

4-30-1998

# Sally McCracken Oral History Interview, 1998 April 30

Laurence Smith

Follow this and additional works at: [http://commons.emich.edu/oral\\_histories](http://commons.emich.edu/oral_histories)

---

## Recommended Citation

Smith, Laurence, "Sally McCracken Oral History Interview, 1998 April 30" (1998). *Oral Histories*. 15.  
[http://commons.emich.edu/oral\\_histories/15](http://commons.emich.edu/oral_histories/15)

This oral history is brought to you for free by the Sound Recordings at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Oral Histories by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact [lib-ir@emich.edu](mailto:lib-ir@emich.edu).

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
HISTORY

INTERVIEW  
WITH  
DR. SALLY McCracken

LNS: This is April 30<sup>th</sup> and I'm here with Sally McCracken who is a Professor in the Communication and Department, right. Communication Theatrical, what do we call it?

SM: Communication and Theatre Arts Department.

LNS: She's been a longtime member of the university community and she came to Eastern in 1968.

SM: Yes. Good. You've done your homework.

LNS: Yeah. What did the university look like when you came in 1968?

SM: It was in a growth spurt. In the 1960's all colleges around the country began growing and I was told when I first arrived here that we had grown from seven or eight thousand just a few years before to about ten thousand which is about the size of the university when I first arrived in 1968. I also was aware that during the growth of all of these schools around the country there was also an interesting new movement, taking place and that was the unionization of college faculty and that was just when I first got here. Because Belleville College in Illinois was organized in 1968 and a lot of the boards of regents and the boards of governors and all were aware that there was a union movement afoot in the country. I was willfully naive at that point though so I really didn't pay a lot of attention my first year. It's called "try to get your feet wet in the university" and do all that. But I became more aware of it in about 1970 and the university around the country were organizing because there was a sense that the faculty were being relegated to second class status they weren't being listened to by boards of governors and administration at least was the overall feeling.

LNS: This was mostly in schools that had origins similar to Eastern where they were teacher colleges who had become colleges and then universities and is this the kind of school?

SM: Actually it was spread through the private sector too because Hofstra organized about three years before we did. And I was aware that on this campus it seemed as if that I had been told at least before I came that the faculty senate which existed at that time was the body that represented the faculty to the administration in terms of when it came around to raise times what kind of increase did you get and they had a talk, their executive committee had a talk with the president and they all sat down congenially and decided upon it. It wasn't long after I was here though, that I began hearing stories that the senate was not really being consulted very frequently after a point. I believe its all in reaction to the big growth spurt that we had in the sixties and again.

LNS: We were afraid their voice was going to be lost or it actually was being lost.

SM: Was being lost and I believe so that a lot of that stimulated the unionization. Also it was an offshoot of the entire unionization of the public sector, which started with the New York teachers in '64. So it wasn't long after that the Eastern, that Higher Ed got involved in '68. So it was a movement.

LNS: Who were the major organizers was it, it wasn't AAUP in the original?

SM: In the original mix, there were three groups. There was AAUP and that was Judy Gallatin in the Psychology Department, I remember she was president so the AAUP Chapter in '72, '71, '72 and in '73 was when it was organized. There was also the AFT and Stu Caravanic of all people on campus was all involved with the AFT and I believe he was president of the AFT Chapter on campus at that time. And then there was the MFT, which was the Michigan, which is an offshoot of the MEA. So there were three groups contending to represent the faculty in '72, '73. And there was, first, there was an election and the AAUP and the AFT came out I believe ahead, so they had a run-off between AFT and the AAUP and no union and AAUP won.

LNS: Was it a decisive victory for the faculty or was it a marginal victory?

SM: It was one of those votes where it wasn't real decisive. I don't remember the exact percentage that voted for AUP but it wasn't more that 65%.

LNS: What was the percentage that wanted to be unionized? Can you recall that? This is the faculty we're talking about.

SM: Overall, it got to be a pretty high percentage. I think it got to be, when it came down to the final vote of everything, it was well over sixty some percent of the faculty who were involved in one organization or the other. You know, either had been interested in the MEA or the AFT or the AUP.

LNS: So we became unionized in the early 70's?

SM: We became unionized in 1973, the election was held and finally won decisively and I believe the certification came in late '73 or early '74.

LNS: And I remember when I came in '75 there was a strike going on or a faculty strike started some time in '75. Was it a faculty strike or a clerical strike?

SM: It was '76, you remember '76. There was a strike in '76.

LNS: Brickley was president at that point.

SM: Yeah.

LNS: Who was it Jim McGee.

SM: No, actually Brickley wasn't. I think it was.

SM: Ralph Gilden.

LNS: Ralph Gilden. So that had to be '74 then.

SM: Yeah at that time.

LNS: Because Brickley came in late '74, Sponberg left in '74 they appointed

SM: Gilden.

LNS: Gilden for the Interim President.

SM: And he stayed around through '77 or something like that '76 or '77

LNS: But not as president.

SM: As Interim

LNS: No just as I came in '75 so I came in September of '75 and I came as Vice President and Ralph at that point had been acting as Interim VP till I came and then prior to that there was he was Interim President prior to Brickley coming.

SM: Yes

LNS: And Brickley came in late '74 so this had to be

SM: Did Brickley come in late '74?

LNS: Yeah, cause he hired me and I came in '75.

SM: Ok, so Brickley came before. We can stop that for a minute.

LNS: Ok we're back sorry for the interruption. And we're just trying to fix our dates a little bit. It's funny how the dates just slide on us.

SM: Oh, they do. Cause I remember, I certainly remember Ralph Gilden and I certainly remember Brickley and I certainly remember Sponberg, but you're right, I don't have the years pinpointed for when one left and the other took over.

LNS: It's irrelevant in a sense because basically, you've got the right sequence so but there was a strike. Was it a faculty strike?

SM: Yes. As a matter of fact, it was interesting. Let me take you through the contracts. In 1974 was the first contract and it was concluded, it started, the negotiations started somewhere in April, May, April and went through November. The first contract was achieved in November of 1974. Gary Hawks was the chief negotiator for the administration at that point and there was a threatened strike on that contract but nothing ever happened. Because it was resolved and the contract was secured. Then in '76, that's when you're thinking of there was what we called the One-Hour Strike, because the negotiators, I was president at that time, I wasn't necessarily in the negotiation room because Don Pearson was negotiating and I remember Ari Stall and several people on our side. So, or Bill Miller, I should say, not Ari Stall. And so they had actually tentatively reached an agreement in concept but the word didn't get out in time and the strike started. So we literally, they were trying to get it stopped after it had gotten started. So we, yeah, they had reached an agreement but then the strike was already underway by the time they'd reached agreement so we gave the faculty the day off because it was just impossible to retrieve them at that point, they were out picketing and doing all the things they normally do. And so we called it the One-Hour Strike but it actually lasted a day. And everybody was back in class the next day. So that one was our big historic one. And then in '77 was a wage re-opener and in '78 was a full contract negotiation that's when Brickley was the president then. That was the big ten-day strike, the only one that we've ever experienced at Eastern was then.

LNS: Why was there a strike? What was obviously, there was no agreement so that, why was there a strike then but not since then? Because there have been some good times and some bad times since then as well

SM: I think in general it was not just us, there were several other schools who were striking and going out during the 70's. It was prior, to the PATCO thing too.

LNS: And what is the PATCO?

SM: PATCO was when Ronald Reagan fired the Air Traffic Controllers in 1980. Well this was prior to that so a lot of the unions in higher education when they weren't able to achieve their ends at the table and at that time, I think

it was the arbitration clause was part of it as I remember. And a salary differential pool was in there. Do we create that for the faculty to try and equalize salaries. Those provisions were being negotiated. We were reaching stalemates on those. We were just not able to go anywhere. And so the next alternative was to go out. And I remember an injunction being filed by a student saying that their education was being harmed. And it was during the time of the injunction hearings that we were ordered to sit down and try to work it out and we happened to work it out. We'd been through days and days of mediation and unable to reach agreement but through the hearings that we were called in for we were ordered by the Judge to sit down and try to work this thing through within a 48-hour period and we did. And so that ended that strike. Then in 1980 as I said, the PATCO incident really shook a lot of well, I'm sure it affected whether public employees went on strike for years and years and years after that. There was a true fear.

LNS: So Ronald Reagan really accomplished more than he intended to.

SM: I think he did. He put the fear of whatever in many public sector unions. But the 70's was a high point of activity of various strikes.

LNS: It was great irony, they wanted to name the airport after him in California.

SM: Yes I know. In Washington, DC, too.

LNS: I guess it's Washington. Of all of the things to name after him.

SM: The airport.

LNS: There's got to be some malicious irony in all of that. But what do you think the faculty gained from unionization?

SM: From the very earliest contract, the first thing they gained was a procedure for dealing with issues they felt were in violation of their rights and that was a grievance procedure. There had never been a formal grievance procedure. There was a faculty senate handbook and policy manual that existed before that but it didn't have any legal effect. So when we codified it in contract and we took a lot of things that were in the Personnel Manual out and just redrafted them into contract language. Then it became an instrument that had some teeth and you could actually do something with it so we got procedure and we got process and the other thing we began to codify were the structures that were in the departments, governance structures. So I really think what the faculty gained from all the contracts was the grievance procedure and the governance structures within the departments, the personnel, finance committees, that came out in the '76 contract and we began to put them together. The instruction committees

there was a faculty council at that point that got drafted in the '78 which took the place of the senate concept and got expanded on just within the last few negotiations. So the governance structure basically came for the faculty.

LNS: We didn't have a rich tradition of a faculty senate then it was sort of a weak tradition.

SM: We had it in the 50's and the early 60's and then it declined.

LNS: What created the decline? You originally said it was the growth, was it Sponberg not having any commitment to that kind of?

SM: Also the board began distancing themselves from the governance structures as they had existed in the 50's and 60's with faculty.

LNS: Now in the 50's and 60's, Eastern was under a different board. It had its own board in the 60's so that it would have been a breaking point. Was that possible is that possible some of the..

SM: The appointees took on a real different, you know the ones who were appointed by the governor took on a real different stance, which was more managerial. And that was the beginning of the trend of the more managerial administrative structure in universities.

LNS: So Sponberg felt pretty threatened by that?

SM: Yeah well, it divided then into a management union kind of mentality and that came about during the late 60's and you're right, when we went to appointed boards you know by the governor, strictly like that then there was more of a managerial attitude that began to develop. That's what ultimately brought the unionization to the campus was the attitudes on both sides.

LNS: I'd imagine that if there were gains, there were possible things that faculty lost by unionizing. Can you think of any of those?

SM: Actually what you lose is the congeniality in the beginning that might have existed in the 50's between administration. I remember stories of people faculty just sitting down with the president and working through things in the 50's and early 60's. And there was a very congenial kind of atmosphere. So what would be lost would be that sort of small campus interaction that you just don't get when you get larger. You ultimately grow and divide and multiply and you've lost some of that one-to-one interactive capability.

LNS: Do you think you could restore it within a union environment or is it lost forever or?

SM: I think you can certainly have better relations in a union environment. We actually do, in fact we've progressed from what would be called just the initial stages of unionization where you have really polarized points of view about management and administration and then the management looking at the faculty and having polarized points of view. I think we've graduated to a much more mature relationship now in the 90's than we had before. Now will we ever reach the small interactive ability anymore, no, because we're too big.

LNS: Difficulties \_\_\_\_\_ size vs. positioning in terms of unions and non-unions.

SM: Besides the campus too Larry. I mean we have so many more buildings now that when you and I were here. You look around and there's buildings everywhere.

LNS: And there's more to come.

SM: Yeah.

LNS: Committed to it I guess. When you look at the campus, you're here as a young professor in 1968 and you came as Associate, Assistant?

SM: Assistant.

LNS: Assistant and you're now a full professor you enjoyed, I hope being here for all these years.

SM: I have loved it.

LNS: What made you love being here?

SM: I like the people. I really liked the people I met, both on the administrative side and on the faculty side. I've always liked that. I loved the students. I think they're wonderful. They come from families who have never been to college before I like that about our student group that they're the first ones in their families to go. I like the fact they work. I really liked, I've always liked that atmosphere. I did before it was unionized, I did afterwards.

LNS: Where did you come from?

SM: Southern Ohio. I was born and raised in Cambridge Ohio. And I went to Muskingham College. You ever heard of Muskingham a little Presbyterian school eight miles from Cambridge and so I spent four years there and

then I spent a year at Bowling Green finished my Master's and then went to Wayne State. That's how I ended up at Eastern for my Ph.D.

LNS: So you came here after you got your Ph.D.?

SM: Yes. Finished the degree. Came here, thought I would be here like most people announce, I think I'll be here two or three years and here I am thirty years later.

LNS: What is it about Eastern, everybody I know. I came myself, I said to my wife, we'll be here for two or three years. Here it's twenty-three years and I'm still here. What is it about Eastern that you think that keeps people here? Sometimes you hear so many complaints and people are grouching and we went through this unionization period, we've gone through all of this, yet the school has tremendous adhesive qualities in terms of holding people.

SM: Yeah, there's not much turnover.

LNS: What is it that makes us want to stay?

SM: I think in the beginning, it was just the activity. Things were just happening all the time so there was always a little stimulation to be here. There was new building going up, there was a new program. When you get in a growth phase like that I think there's always a little more intrigue to be around. I think the people who are really long-term employees got connected to their co-workers very deeply and more so than they thought. And then another real factor in the job market was that it dried up. It pretty much dried up in the 70's. You couldn't just switch schools whenever you felt like it and now, it's still that way. We have never had the fluidity that we had in the 60's.

LNS: It's not the institution so much, for many people it's this is the best available job for some.

SM: Not for all but for some. And I think you settle in and you really do meet people that you just come to truly love and respect. Like I remember Don Drummond who was Dean of Arts and Science and I just looked upon him as being so wonderful.

LNS: Was he the Dean when you came here?

SM: I'm trying to remember. Actually, yes. He was. He hired me. And so did Sponberg.

LNS: Now Sponberg would be the first president that you worked under.

SM: Yes.

LNS: He was very involved. As I read, look through the materials, he was very involved in every hiring decision you made.

SM: Oh I met him when I hired in.

LNS: He not only interviewed everybody but he made a lot of the decisions. He had a very hands-on approach to the institution. Is that your experience?

SM: That's my memory of him. That he was truly involved in what was going on on campus and we were small enough then that he sort of could be he still could have some say in what was going on and some hand in it. The actual physical location of buildings on this campus divide people too. When you say why? It's what's the feeling of distance that exists and yet people really get close in their departments, so that's what keeps people, plus a bunch of factors and moving on is always a hassle and that sort of thing.

LNS: It's not just inertia. It's a positive force at the university?

SM: Oh I do I've always thought that. I've always thought that we're not stagnate, there's always something happening at Eastern. It either has to do with issues, look at the Porter years. Let's divide Arts and Science. Well that got everybody hot and got their attention. We were always building, expanding.

LNS: What were the issues during the Sponberg era when you came other than growth?

SM: As I recall it was mainly faculty voice began to be an issue. And I heard that for a long time in that early period, every year it seemed to just get worse and worse and worse.

LNS: So Sponberg even though it was small his style wasn't necessarily inclusive.

SM: It was starting to be lost.

LNS: And you said we had a new board emerging. Elloitt was the President that the new board had and then Sponberg came a couple of years after Elliott. Now a year or so after Elliott. And we have an administration that is strong administration, a weak administration. Do you have any perceptions about the administration?

SM: I believe there was a perspective that was growing stronger without listening to various facets of the university was my impression.

LNS: This was the time when the Vietnam War was going on. And do you remember those days?

SM: Oh I remember all the windows being broken out in the Quirk Building on one side because of the riots one night.

LNS: What did they do, throw stones?

SM: Yeah. There were rocks all along there so they just picked them up and heaved them through the windows as they all went up by.

LNS: A lot of anger. Not at the university but at society,

SM: I think it was the whole thing about the war about society about the structures that existed and that were. And by the way you can't divorce that from the entire atmosphere on the campus. There was a great sense of distrust for structures for anything that was systematized like the government the university structure, we had the SDS the students were absolutely looking for freedom that was one of their, and a say and an input and influence and all that sort of thing. So, it can't help but affect faculty too.

LNS: A lot of faculty felt the same as the students.

SM: It was the entire time and the age that made the difference.

LNS: During that time with Sponberg we also had another period on the campus that was pretty frightening that was the John Norman Collins.

SM: I taught through that. '69.

LNS: What was the feeling on the campus?

SM: That was, now that was a real phenomenon for this campus. I remember teaching the Spring term and that was after they'd discovered there had been several murders prior to that killings. And when I started teaching the spring term, I had something like thirteen or fourteen women in one class and men ten or twelve men and by the end of the spring term I only had five or six women left. Because they had heard of another killing and the parents were just withdrawing the young women from school right and left. So it was very fearful period.

LNS: Was the faculty afraid too at that period?

SM: Yes. Especially younger ones. It was a definite, it was a constant awareness that we were nationally being focused upon for all the wrong reasons. And I remember there was some concern about that too, this is all the wrong reasons to be focused on this university.

LNS: So we had the war, we had John Norman Collins, we had the expansion of the institution.

SM: We had a new board.

LNS: We had a new board, we had the bureaucratization of the administration as well. We had people who were being promoted left and right into higher and higher positions more administration more faculty we saw the College of Arts and Sciences develop in a more significant way. Great growth in student enrollments and then all of a sudden enrollments started to decline and that was what that would be around the early 70's, '71.

SM: Then we bottomed out for a period of time.

LNS: And things were getting pretty bad and Sponberg was forced out of the institution, is that your recollection?

SM: Yes, he was forced to step down and it was by the board.

LNS: Why was he forced? What was your understanding?

SM: My understanding of the whole situation was he did not have control of what was going on. He was not carrying out the will of the board either at that point. So it was forces on the board that forced him out.

LNS: Do you recall who those forces were?

SM: I really don't. I wish I could tell you. That part of my memory's shot. I don't remember that.

LNS: So Sponberg leaves and the board appoints a new president, there's an interim president, Ralph Gildea and he had been here as the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, sort of an interesting choice to make as the Interim President, usually you would think it would be the Academic Vice President. Was it Bruce Nelson was the Academic VP at that time? Strong academic VP.

SM: He was very well respected. Again, Bruce was sort of forced into retirement later on because of the same forces that forced Sponberg out.

LNS: There seems to be a lot of people forced out.

SM: Yeah.

LNS: Lou Profit.

SM: At that time.

LNS: So those were some pretty radical change.

SM: And the board began making lots of decisions about what the university would become.

LNS: And they hired a new president who was named James Brickley and he was the Lt. Governor of the State and he was appointed and the faculty went...

SM: Ballistic.

LNS: And they went.

SM: They weren't happy with the Brickley appointment at all.

LNS: And why was that?

SM: Most of the talk about Brickley at the time again, and I can only recollect what I can recollect. Was that he was using Eastern as a stepping stone to move ahead to an appointment in the Supreme Court or whatever, which is ultimately happened. That he was not well suited to be a university president. He really didn't seem to pay much attention to the structures of the university as they existed, didn't respond to them very well. Had no connection at all with faculty.

LNS: Did he try to make a connection at all in your recollection?

SM: There were several attempts to try to connect with him from the point of view of the faculty and I don't recall any attempts on his part to reach out to various sectors of the university. I think a lot of people felt disenfranchised.

LNS: By the process or by the president?

SM: I think by that time, by the whole process and the president. Because we had been with the Interim with Ralph for a while and again things hadn't settled out from the board being appointed and all that sort of thing. So I

think it was again, a series of issues and incidents that caused all the unrest.

LNS: Brickley commissioned a vigorous, a big task force to look at during his administration to look at the future of the university and do you recall that at all?

SM: There was a, Porter did that. I remember a task force being I remember being on one of the task forces for that and it didn't really come to much.

LNS: It came to a big report and a big shelf.

SM: And then it went away cause I don't remember much ever coming from that. But I remember. One incident I need to go back to one of the reasons too faculty were becoming disenchanted with the way things were before they unionized, was the pay, the way in which they got raises which stayed with the Department Head. At that point, the Dean of the Department pretty much determined every individual's pay rate. And that was the time that everyone was becoming sensitized about how much they were paid for what they did. So that was another moving force that you can throw in the pot of the John Norman Collins and the Vietnam War and all of that. There was a real sensitivity about what you were paid.

LNS: So you may be paid less than others who were doing the same.

SM: Because your Department Head was your best friend.

LNS: I see, so it wasn't an equitable system. It was a political, personality driven thing.

SM: Yes and so that was one of the bigger factors.

LNS: When you back and look at the Brickley Era, the faculty were unhappy.

SM: They weren't happy with Brickley from the beginning.

LNS: And he brought Tony Evans with him. Also hired to Larry Smith that was one of his better of appointments.

SM: Yes. Of course.

LNS: Absolutely. Be he hired Jimmy McGee who became the Vice President.

SM: Yes, Jim was during that interim period. Yes.

LNS: Was that a good appointment as far as you were concerned?

SM: Jim did well.

LNS: He didn't last very long.

SM: No, well he had the stroke.

LNS: Yes. Was that on the job?

SM: That was on the job, which pretty much laid him out. And

LNS: Young guy to have a stroke.

SM: That's right and so Tony Evans came after him.

LNS: I see. Ok.

SM: In that sequence. And I think Jim handled it as well as he could walking in and taking over in the interim. That was after Bruce Nelson.

LNS: And then Brickley, Tony was at that time was Brickley's Executive Assistant.

SM: Yes.

LNS: And we had the big ten-day strike during the Brickley period and the clerical and the maintenance workers it seemed that everybody unionized the same time as the faculty did?

SM: Faculty organized first in '74, '75 I think is the clericals they organized in 1975, and 1976 are the PT's and then ASCME or had organized somewhere in there too. And the police did later, so they were the last to organize.

LNS: So everybody's organized. So the times are pretty frightening then to people. I figure if everybody's organizing would that be a fair assessment?

SM: Oh the 70's.

LNS: The instability of the institution and the president being purely appointed over the faculty's objections, I guess. Is that fair?

SM: Oh that's right. There was little input into the selection of the president. None whatsoever. And too you had all of these forces moving at the

same time. The board becoming more and more managerially oriented. Because of the forces down below becoming more and more unionized.

LNS: The economy of the state was in pretty much upheaval at the same time, the late 70's as you recall.

SM: I remember we went through some times where it was slimmer than others. It went up and down during the 70's.

LNS: Enrollments were collapsing. People, faculty I recall were on Plan C for Summer concept there were threats of pink slips, there were pink slippings.

SM: We did in the 70's. The lowest point was in '76, '77 somewhere in there.

LNS: Key Brickley years.

SM: Yeah. The worst times, I believe when we bottomed out. And then there was a gradual improvement '78 through '80.

LNS: Now when Brickley left, people recall this, one of the few times that the faculty really spoke with a strong voice. There was fear that one of the regents, Tim Dyer, was gonna be the president of the university.

SM: Oh yes.

LNS: Do you remember that?

SM: Yes I do.

LNS: There must've been some fear. They took a big ad out in the newspaper.

SM: There was a lot of talk about that. And there was some intrepation on the part of the faculty that he would become the next president of the university and he wasn't thought of fondly by faculty in general because he'd been a regent for a number of years. And in the papers had some fairly caustic things to say about faculty. So they remembered those and that was really the reaction as to his attitude about faculty of his perceived attitude about faculty.

LNS: And so the faculty really organized on that.

SM: Oh yes.

LNS: That wasn't a union activity. That was a campus-wide activity.

SM: That's right. And other unions also felt the same threat. And of course, he wasn't, it was Porter then who came along. Now the faculty didn't have any say about that either.

LNS: Porter withdrew his name and came back said that unless everybody interviewed him, he wasn't interested in the presidency. So that was his way of opening the door to do some collaboration.

SM: So some faculty then interviewed him, right? I do remember that. And he then came in '80 and then we started a growth spurt again during the Porter years.

LNS: Any feelings about the Porter years?

SM: It's interesting, the Porter years are perceived by a lot of administrators as somewhat negative by his administrative style and some of the decisions that were made. The faculty kind of view them as some of their best years. The best pay raises that the faculty got from some of the contracts in the 70's or in the 80's. '87 especially was the best the faculty have ever done at the institution and it was during the Porter years. Now there was a lot of unrest caused too by the suggestion that we split Arts and Science, caused a lot of unrest in the university.

LNS: Do you think Porter was pretty sincere about that?

SM: You know, I don't know. I have no idea if that was just a thought or it was a political thing but I know it did more to really cause the faculty to become concerned than anything else during the 80's.

LNS: What was their fear? What would the fear be of splitting the two? I think Porter was pretty sincere about it from his own description but he wasn't willing to rupture the university over it. It was more than a trial balloon but when he saw the opposition to it he realized that why mar a very successful presidency with an internal fight that just would rip apart all of the things he had built.

SM: I think it ran against tradition.

LNS: Purely tradition.

SM: Really strongly felt tradition. That a really well rounded education is the Arts and the Sciences and that they are in fact a part of the humanities overall and you just don't divide two things that are so tied together in so many ways.

LNS: Porter wasn't trying to do away with the Arts or the Sciences, he was trying to find a better way to manage the growth and the development of the departments.

SM: College with the Arts and a College with the Sciences and have two Deans and now part of it was probably very political on the part of the College of Arts and Science wanting to maintain their largest status. I'm sure part of it was that too. But I know a lot of the faculty who felt strongly about tradition got very exercised over that. That's very memorable.

LNS: At that point, Faculty council and the union, faculty council strong during that period of time?

SM: No.

LNS: Ever been strong since?

SM: It's growing now. It's interesting, going was back to the senate, it was strong in the early 50's and early 60's. It diminished in the later 60's clear through I would say, the early 90's. It was reconstituted in '87 to become a larger body. And actually or was that '92? Maybe it was '92 it was reconstituted to become a representative body. It's grown stronger since then it's taking a position in the governance structure where it belongs.

LNS: The unionization really is dealing with wages and fringes and working conditions the faculty council has proposed in it the decisions as to the curriculum.

SM: Yes, the academic and the governance.

LNS: How do the faculty divide the two? Is it the union people the types of people that are in the union who are also on the faculty council or does it attract different types of people?

SM: No it's an interesting, there's been some hostility over the years between the union and the faculty council periodically and I recall, I've never felt this way really because in my mind, governance has always been what I thought the union ought to provide a base for and we had, you know in the departments and in the colleges we had good strong governance structures but we didn't have one beyond that and the faculty council would be beyond the colleges so when it became a body and there were only twelve to fifteen people on it at one time. It was very weak because it was elected from several people from the colleges and all of that. And it really did not have much influence and the union and the faculty council were always running into each other. They would say something that wasn't contractual and then the union would get upset so there was an

awful lot of tension between the two. It was reconstituted in '92 and then from then on, there's been much less stress and strain between the union and the faculty council. And I think it's because there's the final realization that each body can't deal with what the other one does and it's real critical that they do their own separate jobs.

LNS: That both do them.

SM: Yeah for ultimate harmony in getting along in the university and for all of the structures in the university to work well. That's my only goal is to have things work well and I think finally the faculty council's coming into their own of being a governance structure.

LNS: Is it due to the leadership of the faculty council or is it changing times?

SM: Its changing times and it's also the structural things the changes that were made. Leadership's important but it really has to do with the structure within which you can lead and that makes a difference too.

LNS: Some people say that Porter saved the university. Does the faculty feel that way?

SM: Saved the university? Oh I remember the talks and all those rumors that we were going to become a prison or something like that. I don't know if the faculty feel that he saved it I think the faculty are probably split on the Porter years, of them would say they were the best years they ever had, some others probably because of the Arts and Science things would say oh boy that was just awful.

LNS: The Arts and Sciences thing never happen, but enrollments did grow during that period, significant gains in enrollments, significant gains in funding, creating the Doctorate.

SM: Gains in pay.

LNS: Working conditions improved.

SM: Yes they did.

LNS: The campus became more attractive, etcetera. Porter leaves after what? Nine years, ten years, decade of advancement then we have Bill Shelton.

SM: Came in.

LNS: Came in, Interim leadership under Roy Wilbanks. Do you remember those days?

SM: I remember it was called Transition Council and Roy was sort of riding herd until Shelton came in.

LNS: New president selected and Shelton started out with, I don't know if it was a strike, but it was certainly a demonstration I guess it would be a faculty, do you remember that. Why was there a demonstration? The guy's not even on the job for twenty minutes and people were demonstrating what was the purpose of that?

SM: The purpose of that when I look back now, there was faculty input into the appointment of this president.

LNS: More so than ever before.

SM: Yes more so than any before. And Shelton was not the choice of the faculty. He was not the candidate of the faculty. And some of the things that he was saying in a way was ignoring the fact that it was the union that protested him not the faculty council. The union protested because he was insisting on saying things that seemed to ignore the fact that it was a unionized campus that the union had a very strong voice here and I think the attempt was to show him that they did. And the union had been very offended by his comments of dealing mainly, this was the time when there was that stress and strain between the faculty council and the union and he was willing to talk to faculty council but wasn't very much interested in the union. And so he offended the union fairly heartily. And it resulted in a protest saying, hello! We're here and we're a very strong body and force in the university. And I think this has been a rocky relationship between the unionized faculty and Bill Shelton over the years. Because the first major mistake he made on the job was to decide to take away the two percent increase, two percent of the increase I should say.

LNS: And what gave rise to that, I don't.

SM: There was a shortfall projected that year in the budget and so his solution to that was not to grant at least two percent of the proposed increase. You know to withhold that.

LNS: Did he do that?

SM: No there was a tremendous backlash all over campus saying you can't renege on a contract like that.

LNS: So his economic interest. Now there's some who feel he was really trying to befriend the faculty. He came in and he took areas that had been part of the academic division, personnel matters, took all the personnel

decisions back out of personnel office and moved everything under the Provost, the Vice President for Academic Affairs. As a matter of fact, he elevated the Vice President for Academic Affairs to the Provost level to show that there would be, because the board in appreciation for the Vice President's participation in the transition elevated him to an Executive VP and the president wanted to show that the provost was really the second officer at the university after the president. Talked about learning, the learning university, the learning edge, very committed to the academic and yet the faculty seemed to have never saw that as a positive relationship, suspicious. What's going on in the faculty's mind?

SM: From the very beginning was the offense of the union and I think.

LNS: The faculty being a little bit insensitive to what maybe Shelton was trying to do. You said that there was a.

SM: The initial offense of the union that they felt.

LNS: To the union.

SM: That they felt from Shelton that they felt offended by what had happened. Ran deep and then unfortunately, with the wage, to withhold the wage caused waves very shortly after he'd been here. I think though as time went on that relationship matured that he wasn't seen as being so anti-everything, that he was viewed as trying as you said, emphasize classroom, emphasize students, shifting things to academic affairs, I think that was.

LNS: Significant change.

SM: Oh, yes. Absolutely.

LNS: The Library building up the Library collection building up the multi-million dollar re-equipping the faculty areas all of these things under Shelton building a Library.

SM: And I think that now is recognized by many of the faculty and I think he's also matured too. I think he's seen what it is to be in a unionized environment and yet to be able to realize some of his own goals within that environment. I think he was getting some fairly bad advice in the beginning about the groups. Perhaps people from the personnel division dealing with the union were not giving him probably very positive kinds of signs or how to handle what was happening. I don't think he was given enough information about what had happened in the past at this university and the union to have an idea of how to deal with it in the beginning. So it was our fault too.

LNS: Do you think if you could do this over again that you would do it differently?

SM: Do what differently?

LNS: The whole relationship with the president. Do you think the union overreacted?

SM: Oh, they may have overreacted a little. I think he needed to be more sensitive to it as well. I think it was just six of one a half dozen of another. And again, it's all the newness he came into a new situation as president. And we had a history and unless you really know the history, it's difficult to know what steps to take. I think he's done very well at this point. I think he tries very hard, I think his heart's in the right place.

LNS: When you assess the presidencies, when you look back, you've got Shelton, you've got Porter, you've got Sponberg, you think that if among the faculty the vote is still that the best years were the Porter years or the best years were the Shelton years or the better years?

SM: I would say that Porter would get some votes from the faculty and Shelton will get some votes from the faculty. I think the one who would get the least votes from the faculty of having been any of the better years ever would be Brickley. There'd be a big thumbs down for Brickley's presidency. I think Gilden would probably get some thumbs up for having held it together for a period of time. Sponberg certainly would from a lot of people who liked him you know and thought he was still even though he thought it was still a small campus, that's the way he treated it.

LNS: What other observations do you have when you think about the University? Who are some of the noteworthy faculty members that you recall during the years that you've been here?

SM: Oh there are a lot of them. We go back to the very beginning. Judy Gallatin certainly was.

LNS: She's in what department?

SM: She was in Psychology. She passed on some years past. Stu Caravanic certainly in the very early years. Jean Henley was a little Librarian who was on the first negotiating team who is still alive and well in Ann Arbor. And she was an incredible person. She was older and close to retirement when we negotiated the first contract but she was really an incredible person. Mary McCarthy who's now passed on in the early years was on

the first negotiating team. As I move up through the years, Judy Johnson certainly was involved in the union at one time and was noteworthy.

LNS: Don Pearson of course.

SM: Don Pearson was from the beginning. Karen Lindenberg came in the late 70's to become a little more involved in the early 80's. Actually she became involved in the early 80's doing Grievance Officer and so forth. Cheryl \_\_\_\_\_ the Executive Director of the Union certainly has had an impact on the growth.

LNS: What about non-union faculty who are some of the leaders in your mind?

SM: Over the years basically? Non-union? We're all union.

LNS: No I mean people who aren't identified as necessarily union leaders.

SM: Oh as union leaders. Just people we would identify.

LNS: If you were to say oh, these are some of the real strength of the faculty, these are people who were inspirations to other faculty members.

SM: You know, other than the ones who were involved in the union all those years, there weren't many. Seriously, there were some who some of the presidents of the faculty council really caused more trouble than created good for a period of time up until the 90's.

LNS: What about when you look at the institution in terms of all of the changes and you have during this period, we gained a Doctoral granting status, we've done very well on our accreditations, fully accredited in almost, in every area of the university. Growth of the College of Business, the College of Technology, College of Health and Human Services, all of these things emerged during in the last short history of the institution. Last thirty years of the institution. Any thoughts on that?

SM: Well I know we've grown more in the last twenty years than we probably did in the seventy-five or hundred years before that. I imagine we have. You know just in terms of volume and numbers and I think we are growing for the better. I really do I think a lot of the turmoil that went in the 70's and we finally leveled out from turmoil in the 80's and I think the 90's have been a good growth period for us. And I think we're getting better all the time, as big as we are, we're able to get better and that's my goal is that we just get better and better and better.

LNS: As you walk around the campus when you look at the buildings you travel around, is there any favorite spot that you have on the campus or any other one area other than Quirk or Sponberg theatre or anything.

SM: You know, it's funny, as I walk on the campus I think of it as sort of my home that I live here and I live here a lot anyway, I'm here most of the time. But I walk around the campus and I feel very at home here. And I think I like walking up through the mall area up to McKenney and I look over and I can see Pierce and I see King and Welch and Starkweather and all the buildings and it really brings back lots of memories. Good ones.

LNS: The old part of the campus though. That's interesting, you picked the spots that were here for since 1896.

SM: Yeah, I've been here since 1896, feels like it.

LNS: Any students that you remember with particular warmth and affection?

SM: Oh over the years, lots of them. And Rodney Slater especially who is now one of our outstanding, you know, Secretary of Transportation, he was wonderful student. Many of the students in the theatre, Jeff Daniels.

LNS: Some of the big names.

SM: It's just incredible. I remember just so many others. Just last year, a couple of grad students I have who just call me and we keep in touch and the students, well the students are why I came here and stayed here and am here basically. The union happened to be a part of my life the whole time I was here, but it's the students that keep me.

LNS: One area that has created some unpleasantness for the university was the Huron issue.

SM: Oh yes.

LNS: Any thoughts on that?

SM: Well I had unfortunately or fortunately, either way, some of the leaders of those movements in my classes. And I tried very hard to let that not become the topic, yeah the Huron restoration were in my classes so I would try not to let that not become a predominant issue in the class. But if anyone wanted to say something of course, they could but I like to hear it from both sides. That was well now that caught Shelton too. That sort of caught him going and coming. Because that issue had come up and

literally he was just the recipient of that and it landed on his desk and he made the decision, well, we probably ought to be.

LNS: Pretty courageous decision or stupid decision?

SM: Well it was probably fairly courageous at the time to say that we probably ought not to, we probably ought to be politically correct or whatever and go another way. And then again, it flew in the face of tradition and past and I've always had a great empathy for him about that problem.

LNS: Parking a big issue?

SM: Oh incredible. Since we grew and we've grown to the size we are, parking is probably the number one issue that comes up for faculty and any meeting I've been in.

LNS: Do you experience problems in parking?

SM: Not any more I get here real early and I leave here real late. So I usually don't have that problem. I park way out back but it is a major problem still for students and faculty.

LNS: Athletics? What about athletics?

SM: I've always felt that athletics have a place in the university and as long as they are monitored and viewed to have to be as academically responsible as anybody else, that's fine. I must admit when we started paying all these singers and people to come in at half time and all the money we pumped in at one time, I thought was a little extreme.

LNS: How about the new facilities?

SM: Oh I think we need a Convocation Center. I think it'll be very nice.

LNS: Good for you. Sort of exciting, the whole campus as we enter this new century, it is very well positioned in many, many ways. It's exciting. Any advise for those who are going to follow us?

SM: I think they ought to keep looking for ways to make things work better. You know that to me is what you always need to do. Is do the things that help us advance, do the things that make structures that are in place work better or get rid of them and put something else in that will work better.

LNS: Our job in light of all of your comments about tradition seems to be heavily burnt what about this big impact of technology. We're in the kerosene age of the technological innovations that we're gonna be seeing and large

numbers of faculty are gonna be retiring of all of those who came in under the baby boom years, the late 60's, we're gonna see higher education reshape itself in many ways. Over the next couple of decades. Any thoughts about that?

SM: Well we might as well get used to it and we might as well learn to do it cause it is where it's going. I don't see any other direction other than the technological explosion that we're having now.

LNS: Do you think the union is going to be leader is helping this to happen or is it going to be an obstacle?

SM: I think it's going to have to help. And it is right now in terms of trying to find ways to allow faculty and to encourage them to get into distance learning.

LNS: You would see our union at Eastern, the faculty union as a very positive

SM: I think so.

LNS: force at this point or sort of moderate force?

SM: I've already helped negotiate the Continuing Ed Distance Learning thing the first agreement to go ahead and do it and I think the union won't certainly stand in the way of it. It's going to be faculty doing things differently. But it'll still be faculty doing things you know, participating in education and providing education, teaching. But they may be doing it over the Internet or they may be doing it in the distance learning classrooms.

LNS: Or every place, all at once. Might be taking a course here and a course on the Internet.

SM: That's right. We're not gonna stop that. We might as well figure out how to do it.

LNS: So it'll be a strong energy you think from the faculty council, the union to as we move into this?

SM: I think so. I don't think there will be people blocking it all the way. You can't block something that is.

LNS: It's a force bigger than any one individual.

SM: Oh yes and it's on all the campuses and it's everywhere.

LNS: What makes a good teacher?

SM: What makes a good teacher? You gotta like students. You have to like doing it and you can't feel like it's a job beneath you or you could've been something better or could've done something else if you weren't here, you can't feel that way. You really have to feel that this is the best job in the world and that the students are there and you can teach them or at least provide a learning atmosphere where they can learn.

LNS: I heard it said that after parenting, teaching is the most important activity in society. Do you agree with that?

SM: Yes.

LNS: Do you feel good about being a teacher?

SM: Oh I've loved it. I have. I've had individual classes where I thought, boy I wish there were a little more energy in here. On the other hand, I've always thought, it's exactly the profession I should have been in.

LNS: You still resonate to a motivated student?

SM: Oh yeah. I like it when they come in

LNS: Watching your face, you lit up.

SM: And they come in and they have the ideas instead of my trying to think of it if they come in and they have all these ideas they want to do it's stimulating.

LNS: So you've enjoyed your years overall then.

SM: Oh I've loved it. I wouldn't be any place else.

LNS: Here you are and I thank you very much.

SM: Thank you Larry.