David Sill
Transcript of interview for the History of SIUE Oral History Project
Interviewed by Ellen Nore
March 17, 2006

EN: Okay, it's Friday March 17th, 2006. This is Ellen Nore. I'm interviewing Professor David Sill for the SIUE 50th Anniversary History.

EN: So, so I guess I'll start it out by asking how you happened to come to SIU, uh...?

DS: Accident, accidentally. There was no intention. Um, I had been at a small school in Cincinnati that um didn't close, but it was a Catholic school run by the Sisters of Mercy, and they sold their assets to the Jesuits and Xavier University. And up until the very end of the year, I had thought that I was going to stay there and it was going to become, its called Edgecliffe College, Xavier University. The day before commencement in the spring, the provost from Xavier called all the faculty in from Edgecliffe and that's when I was notified that the whole department was wiped out...

EN: Oh my goodness!

DS: ...and that was the day before commencement. So, so I was on the job market with a young son, a one-year-old son, and, um, needed to find a job. And it turns out that there was a job opening here that was advertised late in the year because they didn't have any travel money. They had to use the travel money from the next fiscal year, ah, to interview, so they were actually interviewing over the summer. And uh, I ended up getting the job! So, it turned out that the timing was just right because I would not have been on the job market in the middle of the summer if it wasn't for that the school had closed down. So, it was entirely accidental, [EN laughter] I never intended to come here. And it was just a matter of this is where the job was open, and I applied, interviewed, and got the job. And there was no more planning to it than that.

EN: Ok, and this was about 1980...

DS: 1980.

EN: Yeah.

DS: Yeah, 1980. I was with a very small class of incoming…

EN: …Yes…

DS: …faculty in 1980.

EN: Right.

DS: Very small group of us. I don't even remember how many, but there weren't many. Under, it's about five, four or five, I think.

EN: And Earl Lazerson had just become President.

DS: Earl Lazerson had just become President, and Earl Beard was Acting Provost.

EN: um hm, And then you decided to stay here, I usually ask people [DS laughs]… why they stay, they stay sometimes...[inaudible]

DS: [DS laughs] Well, one of the questions you asked was, in the email...

EN: Changes and time...

DS: ...was why I decided to go into administration.

EN: Yes, why did you decide to go into administration.

DS: ...and I think these things are connected. My deciding to stay here and my deciding to go into administration are connected. That early in my career, relatively early in my career, I had to make a decision of whether I wanted to go into professional theater, or whether I wanted to go into administration, it's just because I kind of never saw myself as staying in the role that I was hired into. Um, it's not the position I necessarily would have applied for if I'd had a choice when I was hired in. I was an Assistant Professor, but I had some ah [DS smacks lips] technical responsibilities that I didn't want to have. It was, I was, serving as technical director, and I didn't want a job where I was serving as technical director. And so, I, I could have gone to another institution where I wasn't technical director, I was only a designer. I'm a designer in the theater.

EN: Yes, that's what I'm thinking when you won these awards in design.

DS: Yeah, well…

EN: [Both Laugh] You read my mind or...

DS: I'm a designer in the theater. But ah, I was also, actually, I wasn't called Technical Director but that's what my job was. It was called Technical Production Coordinator, and...but it was just a fancy name for change for, no, Technical Director----not Shop Supervisor. We had a Shop Supervisor. But I was, I was responsible for administrative aspects of the technical part of productions.

EN: Okay.

DS: That's the simplest way of putting it. Ah, but its budget and staffing and scheduling. And all of those things, um, and that's not the kind of job I wanted, it wasn't the kind of job I looking for. So, so I could have looked for another position in another university, where I wasn't Technical Director, or I could have gone into professional theater. Or I could have gone into

administration. Those were kinda my choices. And I wasn't really interested in going to another institution, going to another institution, so I really narrowed it down to either administration or professional theater. And I actually had the person who was our shop supervisor, effectively our shop supervisor asked me what I was going to do, and that's exactly what I told him, back in about, must been about '85 or so, and that's exactly what I told him.

And so I kind of ended up in administration accidentally, but it was one of the possible career goals that I'd had for myself. And it was more because I didn't want to be Tech Director than I really wanted to be administration. [DS Laughs] Uh, but I, I ended up as Chair of the Department of Theater and Dance, Acting Chair of the Department of Theater and Dance entirely by accident. We had were doing an external search. Bill Vilhauer was Chair of the Department of Theater and Dance. He's the one who hired me. He was the one who was Chair ah, for when I went through the tenure process and got promoted to Associate. And Bill, er ah, Bill Vilhauer retired. And we were doing an external search. And we had interviewed, we were ready to offer the position to someone, and I don't remember his name, but we were ready to offer the position to someone. And this was at the time when, and there's a whole lot of connected stories here, but it was at the time when Barbara Teters [Academic Provost] …

EN: Yes!

DS: …pulled money back from the Schools. Ah, and one of the things that Peter Bukalski gave up in order to give money back was that position, the Chair of Theater and Dance…

EN: [EN Laughs] Oh Ok, I see.

DS: …position. So, it had to be someone internally, and I was the one who became Acting Chair. So, it was accidental. If it had been the year before, if he had retired the year before, we would have had an external Chair. Possibly the year after we might have had an external Chair. But that year, it was the coincidence of the budget, ah uh [DS smacks lips] struggles, lets put it in those terms, budget struggles that Barbara Teters had. Um, it just was entirely incidental and accidental, and I became acting chair. And that's, then I stayed in administration from that point.

EN: Ok, so that's a very interesting story...

DS: Once I became Chair, then I was set. Yeah, I was going to stay…

EN: Yes, you were going to, yes…

DS: …here. I was committed. And I had made that decision because that was one option... one option was to stay here and go into administration and get away from being Tech Director. Become an administrator. And that would be the career path. And I'd stay here. And that was the decision I made. If I had gone into professional theater, I would of, I would of left. I wouldn't have stayed. There's not enough professional theater in St. Louis. You have to go to Chicago, L.A., Seattle, New York. You can't, you can't stay in St. Louis, go into professional theater, and make a living.

EN: Okay, well, that was our good fortune. [Both Laugh]

DS: Well, or curse, or.

EN: No, I'm thinking that there's lots of different ways to be chair too, but you know, if you wanted to move up.

DS: I was Acting Chair for two years, and then I was Chair for two years, so I was in the position for four years. But two years as acting position.

EN: Well, uh, I asked about changes and continuities, which you have observed from your very post. Maybe you could start with theater here, as it changed over the years. I know the musical theatre option isn't, isn't there anymore.

DS: Musical theater has come and gone. It's not a viable option here, but there's always student, there's always student demand, and so, periodically, the faculty, in response to student demand, try and put together some kind of musical theater option for the students. But it just, um, it's not a good program match for SIUE for a whole variety of reasons, not the least of which is we can't be connected with major musical theater professionally, so there aren't internships, there aren't performance opportunities for students off-campus. You've got to be closer to New York, really if you're going to be doing a musical theater program...

EN: And why you...

DS: ...or you have to really have a huge amount of money. Cincinnati Conservatory of Music has a marvelous musical theater program. It is hugely funded, just hugely funded, and they are connected with a conservatory of music. Um, the theater program in University of Cincinnati doesn't get any funds at all. The musical theatre program is, is in CCM, the theatre program is in, not in CCM, its in arts and sciences or something.

EN: Huh, that's interesting.

DS: And it’s a, it’s a, there's a huge tension between the theatre program and the musical theatre program at the University of Cincinnati, we'd have to do something like that, and that wouldn't be healthy, it wouldn't be good.

EN: So I know that it's been my impression, ya know as an outsider, that our, that we've always done a lot of very contemporary theatre, here, and, and that we've always been experimental and, but, but maybe that's not your view [EN laughs]

DS: There's always a balance…

EN: Kind of a Mix

DS: …in doing. Well, there always is a mix; and there must be a mix if we're really doing a good job at an institution like SIUE. And it's because...

EN: The audience...

DS: It's because of the audience. It's because of the students, It's because of … the multiple roles that a theater department plays at a comprehensive masters' university, particularly one that really respects liberal learning and liberal education and values it, um which SIUE does. And so what it means is you have one role, which is recreational, it's something for students to do, something they want to do, something they did in high school, something they want to participate in. It's a whole lot better than going drinking.

EN: Yes!

DS: [DS Laughs] A whole lot better than some of the other recreational activities students can do, and it has side benefits. It teaches responsibility. It teaches teamwork. Ah, it, it teaches entrepreneurship. You're constantly mounting new ventures. And um, and so it teaches budgeting and scheduling and staffing and all of the things that go into making a new business. So, there are a lot of side benefits in getting students involved, but that you have that recreational aspect, and students wanna do musical theater, they wanna do fun things, they wanna do comedies. But there's a limited [DS makes tsk sound] educational benefit for students doing that kind of theater. And there's not that much need in some ways because students can do the same thing doing community theater. There's a lot of community theater around the area.

EN: Yeah!

DS: If they really just wanna get involved, and they wanna do musical theater or do comedies, they can go do community theater, and there's plenty of opportunity around the area. Um, so it's not necessarily an unmet need if we don't do a lot of that kind, that kind of show, the recreational kind of show. But then we also have to prepare students, in the next role, is we need to prepare students who want to work professionally or want to go out and teach, who want to make theater a career. We need to, we need to give them the opportunities they have, in order to develop their skills and abilities. Ah in order to go out into the professional world or go out and teach. And so there's a whole series of different kinds of plays we need to do for that. They need to have a range of performance opportunities. They need to, in technical theatre, they need to have a range of technical challenges. Um and not just do kinda simplistic things, and not just do things that are not particularly challenging intellectually or not particularly challenging technically. So there's a whole series of kinds of things we need to do that. Every student needs to deal with Shakespeare, for example. Well, Shakespeare is not the kind of thing, that um, is musical theatre comedy in general, although there's Shakespearean comedies, of course. Ah, but its at least more of an intellectual challenge. And, and then the students need to deal with some cutting-edge things, they need, they need to understand what is, ah, for example, what is African-American or Black Theater. What are the, what are the kinda things that are going on in the places where they really might have performance opportunities, which is the off Broadway, off-off-Broadway, kind of production, not a Broadway, big Broadway musical? But what's going on off-Broadway, what's going on in the small professional theaters in St. Louis or in Chicago? And those kind of plays tend to have a cutting edge. They tend to be plays about issues. They tend to be plays that are more confrontational or difficult. So, we need to have some of those kinds of things so they

can have those kinds of experiences. And um, so that those, those kinds of plays need to get scheduled in, in order to provide the students with the kind of performance experiences they need to have in order to be able to make it out in the real world.

Then, there also is the role that theater and theater production plays in a liberal education. Now, this is one of the reasons that theater was done at places like Oxford and Cambridge back at the time of Shakespeare. Theater was part of the liberal education. Because if you're going to be studying the literature of theater, which is a very important part of our culture, you need to see it in performance, and see what is it like when you actually perform Sophocles or Euripides or Aristophanes [EN laughs], or although Aristophanes wasn't performed that much at the time of Shakespeare, ah because it's a little too bawdy. But um if, if you, if you look at the, at the history of, of performance in universities, it always, there always was Shakespeare since the time of Shakespeare. There always were the Greek classics and the, and the, the classics from Continental theater, and these have always been part of the education of the general campus. So, we do some plays for the education, of just the liberal education, enriching the liberal education of the general campus.

And then, we do a fourth group of plays, which are the really experimental or cutting-edge plays that are for stretching our theater students. I'm thinking about what is theater? How do you define theater? And, and these also fall into liberal education. I mean, we're doing these kinds of plays...I'm doing a CIV 115 with Bob [Robert] Wolf [Philosophy] in the, in the fall, about how do you find meaning in an absurd world. And of course, we're dealing with plays that are really on the fringe in many ways, although they're becoming more and more in the center, ya know, the work of Samuel Beckett, for example...

EN: Yes!

DS: …has become more and more in the center. But in, originally, it was at the fringe. Some of the early plays by Sam Shepard, for example, um are, are really not typical. They're not the kind of thing people expect when they go to the theater. So, they raise the question of: even what is theater? And what's the purpose of theater? So we have to be doing that fourth kind of play, too. So some of the more experimental things we do fall into that category, its really stretching peoples' ideas about what is theatre in the first place.

Now when I first got here, I was the radical okay [EN Laughs]. That my interests were in Brecht and Beckett and, and really cutting-edge kinds of things. Um, doing things in interesting ways. And you know, I come from Berkeley.

EN: Right.

DS: I'm a natural-born radical.

EN: Right [EN Laughs].

DS: And uh, the Department was very conservative, very conservative, and... theatrically, not necessarily politically, but theatrically. And um, it was very interesting because some of the faculty were very conservative in terms of kinda that first group of plays I talked about. What are the...

EN: Yes.

DS: ... the recreational kinda things, musical comedy, comedies, ya know Neil Simon kind of things. And I had no interest whatsoever in doing any of that. I've done a lot of it. Just because when you're a designer, you do shows. And, and some of them are very hard for me to do just because you've got to be excited about what you're doing, or you can't do it! [EN Laughs] How do you get excited about doing another production of "Oklahoma"? You just...So anyway, so I was the one who was tending to push.

And Bill Grivna, who has just recently retired, marvelous teacher, marvelous director, marvelous actor. I loved working with Bill Grivna. But Bill was locked into traditional realism. He was trained that way. He was, um, he grew up with that, but he didn't want to do that. [EN Laughs] What he wanted to do was experimental things! He wanted to do international things! He wanted to do cutting edge things, but it wasn't where his training was. And so he kept falling back into realism, and he'd try something, but he'd fall back into realism. And it was just, it was kind of funny to watch. Because…

EN: I think the last production of his I saw was the one about immigrants.

DS: Yeah, Oh, and that, that was a great play!

EN: That was a great play.

DS: *Rowing to America*.

EN: I saw it two times.

DS: ... hey, I did the lights!

EN: As a historian...ohh did you?

DS: Yeah, I did the lights!

EN: Okay, I liked that very much.

DS: And it was, it was a good production, and thats kinda as far as he could go experimentally. Look at some of the new faculty, ya know, people like Chuck Harper. The kind of thing Chuck's doing, Bill really kind of wanted to do, but he kinda didn't know how. And I love working with Chuck. Chuck's just been a marvelous hire. And has done really...the Department has done a number of marvelous hires. The junior faculty in the Department are really outstanding, um, but um, it's really changed, shifted, because the junior faculty have brought a kind of experimental, cutting-edge approach to thinking about what is theatre, what should it be? What should we have our students doing? How do we push our students? And not just the students in the productions, but the students who come to the productions. And I, that, I'm much more in tune with that actually than I was with some of the work that was done earlier. And I kept, I was always the one pushing the envelope. [EN Laughs] And now, whew... I, I work with faculty who push me! Which is great! I love it. It's great! I just did Dance in Concert, and the faculty was really pushing, what could we do, and it was wonderful, I loved it!

EN: Great.

DS: And, and, so, the Department has changed over time. But it has always been a quality department. It's never been a question of quality. But it's always been a department that has been very much rooted in this institution and this institution's mission. It's never been trying to do something inappropriate or something that was disconnected. It's always been a question of what does that connection mean? Not a question of whether it should be connected or not.

EN: Okay.

DS: And that's been part of the health of the Department.

EN: Well, what about the university, what about changes in the, in the, in the university, continuities?

DS: Let me back up just a little bit before we get to that.

EN: Okay, okay.

DS: … And then let me get into it. [DS clears throat] One of the reasons I fell into theater and why I do theater, has to do with my own personality and my own philosophy of life. And it has to do with ah family and community and creativity. And that it, I, I feel very strongly, that a healthy community is one in which we, people are working together and in people are, are working towards common goals.

EN: uh-huh.

DS: That a community that doesn't have any goals is just like a person who has no direction. Communities don't work well if they stagnate. Communities don't work well if they just kinda exist and aren't going anywhere, just as people are not healthy if they're not going somewhere, if they're not moving forward, somehow, somewhere. And so the question often becomes: How do you get people working together in a community? And what are the goals? Where are you going? And if your going in higher education, if you're going towards goals, those goals have to be like twenty years out. Because we work on a very long production cycle, from the time when you develop a program, to recruit people into a program, to get, to get both faculty and students. You're hiring faculty. Ya know we, ya look at, at Criminal Justice. From the time when we first had the idea of doing Criminal Justice to the time when we first *graduated* our Criminal Justice students was at least 10 years. It just takes time. You can't be changing your goal and direction every five years. [DS cough] You'll never get anywhere. You might as well not have any goals at all. So one of the things that I have really felt comfortable with being at SIUE is we've had a long horizon. We've been working way out. We haven't been changing our major goals. We haven't been changing our Mission every five years. We haven't been changing our goals every five years. And it traces back to when Earl Lazerson, well, it traces back further than that. It traces back to Delyte Morris. Ya know, some of what we're doing right now is because of Delyte Morris. Our commitment to diversity is his

commitment to diversity. If you look at our early hires, we had a more diverse faculty in our early hires, than anyone else did! Because he was committed to it. And so, ya know one of the challenges we've had in keeping a diversified faculty is: how do you replace the Phil Hamptons, ya know the Ramon Williamson's, how do we replace those people? Because when we were hiring that group, when we were hiring Rudy Wilson, no one else was wanting to hire those faculty. But Delyte Morris said, "We are going to have a diverse faculty." And we did! And so many of the founding faculty...we had a very diverse founding faculty. That was unusual. Was not typical. That was a core value at SIUE, and it goes back to Delyte Morris. You look at that new faculty, and there was a sense of needing to have an interdisciplinary approach; all of the strength of our interdisciplinary work right now can be traced back to those early years. So again, it goes back to Delyte Morris' time, hiring the faculty, finding faculty, ya know Bill Going. Ya know, these founding people created the culture that we still are working within. We may forget that, but we're still working with that culture that was created by the founding faculty and by Delyte Morris. So that kind of constancy, I think, is very important.

But the other thing is, is it can be traced back to Earl Lazerson and when he was Provost. And I just recently had the chance to talk with Earl about that. And, one of the things... and, and it, I was talking with him about the assessment program...the origins of the Assessment Program. Because Trudy Banta from IUP Live...

EN: Okay.

DS: ...was wanting to write a book about ah leaders at institutions where assessment actually took hold. And um, and so we suggested to Trudy she contact, Doug Eder [Biology, later Director of Assessment] and me, and we suggested Earl Lazerson. He was the leader who really got us started with assessment. So Trudy asked if I would call Earl. So I did. I called Earl, and Earl's first response was, well, he didn't really do anything, he didn't have anything to do with, with the assessment program. And of course he did [Both Laugh], he absolutely did. So then we started probing. And it turns out it goes back to when he was Provost, this is what he said, it went back to when he was provost, and he realized, that if we were going to be anything more than a, just a, an average, routine, comprehensive master's regional university, we were going to have to make a commitment. And because of the changing times and the political reality, the commitment we needed to make was to undergraduate education. We were not going to be a doctoral institution. We weren't going to be a research institution. And so, we needed to focus on undergraduate education. That was something he came to realize as Provost. So when he became President, he pushed for um the commitment to undergraduate education in our Mission. So when we wrote the Mission in the early '80s, it had in it that our first commitment was undergraduate education. I mean, you remember that.

EN: Yes.

DS: And there were some battles because there were faculty who really wanted us to be doctoral, a doctoral institution still, and a research institution, you know all of that story. But Earl's the one who realized that, that wasn't possible, that wasn't realistic. And if we kept at that as a dream, we were just going to flounder around, not have any direction, and we were going to be an average ordinary comprehensive masters university, that was not distinguished with anything. So that was the first part of the commitment. And then along with that, and all of this falls under Earl,

along with that was general education reform, which he started. And I think you know some of that story, and if you want to know more, I have a whole pile from the ahh, [EN Laughs] from the, the archives, that Steve Kerber dug out. Ah, and uh that, that, tells that story. We, of course, ended up with the general education program we have now.

EN: Well, uh, the, the Gen Ed program has always had these, these three parts to it, from, from the beginning and...

DS: Well, it did before it was general education.

EN: Uh-huh.

DS: When it was the General Studies Program. Or whatever heck it was called.

EN: Yes,uh-huh, General Studies...

DS: Yeah, it had the same three parts.

EN: And so the reform under, under Earl Lazerson was...I, I don't think I…

DS: Do you know that story? Ah.

EN: No, I don't.

DS: I need to give you something.

EN: I don't really know. Yeah, because actually those files were missing when I was going through them...there's a, they were, they have a, there's a little card that says "out." It doesn't say who has it, but...

DS: I got this from the archives, the archives dug this out.

EN: Uh-huh, yes.

DS: The archives has a lot of this, and the bigger story, and this predates me; there was a task force. There was a task force of about 20, who spent a lot of time and brought some very, some pretty prominent national people in, to uh, and, and their all described in there, I'm not gonna really cover that, 'cause [Uninteligible] that, that predates me.

EN: Yes, uh-huh, right.

DS: But that task force put together a general education plan. It went to the Curriculum Council of the Faculty Senate, the Curriculum Council of the Faculty Senate looked at it and didn't support it. They thought it wasn't realistic that it wasn't necessary. It would be a lot of work, a lot of cost without a lot of positive result. And the story as I've understood it, and I'd talked with Steve Brown [Music] about this a little bit, was that Steve Brown and Bud [Maurice] Hirsch

[Accounting] got together, wrote out a plan, brought it back to the Curriculum Council, and the Curriculum Council basically approved it, finalized it, approved it. So, it was the Curriculum Council's plan. And um, and it's really Steve Brown and, and Bud Hirsh who put it together.

EN: Yeah.

DS: And in talking with Steve Brown, Steve characterized the plan that the Task Force had done as "a mess," as an "unworkable mess." That's not a direct quote, but it's very close. And if you haven't talked with Steve you might want to talk to Steve.

EN: No, I, I have to talk to him. He was involved in the Experiment in Higher Education too.

DS: He was involved in the Experiment in Higher...

EN: [Uninteligible] things I'm interested in that...

DS: …Oh, you've got to nail down the Experiment in Higher Education.

EN: Yes!

DS: That the closing the Experiment in Higher Education, I think, is one of the biggest tragedies of this institution. Uh, I mean we're gonna end up wandering around a little bit here.

EN: Yeah, I knew we would. [EN Laughs].

DS: Dave Werner, Dave Werner…

EN: It happens a lot.

DS: … did not like the Experiment in Higher Education.

EN: Uh-huh.

DS: It's because it was not managed in the professional way that Dave Werner, was just part of his being.

EN: Well the, the, actually he, he was, he was Dean of Business…

DS: He was Dean of the School of Business.

EN: … at that time [the late 70s, early 80s], and he did seem to make an effort as Dean of the School of Business to offer upper level...

DS: Oh, he...

EN: …capstone courses in East St. Louis. He was the one person, I think, who really…

DS: Dave Werner was a team player.

EN: Yes, mhm-hmn.

DS: ...and Dave Werner would participate in the work of the University, even if he didn't agree with it. Okay, that's one of the things I liked about Dave Werner, he might not agree with you, but if he thought you were doing the right things for the right reasons...

EN: Yes.

DS: ... he might not agree with what you did, but he would support you. I mean, that was an incredible capacity for Dave Werner, and I saw him. There were several times when I worked for Dave, when I would head off in a direction that he didn't believe in [EN Laughs], but he *never,* never stopped me. [DS Laughs] Because I was doing it for what he thought were the right reasons, I was really trying to make things better. I was trying to do things. I was trying to improve the quality. I was trying to get people *energized*. Ya know, I was doing things like that. He didn't really believe in it, but he'd support it. So he didn't really believe, he didn't believe in the Experiment in Higher Education. Not in, it's not that he didn't believe in the intent. He didn't believe in the way it was managed. He thought it was managed in a sloppy manner, a non-professional manner, that it was too messy, that it was too, ah kind of seat of the pants. It wasn't being managed in a professional manner. That's what he opposed, was the management style, not the idea, he was supportive of the idea, but he opposed the management style. Um, he just thought it was too loosey-goosey. He'd never use that term, I don't think, but that's, that's what it was.

EN: [EN Laughs] Yeah.

DS: But the Experiment in Higher Education was a success. And when it was closed down, it was closed down for political reasons. And the successor, State Community College, was a disaster. It was closed down and replaced by Metropolitan Community College, which was a bigger disaster.

EN: Yes!

DS: And it miss-served the people of East St. Louis. And the students who went through that, went through Metropolitan Community College and State Community College did not get a quality education, and when they'd get to this campus, they'd flounder.

EN: Mm-hmm.

DS: Um Lynn Heidegger Brown has a story about a student you might want to ask her about...

EN: Yes, she's in my...

DS: ...For Metropolitan Community College. Uh, you might ask her in particular about that one. Because I remember her telling this story about a student who was crying. Um, and uh, I don't remember the exact words, but you can check with Lynn. But it was something [Uninteligible], Lynn asked her what was wrong. And she said, "well, she had always thought she was an honors student." She'd came from Metropolitan Community College, they told her she was an honors student, and she couldn't handle the work. Well, that's a simple, ya know a single instance, but I think it's telling. And when we went and took over the facility [Metropolitan Community College], we found boxes of microscopes in the lab that had never been opened, never been put out. Someone had bought them and never used them. Uh, and the students were just simply miss-served. And the students in the Experiment in Higher Education were served very, very well. When they came to the campus, they succeeded. They were prepared and succeeded well. Now not everyone succeeded, but look at the population.

EN: Yes...

DS: And the percentage of success, which I can't quote, and I don't know. But the percentage of success far exceeded the expected success rate for the students who came in.

EN: Well, you said there were political reasons for doing away with it, with the EHE.

DS: You want on the record or off the record?

EN: Well, do you… I, I, I...do you want me to turn off the tape recorder? I, I'm just curious, because I've been telling. I interviewed John Farley, I told him that for years I've been looking for the right student to work on that as a project. For their masters or something. There is a, there is a thesis that was done at Saint Louis University, but they didn't interview anyone. They didn't really make full use of the SIUE records. And there's a lot of good records on it.

DS: How can I do this on the record? and...I think some of this should be on the record.

EN: [EN Laughs] I think the right, there's a right person. Maybe one of our faculty someday will write something.

DS: But I'm not sure because it's accusatory...

EN: Ohh.

DS: I'm not sure how I wanna put this. Let me put it in, in one way that it has to do with ownership. That if the Experiment in Higher Education was owned by the University. We are an outsider in that community. Even though we now have been there for the whole life of the university, we were born there. We are still an outsider.

EN: Yes.

DS: And so, here's a program from the outside. The community wanted to have a program, a college, that they owned, that could empower the community from inside, not from outside. Now let's turn the recorder off for a second...

EN: Okay, [EN Laughs] yeah. [Recording stops and starts again]

EN: A meeting at 11...

DS: Oh, I don't know, what's my meeting at 11?

EN: Okay, I don't know...this is your secretary.

DS: Yeah, I know she'll, well she can text me, too. I do have something. No, I don't have a meeting till 1, according to this.

EN: Oh, okay.

DS: She might have stuck something in...I ended up having two meetings yesterday that I didn't know about, but that wasn't because of Linda that was because of someone else.

EN: [EN Laughs] Okay.

DS: Okay, anyway. So...

EN: So, that's one of the changes then...

DS: Yeah.

EN: ...that is our relationship with East St. Louis?

DS: That is one of the changes with the relationship with East St. Louis. And um, it um, it's been challenging. And of course, we used to offer courses in East St. Louis, even after the Experiment in Higher Eduaction was shut down. Over time, we stopped, we stopped. And um, [smacks lips] it - that was a whole other challenge we could spend easily an hour talking about.

EN: Yes, uh right, right. So...

DS: If you want to come back sometime, we can talk about that.

EN: No, okay, were you involved in those discussions? Were you on committees that dealt with that or ?

DS: We had courses in the Department of Theater and Dance, we had courses in East St. Louis.

EN: Because of PAC Co.? The theatre in... [Performing Arts Company]

DS: No, at that time, It was ah, it was, yeah it was Ralph Green and Bonnie Harmon and then the dancers, the dance troops - Theo Jamison in particular, whose still around. Um, Theo's been marvelous to work with, Ralph was frustrating. And, well, this is… Ralph Green and Bonnie Harmon got angry. And they basically said, "We're going to resign if we don't get our way." And, let's see, who was director of the East St. Louis Center at that time...tsk. Oh shoot, what was…

EN: This is after you came... this is in the 80s.

DS: Oh yes, I was, this was in the 90s!

EN: Who was it, it wasn't Johnetta Haley, was it?

DS: It might have been Johnetta Haley.

EN: Yes uh-huh. Because she was for quite a while...

DS: ... it might have still been Johnetta Haley. Or it might have been Roy.

DS: Yeah, it might have been Roy. Anyway, the response of the Director was, "Okay, thank you very much. I'll accept your resignation." And they were gone.

EN: That sounds like Johnetta...

DS: It does. But it could have been Roy. Um, and um, but working with Ralph Green was a huge challenge. And when he submitted a resignation in protest, I don't think he ever expected the resignation to be accepted, and it was. Um but by that time, there were no courses being offered anymore. The courses were, were only offered in the early, in the early part of the '80s, ah by that time there were no courses being offered. What they, what ah, what they were doing, and this was at that point called the Katherine Dunham Center for the Performing Arts - they were doing activities, they were doing activities for kids and for the community. We tried a number of different ways to do things that would involve our own students, and it just never worked. Ah, we got the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc. I think that's the formal name, to sponsor productions here on campus. And the Alpha's job was basically um audience development. And um, those worked fine, but the amount of work involved, the amount of effort involved, was just not sustainable. And I could never get our students to have performance opportunities, to have any kind of meaningful work. Um, and it just made the, made the amount of work involved not worth it.

And then we were able to start the Black Theater Program uh and bring in basically visiting artists, some of whom were our own graduates, some of whom were not, ah to come in and do Black Theatre workshops and provide performance opportunities for our, for our black students. Ah, and it's a genre, an important genre in American theater. And to have, have it on campus, to have people working with it as opposed to saying, "Well, you've got to go to the Black REP," "The St. Louis Black Repertory Theater if you want those performance opportunities!" Well, a number of our students have done that, and they've been great, and our

connection with the St. Louis Black Rep has been very, very positive through the years. In part because of Bill [Gridna?]

EN: Yes, that's what I'm. You're reading my mind.

DS: Yeah, um. But, but it's not on campus, and what statement are we making for our students if we're recruiting African-American students, black students, performers. What statement are we making if we say, okay, we want you to be here students but we have no performance opportunities for you. Because for many of our Black actors, in particular, their major performing opportunities are in the African American Black theater community, it goes by both names. Um, they get, that's where, that's where the real entry-level performance opportunities are. Ya know, once they've made a name for themselves, then they have all sorts of other opportunities. But, where are you going to get started? Um, and that's the big performance opportunity is in African American black theatre um and kind of nationwide movement, and there are many performance opportunities there. And so we need to prepare them, again it gets back to... [Recording stops and starts again]

DS: Oh boy, shes the ah...

EN: She's the visiting person.

DS: She's a former, she's a former student. They did a search. And I don't know what the results of the search were... and very good candidates. Ya know Lisa Colbert [Black Theater Program] had been in that …

EN: Yes, that was so sad…

DS: … position, and she died.

EN: She was a kind of friend of mine.

DS: She was wonderful.

EN: She was.

DS: Oh, I just adored working with her. And she was so good with the students. And, well, she was in Rowing to America...

EN: That's right.

DS: And I respected, admired, and cared for her greatly because she really did bring something special to this institution.

EN: I know she would come to the history department when we were interviewing black candidates. I would give her a call and say…

DS: Yeah!

EN: "… please come to their presentation today," …

DS: She was wonderful!

EN: ... and she would introduce herself. And I'm sure she helped us recruit some people. It was …

DS: Oh, I'm sure she!

EN: She was great.

DS: It was such a shock; she was so young. But we've had others, Kathy Bentley's been wonderful. And I understand, I understand that some of the other applicants for the position were also very strong, so I don't know what the department, ya know, I don't know what decision the department has made. I'd stay out of it.

EN: Sure, right.

DS: Ya know, it's like a bull in a china shop.

EN: ohh I stay out too. I don't go to, I don't go over there and bother…

DS: I can only do damage…

EN: yeah, right [Both Laugh].

DS: … in the department.

DS: People over-interpret just the, an aside comment I might make, and they give it way more value and credence than it should ever possibly have. So I have to be very careful in working with the department. And I love the department, I love the people. I think, and I think they're doing outstanding work. But I just, ya know just positionally, I can't take off the Provost office hat. So, well anyway! I don't know where you…

EN: Well, we were talking about changes and continuities that you've observed. And then we started talking about East St. Louis.

DS: Yeah, we kinda went off on that tangent.

EN: You told me some interesting things about the relationship with the theatre department and the performing arts.

DS: Let's go back to the University and changes in the university, and Earl's [Lazerson's] role. Ah, because there was a whole series of things he wanted to get done as President. And

one of them was the mission, one of them was General Education reform. And then one was assessment. Getting us started in Assessment. And one of the things that Earl was very good at, even though his interpersonal skills were not the strongest ah, one of the things he was very good at, was in getting people to look at how can we take whatever external pressures they are and find intrinsic internal value - in those. So when we started looking at an assessment program, we weren't looking at it from the vantage point of pressures from the Department of Education or pressures from the North Central Association or the State of Illinois, IBHE. We were looking at it from the standpoint of how might it have intrinsic value for us. And um, and that's the kind of assessment program we created, was how could it be useful for SIUE, for us, for our community, to move us forward, and to value undergraduate education, to think more deeply about it, to improve, to get better. If we value it, how are we going to improve it? And if we're not trying to improve it, do we really value it?

EN: That's right.

DS: Ya know, it puts into question whether we value it.

EN: Yes.

DS: So, it's about commitment. It's about making a commitment. And part of that commitment is to improve it to move forward. And that was the approach we had for our assessment program from the beginning. It's unique! I don't know any other institution that really has taken the approach we have taken. I mean there are many institutions that tried, have modeled, or thought about modeling their approach on our approach.

EN: I've seen so many letters [in the Archives] about Doug Eder's presentations in the files…

DS: Well, those aren't lies.

EN: … and how great they are, how transforming they are for people.

DS: They are. If you've ever worked with Doug, out there, ya know working with other institutions. He is incredible; he really is good! He is very, very good. It's easier for him to work with audiences outside the University than it is inside. People are too close to him here. And um and so, he gets into trouble. And you know this institution is very split on Doug.

EN: They are, yes.

DS: You have people who would die for him, who would give their life for him. And you have people who just wouldn't give him the time of day. I don't know how many people are in the middle [Laughs].

EN: Yeah, I would say I'm one of the ones in the middle. But that's one of my regrets as chair. Is that I, I knew we had to do these things. I, but I don't think that I really grasped the significance of them, I have to admit that. I don't think I did.

DS: Well I...

EN: The people were so resistant.

DS: Mm-hmm, yep.

EN: Sort of, you fill out the grids and everything. You go around to your friends, and say, "please, we must do this." Then the assessment report is always a time of intense anxiety. Uh...

DS: Yep.

EN: So, I, I, but I know its important. I know it is. I know I could, I just didn't approach it. I don't know what I, I just didn't get it. [Laugh] That's a terrible thing to say.

DS: The Departments that have "gotten it" okay, have just taken it, and found it to be intrinsically valuable, and they have taken it and run with it. And it becomes a really important part of who they are and what they do. And, and it's exciting to watch!

EN: Yes.

DS: And the bigger question is: how do we, how do we get every department...

EN: Yes, I agree.

DS: ...to buy into it, and see how valuable it can be? And really get excited about it the way Psychology does.

EN: Yeah.

DS: Or the way Art and Design does, and, and so that's a big question. And we haven't gotten the final answer on that, and then we have things, we have some departments that did really extraordinary things and then they kinda backtrack, they kinda stop doing them. And so how do we re-energize them. Ya know, at its best, the assessment program has intrinsic value, its exciting, its interesting, and its exciting for the students and its exciting for the faculty. And it makes any work that goes into it absolutely worthwhile. Laura Strand calls the Mexica Project, which is part of their [Art and Design's] senior assignment, the most valuable teaching experience of her career. She can't do it every year, it's too much work. They do it every other year, so it's taking a sampling approach to assessment. Now they also do, every student obviously has to complete a senior assignment, so they do other senior assignments. But the Mexica is part of their senior assignment program, where they're able to sample some students and see what can the students really do if you put them in a more intense environment, and give them a richer experience. What can they really do? And, and what might we change in our curriculum so they can do it better? Um, tsk... but that's what energizes Laura, that's why she continues doing it even though it's such incredible work. Well, how can we get those experiences [chair creaking] for everybody to be that kind of valuable experience? So yes, it's more work, but boy, it's worth every bit of that more work. Isn't it exciting, isn't it interesting? Because when

it works right, it's incredibly rewarding. For everybody involved! For the students involved, for the faculty involved, when it works wrong, it's a pain in the neck, and it's a bureaucratic hurdle, and it's stressful, and it's problematic.

EN: Yes, well, we've always had a senior assignment, and I can see that we did things that were very valuable. Like, like we started having them reviewed by all the department. Took off the names and everybody had to look at the results of our teaching. We never had time to have a year of the curriculum, because we were too busy hiring people...

DS: Yeah.

EN: ...which for us was an exhausting process the way we did it. But um, but now they're having the year of the curriculum there, it's so exciting.

DS: Yeah.

EN: Well, so I can see that it did have an impact - but I just regret that. You know, now I really think I do understand about it, and I just regret that I wasn't able to lead people that way. Uh...

DS: Yeah, well...

EN. Because there was a lot of resistance in our department. Our department was one of those departments where I think overwhelmingly people didn't appreciate Doug Eder.

DS: I think he had an edge.

EN: But I think he's really, is a great person.

DS: He has done so much for this institution. He has been so positive for the institution.

EN: Yes, I think he has.

DS: Um, but one of the things that Doug and I have talked about for a number of years is: what's going to happen when we leave? Because a lot of things that happen happened because of us.

EN: Yes, it's true.

DS: Or have happened because of us.

EN: That's true.

DS: So what's gonna happen when we leave?

EN: That's right.

DS: And one of my goals has always been to make myself dispensable. I should be able to walk out the door, and the institution doesn't miss me, and I don't feel comfortable if that's not the case. So I want to be absolutely, ya know, it's kinda...

EN: So are you, do you have an acolyte that you're bringing up into the culture you want to foster? Do you have people who are ready to go...?

DS: Look at what's going on here, Sue Thomas [Psychology] now is Assistant Provost for Planning. She's a professor. She just was promoted to Professor. She has experience with the Senior Assignment. She's been involved with programming.

EN: With Psychology.

DS: She was Chair of UPBC [University Planning and Budget Council]. Um, she has been engaged in research. She just got a NSF Grant [National Science Foundation] with Jerry Weinberg. So she's been doing interdisciplinary work. Jerry Weinberg's over in Computer Science. [Creaking noise]

EN: Oh, yes.

DS: Um, she used to teach research methods. She understands psychology research, which, ya know. So she understands Social Science research. She has very high standards for herself, for her own performance, for her work.

Ah, when I came to this office, the person who was there [Assistant to the Provost] was Dwight Smith. Dwight Smith replaced Dan Gonczy.

EN: Yeah.

DS: Dan Gonczy was a wonderful person, everybody loved him. He died. And it was really sad.

EN: He was a friend of mine. A very dear friend.

DS: I can't say he was a friend, but he was a valued acquaintance.

EN: He always came to my class and gave huge presentations.

DS: Dan was wonderful. He was wonderful. But he wasn't a faculty member. He didn't come up through the ranks. He didn't know what it meant to have to face promotion and tenure.

EN: No, that's right.

DS: He didn't know what it meant to have to maintain a curriculum; he didn't know what that tension is between the undergraduate curriculum and the graduate curriculum. He didn't know what the hiring process was.

EN: Uh-huh.

DS: Ya know there are a lot of things he didn't understand because he didn't live it.

EN: Right, [EN Laughs]

DS: Right?

EN: That's right. [EN Laughs]

DS: So when Dwight Smith was hired, Dwight Smith had credentials that Dan didn't have. Dwight Smith had a doctorate, he, his Doctorate was in Education, and educational research, he had a background in educational research, which wasn't bad. But, when I got in this office, Dwight Smith did not see himself in a kind of faculty role. Or at that level. Okay.

EN: No, I can speak from...as a person. He wasn't perceived as a faculty member.

DS: And he didn't think of himself as a scholar, I mean, he didn't see his role as a scholar. If you look at Sally Ferguson, Sally Ferguson is not a faculty member. She doesn't pretend she's a faculty member. She doesn't see herself as a faculty member. But, when you talk with her, she sees herself as a researcher.

EN: Yes, she does.

DS: She takes a very disciplined, scholarly approach to her work. I love working with Sally.

EN: I loved interviewing her [EN laughs].

DS: She is incredible.

EN: Yes.

DS: She's absolutely incredible. She is part of why we are, who we are, and where we are. But Dwight didn't see himself that way. Dwight saw himself as an office worker, as a bureaucrat, as someone who would be passing paper and taking care of files and, and enforcing policy, and that sort of thing.

EN: Yes, you've got him!

DS: That was the role that was defined. And one of my goals is, as his supervisor, because I started out as his supervisor, one of my goals was to take this potentially incredibly valuable person and empower him, to get him to the point where he was able to take a more scholarly, rigorous approach to his work. So he wasn't just passing paper, he wasn't just taking care of files, he wasn't just enforcing rules. But rather, he was taking some leadership and stepping forward and looking for areas that needed tending and taking rigorous, scholarly approach to doing that. [EN Laughs] So, one of my successes that I feel somewhat proud of, I don't think I ever got him to the point I wanted to get him, but [EN Laughs] was to get him to make that shift.

EN: Huh.

DS: So that by the time he left here, he was taking initiative. He was starting to get people together to develop programs.

EN: That's true.

DS: He's the one who created Pharmacy. That wasn't his idea, he created it because it was David Werner's idea, but he's the one, Dwight Smith's the one who made it happen. That wasn't the role he had when he, when I got in this office. He never would do anything like that. But he was able to make that happen. He was able to make that happen as a scholar. He's the one who got us involved in AQIP, but he did it at a level that wasn't bureaucratic, that wasn't just paper handling. It was, was taking scholarly leadership as an administrator, and not seeing administration as management, but seeing administrative in a creative way. Administration is creative leadership, as a scholar, as an academic, not as bureaucratic management. And so getting him to have that shift, and to start doing that, and the things he was able to do, [DS clears throat] I felt was a very big success. Frankly, having him leave and having being able to hire a faculty member in that position was the next step in our improvement in this office.

EN: And that's Sue Thomas.

DS: And that's Sue Thomas.

EN: Where are we in the AQIP process? I read the report. Which...

DS: That's a whole other hour we could spend easily, if you want to.

EN: No, I just wondered, the report was...

EN: It goes beyond...

EN: Okay, alright. Okay.

DS: You would need a whole lot of briefing to understand where we are.

EN: oh, ok. Alright.

DS: We will be having a visit, a campus visit in the fall. There was a possibility we were going to have it in the spring, but I had to let the higher learning commission know we can't do it in the spring. One option was we would do it in the fall, and that's what we have to do in the Fall. We can't be ready in the spring. But that's a whole other story if you want to talk about that sometime.

EN: Yes.

DS: But, Sue Thomas is part of making myself indispensable, or making myself dispensable.

EN: Dispensable yes, that's a good theme.

DS: Ah, the other part is Ellen Lavelle. One of my goals has been to have a more rigorous, scholarly approach to thinking about faculty development, and to really encourage, as a direction, are thinking about teaching and learning in a scholarly manner, rigorous, scholarly manner, so it's scholarship of teaching and learning, scholarship of teaching and learning in a meaningful way, not just tokenism...

EN: Right.

DS: ...and jargonism. But what is it we do? How do we do it?

EN: Well, you were the one who brought Ernie Boyer to the campus? Or spread him around for people to look at.

DS: In part, yeah. Although…actually, I wasn't in administration when we brought Ernie Boyer to campus. We brought him to campus. Earl [Lazerson] brought him to campus.

EN: Earl...to speak at the commencement or something.

DS: Mhm-hm, that's right. And I gave him an honorary degree. And he did a kind of pre-commencement. On the Friday before commencement, we had ah...

EN: A symposium.

DS: A symposium, It was wonderful! But that was at the time when the Carnegie foundation. That was before he wrote Scholarship Reconsidered, or it was before he printed it. It was when he had done his report on, on, on kind of the state of education in the United States. And which was his earlier work, that was, that was influential. And that's when we brought him in. Actually, there's a story about this. Again it's entirely accidentally, and I've got to fill in some pieces. The first piece is, you may remember, I was, I was the co-chair of the organizing committee for the Illinois Education Association campaign.

EN: Yes.

DS: Okay.

EN: That was in 1987.

DS: Yeah, something like that late, mid to, late, the late 80s, um.

EN: 1988.

DS: Yeah, and, um, I think the institution actually did very well as an institution in getting through that period. It, ya know. Any organizing campaigns can be very divisive, they can be very hard on faculty community.

EN: Mm-hm. Well, that was something, I was thinking of having a section on was Unions at SIUE, and not, not only the faculty unions but I'm interested in.

DS: And ya know, I told you what my kinda vision is.

EN: To organize...

DS: And so the community, and the health of the community and the creative health of the community is absolute, is an absolute core value for me, and, so I was very concerned that we not do anything that we couldn't live with after that campaign. And so, it's not entirely accidental that *I* am the one who asked Bud Hirsch if he would be, run for Faculty Senate. [EN Laughs] Bud Hirsch was one of the leaders for No Agent.

EN: Er no, yes!

DS: I was one of the leaders for collective bargaining. And I'm the one who asked Bud Hirsch to be president of the Faculty Senate. [EN Laughs] It's those little things sometimes that make the difference...

EN: Yes! Uh-huh.

DS: ...and that's one of them. But, there's another little thing that happened that's very important to who we are and where we are. One of the members of the organizing committee was Marvin Finklestein [Sociology]. This is going to come back, okay, If I forget to bring it back, remind me to bring it back...

EN: Yes, bring it back.

DS: Now, the accidental part I wanna talk, and this is because this is part of the accidental part. But another part of the accidental part of this was the whole question of Boyer.

EN: He was, he was an AFT though wasn't he?

DS: No, he was IEA.

EN: No, he wasn't. Ok, he was IEA.

DS: No, he and I were IEA.

DS: John Farley was AFT [American Federation of Teachers], and John helped contribute to, to the health of the transition because John was one of the AFT people who came forward and said, "We will help the IEA."

EN: Yes.

DS: Dave Valley was, you know there were several IFT people who came forward and said let's work together. And, and that helped the transition because it can really splinter. Um anyway.

EN: Just who were the die-hard AFT?

DS: I don't remember...

EN: You don't remember.

DS: You'll have to ask John

EN: John, yeah, okay.

DS: John would be able to remember.

EN: I did interview him.

DS: I remember some, there was a whole group in education, the School of Education, but I don't remember some of their names.

EN: Yeah, Rosanda refused to be interviewed.

DS: Yeah.

EN: Yeah, so, and I went, when I sent her the list of questions, there were a lot about the union. She says well, she doesn't remember anymore.

DS: Well, Bill Feeny and I were co-chairs.

EN: Okay.

DS: Shelia Ruth was chair before the two of us, and then, she stepped aside because she, ya know, it was interfering with her research, and it was interfering with her work and uh. She was supportive, but she didn't want to have to be in a leadership role, and so Bill Feeny and I agreed to co-chair. Anyway...and and

EN: Mark?

DS: We'll get back to Mark, in, I think it was '92, the American Association for Higher Education, AAHE, which doesn't exist anymore, AAHE scheduled their first, um [DS smacks lips] what do they call it? It wasn't a symposium; it wasn't a meeting. But it was their first Faculty Roles and...

EN: Faculty Roles and Responsibilities...?

DS: It was Faculty Roles and Rewards.

EN: Roles and Rewards, that's right!

DS: It was the first Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards. It was in '92. And um, oh shoot what's her name, that um, ah, the Dean of the Graduate School, Rosemary...

EN: Rosemary Archangel

DS: ...Archangel. Rosemary had been working on a whole series of things to try and, and get - to think about what is Masters' education in a Comprehensive Masters' University. And what does it mean? She brought Joel Lapidus in, she brought Charles [Vlassic?] in. And so she was doing a number of things to get some discussions on campus, and she saw this flyer on Faculty Roles and Rewards. So she contacted the AAHE and said she wanted to send a team of four. And they said great, okay. And then, she contacted different people who might go, and I was one of them, okay. And Ginny [Virginia] Bryant [Chemistry] in Chemistry was another.

EN: Oh, another great woman.

DS: Oh, absolutely. And then, there were two others, and I don't know who they were. Because, AAHE, when Rosemary sent the registration materials, AAHE said "no, we're full." Rosemary called back and said, "Wait a minute. You said we could send four." So AAHE said, "well, tell you what, you can send two."

EN: Okay.

DS: So, the two who went were me and Ginny Bryant.

EN: Uh-huh.

DS: And at that time, I was Acting Dean and of Fine Arts and Communications, and um I hadn't thought that much about, ya know, I had done promotion, tenure stuff, as a chair, I had gone through it myself. I had done it as acting dean. But I hadn't really thought about issues and faculty roles that much at that time.

So I went to the conference, and a couple of things happened. One was, I really got kind of introduced to this idea of scholarship of teaching and learning, number one. Number two, both Ginny and I realized that no one in the country had a clue of what they meant by the term, people were throwing the term around ["scholarship of teaching and learning"], but it varied from traditional social science research about student learning, to just kinda what someone did in the classroom. And everything in-between. And some things way out in left field. That weren't even on the same continuum, and what was fascinating was that you can have, we had, Ginny and I went to a program where there were five different people presenting, with five completely different conceptualizations about what they meant by "scholarship of teaching and learning"! And they never even acknowledged the difference! They never even realized that these are very, very different things. And that was, I learned a lot from that one session about what Scholarship of Teaching and Learning was, and what it wasn't. And the first thing it wasn't, it wasn't a discipline in any sense of the word, and there was no agreement. Okay, so that was

one thing I learned from that conference. The other thing is that's the conference where Lee Shulman did his plenary address, where he talked about the idea of, of, teach, teaching as community property. Where he made the argument for the first time in public, or at least the first time in a major national arena. And if we're going to value teaching, we need to value it as community property. We need to value it the way we value scholarship. Because scholarship we value as community property. Until someone publishes something in public, and it gets reviewed, and it gets peer-reviewed, it has no value. It has no, it has no. It's not coined yet. We have to have it peer-reviewed, and it's got to be public, or we're not going to value some of this scholarship. Yet we say we value teaching, but what happens in teaching happens behind closed doors.

EN: Except in our department.

DS: Well, particularly now. There's been a change.

EN: Peer review, we started peer review. Maybe after we heard you, I don't know...

DS: Well, ya know what happened...

EN: Sundiata Cha-Jua did it for us.

DS: Yeah, and see he came after. He came after all of this exhibit. So, but it was, the norm was that people would get in the classroom, close the doors, and it was an exception...

EN: It was a college. Mhm-hm.

DS: ...to have another faculty member come into it.

EN: Yeah,

DS: Okay. That was the exception, not the rule. And publication of articles about teaching was not just not valued. It was devalued. Someone's research would be questioned if they were doing articles about teaching. That was the norm in the 1980s. And um, so, Lee Shulman brought that idea. Made that idea public. And it caught on. People started thinking about this idea of "teaching as community property." And, um, so if you can be thinking about that, "what does it mean? What the heck does that mean?"

Now Lee [Shulman] got involved in it because AAHE brought him into something that Russ Edgerton started. Russ Edgerton was President of AAHE. And Russ Edgerton wanted to, Russ Edgerton got excited about this idea that Ernie Boyer had put into Scholarship Reconsidered about a "scholarship of teaching". If we're gonna have a scholarship of teaching, what's it gonna look like? And how do we think about it? So, he started an initiative called *The Teaching Initiative*, that really was asking that question: "What is a scholarship of teaching?" And he got one of his staff members, Pat Hutchins, involved in it. And they were looking around, and where's the intellectual leadership going to come from? And they went to Lee Shulman, because Lee had, had been looking at teaching rigorously, ah but not just at K-12. Lee Shulman started looking at teaching in medical education, he started at Michigan State,

and helped found the Michigan State medical school. They've got a medical school for Osteopathy, uh they teach the O's. Ah, but he helped found that. And, of course, his background is from the University of Chicago. That's where he had done, all … he'd done his bachelor's, his doctorate, at the University of Chicago. So he had a liberal education background that he brought into thinking about teaching and he started with medical education and then he went to k-12. And so he was brought in to looking at that question of teaching in higher education - 'Cause he could bring a breadth of context to it. And he could also deal with it for what it was, not what it wasn't. He wouldn't look at teaching at higher education as just another variation of K-12. He looked at it for what is, "what is it that's unique to higher education," and "how do we develop it?" "And how do we develop this idea of the scholarship of teaching?" So that's what got him involved, and then, he did that plenary in 1992.

So, that whole variety of accidental things happened. One was we found out why none of the open dean searches were being filled, why we had an acting Dean position in Fine Arts and Communication and Sciences, and of course, it was because of the proposal for a College of Arts and Sciences. So the College of Arts and Sciences gets sold. Finally. Ya know Earl [Lazerson] had been trying to do something like the College of Arts and Sciences from the time when he was Provost [1978-1979]. [Chair squeaking] And he kept putting proposals forward, and the Faculty Senate would say, "We're not going there." So then, it would come up in some other form. And it finally came up in the form of College of Arts and Sciences and actually got some faculty support. And so, it was that faculty support that, that eventually got it passed in the Faculty Senate. And the College of Arts and Sciences was on the table, it was being implemented.

EN: But actually, I thought that the Senate actually voted at the end, unanimously against it but were just over-ridden by FIAT. That's what, that's what's in the records.

DS: Yeah, well…

EN: Even though there was some faculty support for it.

DS: The Senate, the Senate voted against the form or format I think it was, but they had already voted in favor of moving forward. Okay.

EN: So technically...

DS: Technically the Senate had... see it wasn't until the Senate had actually put a stamp of approval on a process of moving forward, that it actually moved forward. So there is complicity in the Senate.

EN: But there, but there was a real effort to derail it.

DS: But there also was support. Yeah, there was support to derail it. I'm not going to talk about whether it was a good idea or a bad idea. Okay. It has happened.

EN: No, that's fine. It's happened.

DS: And now the question is, "how do we make it as positive as possible to get the community moving forward in a creative way [DS Chuckles]." That's my bottom line always, and I… in some ways, I don't care about the form. I don't care about the administrative structure. It's: what is the social structure, what is the culture, What is, are we coming together in a creative way, are we bridging, ya know, I mean, it's that kind of stuff. And is it positive, is it creative? Can we make it positive and creative?

So anyway, so, we have a College of Arts and Sciences. We had a search. I'm Dean, Acting Dean of Fine Arts and Communications. I wasn't necessarily; actually, I would have been happy to stay as Dean of Fine Arts and Communications forever. I loved that job. I love the school. I loved the faculty! I loved what we were doing! Ya know, it's…

EN: Yeah.

DS: It was great, but it was gonna end. So I thought, "Well, I can either kind of, I can go somewhere else. I can put my hat in the ring. I can go back to teach, I can go back to being a professional designer idea." Yeah, its all of those options, who know's what's going to happen? So, I put my hat in the ring for Dean of Arts and Sciences, and then, ya know, there was some contentiousness about, about, how are we going to get the four different Schools to pull together? There was some real worry about if one of the sitting Deans became the Dean of Arts and Sciences, were they going to be playing favorites. Now, ya know, it wouldn't have been my nature to play favorites.

EN: Oh, I can see that.

DS: My job is always to look at, ya know, how do we get everybody kind of pulling together. Ah, but I can understand the concern and what they decided, I think at that point there were still two sitting Deans in the pool. It was me, it was Sam Pearson [Dean of Social Sciences], I think the two of us were still in the pool at that time. The decision was made to not move forward with any internal candidates in the pool. Within a week of the committee making their decision, Dave Werner called me up and said, "You know, Galen Pletcher left. I need to fill the Associate Provost position. How about applying?" [Both Laugh] It wasn't a week. And so, I'd never thought about applying for this position not for…

EN: And so another....

DS: …one second had I thought about applying for this position! Ya know, I always one to be in the trenches. I always liked dealing with questions of student learning and faculty development...

EN: Yes.

DS ...and I had never thought about coming over to the Provost's Office. But I thought, "Well, I can't be Dean of Arts and Sciences. What the heck. I might as well apply, and I can apply and decide later if I want the job." And so, and I liked working with David Werner. I liked working with him a lot. And I had worked with him directly for three years. So, I put my, ya know, I applied. And of course, David had wanted me in the position obviously from the beginning.

EN: Of course.

DS: And so it wasn't a question. But I went through the whole interview process and everything. But um, ya know, we just worked well together. So I ended up coming here. And um, in the fall of '94, I came here in the fall of '94, and Dixie Engelman was able to be Acting Dean of Fine Arts Communications, and I knew she'd do a great job. She's a great people person, and she really doesn't have a lot of hidden agendas and all the things that just drive me up the wall with administrators. Ya know, she'd deal with people honestly and directly and straightforward. And she was trying to get everybody working towards a common, ya know, she was the perfect person to step in. Um, and um, I adored working with Dixie!

EN: I bet.

DS: Uh, the uh. So I came over here in fall of '94, you're gonna see, we're gonna get back to Marv. Fall of '94; I'm trying to figure out what the heck's the job. And I knew intellectually what the job is, but knowing intellectually what the job is in no way really either socially or, or in operational terms, what the job is two different things. So I'm trying to figure out what it was, get my feet on the ground. And one of the things that's part of this job has been to coordinate with the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Every Board meeting, for the board of higher education, they put out a lot of materials. Great reading materials, just exciting stuff, right? [sarcasm]

EN: [EN Laughs] Volumes of it, boxes of it!

DS: [DS Laughs] Boxes of it! So, I'm reading through this stuff. And we had been doing PQP. [Performance, Quality, Priorities] Remember PQP?

EN: Yes.

DS: We'd been doing PQP, and I'd been doing that as a Dean. And it was a pain in the neck, and we were trying to manage it so it didn't do any damage because it could have done extensive damage to the institution. Uh, and I'm again talking about social-cultural issues. It could have destroyed that sense of teamwork, that sense of common purpose. Because it would have gotten people, I mean - Arts and Sciences did that. It got people, it got people seeing themselves in silos and not seeing themselves as having some kind of common vision, common goal, common purpose. They were worried. Because if you're in social sciences and now your gonna have to negotiate space with humanities and sciences and fine arts and communications, what's that going to be? Ah, ya know. What's the space gonna look like? So, there was tremendous amount of risk at that time, and PQP would only make it worse. So how do we manage it to keep it positive? So that had been my connection with PQP.

So, here it is, fall of '94, and I'm reading stuff from the IBHE, and I read this thing, that says that by the end of the year, every institution, every public university had to have *in place* a formal initiative called Faculty Roles and Responsibilities. And my first response was to say, "What? What's this? [Both Laugh] Ah, let's see who's going to be responsible for that? Probably my office. Probably me." And so, that was the beginning of trying to figure out, what are we going to do with this? Now, so, I started looking. What does it, what it means? What is, what does it mean that we're gonna have Faculty Roles and Responsibility initiative? And "how are we

gonna do it in a year?" And you know, SIUE doesn't work that way. SIUE takes time to get people working together, and start thinking about things, and do things in a scholarly, disciplined way.

EN: So the deadline was, this is fall `94. And the year was the end of the fiscal year.

DS: Well, it'd been the..end of the.

EN: Yeah, fiscal.

DS: Yeah, or academic year, end of the fiscal year.

EN: Okay, Okay.

DS: Ya know, if you don't get something done by the end of the academic year, it ain't gonna happen. So the fiscal year and academic year doesn't make any difference. When you're talking about an initiative that engages faculty, you've got to have it done by the end of the academic year.

EN: [EN Laughs] Yes, Ok.

DS: And uh, and we were in the middle of the fall! Ya know, people were already starting to look at finals, and grading final papers. They're not going to start something. And then you get back at the beginning of the, at the beginning of the, at what then was the winter quarter...er no, we were already in semester.

EN: No, we were in semester...

DS: We were in semester. So at the beginning of the Spring Semester, ah, it takes people two, three weeks to kinda get things up and running. And to get things going. So, you're not gonna start anything 'til the beginning of February anyway.

EN: Right [EN laughs].

DS: And then, by the time you get to the end of March, people are looking at the end of the term. You don't get things done in the spring. You get things done in the fall. And so, so, we had to, we had to finesse it, which is what we ended up doing.

But fortunately, the Faculty Senate had already started working on rethinking promotion and tenure. So the Faculty Senate was already working on it. So the Chair of the Welfare Council was Marv Finkelstein...

EN: That's right.

DS: ...and the Associate Provost is me. Now, who do you think was negotiating between the Deans and the Faculty Senate on the promotion and tenure process? It was me and Marv. It was, Marv and I. [DS Laughs] And we had a level of trust that had been, ya know, it had been forged

in collective bargaining, a really tough time. And so Marv and I could talk together about issues that were critically important, and we could trust each other at a deep level. So, I never, ever, worried for one second that what I would say to Marv would be misinterpreted. And I think he felt the same. He acted as though he felt the same. I never asked him. But he acted as though he felt the same. So, we could talk about those tough issues. Those really hard, tough issues...

EN: Yes.

DS: ...without ever any subtext. I could say anything to Marv, and he would take it for face value. He could say anything to me, and I would take it as face value. I never felt that he had some kind of ulterior motive, or something, any kind of undercurrent - or he was trying to scam me or anything. Never for one second! So, we were able to, among other things, negotiate meritorious teaching. That's incredible! That is really incredible! I don't know of any other institution that's been able to do it. There may be other institutions that did it by FIAT, but none of the others that got agreement on the front end between the Faculty Senate and the Deans. Now we just happened to have this thing called Faculty Roles and Responsibilities...

EN: That's a big change.

DS: ...that we had to do. We had to do Faculty Roles and Responsibilities as an institution. So remember [Uninteligible] go back to that thing I mentioned about Earl [Lazerson], if you've got to do it from an external pressure, how do you make it intrinsically valuable? Well, we'd made this commitment to meritorious teaching. And if we're gonna make that commitment, we have a lot of parts to that, that we've taken responsibilities for. One is, how the heck do you define it? Ya know, what's the difference between Satisfactory teaching and Meritorious teaching? That's not an easy thing to define. Just operationally. How do you document it? How do you capture it? How do you evaluate it? Because we're talking high stakes here, and we raised the bar. And before that, quite frankly, if someone could really make the case in terms of research, we just kind of waved our hands at teaching. Ya know, if we were being sued, if there weren't students picketing, if we didn't have students, if we didn't have faculty complaining because the person wasn't teaching what they were supposed to be teaching, ya know, if there wasn't any of that kind of stuff. No sexual harassment complaints; or if you, if we didn't have anything like that, they were probably okay. They were Satisfactory. That was enough. Yeah, ya know, the talk in the hall was pretty good, and we weren't trying to fire this person because, because they, they obviously were incompetent. Then they're okay. They're Satisfactory. And, if they've done really good in research, of course we're going to promote them with tenure. Right? That was the name of the game.

EN: That's right, it still is. It still is in some places.

DS: Well, except…it still is most places. It wasn't good enough here. Once we said "meritorious teaching," that [old practice] wasn't good enough. Now we may not have always gotten it right, but we've got a long way. I've got two dossiers here. Their names are probably on the backside. I haven't asked them yet. [paper crumpling]

EN: I don't know [unintelligible]

DS: Okay, good, I haven't asked them yet, okay, but these are going to be model dossiers in the Library.

EN: To put in the library.

DS: To put in the library. *Half* of the dossiers we had this term could have been modeled…

[Recording ends and starts again]

EN: [Both Laugh] [recording starts in the middle of a conversation]...which they probably might...

DS: Well, anyway, we have made a difference in our promotion and tenure files. Because as I was saying, *half* of the dossiers could have been models this year. The first time we picked models, there were *two* out of 20 that we picked as models. And that was it, there were only two. Now, half, and one of the reasons is because it's another Lee Shulman's idea. Lee Shulman has said that discourse communities revolve around texts, so if we're going to, and he brought it in terms of teaching, the scholarship of teaching. If we're going to really develop a discourse community around a scholarship of teaching and learning, we need to have texts. We need to develop *texts* about teaching. Well, anyway, the texts for promotion and tenure, the dossiers - over in the Library, they've made a difference. So anyway, so Faculty Roles and Responsibilities 1994, '95, there's no way we could put together an initiative in the time-frame we had that anyone was gonna buy into. Because there's no way we could have faculty participation in creating it. So, what we did is we created ah, we created a steering committee, and the plan we put out was a plan to make a plan. So we created it - And that's what we reported in the Spring of '95.

EN: [EN Laughs] That's when you created the committee…

DS: That's when we created the committee.

EN: … on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities?

DS: That's it. That's it. And so, so what the committee did was, in the fall of '95, write a plan and a white paper for the initiative, Faculty Roles and Responsibilities initiative. But I reported in the spring of '95 that the committee was going to do a plan. Um, so we didn't have the plan in place in the Spring of '95, but we had a commitment to doing a plan. Part of what the committee wanted to do was have a symposium in the fall.

EN: I remember that.

DS: And so that first Faculty Symposium, we brought in Dan Bernstein, and we brought in uh Barbara Cambridge and Erv Boschman. Um, shoot, we brought two others, we brought five people in. And all of them were from the AAHE Teaching Initiative. And why did we bring them in? Well, in part, because of that '92 conference.

But there's something else that happened before we brought them in. Lee Shulman was at Stanford. My sister had, as a kind of second career; after her kids started getting older, decided she wanted to get a doctorate in, in Psychology. So, she went back to school. She got her third major. Her first was in Sociology. Her second was in English. Her third was in Psychology. And her first two were at Berkeley. She was also a Berkeley grad. Her third one was at San Jose State because she was living at the time near San Jose, so it was easier getting - doing, doing a major in Psychology. And then she wanted to go back to Berkeley to get her doctorate. They didn't admit her, probably because she was too old. She was a returning student. Ah, it just, it's coincidental that everyone who was admitted to the program was right straight out of…right straight out of an undergraduate program. [EN Laughs] Just a coincidence for sure. But, we wouldn't want to accuse anything. But, ah, she wasn't admitted. So, she figured, "What the heck!" She applied to Stanford. She did her doctorate in Lee Shulman's department. Lee wasn't on her committee, but it was in his department, they got to know each other very well. Lee actually hired on a grant, hired my two nieces to work for him [[EN Laughs] on a grant, so ah I had a personal connection with Lee. And, so I called Lee up and said, "Lee, I'm coming out to San Francisco for something. Can I come see you?" Because I was going to try and talk him into coming for that fall Faculty Symposium. Well, he couldn't do it, he couldn't, but he suggested, he's the one, who was when I was sitting in his office, that he's the one who suggested different alternatives, and one of the alternatives was the members of the Teaching Initiative. And he mentioned Dan Bernstein in particular. So, when I came back, we decided, the steering committee in discussions, we decided, "O.K. Let's go with the, with the uh Teaching Initiative." And Dwight Smith is the one who actually did the contacts. And, and um we got, Dwight got everyone from, of the five we were bringing in on a, on a uh conference call and asked them which one of the group they thought should do the plenary. And on the phone, they all pointed to Dan Bernstein. [Both Laugh]

EN: Okay.

DS: And so, Dan did the first plenary, and then the others participated in workshops of different kinds. But Dan did a panel discussion and everything. But Dan did the first um plenary.

And they introduced the idea of scholarship of teaching and learning as a formative activity, not a summative activity. What they had learned, the very first thing they learned in the Teaching Initiative, in the AAHE's Teaching Initiative, was that a scholarship of teaching and learning was, first of all, a great way to improve teaching. It was a great way to improve your thinking about teaching and to improve your teaching, and secondly, if the faculty are going to buy into it, it's gotta be formative. It has to be positive, it has to be something that adds value to the faculty. Faculty have to see the value. If it is only being done in summative ways, to kind of check up to see if faculty are doing a good job, faculty aren't going to buy into it. They might be forced to do it, but it's not going to be meaningful and valuable for them. If you can figure out how to make it meaningful and valuable for the faculty, what you find is that you get the documents, the texts, the, the "stuff" that then can become summative. So, if you're doing a course portfolio for improving a course and you really improve the course, you now can take that course portfolio, and you can put it in your dossier. And somebody else can look at it, and they can have a better, they can do a better job of evaluating your teaching on meaningful grounds. On something that's important, not incidental. Or not in someone else's hands. It's not the faculty member who comes in who does a parachute it, ah, visitation to your class or student

evaluations. That's kinda something in someone else's hands. This is something you created, this is something you did. You have control over it. That you can put it in the dossier. That someone else can look at it and go, "Oh, I understand what they're trying to do."

If you look at Ed Sewell's course portfolios. You get a real picture on what his approach is to teaching, what he, what he is doing in teaching, what the students are doing, and how well they're doing. And what's the relationship between him as a teacher and the students as learners. It's incredibly powerful. He was promoted to Associate and to Full Professor on the basis of his course portfolios in part. But there in part because they're meaningful for him. And they've made a difference in his teaching, and he can document it, and he was in control. That's the goal, and that's what Dan Bernstein presented. It was the finding of the Teaching Initiative. So then the question became: How do we do that? How do we get faculty in control of their own future? How do we, how do we make things - What are the models? What do these things look like? What texts do you create that then you can put in a dossier, and then someone else can evaluate it? So it becomes summative. But, that's not why you did it. You did it because you can improve your course. But that's all started - He, the hook was he was going to come up for promotion and tenure. But the real value in doing it was because he could improve his courses. And that's what became energizing, and that's why he continued to do it even after he got promoted. Ha! And then so when he came up for promotion for Professor, he'd been doing - he had a history of doing it. Boy, did he have a strong dossier! His dossier is not in the Library for one reason and one reason only. We wanted people to write their statements in first person. He did his in third. [DS Laughs] That is the only reason his dossier for Professor isn't in the library. Because it was outstanding, but it was outstanding because he had been doing this work all those years.

Anyway, so we struggled with that, and we still struggle with that, because if we were to do a national conference right now on scholarship of teaching and learning, and any of those, any of those conferences you go to, on scholarship, or you might go to on scholarship for teaching and learning there's still not a consensus on what this thing looks like. And so you've got some people who are focusing on pedagogy, and you've got some people who are focusing on assessment. You have some people are focusing on developing standardized exams. And you've got some - And it's all over the place! And um so, that continues to be a problem, but I think that's an insoluble problem because if you ask a Chemist, "What is scholarship of teaching and learning, and what should it be?" "What should it look like?" And they come up with their ideal. And then you ask a historian, what should it look like? You're gonna get two different answers, two very different answers. Just the same way you do in looking at scholarship and research. We accept the differences in scholarship and research, we haven't yet accepted the differences in scholarship of teaching and learning. And maybe we never will. But, that's not necessarily a problem because we have texts in the Library on how it plays out in the real high stakes, which is promotion and tenure. You know, hiring, promotion, and tenure - those are the high stakes. And we have enough *texts* now that are really outstanding in the Library that can become models for other people. And we know already from two sources. One is from the dossiers themselves, the improvement of the dossiers themselves, but the second is from testimonials from people who've prepared the dossiers and said I looked at the dossiers and modeled mine after so and so's." "I modeled mine after Kathleen Tunney's," or "I modeled mine off of Dennis Hostetler's," or "I modeled mine off of Mark Bolyard's," which is there now.

EN: Yes.

DS: And I've had many faculty say that, that "I modeled mine off of" and would name one of the dossiers in the library. So they're being used, and it's made a difference. That all grows out of...

EN: That was a great idea, to put them in a Library. I know.

DS: Well, it all grows out of that 1992 AAHE Faculty Roles and Rewards conference that I went to because Rosemary Archangel thought it would be a good idea. [EN Laughs] It just. I've got some stories from the air-force that don't fit on a tape, but sometime I'll tell you, just exactly... It ended up I spent the last two years in the air-force during the Vietnam Era at Camp David - [DS Laughs]

EN: Wow!

DS: Same story. [Both Laugh] Anyway, um, the um, a large part of my energy has gone into in one form or another into Faculty Rewards and Responsibilities. Um, and it goes back to that core value, we talked about before. It's all about building a community that's working towards a goal worth working towards. When you see the incredible teaching that we have going on on this campus and the way it's able to be documented, and, the way it's able to be captured, ah and it's the combination of things, many of which Earl [Lazerson] can take credit for, if not all of them. In one way or another, Earl can take credit for it. And he's done it because of that commitment to undergraduate education, that meaningful, real, where the rubber hits the road commitment to undergraduate education. That finds its way all the way through these Promotion Tenure Dossiers. Okay. The Assessment program, General Education, and EUE [Excellence in Undergraduate Education]. A lot of what you see in the promotion tenure dossiers are connected with those things. Their EUE proposals. Where someone was able to try something, to do something really neat and capture it for a dossier in the proposals and the reports. It's a scholarly activity. [EN laughs]

EN: Yes, I see.

DS: Its a scholarship of teaching and learning. That we now consider passee - of course, we do that. It's just part of where....

EN: But we're unusual. We are unique. In that respect.

DS: We're unusual. We are unique. It blows people away when they hear about it. We've been able to recruit faculty because of EUE. It's because of Earl [Lazerson], Earl's the one who did it. And, it's had a ripple effect. The univ... the URA, the Undergraduate Research Academy, was created by Kevin McCleary on an EUE grant when he was in the graduate school, when he was Associate Dean in the Graduate School. He started that on an EUE Grant. Then it got, it turned out, it was piloted, it went for a couple of years, we said, "oh, this is great."

EN: Yes.

DS: And it came up with permanent funding for it, and an administrative home. It's because of EUE. A lot of the evidence that you see in support of quality teaching in the dossiers is from

mentoring URA proposals, which came from EUE, which came from a real commitment to undergraduate education because it's central to our Mission, which goes back to when Earl was sitting in this office as Provost. It's a direct line. It's a direct lineage.

EN: Okay.

DS: [Smacks lips] You know, that idea of Social Darwinism was kinda discredited because people took it in the wrong way. But, in Complexity Science, that idea of looking at systems as evolving systems, and, and looking at the evolution of systems, one of the fundamental properties of an evolutionary system is that you can trace the change. You can't predict the change, but you can trace it backward. Because change happens incrementally in an institution like this. If you try and do it ah catastrophically— and I don't mean catastrophically in the sense of change as necessarily a catastrophe, but catastrophically in the sense of Complexity Science, where you have catastrophe theory, where you try to make change, rapid radical change in a hurry— if there isn't a foundation for it, if there isn't a lineage for it, it's not going to stay. And that's part of the problem that a lot of institutions have had with trying to do assessment programs.

EN: They suddenly want to have it.

DS: You just suddenly want to do it, and you create it out of, you create it out of nothing.

EN: Yes, oh...

DS: It doesn't work. It's gotta be creative. Our assessment program was created out of, out of what we had been doing. I mean, the first thing the Assessment Committee did when they created the assessment program was do an inventory of what we were already doing. That was the very first thing. When they…

EN: Yes.

DS: When they created the Senior Assignment, we already had programs that were doing capstones. Not every program was doing it, but we had some history, we had some experience, we had some capacity. So, for many programs, it wasn't a big change. They were already doing it. They simply had to kinda modify it and turn it into something that then fit the senior assignment, but it wasn't a big deal. For some, they had to create it from nothing because they didn't have capstones. So uh but...

EN: Is this the way it's done in most institutions, or, is that, were we, by starting with an inventory of what, what we already have? I've talked with, I can't remember who it was about this that...

DS: No. No. No. None of this is.

EN: So this is all unique. In the way...

DS: It's all unique. But there's some reasons why, and it always worries me…

EN: A unique process.

DS: The future always worries me, and you'll see why in a second. One of the reasons we have been able to do what we've been able to do is constancy. We, Earl [Lazerson] was, had been a faculty member and administrator for his whole career for a long time.

EN: Chair, Dean, Provost.

DS: Provost, and he was chancellor for 13 years. David Werner had been a...

EN: Yes, Dean of the School of Business

DS: ... he'd been a faculty member, he was a long-haired, pony-tailed faculty member, which he denies, but there's too many people who will verify that, [EN Laughs] who remember that, and he actually told me that one time. And uh before he became Dean, before he became Provost, before he became Chancellor. Between the two of them, they had a buffer, which was very healthy. Nancy Belck, was a very healthy buffer between the two of them. It would of been much harder for Earl to follow - or for David [Werner] to follow Earl directly because, Earl had a hard edge, for all the really great things he did for this institution, and the extent to which we can look at those things that we really value in this institution and trace them back to Earl - given all of that, he had a hard edge. And there are some people that he could not build a positive relationship with, let's put in that term and just leave it there. I value Earl tremendously. I didn't always like him, um, but I respected him, and respected what he did. But I didn't always respect all the details of what he did. I mean, some of his ways of doing things I couldn't respect. But, the thru line, the big things, the big process, I respect him tremendously. Um, and, the two people probably most, most responsible for everything that's good about this institution are Delyte Morris and Earl Lazerson. I don't want to devalue David Werner at all. Ah, David Werner is a huge player in ah where we are and where we hope to go.

EN: But, but now, we're in a period where there's very, very, there are very few figures of continuity. Or there soon will be, and there will be so little institutional memory. That's...all...that's...

DS: There are no Deans. There will be no Provost. But there haven't been, there hasn't been a Provost in a while. And there's no Chancellor who went through the promotion and tenure process here. Steve [Hansen] is the only one, but he did it in a kind of different way, because he came in, in the Graduate School. So Steve did go through promotion and tenure.

EN: Yes, that's right.

DS: But he did it in a, in a different way. But, ya know, there's Steve [Hansen], there's me. Now, we've got Sue [Thomas], Ellen [Lavalie]. I know Doug Eder's here and the uh next Director of Undergraduate Assessment is internal. I mean, the Assessment Program wrote it that way.

EN: Who, now is, who is going to be the next Director of Assessment?

DS: We're doing a search right now. There are about seven, there's seven candidates. Karen Patty-Graham is chairing the committee. Ah, it's a good committee, it's got people like Ivy Cooper.

EN: That's great, she's great!

DS: Isn't she? Her dossier's also in the Library [DS Laughs].

EN: Yes, just she's another one you wish could rise into the administration of the university…

DS: Yes.

EN: … at some point, because she is spectacular in my view.

DS: Let's turn this off. Can we turn this off?

EN: Yes, huh, oh, yes.

[recorder paused and started again]

EN: So, Sue Thomas.

DS: Yeah, let me repeat that: Sue [Thomas] is now dealing more with IBHE [Illinois Board of Higher Education] than I am. That's been a shift because she was capable of it. And it's really now, I deal more with promotion and tenure than I used to. Dwight used to deal more with promotion and tenure, and that was a shift Sharon Hahs [former Provost] wanted to see happen. But you needed someone like Sue Thomas who could really do that, before we could make that shift. And Dwight could do it in some ways but couldn't in others. And in part, because he didn't have that feel of delivering the curriculum on the ground. He didn't know what it meant to schedule a class, and to deal with enrollment, so to deal with, ya know, because he had never done that.

EN: No.

DS: Whereas Sue has. She knows exactly what that means. And that really helps her because it gives her a context and a foundation[as former faculty] that Dwight didn't have. It's not about capabilities. It's about history, background, experience. So, anyway, so, ya know, I mean that's kind of the big answer to your question,

EN: Yes.

DS: … I think. And we're still going. You know, we've got Faculty Roles and Faculty Development Council in the Senate. We've got, we've got improvements in the, in the promotion and tenure dossiers. We have more meaningful valuing of quality teaching.

EN: Yes.

DS: And, and more thinking about student learning. And, and those pockets that are having trouble dealing with the Assessment Program, one after another are starting to find ways to make a value for themselves.

EN: Yes.

DS: And so, ya know, and if we can keep that thru line, if we can keep moving in that direction, and keep thinking ten years out... we need to be thinking ten years out. And the only thing that worries me is I'm not going to be here in 10 years.

EN: Ah. That's a great, that's a neat thing to about an institution, ya know, is you know it's going to go on.

DS: Well, ya know, people like Sue Thomas and Ellen Lavalie, ya know, these are people you can trust, and they're going to be [creaking sound] carrying that in the future. And and, there's so many faculty, ya know, the Eric Ruckh's of the world. It's fun.

EN: Like the Tom Jordan's and Andy [unintelligable] yeah.

DS: Exactly!

EN: We have some great talent in our department…

DS: Incredible…

EN: …with administrative possibilities.

DS: …talent in your department. Just, it's such a strong department.

EN: Carole Frick.

DS: Oh yeah!

EN: Great people.

DS: Yeah. And that's neat. It's fun. And and it can be hard getting strong personalities working together in a creative, supportive way. And some departments, it works, and some departments, it doesn't. In some departments, it can work for a while and then fall apart, and in some departments, it can't work at all. One of my favorite Departments, that I've been very close to for a lot of years, is Art and Design. And Art and Design was as close to a dysfunctional Department when I first got to know it as you could possibly imagine. And it all had to do with history and it all had to do with ousting a chair. And then that chair trying to payback and get even ah for - until he retired, which was 25 years maybe, 20 years. And it was a Department that had the most incredible faculty.

EN: Yes, that's a...

DS: Absolutely incredible faculty. But they did not function well as a group. As individuals, they were outstanding.

EN: Yes.

DS: It always has been a department with outstanding faculty, but they didn't function well as a group. Now, they function well as a group, so you still have an incredible faculty, outstanding faculty in that department, but now they start feeling that they're working together, that they respect each other. That they can support each other. You don't have things like when Bob Malone... when David Huntley [former Chair] hung one of Bob Malone's [A&D faculty, print-making] pieces, abstract pieces for a faculty show, he hung it upside down, so Bob Malone got mad, and he took the piece off the wall and took it home. You know, you don't have those kinds of things happening anymore.

EN: No, you don't have those kinds of confrontations, no.

DS: But, talk about two incredibly valuable people! But they couldn't live together. [Both Laugh] It wasn't just the two of them, I mean, it was the whole Department.

EN: Yeah, I know.

DS: It was like that, those were just, that's just one example. So anyway, so sometimes the Chair's role and the Dean's role is to get people at least to create a space that people can work with, and work with comfortably, in their own space, and sometimes keep people apart so as people are gonna kill each other if you put 'em together, ya keep 'em apart. And that, and then, their gonna be real contributors and do really good things. Um but ah, sometimes you can get a department where people really see a common...

EN: I think our Department's pretty much like that; we have, we have one outrider who's always been an outrider. But, but we.

DS: Well, there's history there.

EN: Yeah, but we're, I think we are like that. We, we have big disagreements, but when, when it's over, the doors are open and everybody walks out, and we're on the same page and everything. That's why I feel sad about, that we...But, we really needed to reform our curriculum. I think that's what was wrong with our, with our assessment. Ya know, we, we know we need to change our curriculum.

DS: There's some interesting…

EN: Your whole work has had a tremendous influence. I mean. You, your, the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities coincided with Sundiata [Cha-Jua's] who wanted to change the world and everything.

DS: There's a neat guy.

EN: And so, we got peer review of teaching, and we got our mission, we got our own Mission Statement about diversity and a whole bunch of neat things for our department came in, and then, Wayne [Santoni] ya know, started our really, was the founder…

DS: Wayne was another IEA guy.

EN: … of our diverse hiring, yeah, he was really a good model for me…

DS: That's where I got to know him, was the IEA organizing committee.

EN: But um, but we do, I think we really do consider teaching very carefully, and I think that's all the work of your office and these meetings and the office.

DS: Ya know, that's, that part of …

EN: It's wonderful to have ELTI [Excellence in Teaching and Learning Initiative]; for example, you think the class isn't going as you want, you can call them up and have them come in and survey the students, it's just great.

DS: You know, these things are connected because ELTI grew out of the General Education Report that Marsha Puro wrote.

EN: I'm interviewing her on Monday. [Both laugh]

DS: She is a neat person.

EN: I'm going to her house.

DS: And she is very important in understanding where we've been and we're were, because she was with UPBC [University Planning and Budget Council] and chair of the Planning Council at the time when we, when we re-did the position description for the Provost's Office, for example. And we went from a Vice-President and Provost to a Provost and Vice-President. And um, and that was going from Barbara Teters to David Werner. And ah, she's the one who led all of that, and she led some equity things. And she was involved in General Education review. And she was just really involved in a lot of very important things.

EN: Yes, right.

DS: Anyway.

EN: We've had extraordinary leadership here, I think, from the faculty. I think, it's just an a , amazing.

DS: Well, the constancy is part of it, the, the, part of it goes back again to Delyte Morris and Earl Lazerson. Ya know Earl used to have ... a lot of what's really good grew out of something Earl used to do. He had a kind of "Kitchen Cabinet." And he took the um former Faculty Senate, past Faculty Senate Presidents, all of them, and former Chairs of UPBC. And he'd get together on Friday afternoons, and they, they would talk about really important, critical issues about University education.

EN: And there are no minutes of the faculty dialogue meetings.

DS: Not that I know of. It's in everybodys' memory, and a lot of those memories are gone now unfortunately. Some of them are still around. But a lot of them are gone now. And um uh the, oh boy that brings back a lot of memories.

EN: Well you were, Carol Keene [Philosophy] was in on that…

DS: Carol Keene was on it, Warren Joseph [Music] was on it. Did you ever know Warren Joseph?

EN: No.

DS: If you want to know history, I do not know if Warren Joseph is still alive. I hope he is.

EN: I don't know.

DS: I have not, I don't remember hearing of his death. If he is still alive, you should interview him.

EN: Yeah, Okay, Alright.

DS: Yeah, Warren Joseph was in Administration, was in this office. I think he was actually in the corner office over there. And there were some real, there was some infighting, there were some battles, and Warren got ousted. He was, he was on the wrong side of the battle; he was on the losing side of the battle. And he was from music. And so, he created his own little environment...

EN: With the computer.

DS: With computers, for the computer lab, for music. But he was also Chair of UPBC. Earl was on one side, and Warren was on the other. But one of the things that Earl did as a basic idea was try and co-opt people, get people who were on the other side, don't shut them out, but find ways to engage them in a meaningful way, not a superficial way, in a meaningful way. Value them. And he did that with, with Warren. And I don't know the details of that at all. I've only heard a little bit. I think there's some bitterness. There was always some bitterness there. And so as much as I got to know Warren, I kinda never learned the whole story, I just saw bits and pieces. But I got to know Warren when I was Acting Dean, and he was running the, he was running the; I knew him a little bit before that, but I really got to know him when he was acting dean, and he was running the Music Computer Lab, and we had some administrative problems. I also got to

know Mary Sumner at that time because Mary was Director of Academic Computing, and there were some problems. We had an alcoholic who was one of the, one of the ah workers in the, in the computer lab, and Warren and Mary were both trying to rehabilitate him. You know you can't rehabilitate an alcoholic. Um ah the alcoholic will either do it or not. And so, just one problem after another. And Warren and Mary were trying to negotiate, and I was kinda in between them. And Warren and I were very much together on kinda some really basic ideas. And one of those basic ideas is that the work of the University is found in student learning. Student learning is in the center. And, and bureaucratic rules only exist to serve that work. So if the bureaucratic rule is getting in the way, maybe you need to change the rule. If you can't change the rule, you manage the rule so it doesn't get in the way. But maybe you can change it, so it stops getting in the way and starts being empowering. So ya know, that's what you need to look at. And we kept running into things where there were bureaucratic rules that were just getting in the way of student learning. And getting in the way of faculty trying to support student learning. So Warren and I fought some battles together. And Mary, [Sumner] who I respect tremendously, and enjoy, just as a friend, tremendously, and who I value and who has done considerable um building of the University, I mean she really has been a part of it. [DS clears throat] Mary Sumner is another one who's been a part of it. And she um, but she would get all tied up in rules and things. Because in some ways, in some ways she was a wonderful manager and in some ways she had some blind spots. And those blind spots, unfortunately, absolutely hit the struggles that Warren was having. And uh, and actually I remember sitting in my office when I was Dean of Fine Arts and Communications, and Mary was there, and Warren was there. And I told Mary point-blank—and of course, I had no authority over Mary. She was not in my, she was not under dean of finance communications, and I told Mary point-blank "Fire" that helper or whatever the heck the name of it was. It was part of a point-blank, "you've got to fire that…" But, she didn't want to fire him because she thought it would be cruel. [EN laughs] Well, ya know, it's one of those things often, often an alcoholic won't pull themselves together until they hit bottom and if you keep them from hitting bottom you're, that's essentially where we were. We were, we were, we were not holding him responsible for his own actions, and so we were empowering his alcoholism. And, I mean, you know all of…

EN: I don't know about that. I…

DS: But you must of heard of some of that.

EN: I've heard that there was a …

DS: Well, not that specific instance. But, you know, alcoholism in general.

EN: Yes, yes.

DS: You end up, you end up not helping an alcoholic sometimes by trying to help them. And that was the case here. And so we just got into some big battles. Warren and I got to know each other fairly well, and we built a close relationship.

EN: I'll try to see if he's available.

DS: But, in many ways a lot of these ideas, a lot of these ideas we've been talking about, Warren's the root of some of them. Ya know, he provided some intellectual leadership on some of that, and not inconsequential.

EN: Well I hope he's still around. I'll have to look in the phone book. That's always my first...

DS: He'd been marginalized in part because of whatever the political battles were that happened in the 70s that were before I got there. Um, but, even marginalized, he had a place in leadership. Ya know, he made a difference because of referent power, just of respect that people had for him. They listened to him, and his ideas were important, and meaningful, and helpful, and useful. And so... And I do not know if he's still alive.

EN: I'm gonna turn this... [Audio turns off and then turns back on] You were talking about Warren Joseph. And talking about dealing with the question of computer…

DS: Yeah, Warren, Warren developed his computer lab. He was very worried that he wouldn't have a legacy, um, ya know in part because he really feels that he was trying to create something, and originally I think he was trying to create something at the university level, and then he really had to kinda pull in and create something in his computer lab. Um, and he was hoping to see that. And Daryl Cohen really has built on Warren's legacy. Not always in the way Warren would necessarily have selected, but he really has built on, and taken, he's been able to stand on that foundation and take it higher, take it farther. And I just, I really, first of all, just like Daryl, and secondly, I respect what he's doing so much, and admire what he's doing so much.

EN: He's a computer composer also.

DS: Yeah, yeah, yeah, he has a whole story about how he was out of academia and working in the industry, and then he came back in, and he came back in for the right reasons, and um you know he's not teaching because he couldn't make it in the field.

EN: Yes.

DS: He's teaching because he loves to teach, and he loves student learning, and loves working with students, and he likes to push the envelope. He likes to try interesting new things. And that's fun, it's just fun working with people like that. And in his field, in his kind of field, that's important, because he could go out and he could make a fortune out in industry. If that's what he wanted to do, but that's not what he wants to do. So he's doing what he loves.

EN: Good. Well, I'll try to see if Warren Joseph is still alive; there was an exhibit of his, a computer music work done by Theresa at the library recently.

DS: Yeah, so check, 'cause he, ya know I… Ya know, some others like Bill Tarwater [William Tarwater, former Chair of the Department of Music and former Dean of Fine Arts] has died, unfortunately. That's a huge loss. I learned a lot from Bill and not just as an administrator, but as a human being.

EN: Well, I think we've covered a lot of ground here in this discussion ha. I want to thank you for your time.

DS: Oh, glad to do it. Glad to do it.

EN: I'll, I'll transcribe it, I'm pretty good at that. [DS Laughs] Ya know, don't, you shouldn't... [Recording ends]