DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 469 471 HE 035 329

AUTHOR Fincher, Cameron
TITLE Institute of Higher Education: An Oral History (1964-2002).
INSTITUTION Georgia Univ., Athens. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE 2002-00-00
NOTE 37p.; "Interviewed by Delmer D. Dunn."
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History; Educational Trends; *Higher Education; Organizational Change; Social Change; United States History
IDENTIFIERS *University of Georgia

ABSTRACT

This oral history is part of the celebration planned by the University of Georgia Institute of Higher Education to honor Cameron Fincher for his service to the field of higher education and the Institute. Dr. Fincher was interviewed by Delmer D. Dunn about the significant changes that have occurred in higher education over the past 50 years. Fincher identifies national movements that have had a great impact on higher education in Georgia and the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states, beginning with the G.I. Bill after World War II, and moving through the Interstate Compact of the SREB, the arrival of baby boomers in college, the recognition of universities and colleges as public resources, and the student unrest of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Among the major changes recognized at the University of Georgia is the increased emphasis on research and graduate study. At the national level, important changes are pegged to influential legislation, including the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Great changes have been noted in university relationships with both federal and state governments. The history of the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia is traced, and its mission and characteristics described. (SLD)

INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

AN ORAL HISTORY
(1964-2002)

by
Cameron Fincher

Interviewed by
Delmer D. Dunn

The University of Georgia
Institute of Higher Education
2002

Introduction

This oral history is a part of the celebration planned by the University of Georgia Institute of Higher Education to honor Cameron Fincher for his long service to the field of higher education in general and the Institute in particular. Dr. Fincher joined the faculty of Georgia State University August 1, 1951. He joined the faculty of the University of Georgia in 1965 and served as director of the Institute of Higher Education from 1969 until 1999. In 1981 the University System Board of Regents named him Regents Professor of Higher Education and Psychology. That is the position that he holds today.

Dr. Fincher's long involvement in higher education constituted the perfect opportunity to recognize the 50th anniversary of his joining the faculty at an institution in the University System of Georgia. It seemed a good time to record his reflections on a variety of subjects related to higher education. The result is Dr. Fincher's candid observations on a number of matters related to higher education and his reflections on the development of the Institute of Higher Education. His comments provide rich insight that is now preserved by this publication. The reflections are divided into three sections, including his observations on major developments in higher education in the nation and in Georgia, the growth of the Institute of Higher Education, and finally, higher education as a field of study. I posed the questions to Dr. Fincher over a period of several hours in the fall semester 2001.

Delmer D. Dunn
Director, Institute of Higher Education and
Regents Professor of Political Science
May 17, 2002

INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION
(1964-2002)

All questions by Dr. Delmer Dunn appear in italics

Changes Over the Past 50 Years

Tell us about some of the significant changes that have occurred in higher education over the past 50 years. What would you identify as some of the most important ones that come to mind?

I would start at the beginning (for me) because, being a veteran of World War II, I entered college in 1946 and graduated in 1950—the largest graduating class in history up until that time. I like to tell friends that I went to college on the GI Bill and never left. Since entering college I have seen at least six strong movements nationally that had a profound impact on Georgia and the Southern Regional Education Board states.

♦ ♦ ♦

What were they?

The first would be the GI Bill that grew out of wartime experiences in training pilots and officers for the military services. Numerous colleges tried to get one of those programs and they were carefully selected. It was the experiences of the colleges and universities in World War II with the V12 and the V5 programs and the Army Specialized Training Program that set the stage for the GI Bill. The GI Bill was enacted in the summer of 1944 on the heels of the D-Day invasion. Thus, the GI Bill produced the first "revolution" in the postwar period.

♦ ♦ ♦

Why would you call it a revolution?

Because it was the first of many significant changes in higher education that made profound differences! There was great skepticism in the beginning as to the use of the GI Bill by veterans to avoid going back to work. Presidents like Robert Maynard Hutchins at the University of Chicago were opposed to it because they thought military veterans would downgrade the quality of higher education. Even the president of Harvard, James B. Conant, was outspoken about his opposition, but he soon learned that veterans would take advantage of their GI Bill at Harvard as well as other places. Indeed, in the beginning when the GI Bill reimbursed all educational expenses there was a great rush to New England colleges and other prestigious private colleges. Presidents then realized that the GI Bill was not going to turn the nation into a nation of "intellectual hobos." Hutchinson used that term, meaning simply that veterans would not be trained adequately for jobs, and the nation would have an educated population on its hands that had no viable means of income and no significant role in society.

♦ ♦ ♦

I suspect that the democratization of education was part of what they were really reacting against as well.

Yes! Now we read their objections and we laugh. We are surprised that there was considerable skepticism on many campuses about the quality of education that veterans of World War II would assimilate. The veterans, by being older and more mature students (they were the first "adult learners" in higher education), had more serious purposes. Their desire to take full benefit of the GI Bill and move on through to the real world and get ahead with their lives was very important. When I went back to the Atlanta Division of the University of Georgia after earning my master's degree at Minnesota, I was a colleague of several professors that I had taken courses from just two or three years earlier. I was amazed by the faculty members who told me "the class you were in was one of the best classes I ever had." There were at least

eight or nine faculty members that looked back on classes taught in 1948 and 1949, and remembered a mature group of students in their classes and the enjoyment of teaching them. The GI Bill no doubt accomplished its purposes. In fact the benefits in higher education have been so numerous and so well publicized that we sometimes forget that there were other benefits that were equally as important to returning veterans. For example, mortgages on homes, job training, and unemployment compensation were benefits gratefully accepted and wisely used.

Other Revolutions

What other revolutions? You said there were others?

We had a "revolution" here in the South or the southeastern states that came from the Interstate Compact of the Southern Regional Education Board because SREB placed an emphasis on education that we simply had not had in the past. Southern states in particular should be grateful for the Southern Regional Education Board. The states with limited resources could send students to other state institutions where there was a suitable program. This was a firm step forward for higher education and the region.

". . . the civil rights movement forced many changes in public opinion, attitudes, and values."

Of course, we had another "revolution" in the 1960s when the baby boomers first entered colleges in 1964. Although there was ample warning of an impending tidal wave of college students, 1964 is pin pointed because that is the year that the students born in 1946 began college. Students were literally sitting on window ledges because all seats in the classes were taken. The baby boomer generation had a substantial impact on higher education, and we are still trying to assimilate some of the changes brought about. Every twelve years, it would seem, we get a change in the generation of students and we notice differences. The first group of baby boomers that entered college was quite different from the last group of baby boomers. Here, I am thinking of college populations of four to six years.

In the 1950s, colleges and universities were recognized as public resources. The beginning of this recognition can be attributed to a McGraw-Hill study in which the salaries of college teachers did not compare favorably with plumbers, electricians, carpenters, and other skilled craftsmen in our society. Thus, efforts were made in the mid 1950s to increase the salaries of college faculty members and to make faculties a more appreciated constituency by giving them a more important role to play in our society.

Lasting Impacts

What lasting impact do you think the baby boomers have made on higher education?

They called national attention to student rights and privileges. They put across that *In loco parentis*, for example, was dead. Baby boomers were not sent to college in order to break away from home as much as they were sent to become working, employed, contributing self-sufficient adults. Colleges were increasingly recognized as renewable public resources. In other words, here was a resource that we would not deplete in a few years of exploitation. This was a challenge to colleges to renew their capabilities and to contribute more substantially.

Of course, the civil rights movement forced many changes in public opinion, attitudes, and values. I can remember as an undergraduate and even as a young faculty member many friends and relatives who were not concerned with "changing times." Louise McBee has mentioned several times that when she came to UGA as dean of women, the women students had to wear raincoats over their tennis outfits to go to the tennis court. In the South, this kind of change was brought about in less contentious ways than in other parts of the country. It was necessary, of course, that the need for change be called to the attention of those who controlled policy decisions.

My memories and beliefs in all this are focused on higher education in the South and the state of Georgia because I was fortunate enough to be educated in the Midwest. In the 1950s, there were genuine differences between the University of Minnesota, Ohio State

University, and the University of Georgia. The Southern Regional Education Board eased the way on many changes made in the 1950s and 1960s. SREB contributed to major changes in our state because Georgia has been most fortunate to have SREB housed in Atlanta. We could say the same about the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools which gave us a much needed nucleus in Atlanta that has been beneficial throughout the state of Georgia!

Improved Higher Education in the South

In looking at SREB you mentioned that they had combined resources. What other kinds of concrete actions have they undertaken to improve higher education in the South?

SREB dealt directly with the quality of education in the South, and their reports were well publicized. One of their most important efforts was to organize a prestigious committee to turn out the report on regional goals, "Within Our Reach," during the 1960s. Everyone on the committee was well known in his or her own state. Ralph McGill was on the committee at a time when he was one of the few people speaking common sense from the pages of southern newspapers. The Commission set goals that clearly stated what we had within our reach—an opportunity to move ahead! I later did a study of regional goals in which I used the southern associations of history, political science, sociology, psychology and philosophy. I mailed the members a questionnaire on regional goals and asked the members of each group to indicate the extent to which we had met specific goals in the report. The response was quite interesting because many responded with a letter saying they couldn't answer this or that question, but "I think such and such." There was strong affirmation of the goals saying, "Yes, we are making progress, but no we have not met our goals completely and we should continue to make progress." That study was uplifting for me because it affirmed the work of SREB and the influence of the "Within our Reach" committee. There were no negative reactions to the goals within any group, and I did not expect the generous responses received.

"SREB dealt directly with the quality of education in the South, and their reports were well publicized."

Several colleagues on the UGA campus at that time made positive comments saying, "I am glad you are doing this because we need to be reminded that these goals were set during the '60s and are still relevant to the progress of higher education in the southern region." It has been noted a number of times that much of my work is regionally focused. I was indeed regionally focused and eager to see the University of Georgia become another Ohio State if it couldn't become another University of Minnesota. I often thought that O. C. Aderhold's goal for the University of Georgia was to become another Ohio State. He received his doctorate from Ohio State and I could see so much of Ohio State reflected in his thinking.

Changes in Georgia

Do you think he was the one who had the original vision to turn the University of Georgia into a research institution?

I certainly do! O. C. Aderhold was greatly underestimated as a president because he did not come across with flair. He was not colorful, but droll. But he thought well and had a good personal touch. He is the only president who phoned me at home to ask me to do something for him. I was associate director of the Institute at that time, and if he couldn't reach Galen Drewry he would call me. He was remarkably well informed about what was going on nationally, because he was very active in the Southern Regional Education Board and also in the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. His undergraduate degree was in agriculture; thus he began as an agricultural teacher, then became an education teacher. This gave him the background of both. If the Institute of Higher Education was not his "brain child," we were certainly influenced by his philosophical outlook. He openly stated that the University of Georgia should be of service to other institutions of higher education as the College of Business was to businessmen, the

College of Agriculture to farmers and agribusinessmen, and the College of Education to public schools. In a nutshell, he believed that the University of Georgia was a valuable resource to be shared with the people of the state of Georgia.

♦ ♦ ♦

You said there were other people who were involved in the formulation of that vision.

I think of Tom Mahler, Louis Griffith, and George Parthemos. As individuals and as a group, they were forward-looking faculty and staff. Small perhaps, but it was that group who gave the push the University of Georgia needed in the mid 1960s. As a new institute, we did several studies for O.C. Aderhold in his requests to the Board of Regents. When the University of Georgia received "its windfall" in 1966 he had used our studies of student/faculty ratios to present the argument: "We have the students, we do not have the faculty." That is how the University increased its faculty by one-third or one-fourth, gaining approximately 1,200 faculty in a short period of two years. That alone affirmed O.C. Aderhold's reputation for being one of the best side-door negotiators in the state. I never had reason to doubt it.

♦ ♦ ♦

Let's go back to the revolutions that we started with. We discussed the baby boomers of the '60s, SREB, and the GI Bill. Are there others you would want to identify?

There was a great deal about the years 1968 to 1973 that was distinctive. Very few of us in higher education at that time would want to relive those five years. I have thought of these five years as years of "public" dissent. We had a previous period in which the students and faculty dissented about the Vietnam war. We paid for the unfavorable publicity on national networks when the public withdrew its support. Efforts were made to restore order and cut back on "this, that, and the other" in higher education. Those years to me were "down years" in which we lost a lot of opportunity. We had made good progress up until 1968—the year in which the nation did its best to fall apart with the assassinations of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. It took until 1974 or 1975 to work through that! Then we entered another growth phase. We hit our stride in the 1980s, and then there seemed to be an uneasy awareness of the 20th century running out and a new century coming in.

Our work at the Institute was cooperative and pleasant during the 1980s. The later years of the decade produced the planning and the budgeting that influenced the 1990s where the progress was continued. Strong movement can be detected in each of the decades, but they do not neatly fall within the decades. Twelve years seems to be the pattern. There's no doubt that the pattern is effected by changes in national leadership as well as to changes in Georgia governors.

The Carl Sanders Governor's Commission was quite different from the 1202 commissions that later followed. The 1960s are when we openly declared for higher education in the state. Everyone on that commission was recognizable and better known later. Jimmy Carter was on the commission and also three future governors. There is no doubt about the group's influence, or that Carl Sanders saw North Carolina as the role model for his commission.

During the summer of 1959, I taught at North Carolina State, and I was amazed that Luther Hodges wasn't regarded as being forward looking or an aggressive governor. His predecessor, Terry Sanford, was the one who had laid the groundwork and later organized the Education Commission of the States. When Carl Sanders left the governor's office he clearly stated that he would be back and he did run again in 1970. By then higher education was not a platform on which to run because of what had happened in the 1960s. I don't think either Sanders or Carter even mentioned higher education. No doubt we lost much of our momentum because higher education was perceived as a political liability.

♦ ♦ ♦

Since then, a host of regional studies have been conducted. We looked to North Carolina more and more as a model and we got ahead of the pack in the 1980s and 1990s. What can we attribute that to?

Let's go back to the early 1960s when the yoke of segregation was finally removed. I believe that fostered better thinking about the future. The Institute was privileged to contribute to parts of this. For example, we held on this campus the first inter-racial conference of college and university presidents with funds provided by the Southern Education Foundation. Also with SEF funds we brought to this campus

the first black graduate students. O.C. Aderhold's attitude was: we need to do what is right and not become entangled in the political situation. This was a notable change within the University because we no longer had to fight a losing battle.

At Georgia State I had the responsibility of developing a comprehensive admissions testing program. Georgia State was under a court injunction not to discriminate against minority applicants, so we turned to testing. The state did the same when it required the SAT for all applicants to the University System. This action reduced the enrollment at Georgia State to a shadow of itself. The intent was to admit only students who could go the full four years. Hamilton Holmes and Charlene Hunter were going to enter Georgia State, but they were advised by their attorneys and others not to. Many of us believed that Georgia State would be closed if ordered to integrate. It was wiser to bring the applicants to the University of Georgia. Experience has shown that this was not only the right thing to do, it was the smart thing to do. The desegregation of UGA had a greater impact on public higher education than a similar ruling for Georgia State would have.

"The 1960s are when we openly declared for higher education in the state."

Major Changes at the University of Georgia

What other major changes have you seen at the University of Georgia in the time you have been here?

The emphasis on research, and graduate study has been tremendous. The University of Georgia is no longer the institution we were when we could not be included in national studies of doctoral programs because we had not conferred enough PhD's. I recall serving on a committee to locate two-year colleges. At one of the meetings the announcement was made that for the first time, Tech, Emory, and UGA collectively would confer over 100 doctoral degrees. That information was received with surprise. Members of our committee couldn't believe we were turning out that many graduates. Thus, we can take genuine pride in the continued development of this university.

We must take pride also in Georgia Tech's continued development because Tech has been an incentive to UGA to keep pace. Both institutions have risen together and in doing so, they have brought Georgia State with them. In a sense, we now have three universities where we once had a university, a technical institute, and a night school. There are few better indications of progress and continued development than to look at these institutions and see how much they have changed. In the late 1960s and early 1970s when the reputation of the 60s was still lingering, I recall going to national meetings and colleagues would express amazement at the progress we had made. I went to a meeting in Minneapolis of the College Student Personnel Association, and I had at least half a dozen of my colleagues ask, "How in the world did you get George Gazda to come to the University of Georgia?" That was a different question from previous years.

I was asked many times when I was in graduate school, "Why do you want to go back to Georgia?" I had flattering pressure put on me not to come back. I was recommended for jobs in Iowa and Colorado, even in California to keep me from coming back to the South. I remained convinced that I would have a better future in the South. It is interesting that two other graduates from the same class wound up here in Georgia. Bill Pavlik became chairman of the Department of Psychology, and Bob Stoltz became a vice president for the Southern Regional Education Board. Neither had considered the South as a likely place to work. It is also interesting that Bill Pavlik and I had the same major professor.

Changes in Higher Education at the National Level

What are the important changes in higher education at the national level?

I think nationally, important changes are better pegged to influential legislation like the GI Bill first, and then the Higher Education Act of 1965, plus the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We also had the Educational Amendments Act of 1972. These four legislative acts were particularly influential in shaping public policy and its

effectiveness in higher education. Following these legislative acts, we had two or three eras of commission reports: the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, followed by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, and other prestigious committees or commissions issued reports. We also went through a period where governors served as spokesmen for higher education.

Title III of the Higher Education Act, Aid for Developing Institutions, was a boon for us as a new institute. Title III provided funds for institutional research in historically black institutions and two-year colleges, and in other ways provided discretionary funds that could be used by developing colleges.

We received several grants, and our funded projects were indicative of the things we were doing in the 1970s that set the stage for the 1980s. A stronger emphasis on admissions, or "access and equity" issues, came from the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies. Later, as foundations began to pour more money into higher education there was more emphasis on assessment, evaluation, and verifying the value of educational outcomes. The nation shifted its attention to outcomes that were fairly dramatic in moving us away from process. Researchers wanted to see what resulted from four years of college experience. The funding of regional laboratories for educational research and the "following suit" by foundations placed a firm emphasis on evaluation.

♦ ♦ ♦

That emphasis came from the federal level?

Yes! To submit an acceptable proposal, it was necessary to show how you would evaluate the results. That was a healthy trend, but it ran its course. It is difficult to sustain an interest in evaluating your results when your results don't turn out as expected. Now, of course, we place the emphasis on assessment, accountability, and accreditation. The accrediting societies have become much stronger in recent years than they were at one time.

Georgia citizens and residents should always be grateful to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for what they did in 1941 when there was political interference by our governor. As I understand, SACS didn't actually discredit the University of Georgia: they served notice that they would if we didn't change the situation. This action took advantage of the gubernatorial election coming up, and Georgia elected a governor who promised to restore accreditation.

Federal Government Relationships

We were talking yesterday about the role of the federal government and the positive impact of the GI Bill. What mistakes do you think the federal government has made in its relationships with higher education in the past 50 plus years?

The federal government's most serious mistake was a lack of consistency in funding policies and practices. Many projects were funded with expectations that the federal government would continue to support them. Then there would be a change in administrations, national priorities, and the funding needed for projects and programs. The shifts in funding policies and priorities are seen in the Educational

---

"Title III of the Higher Education Act . . . was a boon for us . . ."

Professions Development Act. The federal government accepted responsibility for assistance in training professional personnel—in particular, institutional researchers. The Institute had several commendable grants under this legislation and then funding was withdrawn—for reasons I did not understand. The inconsistency of funding policies has done more harm than it should have in many phases of research, training, and development.

The federal government has also made serious mistakes in setting priorities. At one time funding was available to "teacher proof" the curriculum. When a national emphasis was placed on science, mathematics, and foreign languages (e.g., the National Defense Education Act of 1958), textbooks were developed by top-ranked scientists, mathematicians, and others for courses to be taught in the high schools and colleges. These courses were to be taught by teachers who often did not understand what had been written by university scientists and

mathematicians. Many high school and college textbooks became little more than dictionaries in which definitions followed definitions without leading to synthesis or any other unity whereby students could acquire the knowledge they would need later. Some textbooks in lower division courses still look more like dictionaries than textbooks.

Another mistake was made when the federal government excluded university and college professors from certain areas of research, and set up regional laboratories off campus. This ostensibly prevented the university professor from capturing grants and contracts then using them for purposes not written into their proposals. University professors supposedly had a bad reputation, at that time, for obtaining research grants and using them for purposes relating to promotion, tenure, and career enhancement instead of improving elementary, secondary, or higher education.

♦ ♦ ♦

Anything else at the national level?

These, I believe, are the most discouraging mistakes. Recovery—in the form of learning from experience—took longer than it should have. Currently national centers for higher education are funded for five years and expected to produce significant changes in educational programs and services.

State Government Relationships

We have talked about the national government and universities, what about state governments? What have you seen as their roles?

In more recent years, it has been public policy to send back to the states the responsibility for many aspects of higher education. The role of the federal government—as we have seen—first expanded with the G.I. Bill. The National Defense Education Act put an unprecedented emphasis on science, mathematics, and foreign languages in order to keep up with the Russians. Then came the influence of the space age on funding in higher education, and later, a national emphasis on assessment and evaluation. As the federal government returned more and more responsibility to state government, we have witnessed the emergence of governors as a national group addressing higher education needs and interests. The federal government learned—or should have learned—that there is a great deal of trial and error in funding policies and practices. Georgia is a good example of a state that has learned much from certain changes in federal policy and the South in general has benefitted significantly from changes in public policies since 1945. Federal funding to southern institutions was quite influential in the desegregation of higher education. I remember several programs at Atlanta University in which white faculty members were quite willing to seek professional training and development at an institution about which they had previously known very little! This kind of interracial learning helped all of us to benefit from federal funding and to learn that desegregation was indeed in the public interest!

♦ ♦ ♦

What about mistakes that states may have made in this era?

Some states made the mistake of "dragging their feet" and wasted millions of dollars in legal defenses of their past. At least three states to our west have gone through very difficult times because they did not have a system of state government that could adapt readily to the changing times. Let me use Alabama as an example. Until a few years ago the governor was still serving on the coordinating board as an ex officio member, and would often send his representative to "do his work" with the committee. The University of Alabama and Auburn University were written into the state constitution and the other institutions of higher education in Alabama were creations of the state legislature. No one need tell us which institutions were more subject to political influence from within the state. With so many decisions that were politically motivated, state institutions of higher education were hostages to out-dated structures in state governance.

♦ ♦ ♦

What about a coordinating board versus a governing board system organization? What are the advantages or disadvantages to either way of organizing the coordination of higher education within a state?

Being more familiar with Georgia, I am in favor of constitutional boards that function with a substantial degree of autonomy or independence. States with multiple university systems tend to favor a coordinating board which would

have good leverage with the boards of each institutions. Illinois has a multiple system with different arrangements for their institutions; this works well for them. I've known quite a few staff members in areas such as institutional research in Illinois and I have been impressed with their confidence in progress.

Florida in the Opposite Direction

It is interesting that Florida is going in the opposite direction this year with the break up of their system into individual units.

I don't understand the political structure in Florida. I do know that at one time they could transfer programs from one university to another. Many other states were interested in program transfer and looked to Florida because program transfer was believed to reduce institutional competition for doctoral programs within their own states. Louisiana was interested in what was going on in Florida because they needed to reduce programs. As an expert witness for LSU, I visited Florida State and Florida A&M to learn how they did it.

Florida had a functional university system in the sense that a community college system and a technical school system were linked so that entire layers of postsecondary education were regarded as an extension of public secondary education. The universities functioned as upper-level institutions. Florida was also willing to try upper division universities that left the freshman and sophomore levels to other institutions. In the 1960s when I was doing a survey of nursing and paramedical personnel in Georgia, I spent considerable time in Florida because they "were the future" as far as programs for paramedical and nursing personnel, hospital administrators, and medical technologists were concerned.

In the early 1960s Florida was recruiting faculty from the Midwest, and made no effort to conceal their intent. The faculty and staff members they wanted were in the Midwestern universities. This active recruiting interested me because a few years later we hired at the University of Georgia several faculty members I had met in Florida during my visit. Following the "gubernatorial troubles" of 1967, Georgia's "windfall budget" enabled us to recruit top-notch faculty members. Several were established faculty members who left Florida universities for UGA because the upper-division universities had not turned out as well as expected: I think of Charles Darby who went to Florida Atlantic as a psychologist, with interests in marine biology. He went with the expectations that Florida Atlantic offered an opportunity to combine psychology and marine biology. He was one of the first who came to the University of Georgia and later became chairman of the psychology department and associate dean. He is the perfect example of a top flight faculty member who "migrated" from Georgia to Illinois to Florida, then returned to Georgia.

The separate states have handled the organization of two-year college systems somewhat differently. Georgia has a more integrated model. The Board of Regents have often been criticized for not taking over the technical schools when the opportunity arose—on at least two occasions. I think they were wise in not doing so, because the technical schools were subject to federal funding policies and practices and they were a different kind of institution. Georgia never declared for a community college system as such, but we have been able to develop two-year institutions that have done quite well by being located across the street from technical schools. In 2002 some of us are optimistic that many problems will be solved as soon as technical schools truly become technical colleges and confer associate degrees rather than certificates.

Institutional Growth and Diversity

Do you think the future will bring a greater integration in the states of what we now call the technical institutes or technical colleges with the two-year and four-year institutions that we have normally thought to be "higher education?"

I think it will be both ways. There will be certain areas where we will see more integration—and other areas where we see a wider median in the road between technological education and the cultural, scientific, humanistic education we have in the university. Diversification in itself will bring about many interesting working relationships between the colleges and universities. We will not have a seamless form of public education any time soon because there is still the matter of local influence over the

schools. They also differ too much in the quality of their instruction and guidance. The technical colleges will serve one group of high school graduates and seek ways to get students out of the public schools sooner and into the technical college. No doubt, both systems (technical colleges and university systems) will undergo interesting changes in the years ahead.

Regional Differences

How have the differences between the South and the rest of the country changed over time and what impact has that made on higher education in the South?

The overall impact has been good. I have mentioned several "revolutions" in which the South has been playing the game of "catch up" for several decades. Now there is more hope that we are indeed catching up and actually closing the gap. Here I am thinking of the research revolution. The rest of the nation discovered the remarkable resources and capabilities of their universities sooner than we did here in the South. As federal funding policies promoted research and development capabilities, it was indeed a revolution of funding from outside agencies, foundations, industries, and business corporations. They too purchased research from the nation's universities. Much of this took place in the 1950s elsewhere, we were moving into it in the 1960s before we got sidetracked briefly with the problems that characterized the 1960s. I've often thought there was considerable irony in the way we opened the 1960s by beginning to participate in the "research revolution," and we exited the 1960s trying to catch up with the "managerial revolution." We became concerned with PPBS, Systems Analysis, and Management by Objectives. Altogether there may have been a dozen of these "new approaches" to management. We had national councils of various sorts with economists who contended, "Our universities are mismanaged and not producing." Equations were derived to show that with the inputs to ongoing processes, we're not getting the outcomes that signify a productive unit.

Within the southern states there has been a varying response. We know that Virginia and North Carolina to the northeast, are quite different from Georgia and Florida to the south. The states of Tennessee and Kentucky have long been border states. This has produced different patterns for the various states, but there is no doubt about the continued progress within all the states. Progress has been made grudgingly in certain locations, but progress has been made! If it took a ten-year law suit as it apparently did to shake out stubborn kinks in Alabama, then Alabama is much better off now than it was ten years ago. The same is true of Mississippi and Louisiana where there was continuing dissension with the changes the federal government was bringing about through congressional acts and funding policies.

"The South is still catching up, and states like Georgia are becoming more and more nationalized."

The South is still catching up, and states like Georgia are becoming more and more nationalized. I think Florida became nationalized as it also became one of the largest states in the Union. Many of us do not realize just how big Texas and Florida are, and how big Georgia is becoming. The state of Virginia, for example, has an amazing difference between its northern tier which is part of Washington, D.C., and the rest of the state which is more like Virginia of the past. But it nonetheless changed because of its proximity to the nation's capital. We in Georgia, have been fortunate in the sense that we have been able to accommodate growth in the past better than we are accommodating it now. The city of Atlanta is an example of our increasing inability to accommodate growth. If Atlanta had had a clear view of the future, the city would have a different transportation system, and be more efficient moving people in and out of the city. Atlanta's expressways have a real problem with gridlock, and gridlock will delay much more than our "coming and going."

I am still optimistic about the continued growth of the Southeast. We use to say that at no foreseen time would we have to worry about a shortage of water. Eugene Odom has pointed out that at one time we thought energy would

eventually be free—we had that kind of optimism. We thrived on it to a certain extent. Now, there is a need for planning even more than before. The emphasis put on planning in the southern states has been quite healthy for the last 30 years. We had a "splurge" after World War II, but we lost momentum when desegregation issues drove planning underground. We couldn't plan without taking into consideration the bi-racial composition of the states. That was the political "time bomb" in every planning briefcase. Even moderates could get into trouble by having inter-racial meetings, and be accused of being a communist-front operation. I exaggerate, perhaps, but there were many disheartening days in the late 1940s to late 1950s. When I came back from Ohio State in 1956 we had obviously made progress since I had left two years earlier. Nonetheless, we were still caught up in issues that were not to our credit and were holding us back. It was very difficult for "friends, neighbors, and relatives" to give up "old ways."

Returning to planning, let me stress the importance of systematic planning. I don't know how well planned the changes are taking place on this campus, but with the UGA Strategic Plan there is an effort to make them more systematic. It is never too late to start planning. It is not absurd to take another look at whatever plan you have because things change more rapidly than most people suspect.

Challenges in the Future

We have talked a good bit about the past; let's talk some about the future. What kinds of challenges do you see higher education having to deal with in the immediate future and beyond?

Presently, higher education is in the midst of a genuine technological revolution—the nation and the world as well. The challenge is to accommodate the technical revolution and to become a part of it without deferring too much to trends that may be fashionable today, but not tomorrow. We could also say that we are in danger once again of being taken over by the technocrats Thorstein Veblen depicted. I actually worry about the loss of our autonomy, freedom, and integrity as universities! Right now there is a strong thrust in instruction online. Since our Institute of Higher Education has a graduate program only, I worry about how far we should go in converting courses to WB-CT formats.

I see difficulties in continuing our emphasis of the broader picture in higher education. To discuss something as broad and complex as higher education in courses where there is a focus on immediate and specific topics, students should be interacting with other students in the same classroom. All of our courses should be taught as graduate seminars! In order for students to learn what they should know about higher education, they need to be in well organized seminars, be well prepared for each session, take an active part in each session, and be required to "follow through." Each seminar is, or should be, worth much more than the credit or the grade given.

I worry about master's theses and doctoral dissertations as they are done on laptops. I see a shameful loss of quality in written prelims as a result of everyone using a laptop, because many people can't think and type at the same time! Whereas, their handwriting was difficult to read, at least there was more time for them to think about what they were saying. Now they take much longer with the laptop, and they give us a brief one-or-two pages at most to the answer of a well-structured question. I am afraid that mentally they are still "cutting and pasting." They are taking something from here and putting it in hoping it will fit—maybe it does and maybe it doesn't. I see wasted effort throughout our examining process.

I'm also worried about the integrity of doctoral degrees when the program is overly commercialized. I have served on review committees for Nova University and one or two other "non-traditional" programs. I was actually amazed at Nova's use of technical innovations. I expected them to be technologically up-to-date, but found them to be technologically weak. They were depending strongly on the catalytic effect of a "name" speaker coming in on a given Saturday and spending time with people at one of their off campus units.

I am aware that Phoenix University is getting "good press" and that reputable colleagues are saying they have looked at Phoenix and are impressed. I don't doubt that many courses can be taught that way, but I am wondering how well we can maintain the integrity of the doctoral dissertation so that it is not just a "cut and

paste" exercise. I have heard other students say that they found a paper on "such and such" on the Internet, put it in their thesis and it was well received. That sounds too much like plagiarism, to reduce my academic skepticism.

The reason I use the term "cut and paste" is because in the 1950s when young, anxious faculty members were eager to turn out a book (for promotion or tenure purposes) they tried the "cut and paste" approach. They turned out a book of readings and that very quickly became the "kiss of death" as far as promotion committees were concerned. There's much more to scholarship than merely compiling the work of others.

"The Institute of Higher Education grew out of a recommendation by the SREB Commission on Goals . . . [to] establish an institute or center for the study of higher education."

♦ ♦ ♦

What else would you indicate as a challenge?

We have a definite problem in challenging the intellectual curiosity of our students. They seldom have an active interest in ideas, concepts, and principles! In the 1990s, we became concerned with outcomes, results, or finished products and many students moved too quickly to findings and conclusions. Too many students seem to be inured to process. When a student turns in the dissertation and a major professor calls attention to a misspelled word, the professor does not expect the student to say, "Oh my goodness, I forgot to use my spell check on that page." This has happened three times in the past two years. When I turned in my dissertation in 1956, neither spell checks nor misspelled words were permissible. That was when your fellow graduate students pitched in—to help you proof your dissertation!

The lack of intellectual curiosity and the lack of concern for ideas and other possibilities that have not been spelled out in the textbook are serious handicaps in graduate education. In many ways students are better prepared for their course work in higher education, but at the same time they don't take full advantage of the opportunities to learn in our courses. There is the attitude that this course meets from 9:05 to 10:50 and at 11:00 I must be somewhere else!

♦ ♦ ♦

What other areas would you indicate as likely to be challenges in the future? Would they be different for Georgia rather than the rest of the country?

Everyone has a challenge of getting education back in the mainstream of intellectual growth, development, and maturity. Right now there is too much of a "cash and carry" notion in education. There is too much thinking that I am paying for my education, therefore, I am entitled to it and it is up to you to give it to me. There is too much of the attitude that if I can't get it here, I can get it elsewhere.

Entertainment is now more clearly preferred to education. Graduate students, in particular, have a continuing challenge to put personal priorities in order and understand that an education does not come easily. It cannot be poured into our ears, into our eyes. It cannot be delivered or distributed to reluctant learners. A great part of this is due to the immediacy of the world in which we live. More and more students seem to be taking life one day at a time.

Origin of the Institute of Higher Education

Let us talk first about how the Institute of Higher Education got its start here at the University of Georgia. I know you came shortly after that.

The Institute of Higher Education grew out of a recommendation by the SREB Commission on Goals that one or two universities in the region should establish an institute or center for the study of higher education. Commission members obviously had in mind the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley and O.C. Aderhold, who was very active in SREB's work, took full advantage of the commission's recommendation.

I learned from Galen Drewry that President Aderhold set aside funds for such purposes and did not move until he had the funds to launch

the Institute of Higher Education as properly staffed and adequately funded. The first budget for the Institute (FY65) provided salaries for a director, two associate directors, two other professional staff members, two secretaries, and two graduate assistants. I have explained to colleagues elsewhere how the Institute was launched and they have been amazed that a new unit on the University campus could be launched with that kind of funding and effectiveness—without outside funding!

When I came to the Institute in February 1965, Galen Drewry was director, I was the associate director, and the two other professional staff members were Ted Hammock and Durward Long (both identified with political science). John Muir was the first of many graduate assistants. The names of the two secretaries escape me at the moment because both were wives who moved soon with their husbands.

"The Institute's programs and services . . . were not limited to public service, and later the Institute was called a resource sharing effort on the part of the University."

My first "assignment" as associate director was to read all departmental and college or school annual reports. This gave me an excellent overview of the University and the "pecking order" of the various departments and colleges. Among my new responsibilities in 1965 was the challenge of learning what was going on in Washington and what the implications for UGA might be.

♦ ♦ ♦

Was the Institute's mission primarily public service, or did it also include degree education?

Our original mission was indeed public service and it did not include a degree program of any kind. That was one of the features that attracted the Institute's first director, Galen Drewry. The Institute's programs and services, however, were not limited to public service, and later the Institute was called a resource sharing effort on the part of the University. At one time, all of higher education in Georgia was the responsibility of UGA—as far as state law and the University's charter was concerned—for public higher education beyond high school. Our conception of public service was based on a good, sound rationale. Public service and cooperation still has a bearing on all that we do here as an institute.

The Institute reported directly to O.C. Aderhold, an administrator who, when he called you by phone, placed his own call. He seldom had Connie Penley, his secretary, phone for him. He introduced himself as O.C. Aderhold—never as President Aderhold. As I have said previously, he wanted the University of Georgia to be as much like Ohio State as possible. Of course, Ohio State was a good role model, being a land-grant institution and a public institution centrally located in Ohio where it was considered the "father" of higher education.

♦ ♦ ♦

What about Dr. George Parthemos?

George Parthemos and Galen Drewry made many trips together to Washington, D.C. to investigate possible funding from the federal government. In particular, he and Galen were interested in the Cooperative Research Act. George was the driving force behind the intent to staff the Institute with behavioral scientists. When I came, I came as a psychologist to join the two political scientists already on staff. Galen, with his background in educational administration, was actively recruiting economists, sociologists, etc., to fill the other staff positions.

George and Galen worked very closely together, but a "falling out" may have been inevitable considering the differences in the two individuals. When recruitment of additional behavioral scientists proved difficult, Galen Drewry wanted to hire a new staff member who had been one of his doctoral students at Auburn University. George vetoed the appointment because that person was another appointment in educational administration instead of behavioral science. Galen made an "end run" around George and O.C. Aderhold supported Galen. That produced a schism between George and Galen that was never closed.

♦ ♦ ♦

What about J. W. Fanning? Was he a player in the launching of the early days?

Mr. Fanning was very active in all things related to the growth of this university and its relationship with the people in the state. His presence was very much felt in the early days of the Institute because he was right down the hall, on the third floor of Old College with the Institute for Community and Area Development. His cooperative relationship with the Institute was the reason for transferring the Institute to Mr. Fanning when President Davison reduced the number of people reporting directly to the president. That happened in early 1969. That unilateral decision was the sort of administrative decision that Galen Drewry would not accept from anyone! He started looking for another position and found one at the University of Alabama with immediate tenure as a special assistant to David Mathews.

♦ ♦ ♦

What do you think was Galen Drewry's vision of the Institute?

Galen's vision was appropriate and articulate. He was unusually knowledgeable and understood the Institute's need to explore its own possibilities. He was quite active in seeking out foundations and cooperative efforts that would involve the Institute. He established working relations with the director of the Southern Education Foundation—he could do so as a co-author of an influential desegregation report in the early 1960s. In short, he had good contacts in several of the right places!

♦ ♦ ♦

What do you think his contributions were to the Institute?

He gave the Institute an excellent launching. We could not have asked for a better director. He had an even temperament and he consulted with others before making policy decisions. As associate director, I was consulted on all decisions during his tenure. Galen did not seek another associate director until 1968 because he did not want to fill the other position just to fill the position. The Institute has been privileged over its many years to carry unfilled positions, so we were under no pressure of losing the position.

Galen involved me in all decisions concerning the Institute staff. I never felt that he was meeting in secret with somebody, or that he had an arrangement with a staff member I didn't know about. He was very open and a remarkable individual to work with—"with" instead of "for." To give one example, he served on the President's Council and attended the Monday morning meetings that were obligatory in those days. He would come back from those meetings, call me into his office, and go over what had been said at the meetings. He would often ask my advice when he thought something had implications for the Institute.

I remember FY 1967 when UGA got the big windfall of new faculty positions. He called me in after a meeting he had attended with the President's Council. His approach was, "I don't believe these deans around here know what is going on. There is going to be money available for many faculty positions. I think we can get a position if we could justify it." He asked me how we could justify another staff member, and we talked about needing someone in this area and that area. Galen decided we should ask for two in order to get one. As it turned out, he asked for three and got three. By this time, Galen and the Institute were recognized as the place where things could be done quietly and effectively without fanfare.

Galen was very effective in solving problems and O.C. Aderhold relied on him heavily. Later, we had a systems analyst group on the campus working with the computerization of higher education, and this group was given to Galen "lock, stock, and barrel." That unit was the beginning of institutional research at the University.

♦ ♦ ♦

It was located within the Institute of Higher Education?

Yes, five new staff members were moved in—budgetarily and physically. Two staff members were experienced systems analysts and the director of the unit was Bill Parker. One of the systems analysts, Dan Shealy, became one of our graduates, writing his dissertation on the increasing functions of admissions offices.

♦ ♦ ♦

You mentioned earlier some of the reasons Dr. Drewry left. Were there other reasons besides the change in reporting status?

For Galen, that was quite sufficient in the sense that he was not a person to be treated that particular way. The letter was evidently written by Boyd McWhorter rather than Fred Davison,

and it was somewhat curt. It was written as an order that from now on you will report to Mr. Fanning. Galen quickly agreed that if we had to report to a vice president, Mr. Fanning was the one we should report to. I have always believed that George Parthemos would have turned it down, if the Institute had been offered to him. In any event, Galen was gone. There were many administrative openings in those days, he could move without difficulty, and he did. As I have said, David Mathews, then president at the University of Alabama, appointed Galen as his assistant—with tenure!

♦ ♦ ♦

Did Galen ever become a college president?

No, he eventually returned to teaching and then retired from the University of Alabama. He was one of those rare individuals you would not hear from for six months, then he would phone and pick up right where he left off last time. There was never any apologies for not keeping in touch. He would call and say, "Cameron, can you give me some help?" or "Answer a question for me." Almost as if he was in an office down the hall. He was a very agreeable and likeable individual. I never heard him speak a cross word to anyone. But he could be firm if he needed to make a point. The worst mistake he made was to staff the Institute too heavily with former students and colleagues that he had known elsewhere. He did that because we found out early that we were not going to be able to staff the Institute with behavioral and social scientists as we had hoped. Job opportunities were too plentiful elsewhere.

"I saw no conflict between what I had been doing as a psychologist and what I was doing in the Institute."

We tried to recruit people like Reece McGee, co-author of "The Academic Marketplace," of Caplow and McGee, and also David Brown who had written a book on faculty mobility and later became chancellor at the University of North Carolina, Asheville. Brown was an economist and did not want to leave the security of his disciplinary base. That is true to a certain extent. It is difficult to continue being active in a disciplinary field and also be actively involved in the various things we do in the Institute. That is why it became important for us to develop our own discipline of higher education. For me, in psychology, it was much easier than it was for others to make the shift. I saw no conflict between what I had been doing as a psychologist and what I was doing in the Institute.

♦ ♦ ♦

What attracted you to the Institute?

There were many activities going on during the 1960s. This university was definitely "breaking out" or "pulling away." The windfall of funds in 1967, and the increase in the faculty was indicative of the changes that had taken place earlier. When I came here I was already doing many of the things I came here to do. I had conducted a statewide survey of nursing and paramedical personnel, the state's academic programs, and the supply and demand for personnel. The year-long survey was funded by the Board of Regents, the Department of Health, and the Department of Education. As a result of that study, I was appointed to several committees in the Board of Regents—and one event led to another!

♦ ♦ ♦

While you were still at Georgia State?

Yes, Georgia State was just across the viaduct and I could leave my office, run across the viaduct and help out with this or that. I was, to a certain extent, an unofficial staff member at the Board of Regents. I came and went quite often. When I met Galen Drewry, he and I were members of a committee that had been appointed in early 1964 to look at locations needed for two-year colleges. We were well into the junior college movement. Galen and I had been appointed to a distinguished committee. Mr. Fanning was a very active member of the committee. If anyone knew the State of Georgia, he did. There were a number of other people on that committee. John Fulmer at Georgia Tech was well known nationally and the author of books on such topics as southern agriculture and it's mechanization. Thus the committee members represented "the breakthrough" that the South in general was beginning to make, and Georgia in particular was beginning to make.

With the exception of Galen, members of the committee were Georgians. The influence of

Tom Mahler was quite evident in the work of the committee. He had been administrative dean at the Atlanta Division and was responsible for my move to Athens. He had asked me to meet him at the Howard Johnson's Restaurant in Atlanta. At lunch he told me about three positions and said in effect, I could have my pick. I liked the job as associate director of the Institute of Higher Education best because that would give me more opportunity to do what interested me most: planning the location of new colleges. The position of associate director was offered to me in the spring of 1964, but I did not move to Athens until February of 1965. I kept actively informed, however, with phone calls and letters from Galen. I accepted the position on the condition that I couldn't come until January. My wife and I were expecting another child, our youngest, and my father was terminally ill.

"I began to think how we could dovetail our research and our public service activities with the doctoral program."

♦ ♦ ♦

What sorts of things did you do here? What were your duties and responsibilities? What role did you play in those early years?

My first task was to get a handle on the University of Georgia. Galen's first "assignment" was to read all the annual reports of the various departments here and to find out what was going on, on this campus. I was given a remarkable opportunity. My job was to think and to write. I was writing substantial portions of reports for various committees and would continue to do so. My charge here was to explore possibilities and find ideas, toss them out and see how they were received.

I began to have a bit of discomfort when we became very heavily committed in federal grants and contracts that required more and more work off campus. In the early days here at the Institute, I was traveling back and fourth to Atlanta with regularity. Many times I spent three or four days in Atlanta, driving back and fourth. But as we became more heavily committed under our federally funded projects, I spent more time out in the state with units of the University System or with other colleges within the state. The travel was what I didn't like about my fascinating job. That's when my children were young and of course I didn't like to be away from them overnight.

♦ ♦ ♦

What are your views? How have they changed over time with respect to the role of the Institute?

I began to change my views of the Institute and its role as Galen began to move out. He left me a difficult task with the staff we had. The advice I received from Mr. Fanning was no more than, "Cameron, you have some people over there you must help move along." By that time we had started our doctoral program in higher education and we had too many staff members who were not prepared to teach graduate courses and who were not interested in research. For our service programs and activities they were quite capable, but their competencies were not in line with what the Institute needed. I began to think how we could dovetail our research and our public service activities with the doctoral program.

Under Galen's leadership, we had been very strong on administrative team leadership, and had worked with groups of college administrators as a team. I shifted the emphasis to administrative leadership whereby we dealt with individual administrators and their in-service development. This led to workshops, seminars, and conferences for individuals already in a chairmanship, vice presidency, or on the president's staff. We continued to work with many presidents as leaders of administrative teams: for example, Hugh Mills at Gainesville Junior College. Several presidents became the staunchest allies the Institute has had. In such ways we could provide better service by helping develop their professional staffs. Such efforts also made a more cohesive pattern for our instructional, research, and service functions.

One of the difficulties we had in those days was the petty jealousies of others on campus. A new academic program evidently competes with other programs for students, or resources, or for funds. The Institute was often seen, therefore, as unwanted competition by unidentified competitors across campus.

Origin of the Doctoral Program

What was the initiative for developing the doctoral program?

That came out of the College of Education from Joe Williams, the dean. Several faculty members in the College of Education were pushing for doctoral programs in higher education, and were at cross purposes in their thinking. Dean Williams asked Galen if he would help develop a doctoral program. At the same time, Jack Sorrells, who had been on leave as our dean of students, returned to find that the president wanted a younger dean of students who could relate to the students who were "up in arms" about various issues of the 1960s. Dean Sorrells was transferred to the College of Education and may have gone with promises of an opportunity to develop a higher education program.

"Dr. Sorrells . . . visited Michigan State and I visited the University of Michigan."

Dr. Sorrells worked with us in planning a doctoral program. In 1968, he visited Michigan State and I visited the University of Michigan—the two institutions we patterned our doctoral program after. Michigan was an ideal model because the staff wore two hats, as they called it. Staff members within the Center for the Study of Higher Education were also the faculty of the Department of Higher Education. Jerry Miller, who had been at SREB, was the director of the center and he was chairman of the department. We first thought we might have a similar arrangement, but that was one of the few things Galen did not favor. He was most helpful in planning the program, but he had been chairman of the department at Rutgers and had come to UGA to escape departmental headaches.

After Galen left, we went through a period in which several staff members were concerned that without Galen, very much a father figure, the ground underneath would open up and swallow the Institute. My "chore" was to develop a rationale whereby the doctoral program could be recognized as our major service to other institutions, associations, and organizations in higher education. This provided the unity needed. I have never seen any great conflict between what we do as a doctoral program, what we do as public service, and what we do as scholarly research. It did not bother me that we were going to be a department on paper in the College of Education and also be the Institute! As it turned out, the College of Education never put a cent into our doctoral program and consequently we were never treated as a department of higher education within the college. Our *de facto* independence from the College of Education was sealed by Mr. Fanning and Dean Joe Williams. Joe Williams wanted a doctoral program in higher education and it didn't bother him if it was over at the Institute. He knew that we had the money to fund the program and he knew that we had at least three faculty members who can teach. I sent him a budget proposal for two years. He ignored my proposal as deans could ignore so well a request for funds. Indeed, he had a reputation for being the best person on campus with a pencil and a budget.

♦ ♦ ♦

What role did Mr. Fanning play?

When I spoke to him about the lack of financial assistance from the College of Education, he asked if I could take "it out of my own pocket." I said, "Yes, we can fund it." He said, "Then why don't you." Once again, he gave sound advice, with a minimum of words. From there on we've had the doctoral program. When the new provost was appointed in 1969, he eventually got around to looking at the Institute. He decided that the Institute staff should hold faculty rank in the College of Education and he transferred our faculty rank to the College of Education.

The provost believed no doubt, that putting the Institute in the College of Education was a solution to any "problems" we were causing. I had a meeting with Mr. Fanning and Joe Williams to discuss what exactly the transfer of faculty rank meant. Again, Mr. Fanning came forth with one of his very quiet and softly spoken decisions. He looked at Joe and said, "Well, I think we'll just keep on doing things the way we've been doing them." Joe Williams said to me, "Cameron, when you need my authorized signature on anything, just send it to Sybil Arthur and she will sign it." And that's the way we worked for a number of years. Thus, when we want to appoint somebody to faculty rank in

the College of Education, we go through the College of Education. It was pro forma. So that is how we acquired *de facto*, if not *de jure* autonomy. We have indeed been at times, the closest thing to a free standing Institute. We could make agreements with others, let the vice president for services know that we had made the agreement, and we were seldom questioned about the propriety of the agreements we made.

♦ ♦ ♦

Did you lean toward psychology or higher education?

Higher Education, because that was why the Institute was established!

♦ ♦ ♦

And then you added psychology?

I was professor of psychology at Georgia State. I came here as professor of higher education and within a matter of weeks, Joe Hammock asked me to be affiliated with the Psychology Department. As he explained it, I would teach for them—and I did, I taught at least one course a year for them, and serve on doctoral committees. But that's how my title went. What I'm trying to say is: if faculty rank was held in the College of Education, that's where tenure would have to be established as well. Again, I came here with tenure. There was never any question about it.

Faculty Development

What about the FDIG program? If it was faculty development and also a degree kind of program that you administered, what was the emphasis of that and how does that tie in with the doctoral program?

Well, let me mention once again this was one of those problems Mr. Fanning solved very easily with soft-spoken advice. When the FDIG program in the Institute presumably went to the graduate school, the funds definitely went to the graduate school. That was one of the provost's objectives. He was trying to get more assistantship funds in the graduate school. Before his decision, the funds for the FDIG stipends were here in the Institute's budget. When the funds were transferred, Mr. Fanning had the provost insert the simple sentence that nothing in this transfer of funds will alter the operations of this program. So, whereas we had sent out announcements, recruited candidates, and selected participants for the FDIG program, now we recommended them to the graduate school and the graduate school awarded the graduate assistantships that the FDIG program provided.

FDIG awards were, by state law, called assistantships, not fellowships. This meant that part of my job was to protect the individuals from department heads who wanted to use FDIG participants as teaching assistants. We had an arrangement whereby I had to agree to any teaching duties that the department imposed upon the individual as a result of having and FDIG assistantship. That worked well over the years and there was never any real problem. The FDIG program sold itself. Everybody liked it. In July 1964 when the Institute opened its doors, the FDIG program was very much a part of one of its original charges to help recruit and develop faculty for Georgia colleges.

". . . when the Institute opened its doors, the FDIG program was very much a part of one of its original charges to help recruit and develop faculty for Georgia colleges."

I wrote letters to the Internal Revenue Service for the students saying that this assistantship was based on merit and did not require any labor on their part. It was not an exchange for their time and effort. My letters of explanation were honored by the IRS.

♦ ♦ ♦

Is the money still in the graduate school budget?

The money is still in the graduate school and I wonder if the FDIG program will continue to work as well after Gordhan Patel is gone. Gordhan supported the program completely and fully. John Dowling did when he was the graduate dean. It's a good program that no one really questioned. It was a commendable arrangement whereby we could offer assistantships and provide funding for a year of additional graduate study at the doctoral level to faculty members in various colleges in the state —public and private. As I like to remind others, Zell Miller was a young professor from Young

Harris and was in that first-year program. I first met him when I came in February of 1965. His connection with the University of Georgia and the Institute, of course, is responsible for the Governor's Teaching Fellows Program.

♦ ♦ ♦

Well, lets start today with your views about the role of the Institute of Higher Education. Have they changed over time?

Yes! They have changed gradually in many different ways. At the same time I think that most changes have been improvements. What I would emphasize is the amount of time it takes to make the changes an organization like an institute has to make. After I became the director in 1969, it took at least two years to pull the staff together and redefine our mission and role.

The major changes in the Institute came about in the late 1970s and the early 1980s as the Institute's programs and services became better known and more acceptable to others on the UGA campus. Then people began to look at the Institute in a different light and the Institute could function in a different way. In other words, we had to establish our credibility with many oncampus critics. One of the best services I rendered in those years was to write a monthly column for the *Athens Banner Herald*. In those columns I could talk about educational issues and people would read what I said. If I had sent them a paper I had given at a conference or one of my publications, they would have gone swiftly to the trash can. In the *Banner Herald*, I could write a column on what an institute of higher education is and why do we need one. There I could put forth the argument that every major university needs someone who knows what is going on and who can discuss what it means?

In those years, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education published periodic reports and I did my best to keep up with what they recommended. Campus colleagues could and did learn about the Carnegie Commission from reading my monthly column. This gave the Institute an interpretive or focusing role with respect to educational issues. This explains, I think, how we were successful in establishing the Institute's credibility.

Another way is becoming known as a place where a faculty member or an administrator can find help on a particular problem or issue that no one else is providing. This lesson I learned as director of Testing and Counseling at Georgia State. Counseling, in particular, must establish its credibility as a place where students can get assistance with vocational choice, study skills, and academic planning. And, "word of mouth" is the best form of publicity.

For example: when we were bringing in a new dean for the College of Social Work, Dr. Myrtle Reul requested information on the founding of the School of Social Work. She knew that the Institute of Higher Education and the School of Social Work were established in 1964 and two years later we both were moved to Candler Hall. Dr. Reul wanted to know if we had any information on the establishment of the School of Social Work. We were able to supply information for which she was grateful and quite complimentary. So, here again, that is the kind of service an institute of higher education could render—and when an institute or center becomes known as a place where assistance can be obtained, it begins to crystalize.

In brief, the continuing development of the Institute's role was increasingly evident as we moved out of the 1970s—and in the 1980s we hit full stride as an institute with well-established programs, services, and activities. It always takes time to establish the mission and role of any new organization or agency on a university campus—and the Institute of Higher Education was no exception.

♦ ♦ ♦

So, with respect to the organization of the Institute within the University, how has that changed over time? You mentioned yesterday that it originally reported to President Aderhold.

One of the most fortunate aspects of the Institute's history, is our transfer from the president to the vice president for services. We were responsible to a superb leader. When Gene Younts replaced Mr. Fanning, he too gave full support to the Institute. Both welcomed us as a public service institute. Both recognized our academic responsibilities, our research responsibilities—and both were unusually cordial in all our working relations.

Gene Younts was instrumental in making the recommendation that the Institute report to Virginia Trotter, vice president for academic affairs. I am certain that he was aided by Louise McBee. This was an indication that we were not

under the dean of the College of Education. That was a welcome relief and actually permitted us to work more closely with the College of Education without fear of being "cannibalized." The College of Education was in their own state of turmoil and there is no doubt what would have happened to us if we had been "one of their problems" at that time. The same thing that had happened to other institutes or centers. We would have been reduced to departmental status, to generating credit hours to justify funding, and at the mercy of credit-hours-generated in appointing additional faculty members.

We have always had strong support from higher levels and that, more than anything else accounts for our survival. I would have gone back to psychology long ago if we had not been able to maintain some respectable degree of that independence, or semblance of autonomy. Let me just say, "it has been a continuing struggle and I have often been asked by colleagues why I continued to stay here?" As I have said, perhaps too often, I've never interviewed for a job anywhere else because this is what I want to do, and here is where I want to be.

Let me add in complete candor, one good reason or explanation for my longevity. "I have never been interested in somebody else's job." I am not a threat to anybody at a higher level because I have never aspired to higher administrative rank. Indeed, the chancellor recently paid me a compliment by saying that what he liked about me was that I was never pushy. That, I believe, has been very important to this Institute. I look back and see more than a few occasions when I could have "walked out and never looked back." But I never got to that particular point.

♦ ♦ ♦

How personal were those clashes?

The clash with the dean of the College of Education (that led to our transfer to the VPAA) was one of many misunderstandings of our purposes and programs! Another crisis was when the new provost, William Pelletier, did not understand us at all. I would have to say that in both cases, the Institute gained a great deal. When Governor Jimmy Carter wanted zero-based budgeting from the University of Georgia, the Institute put together all of the reports and proposals that had to be assembled and sent to the State Capitol. That is the only time the lights had been on after midnight in the Institute. We had one week to put all the various "packets" together for the University of Georgia. Quite frankly, we were the ones best qualified to drop what we were doing and devote sole effort to the task. In the process, we flow-charted, for the first time, the University's budget of over 300 budgetary units. That gave us insight into the workings of the University, perhaps more than anything else could. I had the "privilege" of sitting down and explaining to the provost who reported to him and who didn't. He was amazed that he was responsible for units like the Georgia Museum and the Botanical Gardens.

"Zero-based Budgeting" was a good lesson for all of us, so I asked later for a personal appointment with the provost—on the grounds that I never felt like I represented myself or the Institute properly to him. I went over and he gave me his undivided attention for over two hours while I discussed the Institute with him. He always had someone else present when he talked with anyone and his assistant Pascall Reeves was very helpful to me because he would ask me questions he thought the provost ought to ask. In any event, the provost accepted my interpretation of the Institute's mission and role.

The provost was like Chancellor George Simpson in one respect; the chancellor could issue a challenge of some kind, and you were either on his side of the line or the other side of the line. Once he decided that you were on his side of the line, he was no longer the adversary both the provost and the chancellor were believed to be. I was glad that I passed muster because the Institute was seen in "a more favorable light." Let me mention the questions that the provost could ask because I thought his questions impossible to answer directly. He asked me, "Don't you think you can hire better people for that institute over there?" That, of course, is a "Have you stopped beating your wife?" question. My answer was, "Quite frankly Dr. Pelletier, I have been primarily responsible for only two appointments to the Institute staff." I then mentioned John Harris and Gary Stock, two staff members whose work had impressed the provost. He accepted my answer and the discussion turned to other topics.

Chancellor Simpson challenged me in a similar manner. He called my office and wanted

to know what I was doing on "that bi-racial committee." He was referring to a bi-racial committee appointed by the American Higher Education Association, working in cooperation with the Southern Education Foundation. My answer was, "Mr. Chancellor, that is exactly the kind of committee I should serve on!" He then asked why I thought so. I explained to him why this particular bi-racial committee was perfectly natural for me to serve on, and I mentioned the other people serving on the committee. He listened to all I said and replied, "Well, okay." To show that I had passed muster he phoned back later and said, "Now Cameron, you understand that you are perfectly within your rights to serve on that committee, and that I was not trying to talk you into resigning or anything like that." Once again I said the right thing. I laughed and said, "Mr. Chancellor, I never had any idea you were suggesting that"—and I didn't!

Again to show how important working relations are, a few weeks later I was invited to give the keynote address at the regional meeting of the College Board in Atlanta at the Biltmore Hotel. I had been asked to fill in on short notice because the chairman of the Board of Regents, Lee Burge, had been asked to speak and he had to cancel for personal reasons. George Simpson, the chancellor, had agreed to introduce Lee Burge. Having the chancellor introduce me was not a situation that anyone had anticipated.

Bob Stoltz (director of the southeastern regional office) and I attended Ohio State University together and received our doctoral degrees in psychology in 1956. I explained to him that the chancellor had not agreed to introduce me and he might not want to do so. I suggested that Bob phone the chancellor and tell him Tommy McDonald was a close personal friend of mine and if the chancellor agreed, Bob would invite Tommy to introduce me. When Bob phoned, the chancellor quickly replied that he would be glad to come and introduce me. He did introduce me, gave me a gracious introduction, and identified me as the kind of faculty member he was always pleased to introduce to an audience such as CEEB members.

In brief, many occasions do not give us a second opportunity! Such occasions are more of an indication of how the Institute has often been given opportunities to demonstrate that its primary purpose is to cooperate with others. We thrive on our low profile and a lack of fanfare for our "good deeds." This is a major point on which Galen Drewey and I agreed—from the beginning!

The Changing Mission of IHE

Well, let's talk about the mission a bit. We touched on it, but in what ways has the mission persisted since the 1960s and in what ways has it changed?

If we go back to the three original charges: to enter into cooperative agreements with other educational agencies and organizations, to conduct institutional research for the University of Georgia, and to help recruit and develop faculty for Georgia colleges, we can see many changes in our programs and services.

The third charge is still an active part of what we do with both the Faculty Development in Georgia program (FDIG) and the Governor's Teaching Fellows (GTF) program. Both programs assist in the development of faculty members for other institutions within the state. Neither of these programs has made distinctions between public and private funding.

As for institutional research, we spun off the Office of Institutional Research in the 1970s. The provost took from us five full-time positions to set up the office. The systems-planning unit that had been assigned to us earlier, became the nucleus of institutional research as it is currently conducted on this campus.

The Institute then placed a greater emphasis on scholarly research because the need to publish for purposes of gaining promotion and tenure was intensified. One of our earliest monographs was on cooperative relations between universities and the developing institutions in the country. The monograph was instrumental in the rationale developed for the Higher Education Act of 1965. The point I'd like to make is that we have always been involved in policy-related studies with implications for the improvement of higher education. And no doubt one of our better efforts is our publications program. Publication of practical, policy-related studies is what really distinguishes an institute from a department of instruction.

To summarize—if I can—the Institute's major services and activities have been and continue to be instruction, research, and service.

Each has its own thrust, niche, or role in the Institute, and in my opinion, staff productivity in all three has been quite commendable.

Contributions and Accomplishments

What would you identify as the most significant contributions or accomplishments of the Institute over this time?

The Institute continues to make a highly significant contribution in its Faculty Development in Georgia program. I don't recall the exact number, but two hundred or more faculty members of other Georgia institutions have the benefits of at least one year of graduate study here in Athens. Since most faculty members are on nine-month contracts, the FDIG program has made it possible for many to enter summer school, then stay one academic year and continue the following summer. They would be paid only for the three quarters of the academic year but they could obtain five quarters of degree credit if they have been accepted early enough for the program. This arrangement would permit a faculty member from Gainesville College (and other colleges within commuting distance) to enroll for five successive quarters of graduate work. This often proved to be enough to put them on their way, to meet residence requirements, and to move towards their dissertations.

♦ ♦ ♦

So its not dissertation specific?

No. The FDIG program should not be judged by the number that received degrees as a result of their participation, but rather judged by degrees conferred, and that would look fairly good. There was one streak of years in which we turned out an average of three doctoral graduates a year.

♦ ♦ ♦

Although they didn't have to concentrate in higher education?

No, candidates could be admitted to any doctoral program on this campus; that was the participant's and the department's choice. We did require the institution to make a case for faculty members in specific fields, however, and establish an institutional need for faculty members such as the participant being recommended. The faculty member was given one year's leave in order to participate and they were guaranteed a faculty position when they returned. This requirement weakened the program later when colleges could no longer afford to grant a leave of absence and guarantee a faculty position upon return. Because the program was a cooperative effort between the University of Georgia and other colleges within the state, we gave preference to four-year and two-year colleges. When Georgia State, who also was building their faculty in those days, recommended a faculty member, the same requirements were enforced: admission to a doctoral program here at UGA, recommendation by the home institution, and a granted leave of absence with assurance of a faculty position the following year.

" . . . the FDIG program continues to foster inter-institutional relations that are beneficial to the university system as a whole."

♦ ♦ ♦

Was the leave with pay or without pay from the home institution?

That depended on the institution and the Regent's guidelines that the combination of stipend and institutional assistance cannot exceed the salary the individual would have drawn if he or she had remained on campus and taught.

The combination of stipend and institutional assistance made the program attractive to most of our best participants. It also made many faculty members think more kindly of the University of Georgia at a time when UGA received the bulk of state funding (in the eyes of other institutions) and did not enjoy a good reputation throughout the state. Our staff heard many complaints on visits to other campuses. The complaints could be summarized jokingly as, "we don't need anybody from the University of Georgia coming down here and telling us how to run our institution." Despite such complaints, the FDIG program continues to foster inter-institutional relations that are beneficial to the university system as a whole.

♦ ♦ ♦

The money for FDIG, was that appropriated from the Regents, the governor, or from internal to the University?

Funds were allocated by the Board of Regents for the specific purpose of developing college faculty members. Funds continue to be allocated for that purpose and the FDIG program continues as a cooperative agreement between the Institute and the Graduate School. The home institution nominates FDIG participants, the Institute selects and recommends, and the Graduate School awards and monitors.

♦ ♦ ♦

And the nominations come to the Institute?

Yes. The presidents of participating institutions must sign off on the nominations made to us annually. Each year we send out a notice that the program is open to nominations. The Institute receives the nominations and then obtains the candidate's credentials from the graduate schools. Nominations are then made.

" . . . the Southern Education Foundation . . . is a small foundation that has derived maximum benefit for each dollar spent."

♦ ♦ ♦

Cameron, what other accomplishments or contributions would you identify as major over the years?

Let me identify several major contributions this way. We have excellent working relations with the Southern Education Foundation, the Southern Regional Education Board, the College Board, and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). I am personally proud of the work we have done with the Southern Education Foundation because it is a small foundation that has derived maximum benefit for each dollar spent. At one time I think their operating budget was only about $400,000. Yet they could take their limited funds and persuade others to join them in ways that would bring about constructive changes in education—especially in developing historically black institutions. That, I believe, is a genuine contribution to higher education in general. Included in this broader effort, we have assisted Savannah State, Albany State, and Fort Valley State colleges in many different ways over the years. We also have worked cooperatively with units of Atlanta University. I know that our participation on many projects has been appreciated. With respect to SREB, I was a participant in the desegregation study that almost became a career. Norfolk, VA, Nashville, TN, and Savannah, GA were identified as locations where there was both a public historically black institution and a public predominantly white institution. As a result of their apparent duplication, these institutions were involved in the courts for well over ten years, and as a result of my participation in the SREB study, I served as "an expert witness" in Alabama and Louisiana. There I found my work with SREB, and especially SEF, to be my "credibility and my protection." On more than one occasion, I avoided direct confrontation with lawyers who would have contested my testimony. Just to give you an example: in the early 1980s I was in New Orleans to give a deposition and was permitted to sit in the room while a previous witness gave his deposition. I knew the witness because he held an administrative position in a Florida institution with which I had worked. One lawyer, in particular, ripped the witness' deposition to shreds because he had not taken a strong stand on desegregation. So, when I was sworn in for questioning, the same lawyer questioned me. Knowing where he was going, I quickly replied, "To tell the truth, [I called him by name] I have never been in a policy-making position." That, evidently was the right answer for him. He laughed and said to the recorder, "I have no further questions for this witness." That meant that whatever I was going to say on the witness stand was acceptable to him. Later, I talked with him and he knew all about me from SEF.

In Alabama, on two different occasions, the opposing attorneys began by saying, "I believe you are a colleague of Dr. James Blackwell," and I said, "Yes," wondering what he was leading up to. The attorney replied, "Dr. Blackwell sends you his regards." Now, that produces quite a different situation from having the lawyer question you as if you were "bearing false witness." Even now, it is gratifying to know my association with SEF and SREB made

me acceptable to both sides in legal issues concerning desegregation.

♦ ♦ ♦

Well, what other accomplishments or contributions would you cite?

I have mentioned the cooperative relation with SREB and SEF, and I would like to give even more emphasis to the Board of Regents (or more accurately the chancellor and his staff). I am particularly proud of the Regent's Administrative Development Program. That was a four-year program in which we increased the number of minority faculty members qualified for administrative positions. It was an ambitious and commendable program on the part of the Board of Regents; it also was part of their desegregation plan as approved by the Civil Rights Office in Atlanta. In any event, the Board of Regents spent over $400,000 a year on a well-organized program in which minority group faculty members participated as Regent's Administrative Fellows.

I had proposed the program ten years before it was accepted—and did not know it was accepted until the Office of Civil Rights in Atlanta phoned me to ask if I would be working on that plan. The Board of Regents evidently had pulled the proposal out of their files and planned to use it. The gist of the program was simply the release of a faculty member for an academic-year fellowship on another campus under the tutorial or mentoring of the president, vice president or dean. The carefully selected participants would be given a year's leave or transfer at full salary. They would also receive relocation funds and travel funds for national or instate conferences. When programs are funded in this manner, something can be accomplished.

All our professional staff members were involved as coordinators of the participants. This gave each participant a personal link to the Institute and its resources. We brought them to the Georgia Center for two weeks of training for which they could receive two hours of in-service development credit (if they preferred and could provide evidence that they held the doctoral degree).

We brought them back in the winter for a seminar and then at the end of the year for a full-week seminar in which they made an intensive evaluation of their respective fellowships. I was the only other person in the room with them for the entire week. These conditions permitted a very free exchange of experiences and observations. Each person made a report on his or her activities during the year. As each fellow made his or her report, the other Regents Fellows checked off rating scales of the presentation. We first used audio tapes to record each report, but switched to video tapes with definite advantages. Each of the Fellows received the only copy of their video tapes. We also gave them confidential copies of their colleague's ratings. Each Fellow's report was then discussed by the entire group. That seemed to be the best way to evaluate a year's activities. By this time I was just one of the group and the exchange of opinions were candidly given and appreciated. I kept in contact with the group for quite a few years and still hear from 10-15 participants each year.

The overall effectiveness of the program was misjudged several years later when the newspapers found out that none of the Fellows had become presidents. The news media showed no interest in participants who had become vice presidents, deans, and department chairs. The Regents program was in fact a once in a lifetime project. For four years it was funded at a generous level and received the full cooperation of the Regents, the chancellor's staff, and sixteen participating units of the University System.

I have not been on the Armstrong State or the Savannah State college campuses in three or four years, but there was a time when I was on both campuses at least twice every year. Many of their faculty members have participated in the FDIG program and they were quite involved in the desegregation studies. In my opinion, we have enjoyed in Savannah a good working relationship that represents inter-institutional cooperation as it should be.

I have given the Governor's Teaching Fellows program as an example that does not result in better cooperation among institutions. We simply do not have the kind of relationship with the GTF institutions that we have with the FDIG program. I don't know if any presidents have written and expressed their appreciation of the Governor's Teaching Fellows program, but I still receive annual notes from former presidents about the FDIG program. When institutions make an investment in the participants in one of the Institute's programs, we

always get a better response. Where they do not make any contribution—there isn't the kind of communication back and fourth that we have had in the past. Part of this is due to the fact that every current president is newly appointed, but much of it is due to the lack of conferences that would be likely to bring presidents and other top administrators to the University of Georgia.

Other services of the Institute can be mentioned briefly. Years ago when UGA was looking for a president we were able to hold a conference dealing with the University's role—and a seminar on what we were looking for in a new president. We had commendable participation from the faculty. There again, I believe, we saw something quite indicative of the kind of role that the Institute can and does play. I remember that you brought Kent Middleton, the chair of the University Council to talk with me; that is the sort of thing I believe the Institute can be real proud of. Our working relationships with UGA colleges have been excellent from beginning to end.

Basis for Success

We're still on the Institute of Higher Education and we've been talking about its history. In your view what's been the basis for the long term success of this Institute?

I think it has been the service we have been able to give, not only to colleagues on this campus but also to colleagues in the other units of the University System, private institutions within the state of Georgia, and also within the southern region. We have maintained something of a regional focus throughout our history, but at the same time we've maintained good working relations on this campus to show that we can provide services that are of value to them. I've often said that if everyone called upon us for the kind of assistance we could provide, we could not possibly meet their request. The staff is too small and of course we have never had any desire to be a larger organization. We've been large and we've been small, and small is better! We need a small, fairly compact, tightly knit staff; that is the way to provide the best services.

Another feature that is important is our self-image. Our self-image has always been that of a service institute with instruction and research commitments—going back to the original charge to the Institute to enter into cooperative agreements with other educational agencies and organizations. That, to me, has always meant that cooperation is our first line of business! We have done very well because we established good contacts, and over the years we have cooperated with many organizations and institutions and with other units on this campus. Not the least of, of course, is the Board of Regents. We have always been on call to the Board of Regents, and maintained a good working relationship with them. There have been long periods of time when the chancellor, the staff or the Board of Regents themselves, did not call on us. That would give us time to catch up on some other things. One of the most rewarding things to me personally is the fact that we have had good relationships with many different agencies/organizations over the years, and these have been valuable experiences for our staff.

"Our self-image has always been that of a service institute with instruction and research commitments . . ."

♦ ♦ ♦

How would you see our institute here as being different or distinctive from other programs. At least are there similarities across the country?

The main distinction is that we have the three functions of instruction, research, and service combined under one unit that has a relative amount of autonomy. We are the only institute or center of that kind. Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher Education is now the higher education program at Michigan. Whereas they, in the beginning, wore two hats, being both Department of Higher Education and Center for the Study of Higher Education. When they had a tremendous budget cut of forty percent some years ago, the Center for the Study of Higher Education survived and became the doctoral program in higher education. At other institutions there is a distinct separation between the center or the institute and the doctoral program in higher education. At Penn State, they have a Center for the Study of Higher Education with a director. They have a graduate program in higher education with a

department head, and the center staff holds faculty appointments in the program. It is like the Institute of Community and Area Development here where the staff has joint appointments in some other department of the university.

I've talked, over the years, to quite a few colleagues in other doctoral programs who wanted to know how our institute worked because they saw us as having a tremendous advantage. There is no doubt that if a program in higher education is in a typical college of education, it is likely to be a money-making program. This requires the faculty to teach their courses wherever a class can be held. Some faculty might be teaching all over the state while others might be teaching anywhere in the United States. Yvonna Lincoln, a colleague, then at Vanderbilt whom we recruited some years ago, would have come to the University of Georgia because she was teaching classes in higher education as far north as New Jersey.

Altogether, departments of higher education have not been treated well in most colleges of education. They are not the main thrust of the college, but there has been high demand for courses in higher education. Therefore, departments of higher education or programs in higher education are expected to make money and that money supports other programs within the colleges of education. That's why I often use the word, "cannibalize" to describe what has happened too often to programs of higher education. Another way in which programs of higher education are abused is the frequency with which they must often make room for ousted administrators. Gene Younts has often complemented us for being able to keep instruction, research, and service under the same umbrella. We could handle all three because we were small, because we had support from above, and because we did not compete with other programs for funds.

Major Accomplishment as Institute Director

Overall, what do you see as your major accomplishment as the Institute director?

I would like to think that I have been able to sell the idea of this institute as a valuable resource to the University, the University System, and the State of Georgia. I have said this many times, not to be facetious but meaning it quite sincerely, "Every major university needs an institute like ours." A university needs professional staff members who can drop what they are doing on occasion and take care of this or that urgent project. More important I think, every university needs some agency or unit that can make a mistake, say "Oops!" be forgiven, and keep working—and even make other mistakes from which others can learn. We have been able to do that. I think of the various things we have spun off. We definitely spun off institutional research. We were instrumental in establishing the Office of Instructional Development. We have established a sound, well-balanced program in higher education—with 127 doctoral graduates to our credit, and both our program and our institute are well-regarded nationally and well-known internationally.

I have taken pride in the accomplishments and contributions of Parker Young and Tom Dyer. Their first contact with the Institute was as graduate students: Parker in educational administration and Tom in history. Both began as instructors and advanced in faculty rank to full professor without "a hitch or a bobble." As I have often claimed, each of them earned an enviable national reputation from the "third floor of Candler Hall."

" . . . 'Every major university needs an institute like ours.'"

Tom Dyer was promoted to full professor one year earlier than required, and he continued to advance in faculty rank to university professor. Parker Young, because of his reputation as an expert of "the law and higher education," may have served on more university committees than anyone else I can recall. Parker also received more invitations to speak on other campuses than any other staff member—he probably turned down more invitations than some of us have ever received.

I also take a great deal of pride in my "recruitment" of Pat Terenzini and Jim Hearn. The two of them joined us as full professors and graduate faculty members, and continued their outstanding research productivity as IHE staff members. Both left us for "family reasons," but with genuine appreciation of the encouragement and support we had given their research.

Indeed, both demonstrated that top-flight researchers can be wonderful colleagues and never cause directors or department heads "a moment of grief."

Let me mention also Phil Altbach and Michael Nettles as "two excellent colleagues" who almost accepted the offers we made. In Phil Altbach's case, he would have accepted appointment as research professor of higher education if the appointment had not conflicted with his wife's career and his son's education. Michael Nettles' appointment conflicted with his wife's career and the inconveniences of "relocation at that particular time."

If I mentioned other outstanding researchers recruited "and almost appointed," I would be accused of bragging. Yet, it is quite true that in the 1985-1996 era the Institute of Higher Education had an ambience or an image that we are unlikely to regain in the future. The Institute could provide resources and conditions that were conducive to scholarly productivity and we could indeed attract faculty and staff members from other regions of the nation. This fact was, to me, a remarkable contrast to our recruiting efforts in the 1960s and 1970s.

♦ ♦ ♦

What challenges do you see facing the Institute in the future?

The major challenge is—and I speak only for myself—the problem of renewing our commitments and contributions so that we can work as an integral unit. I'm not saying that we need to define a new mission for ourselves. We still have a well-stated mission with definite goals and objectives. We need to move together in a charted direction and we need to evaluate the progress we are making. I don't want to say that we need to get back on track—but that may be exactly what we need to do! At the moment, no issues, problem, or guiding principle concerns the entire staff—and there is no project in which the entire staff is engaged. In our move to Meigs Hall, many staff responsibilities fell by the wayside as we moved into new quarters. By this I'll just mention two examples: until we moved to Meigs, secretaries and graduate assistants worked for the Institute and they worked with other staff members. Also, in the past we could assemble respectable numbers of staff and graduate assistants for visitors to meet. We could call upon our graduate assistants who were our students, and we could call upon some of our on-campus graduates and staff. Thereby, we could present a respectable audience to visitors on short notice.

To maintain our status and privileges as an institute, each staff member ought to be teaching, ought to be doing some kind of scholarly research and ought to be involved in our public service program. We run into difficulties on that whenever too much emphasis is placed on one commitment to the exclusion of all others. When too much emphasis is placed on instruction, there may be a neglect of service. On the other hand, people who are overly committed to public service may neglect the research or the scholarly writing they could do. I dislike to use this example, but it takes eleven players to put a football team on the field and we need more situations where everybody is on the field together.

Distinctive Characteristics

You were the Institute director for many years, and institutes are in many ways a distinctive kind of organization of any university. Why don't you comment on the ways that you believe institutes can contribute to higher education.

I believe very strongly in the idea of an institute and in what we could call the old fashioned European way. An institute is almost like a miniature institution in its own right. Karl Jasper has written that the director should be the most intellectual or most productive individual. What I'm trying to say is that there has to be leadership from a single source if an institute is to function as it should—as a source of ideas, as a time and place for scholarly productivity, excellent teaching, and commitments to service that are not in competition with others who can provide that service better. This is a commitment we have met fairly well over the years in working with other institutions.

We've been able to do for some institutions what they couldn't do for themselves. Of course, we've done many things where we were regarded as meddling by being on the campus. Still, a cooperative relationship can be established by an institute that cannot be established by a department. Most departments cannot reward their faculty members for public service in the way they reward scholarship. If appointed

to the faculty in a strictly academic department, you must publish or perish. I'm hesitant to explain that one reason my name is on so many of the Institute's publications, is because I came here as a full professor and was not bucking for promotion or tenure. I knew that it was unfair to Parker Young and other staff members, (Libby Morris is the perfect example) who came up through the ranks to associate professor and tenure, to have them publish in the Institute where they would not receive credit. In other words, Institute publications meant very little in the promotion and tenure process on this campus. I've always thought it a shame that we could not publish Parker Young's "College Students and the Courts." I had to advise Parker that only by publishing elsewhere would his publications count toward promotion. To wit: "College Students and the Court" goes out to many other institutions. It is published in Asheville, and a publication that is a valuable contribution. An in-house publication, regardless of its quality, is always viewed with suspicion by faculty committees. I've gone around and around with that argument many times over the years.

Opposition as a Fact of Life

What is it about the opposition that is sometimes focused on institutes on college campuses?

That is a question I'm glad you asked because I think I know the answer. Opposition comes from faculty jealousies that are based on the notion that an institute or any other kind of extra-departmental agency on a university campus uses funds or resources that rightfully belong to academic departments or colleges. I've tried to explain to many colleagues that we don't have the institute because the funds were taken from anybody else; we have the funds because the institute is able to use those funds for purposes that other constituents need and want.

Take our cooperative relationship with the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents has always supported the Institute in various ways, because the Institute could do things the Board of Regents requested. Departments very seldom can render such services. Consequently, the Board of Regents goes outside the state to get consulting services on matters concerning internal problems. I feel very strongly about that because we were very involved in the windfall that came to the University in 1968. We conducted studies on faculty/staff ratios that President O. C. Aderhold used to obtain over two hundred new faculty positions. His argument was: the University of Georgia had the students; therefore UGA deserved the faculty. The faculty do not understand that someone has to lay the groundwork and to muster the arguments. That is the kind of service that we could provide a president that knew how to take that information and what to do with it.

I have never believed that this institute was not paying its own way. I believe quite strongly that we are an operation that the university should indeed support. By that I mean, we should not be too dependent on soft money. An institute, such as ours, ought to be a nucleus on hard money and with good assurance that they are going to be here five years later. We have a resource-sharing responsibility, as we once called it, just as the university has its land-grant heritage. In this state, the University of Georgia is still the leading institution of higher education, and it has both explicit and implicit commitments to the public interest.

The first question I asked about my appointment as associate director was, "If I come to Athens, will I have to go out and generate my salary every year?" My position has always been on hard money and only occasionally have we been without funds for graduate assistants. The situation at Michigan is a good example in the sense that our colleagues there in higher education are assured of their salaries, but they have no money for students. They go out and raise money to admit students to the program, and they have decided that they will admit only full-time students. We cannot do that at the University of Georgia because of our service commitments. What we should have is the money for at least six graduate assistants who would be enrolled full-time in our higher education program. We should keep the doctoral program small and recruit more part-time students on campus and within commuting distance—but the semester system has penalized us in that respect.

Under the quarter system, students could commute to the University of Georgia from as far away as 85 to 100 miles two days a week (if we taught our courses in the afternoon), and

earn ten quarter-hour credits. Thereby they could earn their degrees in a reasonable amount of time. Now, with the semester system, we are handicapped by one-day-a-week courses that must be offered for three hours credit and require six hours to attend two classes. That is a schedule that facilitates neither effective teaching nor efficient learning.

Instructional Mission

Let's look more closely at the instruction mission of the Institute in our doctoral program. What do you believe to be the most important ideas, knowledge, or skills to our doctoral graduates?

What I've tried to preach over the years is basically that higher education is a fascinating topic. When all is said and done, higher education is an academic discipline. It is, or should be, the study of the institutions—colleges and universities! I think that everyone ought to have more intellectual curiosity about colleges and universities because nowhere else do our "best minds" assemble. Each of us should learn that institutions of higher education are interesting and worthy of intensive study. And no two institutions or programs are exactly the same.

Our students ought to learn that to understand these fascinating institutions, they must gain a historical perspective that permits them to see how colleges and universities have developed in the past. They must also gain a comparative perspective on how they function in relation to similar institutions. Implicit in both historical and comparative perspectives is a developmental perspective that tells us much more than we first recognized. In education, we cook a very interesting stew in an unusual pot! There are a lot of ingredients in the pot and how those ingredients mix is what makes a university what it has been and what it is becoming!

I believe strongly that no one can understand the University of Georgia, or even a two-year college, if he or she knows nothing about its history, does not know how it functions in relation to similar institutions, and doesn't know something about its internal growth and development. I trust our courses are well chosen to represent such points of view. The first course we required students to take was entitled "The Development and Scope of Higher Education," using Hofstadter and Hardy's book. Then we offered a course in academic programs and instructional processes and a course on organization and governance. Those three courses were the backbone of our doctoral program and other courses were added as the program grew. As students go through the program now, they are amply exposed to the three perspectives I have identified.

I am quite aware that most students are not captivated by the aura that colleges and universities have for me. I can say, however, that I have never wanted to work anywhere else. I've done a lot of consulting over the years with industrial and business firms—when personnel testing was the "wave of the future"—and I organized several personnel testing programs. But, I've never been tempted to seek full-time work in business.

♦ ♦ ♦

Would any of these perspectives that you are talking about be different now than they were when you began the doctoral program in the 1960s?

Yes, we are losing our historical perspective. If we talk about the 1960s with our students today, we're talking about "ancient history." They're not interested in the 1980s, much less the 1960s. To step back and pick up a historical perspective, current students must be led gently. History still leaves "a bad taste" in the thoughts of students and younger faculty members. On the surface, some of us are quite interested now in comparative higher education and developmental perspectives are often intrinsic in many of our attitudes and beliefs. But innovation is "the rage" at a time when the developmental perspective is what we ought to emphasize—because course content and substance are not changing as rapidly as methods and techniques of instruction are. Courses change through a slower process of varying content and method (trial-and-error to some extent) and then selectively retaining what seems to work best.

♦ ♦ ♦

Do you foresee any additional changes in the future?

At the moment, I worry about "the future and the laptop computer." There is an attractiveness to laptops and "distance learning" that could prove, in the long run, to be deceiving. Computer systems, networks, etc., are the best

example of how easy it has become to distribute data and information. I am not convinced that knowledge can be disseminated with the same efficiency and effectiveness of classrooms, instructors, and students. As Lee Shulman in his Louise McBee Lecture said that when the instructor conveys knowledge to students, knowledge has not been diminished; it has been shared—and yet the instructor still possesses the knowledge he or she originally had.

I have long thought that both instructors and students should have an increase in knowledge as the result of teaching and learning. I would say that we do not teach unless we plant seeds that sprout. Also, I would say that the saving grace of education, at all levels, is the afterthought or the "Ah-Ha" experience that comes weeks, months, years later when a student understands concepts and principles they have been taught. You cannot program that kind of learning. When the personal conditions of the classroom and the personality of the instructor are absent, information can be filed and remembered, but not the joy of learning in a classroom where there is the tension or excitement of a class getting into an intellectual fray. We used to call that experience a socio-genic effect. Whatever we call it, there is indeed something about personal contact or socialization within a classroom that facilitates learning.

"I can say . . . that I have never wanted to work anywhere else."

♦ ♦ ♦

A face to face aspect?

That's right. For years and years, education kept men and women, boys and girls separated because we thought one was a distraction to the other. When it was obvious that they could be taught in the same classroom, we were surprised. If you ask any male student if he wants to take a class with males only, he'll ask, "Where are the girls?" and vice-versa, I think! All of us have had classes we thoroughly enjoyed attending. Our joy could be brief, no more than a minute or two, but our passing comments following a class could become an important link in what we learned that particular day. Talking with classmates as you go from one class to another is part of our education. That's why the college campus is not obsolete. Laptop computers are wonderful things, but students could think they are learning more than they actually do. They could think they will remember more than they actually remember. And remembering my undergraduate courses, I would add that students can never hold hands with a laptop.

Research: Scholarly and Applied

Today we're going to be talking about research and higher education and some of the changes over the years. Some of the significant works. What are the most important changes in higher education research over the last 50+ years?

There has been several changes in emphasis that reflect the current status of research. The emphasis now placed on qualitative research is one, and continuing change in quantitative research is another. More important, perhaps, is the fact that more researchers are now identified with higher education as an academic discipline. In the past, research in higher education was dependant upon others. In fact, back in the 60s, higher education was regarded as a field subject to forays of investigation. I think of Nevitt Sanford's classic book on the American college. He was joined by many contributors who were well known and well informed, but most of them were sociologists or psychologists or scholars like David Reisman (who would never be regarded as a specialist).

The inconsistency of funding policies and priorities—on the part of the federal government and most foundations—have been a great disadvantage to research in higher education. As a result, federal funding policies retarded recognition of higher education as an academic discipline for a number of years. Federal funding policies were favorable to recognized researchers and—not to professors of higher education—the faculty members, who were supervising doctoral research and turning out doctoral graduates. This meant that professors of higher education were not in the inner circle with educational researchers and thereby "eligible" for federal funding.

Indeed, the federal government had taken steps whereby the great majority of federally funded research in higher education would be

conducted at the Center for the Study of Higher Education in California. T. R. McConnell—the founding director—had a staff of perhaps forty researchers of different types and with excellent qualifications as researchers. They turned out volumes of research that the rest of us read, as soon as we could, to keep up with what was going on in higher education.

The Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley established research in higher education as essential to higher education as a field of study. At the same time—and in a less conspicuous manner—institutional research became essential to academic administration and governance. Thus, institutional research began as institutional self-studies required for accreditation.

Until the federal government recognized the value of institutional research and funded the training of personnel in developing colleges, institutional research was not the kind of research that professors of higher education taught. That's a lengthy way of saying that institutional research has seldom been recognized as research because it's not funded from outside. As valuable as institutional research is, it is regarded more as a data providing service than as the exploration or investigation of in-depth topics and issues. The future of institutional research was assured only when the federal government began to require masses of data reported on higher education.

There is a classic report called the Father Henley Study—Henley was a Catholic Priest—that identified the kinds of data that the federal government should have in funding institutions and holding them accountable. When the Institute was first initiated we made periodic, if not frequent, trips to Washington to find out about the changes that were forthcoming. That is where we first heard about ERIC (the Clearinghouse for Educational Research) and HEGIS (Higher Education General Information Survey) and its successors.

Both the federal government and the foundations wanted to fund research with publicizable results. This means that most of the higher education research is still not coming out of program of higher education. There are many reasons for this, one of which is that the federal government went through "interesting experiences" with college faculty. Federal efforts to fund research was quickly captured by faculty members who could write the kind of proposal that would clear the hurdles in Washington. When I came here in 1965, there was a professor in the School of Business who had written a good research proposal, submitted it, and received funding for a project that would have been ideal for the Institute. He shared his findings with us, but as soon as he wrote the report, that project was over and done with! This could be indicative of higher education research in general. There is still a question of how many people identify themselves as higher education researchers as such, rather than identify themselves as economists, psychologists, sociologists, or political scientists, in order to maintain their professional ties and their academic identity.

In retrospect, those of us in higher education were wise not to identify ourselves with secondary and elementary education. But we continued to play second fiddle to them in funding and have done so for quite some time. This Institute has been more fortunate in seeking funding for service-oriented projects, in working with developing institutions, and in the professional development of academic administrators. That is where we found funding in the first ten to fifteen years of the Institute. Currently research funding is much too charitable to impressionistic studies that are in keeping with post-modernism. At the same time, we still have detailed regression analyses that gives us two or three pages of regression coefficient with minimal interpretation. The *Journal of Higher Education* is an example of a prestigious journal that once accepted essays from presidents and deans who could give readers their best thinking about higher education. Now, *JHE* has been captured by regression analysts—and there is little difference between articles the *Journal of Higher Education* publishes and those in *Research in Higher Education*. In other journals, qualitative researchers are publishing articles so subjective that critical readers cannot arrive at the same conclusions with the same confidence.

There is significant promise, nevertheless, in recent studies coming out on college athletics. James Schuman and William T. Bowen, have conducted an informative study that cuts across different divisions of athletics and gives tentative answers to questions, such as whether or not organized sports produce leaders. In such studies we find reliable statistical data and meaningful

interpretation. That's the kind of research reports that should be published more often.

In higher education research, we have gone through several stages focusing on assessment or evaluation. At the moment, emphasis in research is not on measurement, it is not on evaluation, but it is on assessment strongly tied to accreditation and in the name of accountability. The assessment of educational outcomes is still important, but it is not as important today as it has been in recent past. Funds are still available if you can find them and use the right "buzz word." That is one "custom" that has not changed in recent years, it's nice to have good ideas, but it is more helpful to have the right contacts. In a way it's reassuring that so much research is still funded. At the same time, it is a shame when "cycles and trends" dominate funding policies and practices!

The Focus of Major Research Studies

In terms of the focus of major research studies have you seen any trends over time? We talked about assessing and evaluation as part of some of that, but what changes over time have been of interest to you?

There has been a significant trend from "testing abilities" to "testing achievement" into the measurement of educational outcomes, and in the evaluation of outcomes that are assessable. This trend has been continuous. In 1956 when I wrote my dissertation, if I had been in higher education (instead of psychology), I probably would have used standardized tests as my topic. I would have tested students for their abilities as related to their achievement. Twenty years later I would have focused on achievement and looked for explanation in the form of inputs. Thirty years later I would have been more concerned with the assessment of "process variables" in teaching or learning. In other words, my dissertation, in the 1950s, might have been exclusively concerned with the prediction of later performance. In the 1970s I might have been exclusively concerned with performance. And in the 1980s I might be concerned with the effectiveness of teaching and used no formal or standardized tests of any kind.

One of the more dominant, quite amazing changes in the 1990s was the fascination of many researchers with methods of inquiry that must be viewed with skepticism by "my generation." I am especially skeptical about the distinctions between qualitative research and scholarly research, not to mention scientific research. At one time clinical psychologists might say, "I'm the recording instrument and if my client talks like a schizophrenic, I want to know how that affects me. I take how the patient affects me and I relay this back to the patient." At present, however, I suspect irresponsible innocence in researchers who might contend, "What I want to do is get into the situation and then I'll see what happens," or "I'll see how it impresses me and I'll record my impressions and then, I'll interpret them." Sometimes a good dissertation can be obtained that way, but only if the individual researcher has the maturity, sensitivity, and the command of the English language to "see" and to "discuss" what is going on and how subjective findings lead to verifiable hypothesis.

♦ ♦ ♦

How has this research changed your thinking about higher education. What books or articles have had the greatest impact on your thinking about higher education?

I am glad you said "articles" because I would contend that the publication from which I have learned the most about higher education is *DAEDALUS*, the journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The books from which I learned a great deal are mostly histories of higher education like Rudolph's *History of the American College*, and Hofstadter and Metzger's *Academic Freedom*. Another book of great influence was Howard Bowen's *Investment in Learning*. Bowen was an economist who never lost his contact with what was practical, or what was down to earth. He had both feet on the ground. But I would hesitate to pick out any one book as having made more of an impression than another five or six that I could think of just as quickly.

"Bowen was an economist who never lost his contact with what was practical, or what was down to earth."

♦ ♦ ♦

What areas need greater research attention in the next few years?

We need to do a better job of evaluating the changes that have taken place since 1989. Right now we have many issues and problems begging for systematic and objective analysis. We can begin with some of the over-riding problems like the "virtual university" and we should include instructional methods using laptops and microelectronic distribution of information.

Here at UGA it would be beneficial if we would evaluate what has happened in our adoption of the semester system: that is the actual changes it produced and the effects that occurred afterward. Like the two colleagues in economics on this campus who looked at Project HOPE. I think of the dissertation that was done recently by a student we lost. Sue Elliott was in our doctoral program, but transferred to Educational Psychology. She has completed a good dissertation on Project HOPE and grade inflation. There should be no doubt that if a "B" average is required to get in, then grade inflation of one kind or another will occur in the high schools because teachers have no desire to be gatekeepers for colleges.

♦ ♦ ♦

Did she do her study on the high school level?

No, only at the college level where students need a "B" average to continue. Most teachers will think twice before they put down a C+ that could have been a "B." Grade inflation is happening, but the escalation of grades is not always grade inflation. A noticeable increase in grades should be noted when students become more knowledgeable about academic standards and instructor expectations. If students can study and get higher SAT scores in order to get a better scholarship from the college, they should be able to get a better education from the college.

♦ ♦ ♦

Well, they also have some incentive to keep a "B" average so they work a little harder.

Yes. We don't know how much is inflation—a kind of gratuity given by the teacher—and how much is the result of conditions under which the student is enrolled and knows that he or she must maintain a "B" average. Higher grades are not inflation if students are doing their work and learning. Of course, that's exactly the kind of research we have always needed.

In education, at least two factors are very important. One is explicit course requirements and the other is clearly stated expectations by classroom instructors. Most of us have had instructors in college who did not expect anyone to earn an "A" in their courses. Then we have had others who have had unrealistic expectations of what they wanted students to learn. The truth may be, most students try to meet course requirements. They do what is required to get credit for the course first, then they do what is required to get as high a grade as they can. All of this says very little about learning.

♦ ♦ ♦

Any other areas that you think need some research attention?

I was going to make a "value statement." I have always thought that when I received an "A" in a course, I probably was coasting. By this, I mean "trading" on what I had learned in other courses, I think of the "B"s that I worked hard to get and really feel like I learned something. Consequently I never was as proud of my "A"s as I was my "B"s. I could feel like I had learned something in that course—and should have learned more.

♦ ♦ ♦

So the grade did not necessarily track the amount of learning.

That is right.

♦ ♦ ♦

Anything else in terms of areas that need greater research attention that you can think of?

I think more institutions ought to be concerned with how they come across to the general public as well as their various constituencies, and explain much better what they are doing in higher education. Most president's reports—printed in lavish colors, beautiful photographs, or elaborate schematics—are not the best way of interpreting the institution to people who want to know! That kind of president's report is better suited for potential donors. Thus it is pitched in a way that does not put across what has happened during the past year, how well we are presently doing, and what we expect to do next year.

Unfortunately, the annual reports of the Board of Regents have taken that turn. In other words, the public does not see a need for photos of students in those reports. I used to think

psychology textbooks were ridiculous in publishing a full-page color photograph of a smiling baby. That may sell the book, but it doesn't teach anything about the baby's psychological development. Most people know that babies smile and that they are very cute when they smile, so unless that photograph is backed up by insightful passages, it is a misguided effort.

There is also a continuing conflict of interest as to who owns and publishes the results of research. There is a serious question of how the results are to be disseminated and who is going to use the results. In the case of research dealing more directly with education itself, a great deal of research never finds the right audience.

Admission reports, in particular, should interpret its findings and conclusions to the general public as well as to on campus users. I think of the "Eight-Year Study" that was so highly regarded in the 1950s because it was not available earlier. This study was conducted on the eve of World War II. The objective was to study the relationship between what students took in high school and how well they faired in college. The gist of the study was—and this is an over simplification—good students will do well in college just as they did in high school. For example, no significant differences were found in the advantages of English literature or American literature. The implication was that if students read books and learned to appreciate one or the other, they learned to appreciate what they had read. The findings of the study were lost in World War II. Attention was later called in many college courses to the implication that how well students learn may be more important than what they study. I have often wondered why these research findings were never used. The answer is: We do not look to the past to find good studies that may help us today, we think they are dated.

♦ ♦ ♦

Well, do you want to say anything more about research?

I will simply say that there is as much opportunity for good research today as there ever has been in the past. We have the problems and the issues that need scholarly and systematic investigation, but we still are at the mercy of funding agencies—we conduct research they will fund, not what we regard as important. One reason why we do not submit more research proposals out of the institute is the fact that funding simply is not available for what we ought to be doing. In other words, we could chase moonbeams and solve problems for others, but our own problems require more attention. We still need to engage in more practical, applied research, more policy-related research than we are doing! On more than one occasion, a good study can begin by getting busy and staying busy! The first step is to start collecting the kind of data you need. There is much to learn from telephone calls, personal contacts and direct inquiry within the researcher's own channels of communication. At least that can raise questions you can answer later elsewhere.

Let me use Project HOPE as an example: Last week I spent thirty to forty minutes on the telephone talking to the assistant vice chancellor for planning at Texas A & M. It was all about Project HOPE. How did Project HOPE come about? There is real interest in Project HOPE and people are making phone calls to Georgia to find out what is going on. Word has gotten out that something is going on here that is very worthwhile. Quite often a research project lies in wait of researchers who can recognize an unanswered question. In a two-year period (1968-1969) the University of Georgia increased its faculty twenty five to thirty percent. To the best of my knowledge, no one has ever asked how it worked out; no one has done a follow-up study. For years I kept in my desk the brochures that announced the new faculty. I worked with many of them on various occasions, could recognize a hundred or more of them, and our mutual paths crossed often. But I never made a follow-up study to appraise or evaluate the effectiveness (or advisability) of so many faculty appointments in such a brief period.

Looking Back

When you look back on 50+ years, what has been most satisfactory about your career? What has meant the most to you?

The thing that has meant the most to me personally has been the people who have been associated with the Institute—either as staff members, students, or visitors and guests—and have kept in touch. They are lifelong friends that we have acquired as an institute of higher education. Grady Bogue is a perfect example.

He is one of the friends who was here as a visiting professor. He returned for the dedication of Meigs Hall, and afterwards he wrote me a short letter. It said, "Cameron, your legacy is not Meigs Hall, it's in the students you have turned out." Coming from him, that is one of the nicest compliments I have ever received. I first learned about Grady when he sent me a manuscript wanting to know if the Institute would be interested in publishing it. I sent it back to him telling him it was too good for us to publish; he needed a commercial publisher who could reach the audience his work deserved. That is how we got to know each other and we have been friends ever since.

♦ ♦ ♦

For more than thirty years?

Yes! Grady Bogue also paid me a nice complement by dedicating one of his books to me and two other "old timers" that he said had influenced his career. I have already explained the pride I take in staff members and colleagues, but let me repeat, "It's friends, colleagues, and staff members who made this institute.

At a somewhat lower level, I take pride in the annual reports I have published. I say published, because we actually had our annual reports copyrighted. What better way to get annual reports in the Library of Congress. But better still, I think that the history of this institute can be gleamed from our annual reports, because I mentioned people by name—like the FDIG participants—and listed participants who were actively involved in our conferences and seminars. I discovered that if we gave our annual report a title, and showed that we actually thought it would be read—it was read! I have often been surprised at some of the compliments we have gotten on annual reports. I learned about reports from Gerald Robins when he came here from Augusta College. He wrote a monograph on the value of an institution's annual report. He made such good sense that I tried to follow his advice. Some annual reports capitalized on their catchy titles; some of them didn't. As for the distribution of annual reports, I have never offended anyone by mentioning their names and sending them a copy.♦

CAMERON FINCHER is one of many WWII veterans who would not have gone to college without the G.I. Bill. In 1946 he enrolled in the day division of the University System of Georgia Center (soon to become the Atlanta Division of the University of Georgia and later to become Georgia State University). He graduated from the Atlanta Division in 1950, earned his master's degree in psychology the folowing year at the University of Minnesota, was appointed an instructor and counselor at the Atlanta Division in 1951, and earned his doctorate in psychology at Ohio State in 1956. After serving nine years as Director of Testing and Counseling Services at Georgia State, he transferred to the University of Georgia where he served as Associate Director (1965-1969) and Director (1969-1999) of the Institute of Higher Education—and where he continues to serve as Regents Professor of Higher Education and Psychology. As indicated in this oral history of the Institute of Higher Education, his work has been well received, widely recognized, and personally gratifying. Now in his 52nd year of service as a faculty member within the University System of Georgia, he is completing the second edition of his book, *The Historical Development of the University System of Georgia: 1932-2002.*

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").