

GWEN ANDREW

March 13, 2000

Jeff Charnley,
interviewer

Charnley: Today is Monday, March 13. We're here in Haslett [phonetic], Michigan, at the home of Dr. Gwen Andrew. I'm Jeff Charnley interviewing Dr. Andrew for the MSU Oral History Project for the sesquicentennial of Michigan State to be commemorated in 2005. As you can see, Dr. Andrew, we are tape recording this interview today. Do you give us permission for the project to tape you?

Andrew: I certainly do.

Charnley: I'd like to start with some general questions about your educational background and professional training that you've had. Where did you grow up, and when did you go to school? Start at the beginning.

Andrew: I grew up in a little town, Plattville, Wisconsin, about 3,000 people, 3,600, something that order. I went off to the University of Wisconsin at Madison. I guess I better say that now since they've got all the rest of those incorporated. In my day, at Plattville they had a Teachers College, which is now the University of Wisconsin at Plattville. I went to Madison to school and majored in psychology.

I went on and got a master's degree there. Harry Harlow, if you know anything about monkeys and that stuff, he was the man, I was his grad assistant for him. He didn't approve of women going to graduate school, but this was during World War II, so he had to rely on women. So for three years, there were one, two, three women graduate students working in his monkey lab.

Then I went off to work at the end of that period and came over to Michigan. Well, I worked for the State of Wisconsin for a bit, but you don't need all that boring history. Then I came over here and worked for the state

for a bit, and finished a doctorate. Then eventually went out to teach at MSU. I majored in psychology, then got a doctorate in sociology and the philosophy of science, which was my major area of interest, that and organization stuff.

Charnley: So you had some experience as a clinical psychologist, then, before you came to MSU?

Andrew: Yes, the first job I had at the University of Wisconsin was working with veterans. I did some clinical psychological testing. I came over here, and the state was developing a test for children, a Rorschach type-test. We called it the Michigan Picture Test. I finished that. Went to school part-time, and then finished up out here. Then eventually became head of the Research Division in the Department of Mental Health for the state. Then I was asked if I was interested in a position out here, so I went out here in 1966, I guess it was. So it's been a long time.

Charnley: You said you were asked. Who made the first contact?

Andrew: Lou McQuidy [phonetic] was the dean of the College of Social Science, which had just been separated out. That was the time, somewhere along in there, that they separated out arts and letters, natural sciences, and social science. He was dean of social science. We happened to be on a committee which was evaluating the Hospital for the Criminally Insane, which was part of the state system. He decided I was a pretty good something or other, so he said, would I like an appointment as an associate professor? That's an important point, as an associate professor in the Bureau of Social Science Research. So I said certainly, although I was still working for the state.

Then I got an offer from the School of Social Work to be a professor there, although I'm not a social worker, to be part-time in an institute, the Human Learning Research Institute. Well, because McQuidy had appointed me as an associate professor in the bureau, I had to be appointed as an associate professor in the regular tenure-system job. So that worked out fine. Then I was there.

Well, how did all that work out? Oh, I know. The person who was director of the School of Social Work left at the end of a year after I'd been there. I think he was only there a year. They asked me if I'd be acting director, and then they did their nationwide search and so on, and ended up asking me to be director. So I did that. And then after, let's see, that would be '67, I guess. Probably officially, yes, I think it was the summer of '67.

Then I was asked to be acting dean of the college when [Clarence] Winder decided to become provost or was appointed provost. So they did another nationwide search, and again asked me if I would like to be dean of the college, which of course I would like to be, so I took that job. I started acting in 1974, October, and then I became the regular dean, I guess, in September of '75.

Charnley: Were there any other women as deans at that time?

Andrew: Lois [A.] Lund was dean. Human Ecology and Nursing had women deans, but I was the first dean of stuff other than women's colleges on the campus. As a matter of fact, when I was director of social work, there were only three women in the country. When I went into this, there had been a woman dean from Northwestern in the Big Ten. She was Hannah Gray, who became president of Chicago. She was off at Yale or some such place in between. But anyhow, I was the second dean, but I figure I followed in pretty fancy footsteps with her.

Then I just stayed in that job until I retired, although I also was acting dean of human ecology when Lois Lund stepped down. For a couple of years, I was doing both deans, in social science and human ecology while they searched for that one. And then as I was retiring, in 1989, I stayed on a bit because they searched and searched for the dean of social science to follow me. And then Ken [Kenneth E.] Corey, who took over, was going to be a few months late, and so forth. That took me up to June of '89.

In that time, they asked me if I'd be acting dean of nursing. So I became acting dean of nursing for a couple of years. It always seems to take a couple years to find a dean. It did then. I stayed in that. Then, when I finished the nursing deanship, they had what they called Human Health Programs, which was a kind of overarching thing over the colleges of Human Medicine, Osteopathic, and Nursing. Now that's since demised, but they asked

me to be, I think the title they gave me was assistant Vice Provost for Human Health Programs. There, my big job was to help them select a billing system and a record system for the medical practices that they had.

Then following that, they were engaged in a kind of a research project. I guess that's that fancy term for it, a project, to see whether they could lure physicians that were learning to be doctors to go into rural communities. They needed somebody to manage that project for a while, and I did that for a bit of the time and then finally left the university. So there's your career bit.

Charnley: In a nutshell. What first attracted you to psychology as a study?

Andrew: I thought when I went to Madison that I might like to go into medicine. I took some psychology courses and I think that's what got me into it. I liked that and I liked philosophy. Well I said, I'll do a double major. They said, "Oh, no, you can't do any such thing." So I decided, well, I'm never going to get a job in philosophy, so I'd better do psychology. So that's what I did.

Charnley: [Laughter] No money in it. Interesting combination. In coming to Michigan State, you've already talked a little bit about how you actually came here. As associate professor, did you have tenure when you first came?

Andrew: No, no. That was just an appointment, with the understanding I was still working downtown.

Charnley: When you first arrived, what do you remember about the campus? How was it different than it is today? Some of the earlier impressions that you have about the campus?

Andrew: Well, if you mean physically, I had been here so long as I don't know as I had any different idea about it. But the thing that I think struck me were two things. One, the tenure system itself. I had been working with the

university. They'd have joint appointments with people on campus and then the research division that I was in charge of downtown. But that was where I guess I began to learn about the tenure system and have some sense of what it was. That was an impressive piece of stuff, I thought, and I still think it's a good idea, in spite of some of the troubles that it has.

I think the thing that stuck out the most for me was the sexism. It was amazing. Now, I'd been working in government, and there was a kind of glass ceiling for women. There's no doubt about that. There were very few--I think maybe the state librarian had been a woman at one point, but that's about it, the really top jobs. But you could go some place in it. You could get decent rank. I had a pretty decent rank in the state. But I went out here, and it was just amazing to me. For example, the sociology department said they really didn't want women because it was troublesome to have them on the faculty and so on. That kind of thing was almost startling. Of course, it wasn't very long before that went by the board.

See, when I became dean, it had become possible for a woman to become a dean. It wasn't very likely, but it was possible. If it had been a few years earlier, I wouldn't even have had a shot at it. A few years later, they'd have been looking for women and I'd have been able to grab it more easily. But anyway, it was interesting.

Charnley: So you ran into a few of those brick walls. Not so much a glass ceiling, but it sounds like you bounced off and found your way around it.

Andrew: And I heard more about them. Now actually, I was very fortunate. Because you go back to World War II, Harry Harlow didn't believe in women going to grad school, but he didn't have anybody but women to go. So in the war, there were all kinds of contingency things. And then, as I say, the sexism thing had started. There would be concern about it by the time I was beginning to be dean, as I remember. It had become possible for women to go somewhere, that's all. So I didn't really hit the ceiling so much as observe it.

Charnley: Did you live in the area, or were you in Lansing when you first came?

Andrew: When I first came, I was here. I did some traveling around the state, so I spent six months on the Upper Peninsula and that kind of thing, on the mental health job. Mainly I lived in Lansing.

Charnley: In terms of your administration when you first got involved, what would you say were your main duties as an administrator or as a dean? Were there any things that surprised you when you first went into the job?

Andrew: No, it seems to me that--well, I don't know. I think the thing that was most different about it was you had to keep switching what you were thinking about because you had so many appointments with different people and so on. But I think I developed my own style of administration and so on. It seemed to me my biggest job was to try to build the system. You can use the budget to do that. So I started from there. I don't know how much you want me to rattle on about administrative style.

Charnley: Talk a little bit about it, your system that you developed.

Andrew: I think what you do is you have certain kinds of things that you use. One of them is ambiguity. That's a very useful piece to have. People used to say to me that my administrative style was to ask questions that I knew the answer to, but it focused them on what I wanted. Well, I don't know. That's an observation that's made. I think it's probably true.

I think the big trick in being a dean is management of resources. I think that's any administrative challenge. But I'm not talking about keeping track of the money; I'm talking about the systems you use. Like I always used to say, you need a Swiss bank when you're a dean. You get some unit, some piece, I used the Social Science Research Bureau, now called IPSR. But I used that as a place to put money, so that other people couldn't track it, like the provost and so forth. You're not cheating them, but you've just got a place to park your money. You need that. And you need to over-budget.

I guess I'd say just try and go down these things, you manage the lines, blur the lines in departments and units like that. Create joint programs. Push that kind of thing, the joint appointment. Try to get joint appointments. That's not easy to do, because people tend to think that they don't know where they are, and so on. I think faculty will put this together themselves, but there's a kind of departmental tyranny, and that keeps people from wanting to let the university reorganize itself. They're always afraid of what's going to happen with that. So you have a hard time to get that done, but it is something you need to do. They're doing much more of it now. That's come around again, as far as I can see.

Charnley: This collaboration you're talking about, or the joint appointments, that's within the university?

Andrew: Yes.

Charnley: Rather than professionals in psychology coming in and teaching a few adjunct courses.

Andrew: Yes. You do some of that, but that's not big-time stuff. The one I was really worrying about was joint appointments within the university. As I say, they're not easy to pull off. And joint programs are even harder to pull off, but they're a good idea if you can do it. But the main point is, do not tenure people into a unit.

In other words, I'll give you an example. Medicine, when it was created, had a lot of joint appointments with other departments and stuff. What happens to them is that they get the professor in, and the professor begins to have different interests and starts doing something else. I'll give you an example. We had one in sociology who was in medicine, I've forgotten which department over there. But he got interested in criminal justice, so he was doing all his work and research, and it was very good work, he was doing it there and medicine wasn't getting anything from their joint appointment. But because they had tenured him into it, they had a hard time doing anything about moving him out of it. Whereas if they had had a joint appointment saying, "We want this kind of thing from the Department of Sociology. You provide that and we'll put up the funds to pay for it, but if you don't

do it, we don't provide the funds." And they have to agree to [unclear] and so on. But that's the way to do your joint appointments, I think, rather than tenure them into a spot like that. So their interest in change is the main point. Anyway, that kind of thing.

The faculty, as I say, will do the joint work themselves, but if it comes to voting to being joint units, they won't do it, because they worry about so many things. So it takes some leadership to get them to do that. Departmental tyranny is very powerful.

I also think you cut competition. You do that by rotating the goodies that you've got. You've got resources. One time you put some in one unit, another year in another unit. They begin to realize that you're going to do this, so they aren't so upset when Unit A gets something and they don't, because they know they'll get their shot at it when they've got special things to do or they're doing something. So try to cut the competition. Most people say that's not a good idea, but I think it's the way to go.

I think the other thing I always thought was keep in continued contact with the chairpersons and directors of the departments and schools. You have formal meetings with them, or I always did, individually. You always had meetings with the whole group. But those are more pro forma, because they don't say anything that means anything and so on. So you kind of have to have your meetings with them independently. And then I tried within every two-week period to see that I at least talked to them on the phone, that kind of thing. So you know what's going on, they know you're around, and so on. I think that helps.

I think you should experiment. Keep trying to create different kinds of things to do, so that it doesn't just become a constant routine. One example of that is when they began pushing the off-campus programs. Now this has changed a good deal now, I'm sure, but when they were going when I was there, we decided to set up what I called a co-op. All of the money, instead of going to the units individually, that generated the money, it went into a pot. And again, then we used this system to get them special things, and they would get more than they'd get if they each had their own little pot. Because you can make money mean more if you got a bigger pool. So we did that. That's the kind of thing.

Over-budget, I guess I mentioned that. It's very easy to do if you don't get yourself making all your money

permanent assignments. If you give a unit so much money in year one, it doesn't mean they're going to get it in year two. Some people, I think, doled it out for good. But I didn't do that. I used to figure about 10 percent on a million dollars should be simply over-budgeted, because you'd pick that up somewhere along the way, and so forth.

Charnley: It sounds like a tithe. [Laughter]

Andrew: Yes. That's about right.

Charnley: Or an endowment.

Andrew: Yes, something like that. It's harder to do now, because I think the provost does that exactly. So she picks up anything you've got in your hands. I imagine it's harder for deans to hide their dough, and so on.

Charnley: It sounds like in terms of working with administrators, you worked well one-on-one with the individual chairpersons of the various departments?

Andrew: Yes, I did a lot of that. I think that's an important piece to do. Because as I say, you can have your group meetings. There are some things you can do that way. But they really won't. See, they want to compete. I used to have, the psych department would come in and say, "Now, we're the best unit you've got." And I would say to them, "Where are you in psychology departments? Are you better than the other departments? You're not even in their fields. How do you know you're better?" I think they want to compete, and then get more dough out of you that way, or more resources. So as I say, you have to keep that from happening. That's where you do the individual work with them. And then, as I say, they learn how you're going to operate so they'll cooperate.

Charnley: It sounds like healthy competition.

Andrew: Well, I think it's unhealthy to compete. That's what I'm saying. I'm trying to keep them from being competitive.

Charnley: I see. Some of the administrators that you worked with. First president, President [John A.] Hannah was here when you first came. Did you have much contact with him?

Andrew: Not a lot, because it wasn't very long before he left. I think, looking over the presidents, there's this expression, people are in the right place at the right time, the right person. That's really reversed. I think it should be the right time, the right place, and the right person. That was Hannah. He was the right person. But the first requirement was the right time. This was post-World War II, and everything was expanding. This guy was smart enough to see that here was his chance, so he was in the right place. Because there was a university that could expand, and so on, was a state facility but nowhere near as big as Michigan and all that. And then he was smart enough to do it, so he was the right person. He built the place and others can build on that.

He used joint programs, by the way, constantly. A lot of that went on. And as I say, I think that's happening again now, as people are beginning to ignore boundaries. All this talk about the science corridor and so on and that work. So there's a case of where the knowledge itself, I think, is bringing about the boundary change. But in his day, he was smart enough to see that there are certain things you can do if you don't build these boundaries.

I think University College is an example of that. He created that thing. I don't know whose idea it was. I don't think it was his, but it doesn't matter. He knew enough to pick it up and do something with it.

Charnley: The other presidents that you worked with?

Andrew: Then [Clifton R.] Wharton [Jr.] was next. He was there during a very tough time to be president,

because the students were just raising holy heck. This was the challenge to authority period, and all that kind of stuff. He was a very sensitive man, very self-conscious in the best sense of self-conscious. He was a bit of an elitist, and he really seemed to me to do a very good job in a tough time. But it was a little harder to see his effect. Of course, you got Wharton Center [for Performing Arts] out of all that, which is something special. I think he did a good job of holding it together.

Then [Edgar L.] Harden came along as an acting president or interim, whatever they called it. He was a real politician, the most of a politician of any of the ones I had anything to do with, as far as I could see. He wasn't a scholar, and he didn't worry a lot about the curriculum and that kind of stuff. I don't think most presidents do. But he certainly was attuned to what was going on outside the place and that kind of thing.

And then I guess [M. Cecil] Mackey followed him. Yes, he was the interim, and then Mackey came in. Now, he came at a bad time because money was running very short at that point, and he had to do something about that. I think he tried to do too much. He was too ambitious for what he needed to do, and tried to fold in a lot of other things, in terms of reorganization and so on. And he made the common error that went on all the time then, of asking faculty to make decisions that they can't make, like how are we going to reorganize this place? We got the Blue Ribbon Committee together to try to say what do we cut out. They don't know enough to do that. And they obviously are very competitive, and so it's hard for them to do anything for him. And then the board really didn't support Mackey anyway with this stuff. They may have thought they were going to, but as faculty would go around and talk to them, they'd change their minds.

You have to come up with these plans on your own. I think he had them, but somehow he didn't manage to get the faculty to follow with him, and so on. He had pretty good ideas. Breslin [Student Events] Center was his notion. He wanted to combine the core colleges, arts and letters, social science, and natural science, which actually should have been done, but there was no way to pull that off. They got into the problem of kind of compromising their deans, so they couldn't support them. I'm not sure that the other two would have, as a matter of fact. Anyway, that didn't happen.

So he really had kind of a disastrous presidency on grounds that were, a lot of times, in his style. He was

not a friendly, hale fellow, that hearty handshake sort of guy. Nice man and remarkably good at knowing who he was talking to. I meet him on the street now, and he'll still know who I am by name and so on. But anyhow.

Then we went to [John A.] DiBiaggio. DiBiaggio was an interesting guy. He was the wrong time and the wrong person to follow this kind of metaphor that I'm talking about. You look at DiBiaggio, while he was here. I got thinking about his Christmas cards. Now he's one who would, the card would come out and they'd send them all over hell and gone, of course. There's a picture of DiBiaggio and his Packard, I think it was, that he managed to pick up someplace. But there were pictures of DiBiaggio. The one I got from [M. Peter] McPherson, or get from McPherson, is always something about the university and so on. There's a difference.

Charnley: A personal difference?

Andrew: A personal difference there. DiBiaggio, of course, got in trouble with the board. Now, that I think was just bad board business, where they were telling him what to do with the athletic situation. I don't blame DiBiaggio for that. He really did get caught in a bad one there, but then tried to fight it out and finally had to get out of here. He didn't do much with the university per se, as far as I can see. Tried to start the money-raising thing. That really became stronger during his time. But that was just following the times, what was going on. Everybody was starting to try to get more money. Worst part of a dean's job.

Charnley: Do you think he was more of a politician and less of an academic leader, I mean in terms of raising money with the legislature?

Andrew: I don't think he was really good at that either. He didn't seem to get along with them too well. He was a very charming man, but there didn't seem to be anything more to it than that. For some reason, he couldn't seem to pull stuff off.

Now you get to McPherson. Here again you're in the right time, the right place, and the right person.

There is more money. It's a place that it's possible for it to be on the move again, and he's smart enough to do it. Also, is very good outside. Seems to learn how to do things very quickly. See, here's a guy who really hasn't got any academic background and everybody would say he can't possibly succeed. And what are they doing? He's obviously doing very well. Part of it, I think, is because he just simply learns, and he's capable of accommodation. He has large-scale principles. I'm not talking about the principles he generated when he came, but just the way he runs. The international notion that he has is what I'm thinking of, kind of a large-scale principle that finally evolves, and the students will get much more of that experience.

They say he micromanages, and I think he probably does tell people, "Why don't you do this, that or the other thing," but I don't think they pay much attention, and I don't think he worries that much about it either. I doubt if he really micromanages, let's say.

But in any case, he's been very successful politically, but again not as an out-and-out politician, but more of what I would call a Hannah style of being able to work with the politicians and so on. That's my impression of him.

Now, of course, I left before he was there too long, but he did ask me to be on some committee and develop all these principles he was talking about. I got a good exposure to him there, and I was pretty impressed with him.

Then you go to provosts. Do you want to talk about them?

Charnley: Absolutely.

Andrew: Okay. I had started when [John] Cantlon was provost, but then the day I was appointed as dean of the college, not acting dean but as the regular dean, was the day that Wharton reorganized a lot of his administrative offices and moved Cantlon into research.

[Begin Tape 1, Side 2]

Charnley: This is an interview with Professor Gwen Andrew.

We're talking about provosts at Michigan State. You were mentioning Larry [Lawrence L.] Boger.

Andrew: Yes. He was very good at his job, I thought. He was heavy on delegating to deans. Of course, he'd been dean of agriculture, and he probably thought the deans ought to do what they're doing without any great deal of interference. So you didn't see a lot of him. It was up to you to make the appointments, and go in with your notions, and he was always very good at accepting innovative ideas, as far as I could tell.

I'll give you an example. I knew I was going to have a chunk of money left. I'm going to say 50,000, I don't know if it was 50, 100,000 or something at the end of the year. I said to him, "I'd like to give that to you, and you keep it for me so I can use it next year or some time in the future. I just want it in the bank." He said, "Fine. I'll do it. I need some money to buy sousaphones for Arts and Letters, the music place, so I'll take your dough and we'll do that." So that worked very nicely for both of us. That's what I mean. He was willing to do those things.

Now, when he left the job, they got very upset about my wad of money. Finally said, "You've got to use it. We're not going to hold it for you anymore."

Charnley: Use it or lose it.

Andrew: Right. Anyway, I thought he was good at that.

Winder was good. He followed Boger. He was especially good at codifying and at developing an institutional memory, and he was personally committed to the development of the institution. Those were his great strengths. He was kind of trapped with the Mackey, when they were trying to downsize or save money, or whatever.

Charnley: What was his background?

Andrew: He was out of psychology. In fact, he was the dean of social science before I was. I took over from him, and he had a very well-organized college, obviously, when I got there. The person who preceded him, Lou

McQuidy, had been an Army colonel or something, and he was very well organized. Winder was a bomber pilot, so they all had all of those things. [Laughter] But in any case.

Charnley: You had served at the University of Wisconsin.

Andrew: Yes. But his style was very close to the vest. He didn't tell people much about what he was doing, and people got upset about that. Nevertheless, as I say, he was a good codifier and organizer and so on.

Then David Scott followed him. I was on the search committee to get David Scott. I thought he'd be a good choice, and I spent lots of time trying to undermine the other candidates. But we had some pretty good ones on the list. Most of them became provosts someplace or other. But his style, he was very much a person of style. He had a lot of class. Knew how to use, how to be the--what do I want to say--the cultural kind of provost. If he were going to make remarks about someone, they were always very nicely done. They weren't dry stuff, and he prepared and so on.

Charnley: He was a scientist, wasn't he?

Andrew: Yes, he was. Physicist. He was a bit of a fly-by-night in the sense that he was always very much concerned about his own ambition and where he was going to go and so on. So he hadn't been provost very long before he started looking for presidencies. I knew about that because I was serving as one of his referees, or references, however you want to put it. So you knew when he was doing this. He wasn't there very long before he was at that.

He was a good guy, and I liked working with him, but he had no sense of the social sciences. We used to have what we called Project David Scott or something like that. We tried to get him to understand them. He was very hard to teach, because he had his notions about the humanities and so forth, and he didn't know where to put social sciences, as far as I could see. It wasn't a big concern to him. But he did like the egalitarian notions of the

social scientists. I've heard him say he was a socialist and he probably had some of that thing about him. But anyway, that's pretty much my story of administrators.

Charnley: Did you find, among those, one that was particularly easy to work with or that fit your style?

Andrew: Well, I think that Boger was easiest to work with, but as I say, he wasn't there very long. Had Mackey come in as president with Boger as provost, I don't know what would have happened. As I said, they had rather different styles and, I suspect, different ideas about how to do those things, so I don't know. Boger would be much more authoritarian than most provosts were, in a way. But in another way, he wasn't, because he did so much delegating. So there you are. But what he wanted, he wanted.

Charnley: Some of your own research. How would you describe your own research and scholarly work?

Andrew: I was interested in systems theory and how it played out in formal organizations, but I have trouble calling it terribly scholarly. It's not overly scholarly, let's say. I did quite a bit of publishing, like everybody else, or maybe more than everybody else. There were a few good things, and a lot of them that wouldn't have mattered if the world had never seen them.

They were heavily applied and relevant to wherever I was. So when I was in the mental health business, I did much more on that area. Usually these organizational emphases were in most of these. Then when I was director of social work, I did much more on how to organize schools of social work and develop curriculum and stuff for those. Now I'm on the Board of Medicine for the state, so I've been doing papers on how to organize boards and their functions, and so on.

I think the best stuff I did--well, I did some speeches I like, I guess. I did one for Phi Beta Kappa here that I thought was pretty good, and one for Phi Kappa Phi, so the speaking things I used to like to do. I guess that's about all there is on that.

Charnley: In terms of scholarship, articles, conference papers, which were the main emphasis? Monographs? What would you say was the main, or your best?

Andrew: I think I was a better speaker than I was anything else. But as I say, I published papers and monographs, those things. As I say, some of those were reasonable, and some of them probably not great.

Charnley: In terms of teaching and views about students, maybe it would be good to talk a little bit about that. What did you like about the classroom?

Andrew: Oh, I like to show off, so it's always fun to teach, although teaching is hard work. I think people who haven't done it don't realize how hard a work it really is. That's one thing I thought as a dean, whatever. I always tried to teach at least one course a year, just so I knew what was going on. Like I say, if you didn't do that, you didn't know what was going on in the classroom. So I used to like to do that. I happen to think big lectures, by the way, are as good as small classrooms.

I got thinking back again of my own background, and I think I had probably four professors, three of them over at Wisconsin and one here, who I thought were superb teachers. Two of those had huge lectures. One of them had a good-sized lecture. That was here, with maybe fifty people in the class. And then another one at Wisconsin who had one of these small, twenty, twenty-five max, and they were all superb because they were good teachers. It didn't make a difference the size of the class. And so on.

Charnley: Who were they?

Andrew: Who were they? One of them was Kecofer [phonetic] at Wisconsin. The other one was Norman Cameron. Then, here--oh, no, the philosopher, what's his name? I never can remember. I'll have to look it up.

It's one of these books, because one of my great claims to fame was that I ended up being published in a book with him. He went off to become president of Sarah Lawrence College. He was the one with the small class. He was very good.

Charnley: Here at Michigan State?

Andrew: No, that was Wisconsin. And then here at Michigan State, another philosopher. He was a philosopher of science. God, I'll have to look his name up too. It's terrible, I say I know all four and I can't think of who they were.

Charnley: I'm sorry to put you on the spot. I don't mean to do that. Do you think lecturing's a lost art? Good lecturing?

Andrew: I doubt it. I think people that want to do it can do a good job with it. And if they're no good, they're hopeless.

Charnley: [Laughter] With a large audience. That's the only unfortunate thing.

Andrew: But it's interesting, those four people, one of them was in economics, Kecofer, and then Cameron was in psychology. And then the guy here in philosophy of science was obviously in the small course. It wasn't a small group. That guy was a philosopher. So those are kind of the areas where I had my really good teaching.

Charnley: Was there any particular classroom technique that you liked to use and used effectively?

Andrew: I liked to lecture. Although usually I had classes of a size that you really had to lecture, so I didn't get a

lot of experience with the smaller groups. I would say my one major teaching discovery, if that's what the word is, was that I always gave blue book written exams, essay exams. I would give them a choice of maybe two or three questions, and they would pick one. They had to answer the question on one side of an 8-1/2-by-11 sheet of paper. Now they've got however long you have for exams. What is it, a couple of hours, or something?

Charnley: Two hours now.

Andrew: They spent their time on organizing whatever they did with it. And then I would get this thing, and if it was longer than that, I didn't read it. I didn't read anything longer than that one page. It worked beautifully, because they do a much better job of putting what they think together. They can do all the fooling around. They're not just writing to impress you with space-filling and they're not writing just as they think it out. They put it together. So I decided that's the only way to examine people.

Charnley: That's interesting.

Andrew: It worked very well.

Charnley: Concision is important.

Andrew: It means you can also read them and do a better job of grading.

Charnley: Did you have grad assistants with you at that time?

Andrew: No, I never had a grad assistant.

Charnley: So the essay-writing, you placed emphasis on that.

Andrew: Examination and so on, yes.

Charnley: In terms of describing students over the years, maybe from the beginning of your career here to toward the end, did you see any qualitative differences? Are there any generational differences that you saw in the students?

Andrew: I didn't see any qualitative differences. You always have a batch of them that are very good, and a batch that are fairly average, and then a few that are really quite bad. I suspect they didn't write as well, toward the end of that period. Although you've got to remember I was teaching at a time originally, late sixties, very early seventies, most of my teaching other than as I say this once-a-year thing, tended to be at the time where it was very difficult to teach them because there was no way they were going to sit still and let the teacher talk, so that was a tough period for all teachers. I'm not talking about me. My impression is that they became more interested in learning as time went on, but I think that was just the times, not the students per se. But I have relatively few observations about them, because as I went on I taught less and less, I guess.

I used to see them when they were in trouble. They'd come to the dean's office and that kind of thing. My favorite tale about that is the kid that came with his father. His father explained to me that the kid was on, I think it was a swimming scholarship, and that he had other kids in the family. The implication was that if I'd look on this kid a little more favorably instead of letting him flunk out, that they would send the other kids here. People really think that matters, but it doesn't. He went on. The kid, I guess, finally told me this story. He had signed up for a psychology class, and he had never shown up, or maybe he was there once. He had failed because he hadn't taken any of the tests or any of these things. He said he had.

Right after the classes started in the fall, he had to go off swimming or whatever. When he came back, he went to class faithfully, and he didn't know why they were having any problems with this. Then he discovered

much later that the rooms had been changed, and here he was going to a poetry class. I thought if he can't tell that difference, he's probably not the best student.

Charnley: [Laughter] Maybe he was in the wrong field.

Andrew: I guess so.

Charnley: Our department chair had three generations one time. He had grandparents show up with the student and the parents. He wasn't swayed by their numbers anyway.

Andrew: Yes. Doesn't do much for them.

Charnley: The students politically in the sixties obviously were active and that sort of thing. Did you see that either intruding on the learning experience?

Andrew: Oh, yes. Late sixties, early seventies. This is a little behind all that rumpus stuff. No, I think it had tremendous effect on it. I have one student who's a good friend now. I like to tell him that he went through at the time when nobody learned anything. [Laughter]

Charnley: It's like I'm a historian. It's like history without facts during that period. Dates aren't important, they told that whole generation.

During your career at MSU, where you involved in local community activities?

Andrew: Oh, yes. I was on local boards like the Family Service Agency, the United Way. I was on the State Board of Corrections, the governor's appointment to that. I'm now on the Board of Medicine in a governor's

appointment. So I was in a lot of that kind of thing.

Charnley: Which governor first appointed you? Was it Milliken?

Andrew: Yes. Milliken appointed me to the corrections, and then Engler to the Board of Medicine. In both those cases, it wasn't because I was in their political camp. It so happens I'm a Democrat, although I know I voted for Milliken a time or two. But anyhow, that was because somebody knew me and wanted me to be on the board, the director of the departments that were working with these commissions. Kathy Wilbur, for example, would be the reason I'd be on the Board of Medicine. She'd been a trustee and knew me through that. The guy who had worked with me in mental health and research was over in corrections at the time that they appointed me to that, and so forth. So that's where those things came from. And then the United Way, I don't remember how I got appointed to that kind of stuff.

Charnley: They tap the busiest people lots of times.

Andrew: I think they're more visible or something, I suppose. As far as the town-gown kind of thing, there weren't a lot of issues there except, as I say, whatever went on with these particular appointments that I held.

I do remember they used to have a kind of an evening lecture and banquet, and people from the community, I suppose Chamber of Commerce and God knows what else, and people from the university, largely administrators, a lot of people would go to this thing, and you'd get kind of paired up with people and so on, and that was fine. But one year they had the man who was president of Hillsdale come. That was the year that the town people had planned the program, and they invited him. He was a very staunch conservative, and one of the most conservative people in the community was in charge of planning this thing. He got up and gave this introduction about the man, and then the man gave his lecture. He's the guy who wouldn't take any federal money, he couldn't because he wasn't going to have any affirmative action and so forth.

Charnley: George Roach?

Andrew: I guess that was his name. At the end, they were giving him this standing ovation, everybody in the place. There were two women in the audience. One of them was Gwen Andrew and the other is another gal. And those two women did not stand for the standing ovation. So that's my recollection of town-gown, I guess. But usually it was a pleasant enough idea.

Charnley: In your retirement, have you had any continuing university contact or work within the university? Sports activities you've attended? Are you interested at all in that?

Andrew: No, I don't do much with them now, since I finally quit. See, I retired about three times.

Charnley: Three times?

Andrew: I retired from social science, and then from this kind of interim thing with the nurses, and then from the human health thing. So I don't know, I guess I'd had about enough and they'd had enough. I did this bit with McPherson for a while, and that was obviously a short-term thing. There were other people doing it, too. But I haven't had much to do with them since then.

Charnley: As you think about the faculty and staff that you worked with, any that you would like to mention as certainly were very important in either your career, or that you enjoyed working with? Lots of times when somebody's preparing a history, frequently we forget some of the key figures. Sometimes they go nameless. I think that's one of the things we're trying to do in this project, is to put the names on some of those people that have made important contributions to the university and yet frequently the archives don't bring those names out.

Andrew: Yes, and it's very hard to do that when you're interviewing, and so on.

Charnley: Did you have any staff members that worked with you, that you think made your job better?

Andrew: Oh, I had a lot of good staff members. There's no doubt about that. I was trying to think what kinds of things I could tell you about staff.

One thing I noticed is the tremendous difference between what I call--I guess you'd call it the North Campus. I always say "on the other side of the tracks." [unclear] Hall side, the Administration Building, all that across the river there. The core college is that stuff. The difference between that group and the medical group, it seemed to me remarkable. It's almost like two different places. So it was interesting to be able to work in those. Now, there's a great commonality. They've got the ideas of the boundaries, they've got the appointments, the tenure, all this kind of stuff.

How can I put this? The College of Social Science is less autonomy-minded, I guess is the way to put it. The people who are in there now, they want their way. There's no doubt about that. But the medical thing is very difficult. Somebody once said to me, "It must be very difficult for you to sit there and do what you're doing and know what needs to be done, and not be able to do it." And that's exactly what it's like, because they have this heavy proportion of people, the clinical faculty, who earn their own salaries or large parts of their own salaries and so on.

Charnley: Through grants?

Andrew: No, they go out and do practice. They take care of patients and stuff. They don't get as many grants as they should as a medical school. But that makes them believe that they really own it more than they do. They don't grasp a lot of the nuances of being at a university, I guess is the way to put it. Now, I don't mean to do this in a

critical way, because I think they're just very different. They come up differently and so on. But they see it as their resources, whereas department faculty, school faculty may think it's their resources in the sense it's their department, but they don't somehow own the income and so on, as these guys do over in medicine, in both human medicine and osteopathic. So those are very different experiences.

I'm not doing a very good job of describing them for you. I can't get a key piece here that would do it. Except I think it does rest a lot on the extent to which they are earning money, and, therefore, believe it's their dough. I used to say that they have a practice of pooling their liabilities and segregating their assets. That's kind of the way they operate. But, you see, you don't have that kind of problem over in the—

Charnley: Arts and Letters. More traditional department.

Andrew: Now, who was good? Well, I think I've kind of told you about people as we went along, so you get some sense of who is good and who isn't.

As far as the deans go, some of them were good and some of them were quite bad. I think the bad ones usually lasted about as long as the good ones. I don't know. [Roger] Wilkinson was a good vice president for finance, or whatever they called him, I thought. You don't know as much about that part. At least I didn't. I don't think most of them do.

I think a lot of the deans didn't really comprehend how to manage their resources, so they tended to dole them out and then they weren't there next year, because they'd given away everything they had. So those were ones who weren't quite as good or the ones that couldn't get their faculty to do anything. But I don't want to name names I thought they weren't good.

Charnley: I understand.

Andrew: As I say, there were some pretty good ones. I always thought Sullivan was an excellent dean.

Charnley: Richard Sullivan?

Andrew: Yes. He became associate provost. I knew him as dean and then as associate provost, and I thought he was pretty impressive.

Now, the deans of medicine. Well, to some extent--terrible, can't remember the man's name. The guy that preceded Bill Abbett as dean. I'm going to have to look these names up for you. Don Weston. Don [Donald] Weston always talked me to me as though we talked alike. We seemed to have very similar ideas. But then he'd go back and he'd never pull it off. I didn't know what he was doing, why he just didn't get it done. Well, after I got over there for a while, I realized that he didn't want to stand up to these guys that were going to give him trouble. He didn't do it, and they didn't want him to do things. So he didn't pull them off. But his heart was in the right place, let's put it that way.

Charnley: Were you dean at the time when there was an attack on nursing, talk of the abolition of the—

Andrew: Yes, I was. I was dean of social science. That's when Mackey was going to dump that college. And then of course they got all the folks outside to defend them and so on. I don't know if he could have gotten rid of that school.

When I took over as dean of human ecology, I was asked centrally if there was a way to do anything with that college, because that had become an anachronism, because it really was a women's college, and you didn't need that anymore. Well, now I think they're doing different things, which is a whole other story. But I saw no way for them to do anything with that college. It was full of alumnae that were wives of people in the farm community that were really significant people, some of the trustees and so on. So they didn't have any chance there. I'm not sure whether it would have been a good idea or not.

Somewhere in here, I was making some notes about the university itself. Is there another question here?

The thing that has to do with--I guess it had to do with changes and so forth. I would say that during the time I was here--here it is, major changes--the University College demise was probably one of the biggest ones that occurred when I was dean, when they took out the college and they finally took out the departments and so on. I'm not sure that was a good idea. At the time I thought it was a good idea. The disadvantage of it was that people were in University College and their colleagues tended to look down on them. But actually, when we got the Department of Social Science out of that college, there were people in there that had excellent degrees from very good places. I have no reason to assume they weren't good teachers.

I think it may have been a good idea to break up the college itself or some way get those units related more to their respective colleges, but I'm not sure it was a good idea to shut down those departments. Now, they tried to solve that with integrative studies or whatever they call it. But that was kind of a soporific at the time they did it. The deans came up with the scheme how to do that, so we made it so weak that I doubt if it's doing a great deal. I don't know that. It may be fine, because I haven't been there since. But I'm just not sure that was a good idea, to split that up.

The other major change that occurred during my time was the kind of catastrophe in the social sciences themselves, because they became guilty, if that's the word, about some of their theories. They became less theory and they moved from science to social issues. Now, I see nothing wrong with social issues. I kind of believe in those myself, worrying about them and so on. But I used to keep saying to them, "Let's get the science back in social science in this thing." Do that bit. I would say that was a big change that occurred. So that what had been one of the top leading colleges, I think has had short shrift from the provost's office, in part by its own doing, of these kind of, we can't stick with functionalism. We can't stick with that, or as Winder once said to me, "The psychology people weren't as good because they got lost from theory," and so on. So those things were, but those were not just MSU. Those were all over things.

I suppose I'd give you a characterization of myself. How's that?

Charnley: Okay.

[Begin Tape 2, Side 1]

Charnley: This is tape two of the Professor Andrew interview.

We're talking about a general view of education.

Andrew: Well, I was telling you I'm an elitist. I worship intellect. I'm impressed by expertise. I have high regard for manipulative people. I think that manipulation, well done, always impresses me. And I'm a showist [unclear]. I've been told that I'm a master of piffle.

Charnley: Piffle? [Laughter] Very interesting.

Andrew: [Laughter] That's why I like to give speeches, because you can throw a little piffle in.

But anyhow, have I answered what you wanted?

Charnley: Pretty much. We're also asking each of the interviewees if they had a couple of people that they might recommend for a broader-scoped interview. In other words, somebody that we just couldn't do without. Does anyone come to mind, either as emeritus faculty?

Andrew: Well, I'll tell you a guy that I think would be very good, particularly for the medical area, is Norm [Norbert B.] Enzer. He was chairperson of psychiatry, and he's also had various assistant, associate dean jobs over there and been with probably three of the deans, so I would think he'd be a good one for there.

Charnley: You mentioned the institutional memory, too, of the different colleges.

Andrew: Winder, of course, but you've certainly got Winder on that list.

Charnley: Yes.

Andrew: Are you going to be able to get outside of town? Get the Whartons and so on?

Charnley: Yes, yes. We've got some travel.

Andrew: Those people will all be on your list. I'm trying to think who there is that I—

Charnley: And again, if you can think of someone else, and you think of it. In looking back at your career at Michigan State, any kind of reflective words that you can think of to describe your experience here at MSU?

Andrew: Well, I don't know. I certainly think it's a good place, obviously, or I wouldn't have wanted to stay. It did well by me, and I hope I did well by it. It's a place that's been on the make quite a bit. It's had a tough time because I think Michigan, as somebody told me years ago, every time they started to move something up at Michigan State, they'd look up a hill and it's like a sand dune, and Michigan's up there throwing a bucket of sand down.

[Laughter]

Charnley: So inter-university rivalry.

Andrew: And it's much tougher in a place where you have the two separate institutions. Madison doesn't have it. They've probably got it internally, but they don't have the kind of problems of development that Michigan State has. On the other hand, it does give their ag school more clout, I suppose. I think they've done pretty well with what they have. I really do.

I think they show the ill effects of the sixties and so forth. Some of the faculty came out of school--again,

this may be more of the social sciences, might even be true in the humanities, I don't know about that, but there's this tendency for them to believe in confrontational style and so on, so it makes it harder for an administrator. You can work with that, because they're not unreasonable people, once they figure out that you're not just a mean type.

Matter of fact, that's why I became assistant dean. People were fighting with their deans. Part of that was this idea that administrators are bad people. I can remember them finally learning that administrators really weren't out to get them. [Laughter]

But I don't know how all that answers your question. But I think this university's come a long way. It's certainly standing on the shoulders of a giant in Hannah.

Charnley: I didn't ask you about the current provost. Did you have much work with Lou Anna Simon?

Andrew: Well, I've known Lou Anna for a long time, but I didn't really work with her as provost, because she became provost after I left the business. I've worked with her enough, and I did a little bit of consulting with her she asked me to do after I finished up all this other stuff. That was just a small quarter-time thing or something. This is a very bright woman, there's no question about that, who knows her place and her organization and so on. Because she grew up from grad student to provost in the place, she knows it inside out as far as the central administration goes, and knows how to use that knowledge.

Charnley: Well, I can't think of too many more things to ask. I do appreciate your contributions, and thank you very much for the interview.

Andrew: Well, I hope they aren't too boring. That's the big problem.

Charnley: Not at all. Thank you.

[End of interview]

Index

Boger, Lawrence L. 15, 18
 Breslin Student Events Center 13

 Cantlon, John 15
 Corey, Kenneth E. 4

 DiBiaggio, John A. 13, 14

 Enzer, Norbert B. 31

 Gray, Hannah 3

 Hannah, John A. 11, 14, 32
 Harden, Edgar L. 12
 Harlow, Harry 1, 6
 Human Learning Research Institute 3

 Lund, Lois A. 3

 M. Peter McPherson 14
 Mackey, M. Cecil 12, 16, 18, 29
 McPherson, M. Peter 13, 14, 25
 McQuidy, Lou 2, 16
 Michigan State University 2, 5

 Scott, David 17
 Sexism 5, 6
 Simon, Lou Anna K. 33
 Social Science Research Bureau 7
 Sullivan, Richard 28

 University College 12, 29
 University of Wisconsin - Madison 1

 Weston, Donald 28
 Wharton Center for Performing Arts 12
 Wharton, Clifton R. Jr. 12, 15, 31
 Wilkinson, Roger 28
 Winder, Clarence 3, 16, 30, 31