he provided leadership in really constructive ways, and he set a tone of cooperation, where the school was a school, it was not a series of departments. And that made it possible for people to cooperate across disciplines. And I think it set the tone that allowed GBA to happen. It, I, when he left to become Provost, I can remember saying, we are going to look back on this period as the golden age of the Business School. And from my perspective, we, that's exactly what happened. That, also from my perspective, things deteriorated almost immediately after he left [MP laughs].

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: But he was, he just did a wonderful job.

EN: In many ways, I think he was wonderful. He was one of the, maybe the only Dean, who really tried to make Capstone courses for East Saint Louis for example, when they wanted Capstone courses down there. He was the one came up with something. So I can't think of other examples, but he just, he was...

MP: Yeah, it was very, in his, he's got such a low-key manner. And, you know, and you don't realize that he's making things happen until after they've happened [EN and MP laugh]. You know, he, I think A) he understood incentives, but in many important respects, he understood respect for human beings. And so if you respected them, and you didn't make them feel inferior in any way, or put upon, people did their best. And he, you know, he directed money around in a quiet way to support things that he thought were of value. But he knew somehow how to keep people from being at each other's throats. And ah, to this day, I don't know how he does it. I mean, and I've worked with him in so many different contexts. I really don't know how he does it, but he does it.

EN: I know Carol Keene told me, when they, John Danley [Philosophy] was going to have to be let go in a financial crunch. And he actually told her that he'd pay half his salary. She never had to take him up on it.

MP: Oh, from the Business School?

EN: From the Business School. She never had to take him up on it. But that's another example. where I'm coming from.

MP: Yes, yeah.

EN: Yeah.

MP: My first year at the university, before I had finished my dissertation, I got a letter from Barbara Teeters that said, "Thank you very much. But your services are no longer required." And basically what happened was that a letter like that went out to everybody who was not, not on tenure track because of financial problems. [MP clears throat] And I called him, and I said, "You know, I got this letter from Barbara, what does this mean?" He said, "Oh, ignore that." I said, "You know, easy for you to say, I mean, ignore it." I said, "I can't live with any probability that I am not going to be employed, because I mean, you know, I'm gonna have to go look for another job." So he does, what he did was, he had, we had at that time an off campus program of for MBAs on Air Force bases.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And it was it was not state appropriated money. It was, you know, it came from that program. And he had the flexibility to move you onto one of those lines. And that's what he did. He said, he told me, he would move me on to one of those off-campus lines, and not to worry about it, you know, if in fact, the financial situation turned out to be as bad as they anticipated. Well, it never was as bad as they anticipated. And I never had to be switched on to one of those lines. But he made it clear that he had a way to handle it. And, and there was no futzing around, you know, there was no maybes and all that kind of stuff. It was, I made myself clear, he made himself clear. And, and that was resolved. That was

the end of it. And so, he, you know, when he had this money that he could use because of the off-campus program, which of course they don't have anymore. But well, and in fact, they don't have it anymore because from being a moneymaker, it eventually became a money loser. But at that time, he had some flexibility. And when he needed to use it, I think he used it well, you know. And he shared, as Carol said. So anyway, he, he had good taste, I think, and good, a highly ethical man. And then Dave Ault became Dean.

EN: Yes.

MP: And um...

EN: Was he a chosen successor, you know...

MP: Well.

EN: ...for David Warner?

MP: They did a search. I guess the outsiders were not very interesting. And it came down at that time to Ault and Carver. I have to tell you one anecdote.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: I had a dinner party, which I had planned a long time in advance, and Ault and Carver and Werner, were on the invitation list. And it turned out that it was the day, that day that Werner announced that Ault would be Dean.

EN: Oh.

MP: And to say that, that was an awkward evening in my home [EN and MP laugh]. Anyway, now how did that happen? I guess Ault was the acting Dean, when, and then Werner was the provost. So then he had to be the one to choose. And he chose Ault.

EN: Yeah, so was Ault an economist?

MP: Economist. Yes. Ault is an economist. And ah...

EN: Okay. Oh, that's right. He was published in *The Economist*, I remember that.

MP: And he, he and [Gilbert] Rutman, we're team you know, they wrote together a lot. He was chair of the of the Econ Department at one time, as was Rutman. And he was Associate Dean under Dave, under Werner. The Associate Dean for Graduate Programs I guess. Um, he um, if Dave had an easy way with people, if Werner had an easy way with people, Ault did not, does not. He's very awkward. He doesn't read people well. He doesn't understand people's motivations very well.

EN: Nice to know for a good interview [EN laughs].

MP: Yeah right, but he's ah, he really doesn't. And early on he, he made choices that started to shatter ah, the, the good feelings that were in the Business School. He, he doesn't have much respect for the other disciplines in the Business School. I mean, he thinks of himself, as, and many economists are like this, that they're, you know, they have a real discipline. They, they are in the Liberal Arts- but they're also better than most of the people in the Liberal Arts- but they're, you know, what they do is real, and what happens in the applied disciplines, the, is not as intellectually rigorous as what they do, is what they would like to believe. And he was one of the worst of those. And one thing that I could, I could say, in his favor, was that he would, from my point of view, was that he was very supportive of the curricular revisions that that the committee [Recording stops]...

EN: ... Each 45.

MP: Um, anyway.

Unknown Woman: Would you like a little more coffee?

MP: No, I'm fine. Thanks. And he was he was supportive of GBA 300.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: He taught in it. So he tried to serve as a role model. He, and he was supportive of the curricular changes and the, the emphasis upon literacy skills, writing and speaking and an all, you know, calculus. Yeah, that was the calculus was, because the economists believed they need that.

EN: Okay. Okay.

MP: That but he, I mean, he had he supported all that stuff. But partly he supported it, I think, because it reduced the, the amount of hours that people took in the, in the other disciplines that he didn't value as much. But what he did that really made trouble was he decided to reorganize the Business School.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And eliminate some departments and combine them. And he made a lot of enemies. I mean, he called me to try to convince me that this was a good idea I remember. And I said to him, "Why do you want to mess around with things that seem to be working perfectly well?" And um, I guess he was of the opinion that it would save some money. And he had, but mostly what he wanted was to not have to deal with the chairs of some of those applied departments.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: So, if he eliminated the departments, then those that wouldn't, wouldn't have those chairs on his executive committee.

EN: Now, this was when Marketing was...?

MP: Right, Marketing was, was [MP clears throat] subsumed into Management, and um, Finance was subsumed into Economics.

EN: Okay.

MP: And um, he and the third plan was to merge Accounting in MIS [Management Information Systems], but that never happened. And I don't know exactly why.

EN: They had a kind of recent reorganization to, I think, this new Dean [Unintelligible].

MP: I don't know. But the, now, the you know, I said subsumed.

EN: Yes. I noticed. [MP coughs] I wrote that word. [Unintelligible]

MP: All right. Yeah, they were supposed, they would talk about merging. But they'll, those faculty knew exactly what they would what was going on, and that is that they were going to be subsumed [EN and MP laugh] and um, they were. I mean, the Finance just lost its identity completely. And Finance is I think, was never properly valued by the Economists who would never trained in that, in the finance of the what's now the 21st century. I mean, is, it's become very powerful and omnipresent in a lot of respects, in the, in Business Schools all over the country, but it um, never got its due really. Part of that had to deal with personalities, of difficult personalities in Finance. But part of it also had to do with the fact that they what they did was not appreciated very much.

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: And the same thing in marketing. Part of it was personalities, but the bulk of it was that they just didn't respect it, intellectual economists didn't. And there are some, there were some really outstanding faculty members in those two disciplines who never were, probably appreciated in the business school. I don't think. And, in fact, when I was in the administration, I intervened for one of them, because he was being treated so badly. But anyway, once that happened, then the place was in an uproar.

EN: Okay.

MP: And, and there was lots of in-fighting; took a long time to implement it. And what I, what I said about Warner's years that it was a school and not a bunch of departments, became completely undone. And all of a sudden, people had these loyalties to these little groups, you know. And uh, and I can remember saying, "There was a time when we all went to lunch together. And now everybody goes just with their own departments." And his response to that was, at some point, "Well Marsha's worried that nobody takes her to lunch anymore." So it was not getting the point at all [MP laughs]. You know, not getting the point at all.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: You know, not getting the point at all. So that really caused a lot of grief.

EN: Wow. Right.

MP: Well, he also, I probably shouldn't say this on tape, but I'll say it anyway: he has, he has a terrible time with women. He uh... he never rewarded women as women should be rewarded. And, in fact, I mean, this is talking from my own personal experience, I had to request the Chancellor's intervention.

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: In lieu of filing a lawsuit [MP coughs]. So he's, and he doesn't understand that he doesn't understand. I mean, he really [MP laughs], I mean really, you know, he's got terrible time with women. There probably other things I could say. But the basic point is that we got to a point where we were close to having a team come for accreditation. And we had a faculty meeting that was contentious and um, and where he could not seem to understand what it was the faculty was complaining about. And um Bud Hirsch went to see... the same names come up. Bud Hirsch went to see the Chancellor, or the um, Provost, and said, "We can't go through accreditation with this Dean." We'd had a, we, you know, we had those evaluations. And the evaluations were all, were negative and you know, increasingly so. And, and so, we didn't go through accreditation with that Dean. And we had...

EN: Wasn't it Carver?

MP: That's when Carver came in. Yeah.

EN: So he, he did. He was persuaded to resign or when his term came up...?

MP: You know I'm trying to remember how it worked.

EN: Exactly sure how it worked. He must have resigned.

MP: Um...

EN: Then told, and that's it.

MP: Yeah, I think that's probably right. But I... Did you talk to Bud?

EN: No, we haven't. I haven't talked to Bud yet.

MP: Yeah. We'll make sure to ask him about that.

EN: Yeah. Okay.

MP: I don't remember exactly how it, it worked. But I, but Carver became, Carver was the Dean at the time the accreditors came. And quite successfully so.

EN: Uh-huh. All I've seen from him are these, these reports that he did, that were very positive, full of asset statistics of, and a sense of new rooms from donors and... [EN laughs]

MP: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. And he, Carver's a very interesting man. When you meet him, at first, you don't realize how effective he is.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: He can appear to be, you know, very laid back.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And not uh, you know, and not very ambitious for the school. But, but he's none of those things. He is he's, you, Ault could never raise money, and in-part it was because he's so awkward in one-to-one situations, whereas Carver was very effective in raising money. Carver also was very supportive of the curricular changes. And he, now he ah, when Carver was appointed Dean, he made Bud Hirsch, the Associate Dean, and Bud was in charge of curriculum and all that stuff. And in fact, the way they did things was Bud was the inside man. And Carver was the outside man. And ah, by believing as he did, and in, in the curriculum that, you know, that his committee came up with, he, that he had convinced Carver to just go on with GBA and, you know, to continue that kind of thing. And, and so Carver was always supportive. And he went out, and he raised money. And he, you know, I think raised, the stature of the Business School in the community.

EN: I think so.

MP: You know, he belonged to the Country Club, and he entertained there. And I think in terms of the local community, he, he, he made a difference. And I never paid too much attention to that, because it wasn't anything that I was ever involved in.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: But I know that you started to see resources that we didn't have before. And he started to put emphasis on having advisors from the com-, you know, from the community.

EN: Yes.

MP: And from the alumni, and all that kind of stuff. I know that we had a, an endowment of a room, you know, in our office suite, that was a seminar, library, tax thing, and we got all kinds of resources for that. I know, now when I started to teach tax, I was able to get computer resources for my students to use that they'd never had before. And Bob, and Bob [Carver] was responsible for, you know, raising money that was necessary for that stuff. So um, and I don't remember much in the way of faculty anger and aggravation in that period. I remember we had a strategic planning process that went on while he was Dean that where I chaired the Long Range Planning Committee, I guess.

EN: Was that PQP ["Priorities, Quality, and Productivity of Illinois Higher Education: Summary and Assessment for 1992-1993 and Recommendations for 1993-1994] during his time?

MP: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. And ah, I know the planning process. I interviewed, you know, I interview members of the faculty, the committee, and I, you know, just to see where they were in terms of

resources and how happy they were and all that kind of thing. And of course, at that point, everybody said they needed more, more and more [EN laughs]. But there were no, there were no big-time fights. It wasn't like, you know, fighting over department reorganization. So I would say it was a much calmer period, and accreditation went very well that time. They must be ready, they must have gone through another one, by now.

EN: Oh, I think so. Or I think we were accredited for 10 years, or something the last time.

MP: That was, that was campus wide.

EN: Oh.

MP: But the Business School has its own accreditation process.

EN: Oh, okay.

MP: So [MP clears throat] I've been gone now... seven years.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: So...

EN: So there must have been another one recently.

MP: There may very well have been, or they might be just about, you know, they might be filing reports and, you know, doing all the stuff you do before accreditors come. And that time, [MP clears throat] the Accounting Graduate Program was up for accreditation for the first time. We've never had a graduate program before.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And it came through, okay. Which was something that we were worried about because it had small enrollment at that time; it was so new. And now, you know, he did all the things that were necessary to get it done. But they must be, they must be right in the middle of one right now.

EN: Yeah, they must be. My last, the last things I looked at from the School of Business were his over-the-top report for 2001 or something [EN and MP laugh].

MP: Yeah.

EN: So you tend to think that the School of Business is right on top of everything and doing alright. But then this last thing, it's, it seems like it's changing now. There's, there's a huge turnover. There's very, there's going to be fewer and fewer people with institutional memory. John Meizel will become more important person, more and more. He's already important, but an even more important person because he's one of the few with memory.

MP: Yeah. Is Elliott retiring?

EN: I don't know. I wrote to him about an interview. He might be on sabbatical or something. I just haven't heard from him.

MP: Yeah. I know. Pug [phonetic] is probably retiring soon.

EN: I haven't asked Pug for an interview. Do you think I should?

MP: Well, Pug's an interesting person.

EN: Yeah. Okay.

MP: Especially over the last few years because, as the rest of us have kind of phased out...

EN: Yeah, I'm gonna, I'm going to tell him let's have an interview focused on, on this. on the 21st century so far in this School of Business. Okay.

MP: Yeah, that's a good idea. Because ah. And yeah, and you're fortunate that [John] Meisel still has children who have to be educated. That's why he's still working.

EN: Yeah. H has a son at SIU. One at Quincy and his son's a freshman.

MP: Yeah, well didn't realize that the younger one was already in...

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: Yeah. So [MP clears throat] yeah, that's, that they had their children later. So, there really aren't very many others left...

EN: No.

MP: ...Who are, the who have been around for a long time and also have been involved.

EN: Yes. That's right. John Farley is retiring at the end of this year. I mean June, whenever this year, the fiscal year ends. I mean, not that you ever agreed with a lot of his stuff [EN and MP laugh]? I always admired him but..

MP: There were things he did that I agree with. There were things I didn't.

EN: He was a very involved person. But, but there's hardly anyone else.

MP: I read some of the stuff on the faculty listserv, and that, that I get such a kick out of it.

EN: I don't have the listserv anymore.

MP: Oh, yeah. [MP laughs]

EN: I didn't opt out of it. But when I retired, I was just cut off. And that was it.

MP: Oh, really?

EN: Yeah.

MP: Well, I do. And I read it and I laugh [EN laughs]. I laugh because, you know, they're people arguing over things that I can remember arguing about and um, and but I don't recognize any names except for Farley.

EN: John Danley is.

MP: Oh John Dan...

EN: Oh, yeah, he's the chair of the new of the search for the new Provost, which is great.

MP: You know, I was gonna send him a note saying that that, 'Gang of Six' is still... [EN laughs]

EN: You should. He would probably love that.

MP: Yeah. Still, still searching.

EN: There's, there's little institutional memory [unintelligible] The Registrar, fantastic new Registrar is, is from, was Belleville Area College [BAC became SWIC, Southwestern Illinois College in 2000]. And she's just wonderful. Christa is gone, [unintelligible] and all those. Phyllis Werner is leaving this month, on the 30th. She was there for a long time.

MP: Oh yeah. She was a student of mine. I made her cry [EN laughs]. I made her cry 'cause she looked at the midterm and said, "Oh, I can't do this." And then of course she did. [EN and MP laugh] But ah, yeah, they're really all gone. Bob Vanslow [phonetic] is still there.

EN: Yeah. I haven't interviewed him either. But...

MP: He's got an interesting perspective.

EN: Yeah

MP: You might find him interesting. Because he's been through all of those VP's that have been there. Yeah.

EN: Right.

MP: Well, and then, Gary, I don't know at all. I never met him.

EN: I don't know him either. Just his chagrin, first by the story in *The Alestle*, and then oh [EN and MP laugh]. Anyway, well, that's nice to know. I'm glad to know, I knew that there have been some conflict over reorganization under David Ault, but I never exactly understood what it was before. You know, I wasn't, and I've always seen it from a distance, you know, really. Well I'm glad to know about... And then Bob Carver, I, I've met on a few occasions for chapter reports and things, very formal and, and then I saw those big reports.

MP: Uh-huh.

EN: And Bud Hirsch is just, I just wondered if, um, if people like you and Bud Hirsch. Were you? Were you kind of, were you recruited by Earl Lazerson at all? Or I just think there was an infusion. I know people have different memories of Earl Lazerson and different views of him. But it seems like there was an infusion of a few people who did come in. They were such high-quality people.

MP: Recruited to come to the University?

EN: Yeah.

MP: No.

EN: No, no, nothing, he had nothing to do with Bud Hirsch coming here. Nothing...?

MP: Nope, it was just...

EN: It was just accident, historical accident. I wondered because he, he was from Washington University. That's why I wondered about you and Bud, if you were, if there was any kind of a network there or anything? Because it was so good for the university.

MP: Just serendipitous [EN and MP laugh].

EN: Well the luck. Accident of history [EN and MP laugh].

MP: Yeah, right.

EN: Well, I wanted to talk about your UPBC [University Planning and Budget Council]. And your role in that. Now there are copious records for the UPBC, but they're not very juicy [MP and EN laugh]. And I've wondered exactly... Now you were in at the beginning of it? Pretty much. Or the IBHE mandated it, then...

MP: And Warren Joseph was the first...

EN: Warren Joseph was the first.

MP: ...Was the chair. And I mean, I didn't know. This was, you know, I was very new when I got started there.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: [MP clears throat] When Warren Joseph was the chair, and I didn't know if it was old or new or whatever. But Jerry Hollenhorst, who was the Faculty Senate President, and an economist...

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: ...Talked me into becoming a member of UPBC. And they made me Chair of the Long Range Planning Committee, like right away. So I was elected to the Senate. And, oh, that's how that worked. I was elected to the Senate. I was appointed to the Planning Council. And at that time, the Planning Councils only function was to be the faculty representatives on UPBC.

EN: Okay.

MP: That was the structural connection. And so when I was elected to the Senate, they put me on the Planning Council that made me a member of UPBC. And then I became Chair of the Long Range Planning Committee in my first year in the Senate.

EN: Uh-huh. And I heard that that was when the Long Range Planning Commission really had teeth, as someone put it.

MP: Well, what he, now what Earl wanted was a planning process put into place. And I, you know, I was new. And I just kind of stumbled into it. So he had us, you know, there were already reviews of departments that, that were going on as part of another process.

EN: Part of the reviews by [unintelligible name given].

MP: No, I mean, we had those internal reviews of departments- what did, when did we call them, I can't even remember. Where faculty team would come around and talk to you about, you know...

EN: Oh, yes. Right.

MP: ...What was going on in department.

EN: Right. Okay.

MP: And so, but we repeated those. We just, you know, was an independent, what he want, what he was trying to do was, he said, was put a process in place that was, that could be used all the time, that was not ad hoc.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: So we, the first thing we did was review the academic departments. And we had budgetary recommendations, which the internal review committees never had, formally. We were supposed to kind of look at these as a whole, line them up and say, this department got more, this one got less, and this one, their relative resources stayed the same.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And we did, and then the other thing we did was, we did the same thing in future academic years for the non-academic units. And nobody had ever looked at what they were doing.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And even to this day, that doesn't happen very often, when I talk to, to Pug about budgeting, it's all Academic Affairs. That's what they worry about, which is, you know, it takes the bulk of the money.

EN: Uh-Huh.

MP: But there's, there is more going on in the university. So anyway, we did the same thing with the non-academic units. And boy did we meet some strange people, in that period. There were people who had been hired right when the university was organized, that you wonder what they were doing in an academic institution. Even, I mean, they didn't seem to understand that they were in academic institution [EN and MP laugh], even though they were not in the on the academic side of the house. But anyway, we made read, recommendations, you know: relative increase, relative decrease, or stay the same. And we, you know, we looked at a lot of documentation, and um, we paid attention to budgetary matters. And I guess it was, it was helpful in that process that I had the accounting training, because I could look at stuff. And I could ask questions that a non-accountant probably wouldn't have asked, while still carrying through the academic side of the, you know, the setup of priorities. But anyway, what happened through all of that was that Earl pretty much paid attention to the recommendations of the committee. So that's why I guess people said, "We had teeth." That when the committee made recommendations, he pretty much you know, in terms of relative resource allocation, he pretty much went along with them, and was, was happy to get it. Something just went through my mind... Oh, the other thing that happened in that period...

EN: I'm thinking about Enron [MP and EN laugh].

MP: And the other thing that was going on in that in that period was that I was a chair, was...

EN: You were also Chair of the department in this period? No. This is when you were Chair of LRP?

MP: Yeah, Long Range Planning. Yeah. I was never chair of the department.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: They, Barbara Teters... once again that famous woman.

EN: Yes.

MP: She put into place a set of raises for the Deans, who were in fact underpaid at the time. And, and argued that it was her role as Provost to look out for the Deans. And so of course, people on the faculty like John Farley, and, and Wayne [Santoni].

EN: Yes.

MP: Said, "Whose job is it to look out for the faculty?" Okay. And there was a big brouhaha. And so the Long Range Planning Committee...

EN: Well, that's when you did...your famous....

MP: Well, we did we did...Equity Study. Okay. We came up with a way to address whether faculty were being properly paid or not. And had a recommendation for an equity plan, details of which I have absolutely no memory [EN laughs]. But I can say that in order to sell it to the faculty, instead of just talking about it in the Senate, which had to pass it...

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: ...I went around to all the schools and met with the faculty to explain how it would work. And um, and it was at that point that I got to know a whole lot of people on campus that I had never met before. An event truly. And I also became identified as the enemy by people who were interested in collective bargaining.

EN: Alright.

MP: Because it was, this was an alternative, this Equity Plan was an alternative to using a union to get higher salaries. And so the... people...call me names [MP laughs].

EN: Oh.

MP: I had a terrible meeting with the School of Humanities, I remember. Anyway, that was passed, that the, the faculty went for it. And uh, Earl agreed. Well, actually, Earl had agreed to implement it before I went to the faculties, and if it passed, he would implement it. And he did. So that it turned out that it was possible for the faculty to in effect, negotiate with the administration without actually bargaining collectively. So I guess you could say, the Long Range Planning Committee had "teeth" in that way [EN laughs]. I know I also... What else? There was a time when I was in the administration, that's what happened. I was, I was already in the administration. And I was, I guess, I was still Chair of UPBC, even though I had gone into the administration. And even though I was no longer a member of the Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate adopted me. Okay, they made me, I was I was an ex-officio member of the Staff Senate. And, and as a result of that, I was, I was allowed to stay on as Chair of UPBC, even though I was in the administration. But I don't remember what we did that? I don't think there was any big to do at that point. At that point, I was chairing UPBC, I wasn't chairing Long Range Planning Committee.

EN: I was gonna check and see... I'm interviewing so many people now that I lose track of who told me the stories, all the stories. Oh, I know, it was David Sill. He was a big union organizer. You know, but, after they, after the first vote when they had to vote on agent or the combined unions, he, he got cold feet. And, and he told me that he was the one that asked Bud Hirsch to run for President of the Faculty Senate. Because he thought that would be, that would he was the leading exponent of "No agent." Isn't that interesting?

MP: Right. Right. Right.

EN: Yeah.

MP: Well, that certainly may be. But by the time it came down to a vote, I was, I had just gone into the administration.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And you know, I my name was on the list of eligible people to vote, but I really wasn't eligible at that point. And I can remember having my name challenged, you know, I was the...

EN: By the Faculty Senate?

MP: No. On, in the organizational meetings with...

EN: Oh, in the meeting for the voting for the Dean.

MP: And I said, "I'm not going to vote," you know, "Why don't you wait and see if I vote, you don't have to, you know, challenge me ahead time. I know I'm not allowed to vote."

EN: Uh-huh. That's interesting. You know, I tried to interview Roseanne, but she's the only one who's refused to be interviewed.

MP: Really?

EN: And I had asked him a lot of questions about the, about the union. I had sent her a lot of questions, and she said, "Oh, just reading the questions gives me a headache." [MP and EN laugh]. I remember [unintelligible] I thought she would tell me something interesting about that. But... Well, how was it, I guess, how was it, how was it, what's your view on President Lazerson?

MP: It's complicated.

EN: Well, that's how I, well it is complicated.

MP: Yeah, it's complicated. He was also a person who was very awkward with people.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: He didn't hear well. I mean, I don't mean physically. He didn't listen well. He didn't, he didn't hear well. Well, he didn't understand. He didn't appreciate what people were saying to him often. He was, he was very authoritarian with the staff. And all of them were terrified of him, except David Werner, who always kept his perspective and his cool. But everybody else was just scared to death of him. And that's because he would blow up. I mean, he would...

EN: That's what Cindy Jones, that's a word she used.

MP: Yeah, he would just, he would explode. Turn red in the face. And you know, but my experience with him also indicates that if you didn't lose your sense of perspective, and you could counter what he had to say, he would listen.

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: So I had one experience with him that I think kind of indicates that, and this is, as I'm talking now, as a member of his staff, not as a member of the faculty.

EN: Yes.

MP: He, I had written a letter to... Well, let me back up a minute and say, I was, when I was in the administration, I was Assistant Vice President for Administration.

EN: Yes.

MP: And I had line authority in personnel. And, in general, I had a more conciliatory attitude towards faculty and staff than anybody else in the administration. And my immediate superior just did not, I mean, he I mean, he was interested often in very harsh, what I consider to be very harsh treatment.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: But anyway, I wrote a letter in the period that the um, staff was getting... The period in which the staff was getting itself organized to negotiate. They had already, they had voted to, to bargain collectively. And they were getting organized to negotiate, and they were coming to grips with some of the things that you have to do. And I wrote a letter that basically said, "These are, these are the procedures, and I'm sure that over time, we will be able to work out some sort of, you know, of a modus vivendi."

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And my superior [Vice President for Administration Ben Quillian] brought the letter back to me and said, "Earl thinks it's too long. And it's too, um, it's, you know, it's it too conciliatory." And handed me a letter that I was supposed to send out over my signature. And I read it. And I said, "This is too harsh. I'm not signing it." I said, "This is not going out over my signature. If you want to send it out, send it out over your signature, alright? But it's not going out over my signature." And while I was sitting in his office, Earl came in. And he said to Earl, "She thinks this letter is too harsh." [EN laughs] And Earl said, "There she is..." you know, something like "...the Vice President of chicken soup" or, you know, "She wants to give them... she's a Jewish mother, she wants to give them chicken soup." And then he said to me, "If you think it's too harsh, fix it."

EN: Oh. Uh-huh.

MP: Okay. And I fixed it. I made, and then I fixed it and went out over my signature. And there were no objections. So, I never knew in all of that, how much was Earl, how much was my superior...

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: Whatever. But I did know that if you could reach him, he would respond. And I also know in dealing with him, as a faculty member, not as a member of his staff that um, he was, I never had an experience with him where he yelled at me. I was always open. I mean, I always let him know when I disagreed with him. He was responsive to what the faculty wanted. But he never seemed to understand what it was ahead of time. He couldn't anticipate. He never anticipated what other people's needs were, you know, he. And so he's, he was a very complicated man. I can, I can tell you another story that maybe Carol [Keene] even told you. That we had this group that was called Faculty Dialogue.

EN: Yes, she mentioned that.

MP: Where, this started with Barb, when Barbara Teeters was still Provost. Barbara and Earl. And what happened was that the Faculty Senate Chair, UPBC Chair and Long Range Planning Committee Chair, met with them. And each time there was a new one chosen, it got, that new one that added into the group, but nobody dropped down. We did it, we did it for years. And what was funny was that whenever there was a new person added, that new person would have all these things to say, to them, to the Provost. And eventually, the Provost was David Werner. And that, all that new stuff that they thought was so important to have, to say, had already been said by each new person that had been added to the group. So they had to listen to that quite a bit. But there was, there was one episode where people were talking about how faculty often don't feel appreciated, etcetera.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And somebody, maybe it was Carol, said, "You know, somebody like Vaughnie Lindsay always would write a thank you note, to say, you know, this is, we were really pleased that, you know, you did this and how it was helpful to the University etcetera..." And Earl got all red in the face. And he said, at the top of his lungs, you know it was clear he was really distressed and that this was something that he had thought about before. "Yes, she really had a thing about that, when she was thought that it was her job to be thanking people when it's the President's job to be." [MP and EN laugh] It was like she was somehow usurping his position. And we all looked at each other, like, you know, what is this about? So, there was, there was something about authority that, you know, he was, he what, he felt like his authority was being threatened. And when that happened, he got very defensive and started yelling at people. But at the same time, if you could make a reasoned argument, you could get through to him.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: So some of his reputation for authoritarianism, I think is more a reflection of the insecurity of his staff than it is, than was him. But ah, he still was very difficult to work with [EN and MP laugh]. One thing I can say about him is that his fiscal management of the place was just outstanding. I mean, he was Chancellor in a period- well, I guess he was President. He was never Chancellor, because of the title, change of title. He was, he was in charge in a period when the state was slashing budgets all over the place. The instant, Edwardsville had had money raining from the skies, and at one time. I mean, it was

just so much money. And I think that's why everybody loved Rendleman, because he had all this money to dispense, which was cut, when, in during the period that that Earl was, was in charge. And faculty lines disappeared, enrollments went down, all kinds of things, stuff was going on. And he kept the place together by moving pots of money from here to there, that other people didn't even know were there. Nobody really knew what he was doing.

EN: Uh-huh. Yeah.

MP: But, but, he, he kept the place intact when other campuses were not kept intact.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And he, I mean, he, we have a lot to thank him for in that respect. That in, in fact, it's much, many of the of the things that happened, that made the factory so angry with him like, like the lack of doctoral programs and all that kind of stuff, were, had nothing to do with him. Had to deal with changes in state priorities and state funding. So all of the things that they were mad at him about, were things really they should have been thanking him for, which is his fiscal skills was so good. So, in that respect he was, I think he was just outstanding. But his personality was so peculiar. It was so hard to know, um, how to respond to him. And I, one thing I, he was a master of control of information.

EN: Huh.

MP: I felt- I said this to him at one point- I felt like I knew more about what was going on, on the campus when I was a member of the faculty than when I was an Assistant Vice President.

EN: Huh.

MP: Because information was not shared. Now, again, I don't know if that was him, or that was my Vice President.

EN: Yes. Uh-huh.

MP: You know.

EN: Which are, now Earl Beard and then Ben Quillian... Was Ben Quillian yours?

MP: Yeah. Ben Quillian was mine. I didn't know. I didn't work for Earl. I just worked for Ben.

EN: That's interesting. Yeah. Yeah. [Recording stops] I was very impressed with his State of the University Speeches, where he tried to educate people about the budgetary issues. And I have been charged to discover that, most of the President's, most of the time, and some like Ken Shaw, always used speech writers. But in those two speeches, I think that he actually wrote them. But I, it occurred to me, did you help with those speeches? State of the University with the budgetary...?

MP: No.

EN: ...Information?

MP: No.

EN: On those? I was just wondering. Because it seems to me, they are, there you, I thought you could hear his voice.

MP: Uh-huh.

EN: In those speeches. He did have speech writers. Benny Richardson wrote some speeches for him for different occasions.

MP: Oh, yeah. He had speech writers. Um, but ah...

EN: But it seemed like he wrote those speeches. I couldn't, I couldn't find the link with any...

MP: Um, Paul Gastin [phonetic] wrote a lot for him.

EN: Yes. That, yes. And he was such a wonderful loyal person.

MP: Paul?

EN: Yes, it seems like he was.

MP: He was.

EN: The week, when he was moving to his new job, the week of that move, he was still in there writing suggestions for the next year's goals.

MP: Mm-hmm.

EN: You know. And a wonderful paper he wrote just days before he was leaving [EN laughing].

MP: I don't know how Paul put up with what he put up with it. He was amazing to me that...

EN: Yeah. I really liked him.

MP: Yeah, me too. I liked him a lot.

EN: We always just kept him on, you know if he wanted to come back.

MP: Yep. Yep. You asked about Barbara Teeters. I had some contact with her. And I also found her to be much more complicated. I think she was one of those people that suffered by association with Earl. That she was asked to execute things that we're not good ideas or that we're viewed as, as, authoritarian. Or that were fiscal in nature, and that they, you know, like the letter that they wrote to me saying that I didn't have a job anymore. I mean, that, nobody was being mean.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: It was just the, the needs given, you know, the fiscal realities. So she had, she had to try to decipher what it was he wanted. And he was never very clear. And I think she probably dealt with his temper and did not talk back. So, they'll, and then the same thing happened with her that happened with his other subordinates, and, which was that he became a role model. I mean, if he had these um, streaks of authoritarianism, or if he was worried about challenges of, to his authority, that got communicated through the ranks. There was, there was a crazy period where Deans were, and people were not allowed to talk to each other across, across units, everything had to go down through the ranks and up through the ranks. So that... and, and Dean's couldn't talk to Earl. They could talk only to Barbara. And she got blamed for that. But that was him. I mean, 'cause he didn't want to deal with them.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And again, because he, I think he viewed them as people who were, you know, fighting over resources, and not really looking at the picture of the place as a whole. They were too parochial. and they probably were [MP laughs], you know. But at the same time, she could be very, you know, she could be very unpleasant because she had to put up with what was above her. And she just, you know, she beat on people below her.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And she didn't have the, she didn't have the strength that David Werner always had. And what David always said was, when she was Provost in terms of how he responded to her as Provost, but also I'd bet he did the same thing when responding to Earl. Although I don't know this for sure. He would say, "He'd always wait for some requests to come around the second time. Because so much of what they did was so crazy." It was so you know, unnecessarily an... antagonistic or whatever, that he would just wait and see if they'd reconsider. But you have to have strength of char-, you know, of self to be able to do that. And he always did. But at the, on the other side with Barbara, she could be very charming.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: I mean when I dealt with her on Long Range Planning issues, I never had any problems with her. She asked me one time if I thought that the people who didn't like Earl could bring him down. And I said, "No, I didn't think so." So she was worried about protecting him. Even though by the time she left, she sued him for, you know, gender discrimination. So it was a very fraught time. Um.

EN: Yes. This morning, I interviewed Jack McCall. John McCall. Who was on the search committee and you know Annette Baich and Suzanne [Jacobitti]. And they were on it. Annette Baich, we're going to have an interview and everything. Anyway, he was on the search committee, and he said that he, he had, he had gone with one of the people to go to her campus, after they landed in Little Rock, and driving some distance, but he now, he is a psychologist, he realized that the President was a little over enthusiastic [EN and MP laugh]. And he now, and then later, he realized he had been lied to. But, but he said, he said that, just as you said that she was very charming in conversation she was, her interview was

very good and he's... That's his field- interviewing. And it was a very good interview. And he said, after she was in office, he said she was, she froze, she was crushed. He said it wasn't the same person.

MP: Yeah.

EN: We interviewed. And then another person who I can't remember, I just interviewed Jack this morning so. But another person told me that they were in a meeting once where she called him sir 15 times. And, and it sounds like... And then, and then Jack said that she just, she just didn't have the personality is what he said, to be in that situation. I guess that's what you're saying too?

MP: Ah, you know, by the way, Bud Hirsch I think was on that search committee also.

EN: Oh, he was? Oh, good. That's good. I'd like to hear another story about it, because I think about what... Well, Carol Keene told me, and you know, she always knows everything about politics. And she told me, "Well, the majority of the search committee wanted to call it a failed search." And, and Earl wanted to go get a Provost right now. And that was it.

MP: Uh-huh. And um. Well I, yeah, I just I think that, that a lot of, a lot of both Earl's problem, and her problem, was the intensity of the budgetary problems. That, you know, they, they were making all of their decisions under this pressure of reduced resources. And it brought out the worst in everybody.

EN: Yes. That's a very good...

MP: And, I mean, if Earl had been able to distribute resources, the way Rendleman was able to, we would remember him in a very different way. And if you think about what he did, once he had a little money, I mean, that million dollars for EUE [Excellence in Undergraduate Education] was, I mean, it was extraordinary. You know, it's I mean, extraordinary that that was set aside for innovative things to happen on the campus. And the first few years, there were wonderful things that came out of it, but then what wound up happening, of course, is that it became a fund for buying stuff. And...

EN: Yes.

MP: ...Then it just kind of went down the tubes, but that that wasn't his fault. That was the lack of imagination of faculty, you know. But in those years, when she was, you know, when she was the Provost, and they were having to make those choices about who wasn't going to have a job, and you know, what they were going to do to keep the place afloat. That's a terrible place to be in.

EN: Yes.

MP: And, and so, yeah, she was crushed by it, I think. She had her authoritarian streak, but, you know, when you're getting pushed like that from all sides, and... Sam Pearson used to say that she would, you know, she'd go, she'd walk up and down the hall between her office and his office, and Earl's office, trying to, you know, satisfy him. Trying to... And Sam was a real advocate at first. Nobody could understand that but, he was. And, but...

EN: I haven't contacted Sam in years. I might as well go ahead and try now.

MP: But I know you know, she would, also when she would get pushed on, David Werner told me there was a time... when she, he was supposed to go to her office, and he called to find out what the agenda was so he could bring whatever he needed with him. And she called back and said, "If I think you need to have an agenda, I will provide it for you. But if I say you're supposed to be here, you just come here, and you know." I was like, "Oh, what's that all about?" Now, you can imagine she had a bad day, you know, it's like. But [Ben] Quillian was like that, too. I mean, they all had the sense that their authority was being, was being trashed, and in some sense, and I think that's just how threatened everybody was, by the situation. And, and by Earl.

EN: Mm-hmm. That's interesting.

MP: You know, I'm just thinking, there was one time when the building service workers, when I was in administration, they asked me to go around and look at where they were supposed to have their lunch. Each building had a little place where they had lunch. And each building was worse than the other. They were like closets. They were claustrophobic.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: They were having lunch in places with mops hanging over their heads that hadn't been painted, in, you know, whatever, 30 years.

EN: Yeah.

MP: And I had tried to get Plant, to paint these little places of these to make a decent, you know, clean places. And they weren't doing it. And Ben finally called somebody from Plant and said, "If an Assistant Vice President asks you to paint it, you paint it."

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And I said to Ben, "That's not the way I would have ever..." That's not the way I would think about it. I think about it, as, "Say to these people, 'Would you like to eat lunch in a place where... that hasn't been painted in? And that, you know, is that the way you want to be treated?'" Make them understand, you know, what this is about. But with them, everything was an authority question, you know. And ah, it was always very hard for me to understand. [MP and EN laugh]

EN: So maybe he selected subordinates, are you saying, that had similar insecurities or...?

MP: Um, maybe. Or maybe he just thought everybody was like that. Yeah, maybe he thought, you know, it didn't really make any difference, that he was going to do what he wanted to do anyway. Everybody was sort of marginally competent [MP laughs]. I don't know. But he certainly, he certainly brought it out everybody if they weren't like that before, except David Werner.

EN: Yeah.

MP: David demonstrated it could be done. I don't know if he went home and you know, beat on the furniture or something, but you never seem to lose his equanimity. David.

EN: He also worked with Ted Sanders. After Nancy Belck left. It must have been hard. I think so.

MP: Yeah. It's a sad story.

EN: I always thought as a, as a faculty member, I can't remember if it was, coming back in '89? [unintelligible - Squeaking noise and dog barking while talking]. Frank... [unintelligible]

EN: Yeah.

MP: Yeah. Yep. I have no idea. It's probably the mailman.

EN: Oh. Had Frank contempt for people who weren't here for, without knowing what the problems were [Dog barking - Recording stops].

MP: Of Earl?

EN: Mm-hmm. And he was just, and he said, "I don't want to deal with people who were, who are shouting and yelling, but who don't really know what the problems are."

MP: Right. [EN laughs] Well, I think that's right. And he had to deal with that a lot.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And he had to deal. He had to deal with faculty who really didn't understand budgetary matters and didn't choose to.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: I can remember making presentations in some role, I guess it must have been his chair LRPC to the Faculty Senate, or when I went around to department, to schools to talk with my little budgetary pieces of paper...

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: ...You know and explain what was going on in the budgets. And there were lots of faculty who just tuned out. You know, they, and they will have just a terrible time understanding and, and then, I don't know, chose to not care that they didn't understand and then went forward with it anyway. So I think a lot of his problem was that he was there in a period of shrinking resources. But his personality complicated that.

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: Because there are ways to make that a, you know, let's do, let's be in this all together. You know.

EN: yes, that's right,

MP: There are that, you know, that this is not, this is not pointed at anybody, you know, we're all in this together. Let's see what we can do together. And make it clear that that's what's going on. But you know, even though he made those speeches about budgets, I always used to say, he seems to me to start in the middle. That is that he doesn't take people from where they are, to where they need to be in order to understand, you know. He must have been a terrible teacher, I don't know [EN laughs]. But he, so that he never, he never was able to, you know, to adequately communicate what was going on.

EN: And he did start out his, his first message, which, which I thought was very impressive, when I read, when I read it, was that sometime, sometimes adversity can bring opportunity. I thought that was a great way to start. There was a kind of 'elan maybe at the very beginning. This is before Barbara Teeters was hired. There was something of that.

MP: So that's before my time.

EN: Uh-huh. Well, Larry, people like Larry McAneny, who was very, one of the first faculty members, a really great guy in Physics, who retired in 1987, said, said something like that. That he, he his measure of people was efficiency. As a physicist, conserving energy and stuff. So Earl was a very efficient Chair. And he's a very efficient Dean. He was very happy when it became provost. He was very happy when he became President.

MP: Yeah.

EN: And then... [MP and EN laugh] he saw that he had been mistaken, but he sort of indicated that it was a personal, I don't know, just kind of atmosphere that you're saying it dissipated and turned into rancor.

MP: Yeah. Well, I mean, part of it was just the budgetary problems got worse and worse.

EN: Yeah. I'll agree with that from what I know. Well, what about women in leadership and higher administration on the campus? I know that's a concern among younger women now. I would say that there's a feeling that we don't have any mentoring program on campus. And we have some tremendously talented younger women now. I don't know about School of Business. I don't know anybody, except Linda Lovata, who isn't exactly a young person anymore, but I always admired her a lot. Linda Lovata.

MP: Lovata. Yeah. She was in my department. Well, I guess that's a mixed bag too.

EN: Uh-huh. Did you think there was a glass ceiling? Did you feel that?

MP: No.

EN: No.

MP: Not, not campus wide. But in the Business School for sure.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: The, I mean, the Business School's culture was not very, not very friendly to women. And when, when I was tenured, I mean when I received tenure, I was the first person in, the first woman and Mary Sumner and I got tenure at the same time. And we were the first women to get tenure, in ah, more than ten years. It wasn't that they, they didn't give women tenure, it was that they didn't have any women in the pipeline.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And uh Anne...what was Ann's last name?

EN: Oh Ann... Lane?

Unknown man: Schwier.

MP: Very good. There's the historian. [Crosstalk]

Unknown Man: I'm trying not to listen.

MP: Yes. Ann Schwier was in the Economics department.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And she was the, what had been tenured. And then there were, there was Vaughnie Lindsay and another woman who were tenured in Business Education.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: Which at the time, I mean, in event, it was sort of the precursor to the MIS [Management Information Systems] department, but at the time was for people who taught business in high school, you know.

EN: Yes.

MP: And I guess they did. Well, I don't know what they did. So I won't even guess, but it was a traditionally female field. Anyway. Those were the only, there were those two women in Business Education. And by that time, Vaughnie was Dean of the Graduate School...

EN: Yes.

MP: So she wasn't, she was not a presence there. And there was Ann Schwier in Economics. And there was another, there was another woman in Business Education. And so that was three. And that was, you know, like, ancient history, is, that department wasn't being funded anymore. You know, the programs were going away and stuff.

EN: Right.

MP: I mean, they don't even do that in high school anymore. Now, that was it. Those were the women. And then, then Mary and I came along. So for years, there were no women in any positions of authority. And when I started to do my thing, it was on a campus wide level. It was not, it was not in the Business School. And largely was not at the Business School because I didn't feel comfortable in any kind of a, you know, an authority position in the Business School. So and the Business School is different from the rest of university. What I thought about the rest of the university was that it was remarkable how many women were in positions of authority, coming and going. I mean, you know, there were women Deans and there was Vaughnie, Dean in Graduate School, and there was a female Provost. And then, of course, eventually, there was Nancy [Belck]. And maybe athletic director was a woman [Cindy Jones]. And you know, Carol [Keene] and, and Suzanne [Jacobitti] had been Deans early on. There were quite a few female chairs all over the place. Not in the Business School, but, eventually. At one point Mary [Sumner] was chair for a short time. But I, you know, so I always thought that women had, you know, a lot of visibility and, and a lot more authority than they would, than they did in most, in many other places. And I never sensed, for example, with Earl any kind of feeling that women were not treated equally. I mean he had women Vice Presidents. He had women Deans, you know. So I thought, you know, campus wide, I always felt that women did pretty well. Now my, my, sense of what's happened over the last few years is that that's less and less true.

EN: Uh-huh. I was gonna say about Earl Lazerson and women Deans though, that Suzanne and Carol were ousted by him.

MP: Yeah, but that was...

EN: And men replaced them.

MP: Yeah, that was over resources. That was I mean, that's his version of it anyway.

EN: Okay.

MP: I mean, that's...

EN: Okay, that's interesting.

MP: You know, that he, he said, he has he said to me, at one point that he hated being Provost because he couldn't stand working with the Deans. [EN laughs] [MP coughs]. Because they were so attached to their own units, you know.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: Didn't see the bigger picture. Well, who were the Deans then...I think.

EN: Well, there was David Butler, and Sam Peterson.

MP: And Sam Peterson. And ah....

EN: And David Steinberg.

MP: Right.

EN: And ah, Ault, David Ault... and I can't, I don't know the woman in Nursing right off the top of my head.

MP: Well they came and went, but they were obviously they were all women. Well, that's true. I hadn't thought about that. But as a, as a campus, I just thought there were a lot of women always. And I and I don't think that his moving Carol and Suzanne out, which he did...

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: ... had anything to do with the fact that they were women. I think it had to do with the fact that they were strong spokesmen for their point of view. And look what he replaced them with.

EN: Uh-huh. [MP laughs] Right.

MP: Namby-pambies.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: So I, in that early period of his Deanship at least, he, I think in those roles, he wanted people who would be, I mean, I think he'd be more explicitly wanting people who would be weaker, and who wouldn't cause grief because the role of the Dean was being diminished.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And I think it still is.

EN: Uh-huh. That's an interesting comment.

MP: But I, I never, I never felt in dealing with him that the fact that I was a woman made any difference. Whereas on the other hand, for example, dealing with Ault it was, I mean, it was just obvious.

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: Right? So the Business School is just as, it is, and was, a completely different culture I think.

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: Now, I don't know anything about the guy who's currently Chancellor. And we're going to have a new Provost.

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: So but, you know, there, I guess how many Provosts have been since I was there? Three? Four?

EN: Three.

MP: Three, I guess, with David [Werner] and Barbara [Teters] and Sharon [Hahs].

EN: Yeah, Barbara and Sharon.

MP: So two out of three women. Whatever the reasons, I mean, but I don't think there are many places that could match that. So I, you know, in my experience, campus wide, it didn't hurt you being a woman. In the Business School it hurt you.

EN: Mm-hmm. That's interesting. It seems, I don't know the Business School now at all. That doesn't, but with Kathryn Martell is gone, it seem there aren't very many women involved there now.

MP: Well, you know, I don't even know what to do.

EN: Maryann Pettit.

MP: Maryann Pettit.

EN: Yes, is she a part-time person?

MP: She's full time, but she's an instructor.

EN: Mm-hmm.

MP: And you know, she'll always be an instructor. She's kind of a career non-tenure person.

EN: And then there's another career non-tenure in Economics that's beloved by other IS [Interdisciplinary Studies] teachers.

MP: Right. Laura Wolff probably or something.

EN: Yeah Laura Wolff, right.

MP: Right. But you know, what happens to Career non-tenure people? I mean, they're not...

EN: They're dispensable.

MP: Well, they're not...

EN: They have no power in school.

MP: Right. Exactly. And in Accounting, there's Linda and there is now an African American woman who they hired last year maybe. In Management there's ah Gertrude [P. Pannirselvam] who you may know. Do you know Gertrude? She's from Sri Lanka I think.

EN: Yes. I know her from, because she runs a lot of big committees on campus.

MP: Yeah. Yeah.

EN: Yeah. Yeah. She's, she organizes the faculty seminar. The annual faculty seminar.

MP: Right. Right. Right.

EN: Oh, yes.

MP: Yeah.

EN: I know who she is.

MP: And she's wonderful.

EN: Uh-huh. Yeah.

MP: And there's Laura, who is, she's married to the Associate Dean, but I don't mean that as....

EN: No.

MP: As I that's just my identification of that, but she, they came together. And she's in in Management and Production.

EN: Oh.

MP: And there are new people in um...

EN: Mary Sumner.

MP: And yeah, Mary is still there. And there are new people in that department, new women. I mean don't even know how new they are. But they're new since I was gone.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And Economics. See now there are those two wonderful instructors...

EN: Yeah.

MP: But and....

EN: They're famous. They're both just famous everywhere, more famous right now than probably anyone.

MP: But see they're not valued at home.

EN: In the Business School.

MP: I mean it was the same experience I had. And the ah, the Econ department just doesn't have women. They never have women. Now that I don't know, in Finance they had there was a woman in Finance when that department was merged in, but she left. In fact, that everybody left all the finance faculty left except Rakesh [Bharati].

EN: Jackie Solard [phonetic]

MP: But I mean, that was the function of not have, you know, being valued, but I don't know now, if there's a Finance, a woman in Finance, or not, I don't know who they have.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: But they, they had no women, except Ann who was hired you know back when Homer was a pup. [phone ringing] All those years there were no, there were never many tenure-track women. And it's not again, it wasn't that they weren't, that they hired them and they didn't stay or whatever. They would never, in my whole, in all my time, they did not hire a single woman. And they're, I don't know what's doing the Marketing, but I don't think there are any women. So it's a, it's a different world. It's a whole different world. I think there were people who could, who were capable of mentoring, and they probably still are in the Liberal Arts. It's a question of whether they choose to do it or not, you know. But everybody's so young, relatively speaking, is anybody tenured? [MP and EN laugh]

EN: Right.

MP: You know, I mean, they're all of them, are so, you know.

EN: Yeah.

MP: And they're in there. You can't be mentoring when you're still you know, getting your feet wet in your own career. And so...

EN: Wendy Shaw's the associate, she's terrific in the CAS now. She's the one who handles the money and everything in CAS.

MP: Is she, is she, she's tenured?

EN: Oh, yes. She's good. She's a very good scholar in her field in geography. She's published several books. She founded an online journal which she's continued, and she's been president of the association. And she's Wonder Woman. [EN and MP laugh]

MP: You know, so she could take on that role.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: Yeah.

EN: Yeah.

MP: And well, you know, Dixie was Associate Dean over in payroll.

EN: Yeah. She's gone.

MP: Yeah, Dixie's gone. But I, I think that women are just going to have to decide that they're going to take on that role for one another. [Dog barking] That's the mailman. Okay. Mailman. Stop. That's enough. Sit down. [EN laughing] Hold on, let's get them out.

EN: Yeah. Okay. [Recording stops] I asked him, I asked him to interview some of these people in the in the Business School like Bud Hirsch. But I thought it might be but he told me, no, he said "No it's a man's thing, that mine is bigger than yours and it wouldn't go well and...."

MP: [MP and EN laugh] He's probably right.

EN: I guess he see's the same things you do [Both laugh] at the Business School. Cause Bob Carver, he runs around the track with Bob Carver and I said, "Why can't you just ask him to take an hour or two sometime and sit down?"

MP: Uh-huh.

EN: You know. He said, "It wouldn't go the way you think it would."

MP: Is this on?

EN: Yeah, it's on. So at, what about turning points in the history?

MP: Of the university?

EN: University, or whether or anything that, what your, the thing you did that you really are most proud about? Of all the things you did on that campus.

MP: Oh, GBA 300. GBA 300 is what I'm most proud of. There's no question about that. That it actually lasted. But you know, this is typical of the Business School. This is the way my, by the time I left, I was really miserable. GBA 300 was the creation of that Gang of Six.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: But I was the one that got that Gang of Six together.

EN: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

MP: And when [David] Ault decided that GBA 300 was something of value, he and Don Elliot arranged for it to be presented at a conference in San Francisco. Without my knowledge.

EN: Oh.

MP: And without my participation.

EN: Oh.

MP: And the way I found out about it was by reading, 'cause I had been to that conference in previous years, I read the um, I just remember, reading the title of it and thinking in, in the ah, the program...

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: ...Reading the title, and thinking, "Hey, this is something we would be really interested in." And then realizing that it was ours, that I had not...

EN: Oh-no. Oh dear.

MP: Yeah, I had not known a thing about it.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And I know, eventually, Norm [Nordhaouser] was invited to go.

EN: He was? I didn't know that.

MP: And Julian Bueno, who had not been part of the original group at all, but had taught in it.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And um, and when Gil Rutman told Dave Ault that that was really inappropriate that I had not been included, his response was, "Well, there wasn't enough room at the table for all those people." So it's like he had no, I mean, he had, he didn't think about it at all.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And ah...

EN: Oh dear.

MP: So that was kind of the topper on it for me because I mean, as I said, 300 was, was what I felt closest to my heart.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And then to have that presented without me, without even my knowledge, was well, it's illustrative of a lot of things.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: But definitely was illustrative that Ault couldn't see a woman could contribute much of anything to anything.

EN: Oh dear.

MP: So, I'd say, that kind of sums up what my experience in the Business School.

EN: Yeah, Uh-huh.

MP: It's not a good way to have that summarized. Um, turning points... I'd say Nancy Belck's period, even though it was a short period, was a turning point. Because she was exactly what the campus needed at the time. I don't know if in other times, that would have been true. But she had a wonderful way with people.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: She made people feel valued. And so you're moving from a period of, of all that intensity of the Lazerson administration to, to something else. And from the anger of the Lazerson administration to something else. She came along, and she knew just how to make people feel good about being where they were. And about... [Pause] And at the same time, there was a big turnover, there was the beginning of the big turnover faculty.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: So she there she was as Chancellor, and with Dave as Provost, two regular normal, decent people without all that complicated angst, you know, and, and new faculty, and you could kind of start a new way to think about the place.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: Now, I don't I don't know where the faculty is now. But I can't imagine that there are as many angry and bitter people as there were at the time that Nancy took over. People who thought that they've been promised something and then the promises hadn't been kept. And, so I think Nancy's time was a real, a real turning point. And I don't, you know, I don't know if for people who weren't there at the time, if you asked what she accomplished, you know, you can't look at buildings. And you know, you can't say well, she built this program and she, you know, she built that building or that kind of thing. But at the time, what she did was just crucial.

EN: Uh-huh.

MP: And she, you know, she wasn't there very long, but it was all that was necessary, I think, combined with a new faculty.

EN: Yeah, now then. Well, I'm from Nebraska, but you see people from UNO [University of Nebraska Omaha] she's still there. And then just like her, she's brought in millions of dollars.

MP: Mm-hmm.

EN: Faculty love her [EN laughs]. They are doing some new building there, and they always say, "Thank you."

MP: Well, I think I think we...

EN: I think, "Well, you should thank Ted Sanders." [EN and MP laugh] He drove her away. You know.

MP: I think she would have done the same thing if she'd stayed. Because she was very effective in the community. I mean, they didn't know what to make of Earl in the community. But they, they, they loved her. And if she'd been here long enough, she would have raised money and you know, and done all that kind of stuff. She would have just barely enough time to set the groundwork. And, and then David Warner did a wonderful job by his low-key way.

EN: Yeah, but that's great that he stayed on as Provost.

MP: Yeah. And he you know, becoming Chancellor [recording ends]