

SRU ORAL HISTORY

"SLIPPERY ROCK UNIVERSITY, INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
APSCUF: 1957-1991

INTERVIEWEE: DR. RICHARD HAZLEY

INTERVIEWERS: DR. JOSEPH RIGGS AND LEAH M. BROWN

10 JUNE 1991

R: This is Joe Riggs and Leah Brown interviewing Professor Dick Hazley at Indiana University of Pennsylvania in Indiana, Pennsylvania, June 10, 1991. The flow of topics are all suggested topics, so it's sort of random selection and whatever suits you or you can pick and choose and then we'll get in with a question here and there. If your narratives are fairly long, that's good.

H: Okay. I think one of the reasons I came to Slippery Rock was proximity. I didn't start teaching until I was 30 years old. I had finished my graduate work at Columbia and, frankly, had had enough of the academic environment, and I made the mistake of thinking that I would go into the world of reality, the world of business. I took a job with National Biscuit Company as a management trainee. That was one of the many big mistakes of my life. I found out that there was no more reality there than there was in the academic world. It was just a different kind of unreality. I mean, you had to devote your life to the Premium Saltine there. I spent six rather unhappy years there, each year getting unhappier. I had reached a point where I

H: wanted desperately to get out of there, but I didn't know how.

At that time, you may remember, there was a kind of five acres and independence move in the country, where you would have your own piece of ground and raise your own food. I got caught up in the idea of maybe becoming a farmer which was insane but seemed to me very reasonable at the time. So I bought a farm in southern Butler county and started very methodically and systematically, the way insane people do sometimes, to start a dairy farm. After a couple of years, I had the farm on the verge of becoming a working operation. It occurred to me that I might want to substitute teach while the farm was getting on firm financial footing. So I set up an appointment with the superintendent of the South Butler County School District. I met with him one summer evening, which I'll never forget because I owe him my life in a way. His name was Lawrence Derickson. I took my credentials. We sat and talked for about a half an hour. I told him what I wanted to do. Finally, he looked at me and he said, no. He said, "I don't want anyone with your background substituting. How would you like to be chairman of the English department?" I said, "But I have no education credits." He said, "Well, that may be a great advantage, and besides you can pick those up in the evenings. We need somebody like you in the English department." That was in 1957 and he hired me. The first two years,

H: I think, were among the happiest years of my life. I thought I was in heaven. I was getting paid for reading books and for talking in a classroom. At the end of the second year, I realized that while I really enjoyed this, if I stayed in the high school. I was going to be repeating myself for the next 25 years. The curriculum would not change and I would get stale. I decided to apply at Slippery Rock.

In those days, a lot of the students from this area that I taught in, some of them marginally poor in a rural area but very bright, some of them, who wanted to go to college had only one place to go and that was Slippery Rock because it was near and it was cheap. At that time at Slippery Rock, you had to take a writing exam and a grammar test. That was part of the admissions policy. I had been such an enthusiastic teacher and I had so much energy, which I wish I had now, that in my academic class the students had a grammar test every day and wrote a theme every week. The consequence was when they took those tests at Slippery Rock, they always scored in the 99th percentile in grammar and did very well on their written tests. So Carl Spotts, I think was the name of the chairman at the time, knew me. He'd never met me but he knew me. He would say to the students, "Who was your high school teacher?" Because some of them even got exempted from English I.

H: So he hired me really without much of an interview at all. I remember a friend of mine and I went fishing at Pymatuning [Lake] at six o'clock Saturday morning and on the way back we stopped at a gas station and I changed and then went in for my interview with Dr. Spotts. I had the job. So that's how I arrived at Slippery Rock. I'm happy I did that.

I think at that time the department was much, much better than I expected it to be. All of my education had been in private institutions. I really didn't know what to expect at Slippery Rock. I found that, at least then, it was a place that attracted people who were not always the conventional academic types, but who were very good and very bright. There was Jack Marken and John Huzzard and Al Schmittlein, who's still there I guess, and myself and some other people. I thought it was a very, very solid and very good department. I enjoyed it very much.

I think one of the things I wasn't prepared for was the kind of tone of some of the old timers in the administration. I remember the Dean of Women, Lois Harner. She was, I guess, almost a stereotype of the old time dean of women. On our new faculty orientation day, I remember she explained to us that the students were required to dress for dinner--the girls in stockings, heels and skirts, the men in shirts, ties and jackets. "Because many of our students," she said, "come from

H: homes where they don't know the social amenities, and it is part of our mission to teach them those social amenities." That was a little bit shocking. Later on I heard from several female students a story of how Lois Harner used to check everybody in at night. All the female students lived in North Hall at that time. I think the student population was only around 800 or 900 when I started there. I think they had to be in, if I remember correctly, at eleven o'clock on Friday night and twelve o'clock on Saturday night. She would check them in. There was only one door they could come through. She would be seated at the desk there with the check-in sheet and and as they leaned over to sign in, she would say, "And did you have a pleasant evening?" They would have to answer, and when they answered she sniffed, and if she thought she smelled anything on their breath, they were immediately suspended for a week. There was no due process. They went home for a week. So those kinds of things I wasn't quite used to, but they changed over the period of time that I was there.

Maybe my initial disappointment was my first freshman English class, because at that time they had block scheduling. All of the people in each of the disciplines went together. My first freshman English class consisted of about 35 males who were all Phys. Ed. majors, who knew less than the tenth graders in the high school I had just come from. That changed, too. I think

H: I remember, and it's a good memory, that over the period of the five years that I was there, there was a constant improvement in the quality of the entering freshmen. But that first day was a shock. I remember when I asked them to name the parts of speech, I think they wound up with thirteen or something of that sort. I enjoyed the teaching. I still had a great deal of energy. The schedule was very heavy. In my first semester, I taught three sections of freshman English and three sections of literature. Each of those, of course, was three credits so that was an 18 hour load. Entering faculty were expected to keep a six day schedule, so they would spend more time on campus and be more available to students. That meant that I taught Saturday mornings in addition to the five other days. That was a very, very heavy teaching schedule at that time. I didn't mind it at all. I enjoyed it very much.

I enjoyed my colleagues a great deal, particularly, Jack Marken. I doubt if you have had a chance to talk with him. Probably not. I think he's somewhere out in Wisconsin or Michigan, somewhere out in that area. Jack had been very active in the AAUP. He and I came there (SRU) at the same time. He was maybe five or six years older than I am. Jack got me interested, and together we formed an AAUP chapter at Slippery Rock, although I should take very little credit for it. I was kind of tag-along on that, helping him out, and he was the one who was interested. We did get a chapter formed there. That brought about a little bit of change

H: in the University because at that time the only active organization was PSEA in the school. I had had what I thought were some disappointing experiences with PSEA when I was teaching high school and I was not inclined to join them, although Dean Nelson Hale tried to put a little pressure on me. I don't know if Nelson is still around or not.

B: He's still living, but I haven't seen him for a while.

R: Was the AAUP seen as a threatening move?

H: No. I think there was really no reaction. No administrative opposition. No support but no opposition. That was fine.

I think it would have been difficult in those days to oppose the AAUP. The reputation was very high and we formed a fairly active chapter. Although when Carter came, and I left the same year Carter came, Jack told me that he (Carter) came in and adjourned summarily a meeting they were holding in a classroom saying they had no right to meet in a classroom. But that was five years later.

R: Can you tell us about the subject area in which you taught and how it declined or prospered?

H: In those days, I think, we were expected to be kind of jack-of-all-subjects. I did manage to get established, which they hadn't had prior to that time, a course in Contemporary British and American Poetry, which was my particular field. I think it was in my third or fourth year that I started teaching that course.

H: Up until then, I taught, in addition to what we think of as the nuts and bolts subjects which all of us taught, Advanced Composition and Creative Writing and Modern British and American Poetry and a few other things. History of the Drama. We were expected, I think, to handle a lot of subjects in a lot of particular areas.

R: English majors were also education majors?

H: Everybody at that time was an education major. Of course, the market was very good for English education majors at that time, so that was fine. I remember a few funny things. At that time, each of the institutions, each of the fourteen, had a particular area of emphasis and Slippery Rock, of course, was physical education. One of my colleagues in the English department, John Huzzard, told me this story which I will never forget. John had been hired, I think, two years previous to my hiring, and he was a fine man, very shy, introverted, but a good scholar and a good teacher. He looked a little like Peter Lorre. He told me that when he was interviewed for the position by Dr. Weisenfluh, he was sitting in Weisenfluh's office and he said the interview was going very well. He said, all of a sudden in the middle of a sentence, Weisenfluh leaned as far across his desk as he could and looked at John very closely and said loudly, "your one eye's askew, isn't it?" John did have one eye that was not quite right, and poor John who

H: was shy and very timid said he didn't know what to say, but Weisenfluh hired him anyway in spite of his one eye being askew.

I think, generally speaking, my professional satisfaction at Slippery Rock was very high up until the last year when all the turmoil in the administration began. The only bad experience that I had again concerned Dr. Weisenfluh, but in spite of this, I still like him. He was, I think, by nature a kind of autocrat, but he believed in democracy so he forced himself to conduct things in a somewhat democratic way. I guess in the middle of the second semester of my first year I took over as sponsor of the literary magazine, and I think we put out some pretty good issues of that magazine for a couple of years. I would frequently take pieces from my Advanced Composition class, little set exercises that I thought were good and put them in the literary magazine. This one, somewhat older, student, a married woman, I can't remember her name now but she was very bright. Kathy Luchs, that was her name. She wrote this tremendous sketch, I thought, of a homosexual man. It wasn't done satirically. It was just straightforward and it was just a character sketch and nothing licentious or scandalous about it in any way. But it was clearly about a lonely, homosexual man. That's what it was about. That came out in the spring. My family and I went to Florida to

H: visit a friend for a week or so, and I came back from Florida and I thought I would go up to the office and check my mail. I think it was a Friday or Saturday and I hadn't bothered to shave or really wash up. I was looking a little bit scruffy. Biswanger was chairman at the time and he said, "Dr. Weisenfluh wants to see you." I said, "Now?" He said, "Yes, right now." So I went in and Weisenfluh had copies of all of the literary magazines that I had been sponsor for and he was clearly upset. I sat down and he started to talk to me about decency and morality and finally he opened the magazine, he had a marker in it, to the sketch of this homosexual man and he said, "I can't see where this is about anything except homosexuality." I said, "Well, you've got me there." It turned out that at that time there was an automobile dealer in town who owned an automobile agency, I won't say his name, who was a self-appointed moral mentor for Slippery Rock. He had students reporting to him on what they thought were immoral statements by faculty. Then he would call up the President. I was teaching the Graham Greene novel The Heart of the Matter in my Contemporary Literature class. It was the second run-in I had with Weisenfluh. I remember going into the class and saying in my lecture of the novel, "Now the central problem in this novel is adultery." And that really is what the central problem of the novel is, but Graham Greene, a good Catholic, is really a very moral novelist. The next day, Weisenfluh called me in and said

H: that he had some complaints that I was advocating free love. I was relieved of the sponsorship, although Raymond Biswanger, I have to say, really yelled at Weisenfluh. He backed me up very, very strongly which I have always appreciated. I guess those were my biggest disappointments and they're not particularly grave or serious.

After Weisenfluh was relieved, one of the reasons I left the college was that I, along with a number of other people, were very active backers of Dr. Edwards. I don't think Dr. Edwards was the most dynamic kind of person. I don't know what kind of a president he would have made. He, too, was a little set in his ways. I remember him calling in a fat, male student and telling him that before he could go into practice teaching he would have to lose 30 pounds. That's true. Do you remember when those things happened? No. But anyway, he was always accessible. He was open to faculty and willing to listen to faculty. A number of us backed him quite strongly and I had the sense that when Carter was selected that he would be vindictive because of that, and so I decided that it might be time to leave. Besides that, I had several good friends who taught here [IUP] and Indiana was just about to become a university at that time, 1965. I thought it might be good to get in on the ground floor. So I took my departure. I was wrong about Carter. I predicted that he wouldn't last more than a year. He lasted two.

- B: How about the role of the dean? You said that your department chair supported you then. Was there a dean between the chair and the president?
- H: As I recall that incident, I don't think the dean was involved. There was really a lot of direct contact between Weisenfluh and the faculty. I say that to his credit. I have no recollection of any intercession, one way or the other, on the part of the dean. It was directly between Weisenfluh and me and Raymond Biswanger.
- R: About your leaving, Carter was only a part of the reason. You had compelling reasons for coming here [IUP] as opposed to staying there. Carter just made it a little easier for you to exit the premises.
- H: Right. Great turmoil followed in the English department after that, high turnover rate. I think Jack Marken told me, and I kept in touch with him and Al Schmittlein for a while, that I guess in the next three or four years there was a hundred and fifty percent turnover or something.
- R: I came there in 1971 and they lost a lot of folks immediately after that. A very young and bright group and they're mentioned in other tapes, who had a very strong student orientation and they had a very sincere, liberal bent. They were extremely popular among students. That doesn't mean they were easy teachers or anything of that sort. But I know

R: we lost a lot of folks in the early 1970's and mostly from the English department. A lot of people came there with the promise of a Ph.D. program. I think that was one of the things they were talking about in the late 1960's and some of those things never happened, of course. Ken Edgar. He left at the same time that you left.

H: No, he left one semester later. I left at the end of the spring semester in 1965 and he came here [IUP] in the beginning of the January semester in 1966. He too had been a strong backer of Edwards. Very strong. I know that Carter did some things to try to prevent even his transfer to Indiana. That he invented some scandalous stories about Ken. He was a vindictive man. Ken told me, as a matter of fact, that he fired a policeman because the policeman gave his daughter a parking ticket.

R: City or campus police?

H: Campus police. That's secondhand but Ken would have no reason to lie to me about that. I know about the AAUP meeting. Jack Marken had convened an AAUP meeting in which they were going to discuss ways to take their concerns to Carter. Their concerns about the tenor of the institution under him. He just came right into the room and summarily adjourned the meeting. He said, "You have no right to meet in a classroom." He threw them out.

R: Did you have a personal confrontation with President Carter?

H: No. The only time that I talked to him at all was when I came in to tell him I was leaving. At that time when you went from one institution to another in the state, for the accepting institution to accept you, you were supposed to have the permission from the institution you were at. He reluctantly gave it. I don't know why, but he wanted to know why I wanted to leave and all that sort of thing. My memories of Slippery Rock are very good. There was a sense of small timeness about the institution but it's still, I think, very solid in its education. I remember when I applied for promotion to associate professor. I didn't have my Ph.D. I'd finished all the credit hours required for a Ph.D. but they didn't quite meet the required number of credit hours under Pennsylvania statute. I forget now what that required number is, but I was three credits short even though I had all the credits I needed to get the Ph.D. I had a kind of certificate from the University of Florence which I had attended in 1950 in Italy. So I went in to see Dr. Weisenfluh and I explained the situation to him. As I say, even though he might have been by temperament an autocrat, he believed in democracy. And he believed in listening to faculty. I told him the story. Well, he said, get me a copy of the certificate and I'll see what I can do. So I got him a copy of the certificate and brought it in the next day and handed it to him. He looked at it and said, "University of Florence. Well, that's a good school."

R: One of Alabama's finest.

H: Right. But I got the promotion. "Well, that's a good school," he said.

B: The students were under pretty rigid rules you talked about under Carter. How would you characterize the students? Were they pretty passive? Any activist groups?

H: Yes. I think that's a thing I enjoyed about Slippery Rock more than I enjoyed here, or an experience I didn't have here or haven't had here at Indiana. Just as you, I think, sometimes got faculty who were not in the conventional academic mold, you got students there who were, in the good sense of the word, kind of oddballs. Some very bright and came from maybe lower middle class backgrounds. They came to Slippery Rock and suddenly all the doors started to open up for them in their minds. There was that sense of excitement. As a matter of fact, they formed a club and I can't remember the name of the club now, but it was a club of students who were just interested in ideas and they asked me to be their sponsor. We used to meet at my house or sometimes in the basement floor of Old Main. They would meet once a week and each week they would decide what topic they wanted to talk about the next week. One of the things I remember is Walden Two, for example, which was very big at the time. Then they would decide on the topic and then it was the duty of every member of the club to

H: go read up on that topic and to come back the next week, and we would invite a faculty member who we thought had some expertise in that area. He would come and address us and talk to us. Now these were not the mainstream students but there was that group there that was really alive.

There was one who later became the Pennsylvania state chess champion, John something. He had Nelson Hale for education. Everyone took education courses. Nelson was accustomed to reading to the class most of the time. He came to a part in the text where he read, "Generally speaking it is not a good idea to read from the text in class." And John who couldn't stand it any longer stood and said, "Don't listen to this man, everything he is telling you is wrong." So you got that kind of student. I found them delightful. I didn't find that here [IUP]. Here, when I came, I think, most of the students came from an upper middle class background. A little more economically advantaged. You didn't get that kind of freshness here where the doors were really opening up for them. When they were discovering. One student named Bob Dixon, maybe I shouldn't tell this story, had determined for himself that most people in the world pay no attention to anything and don't see anything. So he wrote "Fuck" in lipstick across his forehead and walked around campus to prove that people didn't see anything. That's a little extreme, but I enjoyed those students very much.

- R: I heard about a student on campus who wore a black box over his head and didn't identify himself and went to classes and wore this box. People got used to it and he became a part of the scenery.
- H: Another thing they did in Nelson Hale's class and this fellow John was responsible for this. When they filled out the class list the first day John wrote at the bottom of the list Charles Roast. For three weeks Nelson kept calling Charles Roast. He didn't see that the nickname would be "chuck roast". He didn't make that connection and he wondered where Charles was. Charles never showed up for class.
- R: Good story.
- H: I had very little connection with the Board of Trustees when I was there. Oh, George Moore. I see his name here. Is George still around.
- R: I have no idea. Marc Selman mentioned George Moore. George came from West Virginia University. Marc did his doctorate there and so he was selected by George Moore and then Marc became assistant to the president.
- H: I think after Wieand left, George was briefly the academic dean, too. I liked George very much. He was a very bright guy. A little sardonic but very bright. We had a married team at

- H: Slippery Rock at that time. Charles and Mary Shinaberry. George wrote a beautiful poem in rhyming heroic couplets. I just remember the first couplet which was, "These are the Doctors Shinaberry,/Doctor Charles and Doctor Mary," and it went on like that.
- R: That must be in your archives, Leah.
- B: We'll try to find it. Mary Shinaberry is still living in a nursing home but pretty bright and once in a while comes to visit and attends graduation. Sits in an honored seat and is still connected with us.
- H: George was, I think, a very bright person. I had heard that he died but that was again hearsay.
- R: Well, he pops up in an interview.
- H: He and I were very good friends. Bob Duncan, George Moore.
- R: Yes. We're going to interview Bob. He's in Florida and is back to Slippery Rock once in a while.
- H: In those days, we used to have a once a month party group. Sometimes at Bob Duncan's. Sometimes at Al Schmittlein's. We would all get together. Sometimes at Ray Biswanger's.
- R: Duncan applied for the presidency. He was interviewed along with Edwards and Carter.
- H: Yes, I think he did. Of course, we made Time magazine when Carter turned off the electricity. You probably have that story.
- R: No. It was mentioned but I didn't get the story.

H: Oh. Carter was, I think, if I remember the times correctly, Carter was hired in March of 1965. At that time, Edwards was occupying the presidential home. Carter was not supposed to take possession till the end of the spring semester but came in and decided he was going to live in the presidential home, and Edwards refused to get out. I think along about the end of April or very early in May. Carter then had the water and the electricity turned off to try to force Edwards out. Edwards refused to leave. They carried water in by candlelight. It was written up in Time magazine. Just a little squib.

R: Certainly newsworthy.

B: Wonderful example for the students.

H: Yes. Right. You think of this place as intellectual. My mother-in-law who had no education but who always thought of the university or college as a kind of cathedral of learning was so shocked. She could not believe that when she read it in Time magazine.

R: Are there other personalities that you remember particularly from those years. I wrote some names down of people.

H: Well, I remember Mark Shiring, of course. He went into administration very quickly after he got there. I didn't see much of him. I didn't have much contact with him then. Bob Lowry I remember.

R: Bob is in Florida.

R: We're going to interview him.

H: Good. You going to Florida?

R: No. Another faculty member is going to interview him.

H: Al is still there. Al Schmittlein?

R: He's the golf coach.

H: Is he golf coach?

B: And in the English department.

H: And his blood pressure hasn't given him a stroke or anything? He had terribly high blood pressure.

R: Oh, yes. When he was Dean.

H: Yes. Even before he was Dean. He told me he used to be able to hear it bubbling in his ears. Wieand conducted my initial interview. I remember him very favorably. I was impressed with him.

R: What about after you came here [IUP]? You became the first president of APSCUF?

H: No. I was the second fulltime president.

B: After Marty Morand?

H: No. Marty Morand was Executive Director. Up until that time the president, a faculty member, had been the nominal head of the organization. I was preceded by John Watson who is now the President of California (University of Pennsylvania). Then Pat Johnson from West Chester who took over when Watson had to

H: resign because he took the administrative post at California. Then Bob Winter. Bob Winter was the first fulltime president of APSCUF. I succeeded Bob. I was the first president to serve for more than one term. When I came here, of course, APSCUF was not active in the sense of being a union. Although it certainly was active as an organization. I was shocked when I came here [IUP] to find that in some ways the faculty were less organized than they were at Slippery Rock. At Slippery Rock we had at least the beginnings of a faculty senate. I don't recall that it was called a faculty senate. But the faculty used to meet once a month with Weisenfluh and with other members of the administration. It was the kind of forum where we could voice our concerns and I think was very good. I don't know what happened under Carter, but certainly under Weisenfluh we had that, again because he believed in a democratic government. I came here and found that there was no faculty organization at all. There was PSEA which wasn't really active as an on-campus faculty organization. So we did form a faculty senate here. I was instrumental in helping do that. I think it began around 1967. But until then there had been less of a faculty organization here than there was at Slippery Rock.

R: In those years in the late 1960's while you were here and the early 1970's when Watrel was president at Slippery Rock, you were on and off our campus from time to time as a speaker and just giving your state of the union messages. Do you have any

R: reflections on the impressions you had about Slippery Rock in that period of time?

H: Of course, my impressions during the Carter years were almost uniformly bad because the contacts I did keep up with kept telling me all of the unbelievably horrendous things that were happening there. The turnover. The destruction of morale, generally. Actually, I think the second week of my APSCUF presidency was when Watrel was ousted from office. Treated as though he were a dictator in some banana republic or something. You know the state police came in and locked up his office and threw him out. Since I was in APSCUF at that time and president, we took a very active role in protesting that kind of action. I don't know what a man could have done to justify that kind of treatment. We did get an apology later from the Department of Education but the damage had been done. Who was it then who took over temporarily?

R: Jim Roberts.

H: Roberts, right, who wanted very much to be president. I guess he never quite made it.

B: He was his Academic Vice-president.

R: I think through all of Watrel's years, through the nine years or so.

B: Probably wanted to be president all through those years, also.

H: Yes. And frankly because of the APSCUF sentiment at least expressed to us in Harrisburg at that time, we took an active role in opposing Roberts as president.

R: How is that translated, an active role?

H: Well, lobbying with the Department of Education, primarily, because at least the APSCUF leaders at that time felt that Roberts was certainly not the man to take that office. I don't want to say anything against him because I didn't know him at all. I did try to reflect the views of our constituency.

B: So that the lobbying had to do with?

H: Pittenger.

B: Okay. Because of faculty concerns?

H: Right.

B: That's why it was appropriate to do that. Not pro Watrel?

H: No. Definitely. I had no brief for Watrel, simply again because I didn't know him. The only position I took was that regardless of what the reasons for dismissing him were, it should not have been done in that fashion. I think it was important. I remember a couple of years later when we felt that the then current president of Edinboro really ought to be replaced, a man who had done, I think, very good things very early in his career, but who had developed some problems at that time. I kind of liked him. But we went in to see the then Secretary of Education, Caryl Kline, about him and

H: made her aware of the situation. She said, well, whatever we do, we are not going to humiliate that man. I think that was the proper attitude and she did get him to resign, but not certainly in the way Watrel had been treated. He left with dignity.

B: What were the years of your presidency in APSCUF?

H: The state presidency was 1976 to 1980.

R: That was two terms?

H: Yes. Two terms and I'm not boasting but I could have stayed there as long as I wanted to.

R: I got that impression.

B: That's true.

H: I was away from my family five days, sometimes six days a week. It just got to be a burden.

R: Do you remember Emma Guffy Miller?

H: I had very little personal contact with Emma Guffey. She spoke on one or two occasions on the first day of school in the fall. I had a friend, Don White, who taught in the Philosophy Department at that time. That was after Wieand left, I think. Don liked Emma Guffey very much. She was a martini-drinking, cigarette-smoking, Vassar graduate, I believe.

R: And an Eleanor Roosevelt buddy.

H: And a Roosevelt buddy and, of course, I think, really the first woman nominated for the presidency of the United States in spite

- H: of reports of other women. I think she was. Some faculty would go out to her place. Don White went out one or two times to her farm and talked to her. The only real story I know about her is the story of the dismissal of poor Norman Weisenfluh who left for vacation one summer and came back to find out he no longer had the job, or was fired while he was on vacation. She did consider Slippery Rock to be her fiefdom. She hired and fired presidents at will. There had been all kinds of stories that I heard about that you would probably get from other people. One president had to leave because he was selling sides of beef from the commissary.
- R: I don't think we've gotten that story.
- H: That I think was in the forties. Another president who had had an affair with a student. So there's that kind of stuff.
- R: Ordinary stuff. Well, if we could talk about APSCUF for a while and the evolution of the union. I guess you were considered a prototype.
- H: I wasn't really in on the ground floor. When APSCUF began to organize, it was, of course, an affiliate of PSEA and NEA. As I mentioned before, I had had some bad experiences with PSEA when I taught in high school. They had asked me to take a position in the PSEA in high school and I had said that I would, but if I did I would try to make the organization do something. At that time, faculty had almost no benefits at all. No hospitalization. No encouragement from local school boards to further their education, or that sort of thing.

H: So I had organized a plan in the high school in which I taught and met with the school board who I think were kind of shocked by the proposals which I thought were very moderate. I suggested that they should share in the cost of health insurance and that they should above all be willing to pay tuition for faculty who wanted to go on and further improve themselves in their fields. They listened to me politely and then said, no. So I wrote to PSEA and said that we are trying to get the following things done in our school district, and I'm sure you have had experience in this sort of thing and I'd appreciate whatever advice or help you could give. I got a letter back from them which said, "We are very interested in what you are doing. Let us know how things go."

R: Good luck.

H: Yes. From that day on I had very little to do with PSEA. So when we got the rights under the Shapp administration to organize, I voted for AFT and was not active in the local APSCUF organization in any significant way for about two years. I was very active in the faculty senate at the time but not in APSCUF. Then it seemed to me that there were some things that the local leadership could be doing and they were not doing. I decided to take a more active role. I got elected to the delegate assembly and then became the local president of APSCUF. At that time we had a one year term. I was local president from 1974 to 1975. Then

H: I had a sabbatical from 1975 to 1976. During my sabbatical, I chaired the negotiations team which was renegotiating the affiliations agreement with PSEA/NEA. It was at that time that it seemed to me that PSEA didn't really want an affiliation. They wanted to absorb us. So I recommended at the end of a year, kind of a fruitless year of negotiations, that we sever our ties with PSEA. That was in March or April of 1976, which was the same year in which I was elected president of APSCUF. Of course, my very active role in APSCUF went from 1974 to 1980. At that time, I chaired the NEA/PSEA affiliations team committee. I was chairman of the presidents' crisis committee in 1974 when it looked as though we might have a strike over the contract. I chaired the committee that wrote the statewide promotions policies, because when the contract was completed in 1974 it was open ended in the sense that it provided for the development of a statewide promotions policy and a statewide tenure policy. There were three committees and I was on the promotions committee and we developed statewide guidelines for promotions.

B: Those guidelines came back and I was chair of the Slippery Rock promotions committee and I came to Harrisburg.

H: I don't remember you there. Do you remember me?

B: I wasn't the star. No. Watrel was the subject of a lot of that conversation. It was a fine document. It presented a lot of problems but people really wanted it to work.

H: We needed some kind of policy so people weren't promoted by whim and caprice.

R: That's still going on in private institutions, of course, and in some of the southern public institutions.

H: Bootlicking and that kind of thing. I remember the husband of a former student of mine here took a job at the University of West Virginia, Morgantown. He told me that whatever you wanted you negotiated directly with the department chairman for. If he liked you, you might get it, and if he didn't like you, you didn't get it. That included raises and promotions and everything. So we felt it was necessary to have some kind of objective policy that would try to get rid of that sort of bestowing of favors.

R: You taught at Knoch?

H: Knoch High School in Saxonburg. Speaking of the APSCUF years, I think the most important thing I did was to combine the jobs of executive director and president so that the faculty-elected president became truly president of the organization and did not depend on staff for the real leadership. Marty Morand, of course, had been a very, very strong leader. And with all of his faults, and he certainly has them, was a good and dynamic leader. But when he resigned I incorporated his position into the position of the presidency. Then there was the establishing of our status as an independent union, free from PSEA and NEA. Then affiliation with AAUP and AFT.

H: That was a true fraternization of equals and not what PSEA wanted to make it, so that we are free to leave them anytime we want. I hope we don't. We have already left AAUP. The establishment of our independent headquarters and that sort of thing. Then, of course, it didn't begin in my term and didn't end in my term, but the establishment of the SSHE system. We worked very hard for that during the four years I was there. Didn't get it until the year after, but all the ground work had been laid in those years. I think many people today don't realize why that was an important thing. The reason it was an important thing is that the 14 state institutions, unlike any other higher education institution in Pennsylvania, were under the aegis of the Department of Education. For years, not during the later APSCUF years, but for years before that, particularly when Charles Boehm was the education secretary and he was education secretary it seemed like decades (Superintendent of Public Instruction). For example, at Slippery Rock I think the second or third year I was there, Charles Boehm became enamored with television teaching. Teaching by television. He got caught up in these ideas. He, by fiat, took a fifty thousand dollar appropriation that was supposed to go to the Slippery Rock library, and God knows they needed it, and instead decided it would go into television teaching. He had cables dug across the entire campus and television installed in

H: classrooms all over the place. I was interviewed along with a number of other people to see if we wanted to teach via television. Then the television sets, after about a year, were being carted away and stored someplace and all those cables are still there. I don't think they are using them, are they? But we were subject to that kind of thing from the Department of Education. Since their major constituency is the public schools, that's where most of their people are, they didn't have a lot of time to be advocates of the higher education system. So we felt we had to form an independent system just to get out from under the Department of Education which, understandably, had to devote most of their energy to basic education. So that was an important thing.

R: When that switch was made, was that when the other schools became universities?

H: No. What had happened here [IUP] is that we had a very vigorous president here, Dr. Pratt, and a very strong state senator whose home was in Kittanning: Pechan. Pechan was very, very influential in the Pennsylvania Senate. In those days, whatever the state institutions got, they got through influence in the legislature. Whatever any education institution got, because you know we have this mad hatter's method of funding education in Pennsylvania. I forget how much state money goes to the state School of Podiatry in Philadelphia, for example, simply because at one time they had

- H: a strong senator backing the School of Podiatry. Anyway, Pratt and Pechan got together and Pechan just used all of his considerable influence to have Indiana designated a university. And he had to do that against a very strong opposition, particularly the University of Pittsburgh who saw this as a threat to them.
- R: Not so much the smaller schools such as Slippery Rock, but the hierarchy of Pitt and Penn State.
- H: Yes. Right. So Indiana became a university largely because of the influence of Charles Pechan and the influence of Pratt. Pratt had been somewhat debilitated by a stroke but he still was a very influential man. Indiana became a university in 1965, and then the move to make all of the institutions into universities really didn't get a lot of steam for a number of years after that. I think it began to pick up a lot of force primarily, or in large part, because of the strong advocacy of Jim McCormick who was president of Bloomsburg at the time, and a number of the other presidents who wanted their institutions to be universities also. They felt it would be easier for them to get grants and they would attract a better grade of students and that sort of thing.
- R: Even though some of the schools that have become universities are a little suspect.
- H: Right.
- R: It has something to do with PR.
- H: Right. It has to do with PR. I remember when Bob Wilburn

H: was president here [IUP], a person whom I admire a great deal, and was, of course, a very influential president on the Board of Presidents. It was his attitude that while some of them should be universities, some of them simply didn't qualify because of their complete lack of graduate programs. Lock Haven, for example, he didn't think should be designated a university. But it very quickly became an all or nothing situation. I think it was better to have the all than the nothing.

R: Yes, because of the size of the support. One shot deal.

H: Right. You had to have the all or the nothing. It was amazing how fast the university signs went up once the bill was signed.

R: It was as though they had been in storage.

H: Right.

B: It was a little hard to get used to saying the word.

R: It was done in the summertime, I think. It was long about the fourth of July and we got all the firecrackers in town out in Slippery Rock and blew a hole in the sky or something. I was interested in the acquisition of Morand and MaCoy.

H: Morand had been an employee of NEA/PSEA. Originally he was with the ILGWU (International Ladies Garment Workers Union). He went from the ILGWU to AFSCME and had been with AFSCME in Washington, D. C. Then he was hired by NEA to

H: organize the 14 state institutions here in Pennsylvania. So that's how he arrived in Pennsylvania, as an organizer for NEA/PSEA. Now when he had been with the ILGWU, he had been stationed in Harrisburg. That had been his first job out of college really when he had been a young man. That was in the 1950's. At that time, there was a fellow living down near Shippensburg who had held a number of important positions with TIME/LIFE magazine. His name was Ramelle McCoy. Ramelle had decided to give up that life and become a dairy farmer. Much like I had in some ways. Then he found that dairy farming had problems, too. So he decided to run for the state legislature from that area and the ILGWU was backing him and they had sent Marty Morand down to organize his campaign. Which is how Marty Morand and Ramelle McCoy became friends. Ramelle later went on to AFSCME, giving up the dairy farm, and then to another union in Milwaukee. So Marty came to APSCUF after the successful organization drive and became the executive director of APSCUF, largely at the urging of a person who later became an enemy of Marty, Dick Keller, who hired Marty as executive director. Marty was very anxious to bring Ramelle here because they were close friends. So he brought Ramelle from Minneapolis to Harrisburg and that's how that connection was made.

R: The early direction when APSCUF came here, there wasn't a

R: prototype here. Was it one of the early ones or first ones of its kind?

H: As a statewide organization, yes. Of course, one of my accomplishments that I'm most proud of, is being able to get people to say the word union. When I was president of APSCUF, it was still an association and there were a lot of people who would not use the word union. Unions were not things for faculty members.

R: Professionals don't do that.

H: That's right.

B: We were not going to be Teamsters.

H: Right. And if it's going to be a union, I'm not going to belong to it. That was the attitude of a lot of people. I very deliberately used the word union at every opportunity in all our correspondence and when I spoke. Eventually, we became that dirty word. We became a union. It was a prototype in the sense of it being statewide. Of course, New York state had had SUNY (State University of New York) prior to us. The thing that we were first in was the dual affiliation with AAUP and AFT. Except for one very small individual union somewhere out on the west coast, I forget the name now, we were the only organization that had managed this. It was the hope and the dream of a lot of us including people in AFT and people in AAUP that this would start a kind of big movement so that that

H: internecine warfare between AFT and AAUP, and NEA could be done away with and we could form a national union. That never happened but the idea was that APSCUF would be first. Once APSCUF pulled it off, then SUNY AND CUNY (City Universities of New York) would then follow suit and then would have the dual affiliation with AAUP and AFT. Those two places fell into place in the way they should and then the idea was that it should continue. There was some internal opposition in APSCUF. Mostly, economic, financial. People complaining about the cost of belonging to both unions. Then one of the reasons it failed, I think, was because of the schizophrenia in AAUP itself. AAUP could not decide whether it wanted to be involved in collective bargaining or whether it wanted to have that old traditional position of the professoriate. For a while, it looked as though the collective bargaining half, and it really was a half or piece, was going to prevail. But in the long run it did not. Most of the people that I knew who were very strong in AAUP and in collective bargaining--an example is Leroy Dubek, who was the treasurer of AAUP and very influential in AAUP at Temple University which has now become AFT and abandoned AAUP entirely--Dubek and a lot of those people just left AAUP entirely. They (AAUP) couldn't make up their minds about what they wanted to do.

R: The time frame for action in the AAUP was so lengthy. Any kind of grievance process over a firing in particular, the investigation took a year, year and a half, two years.

H: Right. The things they did in the forties and fifties were invaluable, I think.

R: Clearly.

H: Clearly. But I think they got trapped in that particular place. Jerry Bledso, who was their staff member in charge of collective bargaining, very bright guy, a former historian at some southern university, left them and went to NEA.

R: Too much waiting for something to happen.

H: Right. They could not decide what they wanted to do. So it was this schizophrenia that I think caused this whole idea that we had of an organization that would eventually envelope all of higher education to collapse. Where you wouldn't have people fighting with each other over representation rights. It really didn't succeed finally. We couldn't have a real united nations of higher education.

B: How about a united nations of the state institutions? Did they come together in APSCUF? Was that a real union of people or were there splits and factions?

H: As you know, there were pronounced factions, and I guess the reasons for that are kind of interesting. Partly, it has to do with the personality of Marty Morand, of course, who had his very, very strong supporters and his very, very strong detractors.

H: So you had Edinboro and Slippery Rock and Shippensburg and Bloomsburg, primarily, who supported Marty very strongly. Then you had those people who wanted very much to get rid of him, primarily at Millersville. And I think Millersville was the real focus of opposition to Marty and to Ramelle MaCoy and the alliances they could pull together from West Chester, from Lock Haven. Clarion was kind of, I think, on the fence much of the time. So there was that factionalism. I think when I became president it was a very fractured organization. Bob Winter, of course, was the kind of personality who promoted factionalism, too. He didn't mean to. He's a very sweet guy but he comes off as bellicose. So the factionalism was very pronounced and it was primarily along the lines of for or against Marty Morand and his buddy, Ramelle MaCoy, as people saw it at that time. So it really took me two years to get any kind of support for myself from places like Millersville and Mansfield. I remember going to Mansfield to speak once and being almost hooted at. That was part due to the local leadership. When Winnie Neff became local president there that changed, too. So, yes, there was a lot of factionalism there. I think it quieted somewhat from 1978 to 1980. Then when Terry Madonna became president in 1980, he, of course, was from Millersville and some of that

- H: factionalism was renewed, particularly the opposition from many of the western schools against Madonna. I think Jim Tinsman has done a pretty good job in putting oil on the troubled waters again.
- R: Is there a way to estimate how valuable APSCUF has been to the academic community, to the impact on students in terms of quality of service and to the taxpayer? I guess we have gotten a lot of things done that would not have been done had we not made that move.
- H: I think first you have to talk about something that may sound non-academic, and that's money. We had a study done, and from 1974 to 1976 or maybe 1972 to 1975, but somewhere in that area, there was an average faculty increase of 110 percent in salary which was the product of collective bargaining of APSCUF. Not only did they get substantial, really very great, increases for faculty, but they did it, I think, responsibly, in the sense that they felt if they were going to get the increases for the faculty, they had to get substantial increases in the budget from the legislature. So the budgets for the state institutions, even though we always seem to be in a budget crunch and particularly in this year, but the budgets for the state institutions were increased enormously and a large part of the credit for that has to go, I think, to APSCUF and the lobbying efforts that it made on the behalf of the 14 institutions. Of course, with the

H: increase in pay to the faculty with the salary schedule with the seven steps and the addition of steps, and then the rather regular increase in the steps themselves, there came an increase in compensation for administration. Theoretically, at least, you should have been able to attract better administrators. Then there was the enormous untaxable increase in fringe benefits which constituted about 27 percent of salary then. I can remember every summer when we received our last paycheck we then had to write out a summer paycheck for Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Do you remember that? Because we were not on the regular payroll. We were paying our Blue Cross/Blue Shield out of our pockets prior to the union. So with the hospitalization, the life insurance, the health and welfare benefits, you created an environment that was conducive to better faculty. In 1975 and 1976, faculty salaries in APSCUF were comparable to the best ivy league institutions except on the professorial level. The professorial level did not quite match them, but we were higher paid on the assistant and associate level than almost all the institutions. It was our theory that these 14 state schools don't have some of the cultural amenities that you get if you teach in New York City or someplace like that, and in order to attract faculty you need to pay them well and to offer them teaching loads also that are not so burdensome they can't really teach well.

H: As I say, when I started at Slippery Rock, 18 hours was the standard load. That was a pretty heavy load to bear. So in terms of salary, fringe benefits, teaching load and then later on in the standardization of policies for the granting of tenure and promotion, I think we created an academic environment that was much better, much greater than it had been before. Then, I think, it follows that you should have better faculty and better instruction in the classroom. I think there has been an improvement. I think. I don't know what's happening in Slippery Rock, but along with any improvements come certain problems. I think one of the problems we are facing in the English department at Indiana is too much of an effort to emulate the traditional institutions, so that now we have new faculty here who are put under tremendous pressure to publish, to certainly get their terminal degrees before they have any opportunity of getting even tenure, so I think we have gone a little too far the other way in some respects but the academic environment has increased enormously.

There's the fact of very real participation. I've never thought of myself as a very efficient person, but when I became the local president of APSCUF I was amazed at the lack of accountability

- H: in administration. These people, and good people, but they had been accustomed to doing things as they pleased and not answering to anybody. The Board of Trustees were just told what had happened. They really had no active voice in any thing that happened. The faculty had had no power to really say, why don't you do this or that. If the president wanted to ask your advice, he might, but otherwise the president and the administration did as they pleased. I think one of the things a good faculty union can do and do responsibly is make the administration accountable for its actions. If you're not going to promote a person, why? What are the reasons? If the reasons are good, fine. Don't promote him. But if it's because you don't happen to like him or you hadn't noticed him before, that's the wrong reason. If you're not going to give a person tenure, why? I think that improves the academic environment.
- B: It's hard to explain some of those things to new faculty to justify why they ought to be union members. They don't remember what the situation was.
- H: That's right. Ideally, unions ought to make themselves obsolete.
- B: And start again.
- H: No. A union is a response to a bad condition. The reason I think it was relatively easy to organize the 14 institutions, is that they had been under the capricious thumb of the presidents for generations. So the union is a response to that. The union

- H: is certainly not perfect. It has made a lot of mistakes, but faculty unionism when conducted properly should help to install a rational process in what goes on in the university and a shared rational process. We had a president here [IUP], not a bad person, Dr. Hassler, who simply could not adjust to the idea that he had to explain his actions. You would give him a list of people to be promoted, and he was accustomed to saying, well, promote him, him, him, him, him, him, and him. But when you say, no, these are the people we think deserve to be promoted and if you don't think so tell us why, he could not adjust to that. He was not a bad person. He simply couldn't adjust to the idea of sharing any of his authority and to being accountable.
- R: The conditions on promotion, sabbatical, tenure, and all of that varied widely among the 14 institutions.
- H: It was incredible. At California they promoted everybody. They really did. That was literally true.
- R: We had a shot at that at Slippery Rock once upon a time.
- H: At West Chester they promoted almost nobody. So you got that enormous difference. It had nothing to do with any rational process and nobody could do anything about it.
- R: Go west young man from West Chester.
- H: When we were on that promotions committee, I forget the figures, but the number of full professors at California was absolutely

- H: astounding. They were shocked that we questioned because it was tradition there, everybody got promoted.
- B: The only criterion was how long have you been there. Three years.
- H: Right.
- R: It's not easy to get promoted at Slippery Rock now.
- H: No. In some ways I think it's getting too difficult, and I think one of the failings of faculty is that they get on these committees sometimes and they act like administrators.
- R: They forget how hard it was for them.
- B: It's their chance for power.
- H: That's right. It's the exercise of power. They suddenly want to stick it to their fellow faculty members. There's the idea at Canadian institutions which I like very much, and Marty told me this because he did a study of them last year. He said, there is the assumption on the part of faculty, at least at the Canadian institutions that he was at, was that if you hire a person, that person is worthy of being a full professor. And if he's not, then it is not he that has failed or she that has failed, but it is the committee that hired that person that has failed. So you look forward to getting your full professorship and you will.
- R: Every time they fire a president in Pennsylvania, they don't retrace those steps to find out how he got there in the first place. Which is an interesting question.

H: Right. There's an old story, I think about Bloomsburg or Lock Haven, back in the 1930's where the presidency was vacant and the son of one of the legislators wanted the job but he hadn't quite finished his degree, and so they held the position open till he finished his degree so he could become president. So I think that has been one of the chief contributions of the union. You get people within the union who want to simply oppose the administration for the sake of opposing. Those things are bound to happen. That's not very productive. That's happened here [IUP] on this campus frequently. I think that if you get an administration that is willing to work with the union, that it can be a very productive relationship even though it sometimes is a relationship with one side opposing the other side. But it can be a productive opposition. We had a president here [IUP], Worthen, who was a total disaster and I think the university is still recovering from him. He came after Wilburn and wanted to have nothing to do with APSCUF. He wouldn't say that. Finally we had a vote of no confidence in him and there was tremendous turmoil on campus. Kind of a Carter summer. He went to Ball State and I understand that he is having the same problems there.

B: But presidents always get jobs as presidents.

R: I was telling Leah that Allan Oster protects them, the executive director of the Association of State Colleges and Universities. A wonderful guy.

B: You said, ideally unions ought to make themselves obsolete after they get things settled.

H: That won't happen. That's ideally.

B: Do you see any new directions for APSCUF? Is it just going to continue as it always has?

H: I really haven't been that close in the last couple of years. I think they got a very good contract this time. Maybe a better contract than they thought they were going to get. I was surprised by the amount of opposition to it. I spoke to some people, and in part I think it was opposition to the present executive committee rather than to the contract itself. I don't know. I just have to say, I don't know what the answer to that is. In some ways I think under Madonna who is not interested in other unions or other institutions there was a kind of coming in on one's self. He was interested in politicking. He likes that in Harrisburg, but he was not interested in relationships outside of Pennsylvania particularly. So I think we kind of pulled in on ourselves a little. I think that Jim Tinsman is a very bright guy who is primarily interested in things running smoothly. I think they have been doing that. I really don't see any new directions right now.

R: I wanted to ask about part-time teachers. Is that okay?

H: Oh, yes. That's a very good subject. We prided ourselves when I was president on having the smallest percentage of part-time teachers in the United States. We got that through several memoranda. First the Ziegler memorandum and then the memorandum subsequent to that by the then secretary for higher education. I can't remember his name, in which we had an agreement with the Department of Education that any part-time faculty had to have the approval of the union. It was our hope that that requirement would keep the number of part-time faculty very, very low. I think part-time faculty are an exploited class. They get practically no fringe benefits. They get no tenure protection. They get no promotion. They get no increase in salary. They are the coolie class. They come in to teach, and because of those conditions, studies have shown that they take almost no active part in committee work or in other campus governance organizations, and that's understandable. I think the increase in part-time faculty began in 1980 under Terry Madonna's presidency where we did not exert the authority we had through agreements. The administration saw it as a way to save money. They were faced with a budget crunch, so one can understand what they were trying to do but it doesn't mean you should let them do it. I think that the whole part-time situation is now very bad. It should not have been permitted to happen and may have reached a point where it is going to be very difficult to do anything about it.

R: Are community colleges an exception to that? Especially in a place like Pittsburgh. The Allegheny County Community College.

H: What do you mean by an exception?

R: Exception to the massive use of part-time faculty.

H: You mean in the sense that they don't use them or they should?

R: That they use so very many of them.

H: Yes. That's what I thought. It may be that they have to.

It's a real problem. I remember that we tried to hold some nationwide faculty union meetings when I was president. I remember one in New York where the part-time faculty had their own representation. You know, got up and told us some of the conditions under which they work. And here they are without representation, without advocacy, and they're constantly exploited. It may be true that the community colleges need to do it. Our original agreement with the Department of Education which should have been held to, is that any time a person is in a position for two years, that that itself is warrant that it is a permanent position, and therefore, the person will not be part-time. They will be hired full time or the position will go. I think if we had stuck to that we wouldn't have this problem. We have people who are simply being used.

R: Are you a PAC enthusiast?

H: Not particularly.

R: Nor I.

H: No. I can see how PAC got started and I don't think they were bad to begin with, but I think they have become bad things.

R: The sooner we chuck them the better off we will be across the board?

H: I think. Yes.

B: Including the APSCUF PAC?

H: Yes.

R: When collective bargaining takes place for a new contract, are there predetermined outcomes that the leadership in APSCUF and whoever is bargaining for the state is aware of? There are no hidden agreements or anything of that sort?

H: No. I think the best negotiators are those people who are creative and flexible. You may go in and say that unless we get 15 percent we are going on strike, but you're lying. You may know that you're going to settle for an approximate figure or you're going to try to, but I think all of the conditions in negotiations are subject to a kind of balance. They are trade-offs between this and that. You want this but you are willing to give that for it. I think the best negotiators are those who are creative in that regard, and who can say well, all right you want this, we'll give this if in return you can do this for us. I think some of that creativity was lacking in the 1980's. I

H: don't know how they got what I think to be a much improved contract this last time, but I think they did a very good job.

R: Is the grievance process working well?

H: Well, it was. It was very expensive. I think it was expensive largely because, particularly in the early years, the institutional presidents still hadn't gotten the message. They still believed that if they thought they were right, by God, they were right. And the idea of being taken to arbitration and being told they were wrong was not something they really believed in for a long time. Even when they were told several times, they still felt they could act arbitrarily. So I think the grievance process has been generally successful, not one hundred percent but generally successful. Again, I don't know what's been going on in the past couple of years. We had a fellow here [IUP], this didn't even reach arbitration, in the Business Department who was not granted tenure, dismissed, because he wore a dashiki to class one day. I wrote a letter to John Pittenger, I was local president, and pointed out that the whole evaluation process had not been followed according to the contract, and that this was not reasonable cause, not just cause, for firing. And Pittenger just on his own wrote back and said, you can't fire this person. You ain't done it right. So in terms of faculty protection, I think, one failing of the union in the past decade has been a loss of protection to new faculty.

H: One of things we have done that I think is bad is to make a contract that at least has the appearance of favoring the old guard to make it look like a colonels' club almost. At one time we had due process for new faculty members who were fired. You had a hearing with the due process panel and you had a lawyer representing the faculty. Now I think that was a little extreme at that time. So a person who had only been on campus three months or six months or something had all of those built-in protections. Maybe they were a little too much but I don't think we should have thrown the whole thing out. I think we should have said, after two years, you are entitled to this. As it is now, you have absolutely no protection. You can get fired before you get tenure with very little protection. Very little due process. I think that's been a very bad thing that has happened. There are some other things that I don't think have shown proper regard for new hires. I think when people come in they should be protected a little.

R: So they become a part of the community, the faculty. They are either a colleague or not.

H: Right. We have had faculty here [IUP] who have been on the verge of nervous breakdowns wondering whether or not they will get tenure. I've seen that happen at some institutions, but that's no justification.

B: We should be more careful in the hiring as the Canadians do.

H: A friend of mine and I once decided we would try to make a chart to show the extent of state funding to private institutions throughout the United States. This is before Pitt and Penn State and Temple and Lincoln were officially named state-related. They were still nominally private institutions. We found we had to make a chart this big in order to get Pennsylvania in, because Pennsylvania was the only state in the union who had this kind of massive funding that went into a whole series of private institutions. Then, of course, in the 1950's, Litchfield at Pitt who anticipated Lockheed and the railroads, realized that if he spent Pitt into bankruptcy that it wouldn't go under, that the state would have to bail it out. Which is exactly what happened. He spent Pitt into bankruptcy and the state bailed him out. The trade-off was that the governor of Pennsylvania would get to appoint a certain proportion of the membership of the Board of Trustees, which is all they got. The idea was that the state would fund Pitt and Pitt would then lower the tuition dramatically and make it available. Pitt did lower the tuition dramatically for about two years and then it just steadily escalated upward. Anybody who looks at the system of state funding for higher education in Pennsylvania is amazed. It has no justification except historical. That where the state dollars went to educational institutions for fifty, sixty, seventy years depending on who

H: was influential in the state legislature. So that if you had an influential legislator, you were quite likely to get some funding from the state and once you got it, it became locked in and would continue into perpetuity. And that's the way it has happened. I can't remember now the proportions that go to Pitt and Penn State and Temple and Lincoln but they are enormous in terms of what happens in the other 49 states. MIT is considered state related and it gets \$20,000 a year from Massachusetts. Some almost miniscule figure. I think the other very bad thing about this is that that is money that is not accountable. Maybe the whole Posvar incident at Pitt will finally bring some accountability. But they get all these millions and they are not accountable for them. The 14 state-owned get their funding and they are accountable for every dollar. Every dollar has to be accounted for. Before we became a state institution, free of the Department of Education, if you broke a beaker in the chemistry class, it didn't pay to have the student pay for that beaker because the money didn't come here. The money went right back to the Department of Education. If it was \$2.75, it went to the Department of Education and there was no guarantee that you would get a beaker back anyway. So we were accountable for every dollar. So I think it's an unjust situation with these state-relateds and the state-aided who are only state-

H: aided because they get a little less than the state-relateds, and none of them are accountable at all for the state monies that they receive. It's an injustice to the taxpayer and I think, an injustice to the 14 state institutions. We have never developed in Pennsylvania what I would call a system of really good red brick educational institutions. That is, state-owned institutions that had the full support of the state and where the excellence was developed as much as it could be. Certainly one of the things that Rockefeller did in New York state was to improve those state institutions enormously. He gave a commitment to them during the time he was governor. Certainly, where you have the land grant tradition in the western institutions you have that. Pennsylvania has always been a bastion of private education. Traditionally, we have had many, many small private institutions. There has never been a commitment on the part of government, a full hearted commitment, to creating an excellent state wide system of higher education.

B: It's a sad note to end on.

R: We need a better benediction.

H: Well, it's not as bad as it used to be.

B: That's true.

R: Thank you very much.

H: Oh, boy, I enjoyed it. I haven't gotten a chance to sound off in a long time.

R: That's what we were counting on.