

## ORAL HISTORY

Dr. Wade Curry, Dean of Arts and Sciences, 1971-1988 Date Interviewed: May 1989

Hi. I'm Bob Anderson from the Department of Anthropology and Sociology and today we're going to have a conversation with Dr. Wade Curry, who was Dean of Arts and Sciences from 1971-1988, and who has been with the College quite a bit longer than that. When did you first come here?

**Curry:** I came in 1961. I was a member of the Speech and Theater Department and directed plays and taught speech courses for the first four years here.

**Anderson:** What did you do before you came here?

**Curry:** I was at Queens College and before that I was at what was then Chicago Teachers College, and when I applied it was interesting. The field was so crowded there were 190 applications for the teaching and directing job at Trenton State. The problem was that the people came out of the G. I. Bill and the Korean War flooded into the colleges and you never needed more than three directors, and there were a lot of people coming out with PhD's in theater than there were jobs for. I was very lucky to get the job here.

**Anderson:** Your PhD. is in Theatre? (Yes, it is) Can you tell me a little bit about your graduate studies?

**Curry:** I got my first two degrees at Pitt, went into the service, I served in Japan in the Military Police and then went to the University of Illinois to work on a theater and English degree.

**Anderson:** How did that impact on you during your years here?

**Curry:** I've always been excited about the arts and I like things that have a kind of sense of attack to them, a kind of spontaneity to them and I found the college campus very congenial as a result because you can be --there's a warmth to the human relationship frequently you're spurred on to do things that you wouldn't otherwise do, and I think there's a kind of electricity in the meetings that take place that is kind of --I wouldn't want to publish the dialog as a play or anything like that --but it seemed to me that there's a kind of spark that goes on the college campus.

**Anderson:** Kind of like live theater?

**Curry:** Yes, it is, yes.

**Anderson:** What were your first impressions of Trenton State College?

**Curry:** There was the unchanging problem of working around the clock at Green Hall and seeing a different time on every face -I often wonder what campuses did that. I ran into one campus after another where you see that. But one of the things that impressed me compared to Queens College where most of my contacts were within my department, and there were few contacts outside my department, was how quickly I got to know everybody\_ The faculty numbered about 100 then and a person who was at all social very quickly got to know just about everybody, and I think at that time you could, without trying very hard, get to know about half the students. So within a year my impression was that this was home. Whereas I never felt that at Queens College.

**Anderson:** Your office was in Kendall Hall? (Yes it was) What did the college look like physically?

**Curry:** Well, you can look at the Georgian architecture and that was what was here. Holman and the Science Building, all of the buildings that looked like warehouses came shortly after that. In the Sixties the idea was to get just as much instructional space as possible so that when allocation was made for a building more stress was on that than on appearance and it really wasn't until quite recently that buildings began to look more attractive. So the buildings that were on the quadrangle were the Library, Kendall, Green Hall --Bray was built shortly after that. The Music Department was in Kendall at that point, so when I was rehearsing --I always liked silence so people could concentrate fully on what they were saying --we'd get halfway into a sentence and somebody would play a trumpet. It was difficult, but the building was always dank and moisture got into people's lungs and of course then we didn't know about the problems of asbestos. The building wasn't a very healthy atmosphere. So the Music Department was very happy to leave. And then the Science Building was built shortly after that. The Nursing Building and Holman Hall considerably after that.

**Anderson:** Where was the Science Department located?

**Curry:** The Science Department was actually in Green Hall. I can remember the labs on the second floor of Green Hall; there was a snake that got loose. They never did find it.

**Anderson:** It may still be in Green Hall.

**Curry:** It may still be in Green Hall. But you'll notice the rooms that have bays (**Anderson**-and those were laboratories).

**Anderson:** You mention the Science Dept. What was the structure of the college when you came?

**Curry:** The department chair was king. The department chairs would meet with the single dean and that was where all the policy was decided. The faculty was no union. There was a faculty senate; the faculty association would perform largely a social function up until we had a major incident in the Sixties that kind of changed that around. The faculty was much more interested in governance. The structure was a much more simple one in which all the social science departments were together, all the education departments were together in a single department, and all the sciences were together in a single department with mathematics. When Bill Goldstein came here he was told by the President even though he was a mathematician, he should be able to teach all courses not only in mathematics but in all the sciences as well. So the idea was that the structure of the college was set up to serve as a high school. So since it was only the social studies department in a high school it should only be one department here. We were a teachers college and couldn't form a department unless it was a discipline that was offered in a high school. The one exception was psychology. That was an exception at this institution; it wasn't true of the other state colleges. The psychology department was part of the education department.

**Anderson:** Why do you think that was the exception here?

**Curry:** I think it was because of one man, because of Mike Smith because he was aggressively pursuing this in his department and very successfully. That one department helped us to convert

into a liberal arts institution as well.

**Anderson:** What were the students like when you came?

**Curry:** The students --one of the things that struck me when I came from Queens College --in the Sixties I guess I was very liberal and I was really a fan of Jack Kennedy and I couldn't believe that there would be people that wouldn't be into him. There was a change that was coming about and an excitement in the early Sixties with Kennedy and a movement to have some kind of a vibrancy --well, at Queens College there were people who were New York conservatives who were giving me a hard time in class in terms of I could hardly say anything without somebody wanting to argue with me. I did not find that at that point at Trenton State College. If you had anybody who wanted to disagree with you in a subject or even pursue it in a direction you didn't want to pursue it, it would be in the upper level courses, no one in the freshmen and sophomore courses. At Queens College it was a different story. Well, they were nice people, they were bright people, but they weren't very self-confident and they certainly wouldn't like to argue with a professor. They just weren't used to challenging anybody. I think some of that has changed. We still have students who are too quiescent. I found that teaching at Trenton State over the almost 30 years that I was here that there was a huge change in the way that students wanted to participate. It still is a struggle, but once you get them moving now, they are ready to challenge you.

**Anderson:** What do you attribute that to --that change?

**Curry:** For one thing we're getting more students whose parents have been in college. Another thing, probably more important than that, we have a different faculty, a faculty that really values a pursuit of knowledge and sense of discovery rather than simply the development of people who are technically proficient in their professions.

**Anderson:** So you think it came about when the change from teacher training to multipurpose came about.

**Curry:** I think it helped. I don't think it's hurt us to come out of teacher's college because of two or three elements. One is --there are a lot of faculty here who are really dedicated to teaching and that is one of the traditions here I think that has been maintained as we've gone on into multi-purpose institution. The other thing is that we've gone into internship, and I would see --I would be amazed at the transformation in the individuals when they would come back from practice teaching. They then would be ready to argue, they then would be ready to challenge and they then would be ready to pursue a vitality that should have been there before but didn't seem to be there until they had gone through that experience. But the co-op that we're doing and the various internships that we're doing in the liberal arts and professions show that kind of quality. The student comes back and there's a lot of critical thinking that goes on then that comes into the classroom, comes into our associations, outside the classroom as a result, so I think that to some extent comes out of the teacher education tradition.

**Anderson:** Can you tell me more about how the faculty has changed and how the instruction has changed during that period?

**Curry:** Well, I mentioned that there was an incident in the Sixties that kind of vitalized the

faculty in the decision-making.

**Anderson:** You're speaking, I assume, of the so-called Heussler affair?

**Curry:** There was that and just before that there was the Moser affair. There was an interesting incident that was at the changeover from one President to another from Hill to Gillenwater. At that point all the contracts were written and signed by the Commissioner of Education and we couldn't even appoint a faculty member without having it approved by the Commissioner of Education. So, when I first went into administration, it was a strange experience. We had the recommendation for reappointment, appointment, for tenure that would come in from the department chair, and I would write then the dean's recommendation to the President and the President would send the recommendation to the Commissioner of Education so there would be three letters that would be going down, two of them written by me, and none of them signed by me. Then the Commissioner of Education would not respond to them and he'd just draw up the contracts, sign them and send them out. But when I'd been on the job for about six weeks, there was a phone call from the Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education. He said did you notice that there was one contract that's not there. We said we didn't notice that. We signed them and sent them out. Whose contract isn't there? Well it was a faculty member who'd been here for one year and he had neglected to put on his application that he had taught at an institution which was known as a Communist front institution. There was no place on the application where he should have put down that he was a member of the Communist party so that wouldn't be expected, but the Commissioner of Education was that he had falsified his application even though he was teaching at a Communist front organization. A Communist front institution. Apparently it was not a paid position. So with one week's notice Mr. Moser found out that he did not have a job. To a member of the faculty this seemed to be an outrage. At the very least he should have been paid for that year. The Faculty Association was put in a position where it had to take a stand --and it did take a stand opposing this.

**Anderson:** This occurred very much in the Sixties.

**Curry:** I think the incident happened in '64 before I went into administration. And I think we were placed on censure shortly after I did go into administration.

**Anderson:** I really didn't know what was going on then. I met Mr. Moser. (Curry-he was in your department, wasn't he?) That's right.

**Curry:** We were placed on censure and then this was resolved by bringing him back in '68, and at that time we were on three year tenure probation. So he didn't get tenure the second time after he was brought back. I think the incident awakened the faculty to the fact that they were going to have to participate much more fully and that it was an abomination that there was the possibility of the Commissioner denying faculty member tenure with a week's notice. And it was something that there really wasn't any hearing on campus. These are the kinds of decisions in which faculty should participate thoroughly and anytime their decisions overturned they have the right to know why. Well, that's what's going on now and what did not go on then. When I arrived here in 1961 there had been a number of faculties who had been let go again through intervention by the central office in Trenton and the faculties were awakening then to the fact that they were going

to have to be much more vigilant.

**Anderson:** This change in the central office in Trenton in the Department of Education and Department of Higher Education must have been very significant. Can you tell us a little bit about how that came about and what happened?

**Curry:** It was very significant. There was first of all a Conant(?) report which was looking at higher education in New Jersey. We were called the cuckoo state then --it means its nestlings, you know old people's nests, and we were sending almost two-thirds of our students outside the state. There wasn't much reason for them to stay inside the state. Rutgers was still acting like a private college even though it had become the state university and not a private institution. The state colleges were teachers colleges, so that the students who wanted a much more vigorous college education than that didn't have many opportunities here. So they went outside the state. Conant was arguing that you can't really have a higher education system that meets the needs of the state built around that kind of model and there was a good deal of discussion of it starting in the mid-sixties and there were two or three different models. One of them suggested by the NJEA was one in which there would still be control by the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Education there would be what was called the Woodrow Wilson University set up on the State University of New York model, and that has surfaced several times since. Most of us were feeling that you don't really get the kind of institution you want that way. We wanted an autonomous kind of institution and we felt that we would never get that out of the Department of Education. We would always feel that we should pool most of our efforts to service some of the high schools and elementary schools, which of course continues to be a major mission of ours but we're arguing for a separate department of higher education rules a Chancellor who would be a member of the Cabinet. And when that model was developed it was only a minority of the college faculties who favored it and the NJEA decided that it didn't want to get into that battle between the faculties and took no action. At first it was opposing the setting up a separate department of higher education. When I came in I can remember the first chancellor, Chancellor Dungan, came out and spoke to the faculty, I don't know if you were here then or whether that was just the year before you came. (Dungan came in 66 and I came in 67) He came out and spoke to the faculty and he said that he wanted the programs coming out of the faculties and the colleges but he didn't want to continue to set up programs and for us to be very docile. Before he arrived I can remember vividly a conversation in which Jim Forcina, who was the Dean of Instruction at that time, indicated that the faculty at this institution wanted to make a curricular change. So he called the Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education and said "Faculty have considered this very carefully and they want to change the curriculum." And the response was "I will call together all the Deans of Instruction of the six state colleges to see if all the six state colleges want to make the same change." There was an interest in making the colleges identical. And at one time there was an Acting Commissioner for Higher Education who was also the President of Jersey City State College and the Acting President of Paterson State College. You can imagine he didn't want to change anything. He had the power and he wanted everybody to follow his example. Under Dungan the nice thing that happened was that we were challenged to

come up with our own plans and he said multi-purpose colleges, arts and sciences and major which meant that the arts and sciences would be central and the professions would be very prominent. There was a lot of resistance to that but I think most of the faculty welcomed the opportunity to fight this out ourselves on the campus. And there was a good deal of change in the academic programs as a result. Now unfortunately he was of such a nature and he forgot sometimes that he was talking to reporters when he was nasty cracks about people so that there were faculty that were actually named by name as being unqualified to be at state colleges. But confronted as it was and painful at the time as it was I think it was a necessary thing to go through. Unfortunately his feeling is that there were so few of us who were worth keeping. And he wanted to be so nasty that he would force all the academic leadership out.

**Anderson:** Do you think that that had anything to do with the fact that he wasn't himself an academic?

**Curry:** Probably does because his background was political science, he went through Woodrow Wilson School of Public Affairs, served in the Kennedy Administration, was Ambassador to Chile, and he knew something about infighting within government. As a result he was very good at presenting the colleges to the Legislature for budgets. He was very unpleasant to work with and I can remember times when Presidents would receive phone calls that were absolutely chastising, they were just furious at the end of them. He really saw himself as the Czar of Higher Education. But it changed things so that there wasn't any way to go back.

**Anderson:** Let me just mention Clayton, I wonder if you would just give us a little hint of the Presidents you've served under. I'm going to come back to the more recent ones later.

**Curry:** Ed Martin was the one who hired me, and he'd put his feet up on the desk and talk to the faculty. I can remember once my little boy, when he was about five, went to the Christmas party and he confused Ed Martin with me, not looking up, wrapped his arms around Ed's leg, and Ed patted his head. We would meet at his house frequently and I can remember the probation committee would meet in the President's kitchen with the President participating, something unheard of in the present atmosphere, but we were kind of feeling our way then. There was a great deal of faculty participation, it was quite informal. There was a real sense of trust, partly because Ed knew everybody's children's names. And I can remember being interrupted several times with telephone calls and I would be in his office. It seemed kind of strange for an Assistant Professor to be in the President's office anyway, but that's what we would do. If we had a concern we would make an appointment and go in and talk it over with him and if we couldn't get the answer we want, everything would go on appeal up to the President. If he couldn't do anything about it he would just kind of shrug his shoulders. As Jim wanted to do when he wanted to change the curriculum, just because the faculty wanted it everybody had to want it in all the state colleges. There was a real sense of warmth with Ed Martin where he was consumed about people's private lives and concerned about the happiness of their children and their family life. There was a feeling --we had to meet every month whether there was any business to be transacted or not --and I can remember when the pocket chess set fell off John Karras's knee and scattered all over the floor, and it was kind of embarrassing.

**Anderson:** Where were these meetings held?

**Curry:** They were held in Allen Drawing Room, and we would talk sometimes in Speech and Theater that that would make a wonderful arena theater, but we felt that it would take so long to get all that dead air out of there from all those faculty meetings. At any rate, Ed was that kind of person where he was involved so thoroughly with the faculty and administrators and there wasn't a sense of gap between the faculty and administration. At the same time there was the feeling of paternalism that the administration was making all the decisions. There wasn't a whole lot of concentration going on. It wasn't expected and Trenton, the Department of Education, was an evil thing that everything could be blamed on.

**Anderson:** The replacement for Hill.

**Curry:** The replacement for Martin was Hill --he was here for three years and he was somewhat of the same mode. We spent a lot of time at his house, he entertained a lot in the Garden House, and I can remember --Ed had a pet rooster and the children would chase the rooster in his back yard. And Hill had a lot of interesting things in his yard. Again a nice feeling of warmth that was there, at least that I felt. Now Hill was replaced by Virgil Gillenwater, and Gillenwater had a different vision. He came in with the Department of Higher Education out of the Arizona system. While Hill was committed to gradually converting us into a multi-purpose institution, and he began that by instituting a Department of Nursing while he was still here, the real move to the liberal arts and the other professions came under Gillenwater, he was here for only two years. We had our first liberal arts programs. There was talk about bringing in a business program, there was talk about splitting up some of the larger departments. Gillenwater thought we could grow into power, so that he wanted very, very rapid growth while he was here. He was unhappy partly because of working with Dungan, partly because of missing the high skies of Arizona. At any rate, he went back to an Arizona institution after a couple of years. And ironically the first meeting of our first Board of Trustees on January 18th, 1968, he resigned, the very first meeting of the Board of Trustees.

**Anderson:** Did he say why?

**Curry:** He may have in private session, but publicly he indicated that he just wanted to get back to Arizona. In some private conversations he said "It's difficult to work in a place where you don't respect your boss." He was still seeing tremendous interference in what he was doing because of the effort of the Chancellor, and I had the impression that the Chancellor was forcing out some presidents on purpose so he could bring in his own people, and that set the stage for the Heussler affair. There was search committee that included faculty and the Board of Trustees and all of us in meeting the various candidates had the impression that it was an open process and that we were participating rather fully.

**Anderson:** What were you doing --what was your title then?

**Curry:** I was the Associate Dean of Instruction. I had come in in 1965 to work with Jim Forcina. Howard Nechamkin had that title before me and Howard really missed the classroom and missed the laboratories so that he told me that I would have to be very aggressive because Jim. Forcina handled all the work and I was going to have to try hard to get some away from him. Well,

actually I had a little bit of trouble in that first year because that was definitely true that Jim would go home with bags of work every night, and I would sometimes wander into his office and he wasn't there to see if I would return some of the phone messages if there was some of the work I could do because I was finding that there really wasn't enough to keep me interested at that point. It seemed strange with every department at the college reporting to that man that his assistant wouldn't have enough to do. That was pretty much what it was. We were trying to start a journal called The Trenton Review. We got the first issue out and Pete Kern and I were doing most of the work on that. The writers that were on the editorial board, that is we were doing most of the editorial work I just mapped the plan and the decisions on what would go into it, but the work on coming up with ways of advertising. So I had plenty to do in addition to being the Associate Dean of Instruction and doing teaching as I did all the time I was in administration, teaching one course. But after that first year the chancellor called Jim Forcina downtown and talked to him and said he had an acting president at Paterson and said that he would like to get back to having that person being President of only one college rather than two and he wanted Jim if he would to take over as acting President of Paterson. So nobody asked me within about two days Jim was up at Paterson and I was Acting Dean of Instruction. At the end of that year that I was Acting Dean of Instruction and Jim was Acting President at Paterson Gillenwater resigned and in came Heussler. We didn't realize until afterward that Dungan and Heussler and the Dean of Instruction who was later Head of Academic Affairs at another one of the State Colleges were all recruited by the Dean of the Woodrow Wilson School along with the Commissioner of Education and the Human Affairs Commissioner were all recruited out of that same operation. So the College was had. Heussler did not really have an academic background, never been a member of a department, and he'd never been an administrator of a college. His background looked good from a scholarly standpoint and a lot of it was hype --a lot of it there wasn't much substance behind it, so he came in and we had the impression that there was going to be an excitement and a participation in faculty decision-making. Instead there was a tremendous centralization of decision-making. And there wasn't much respect for faculty. There was a feeling that the Board of Trustees and the President should pretty much run things. He brought in his own Vice President for Academic Affairs without search.

**Anderson:** Who was that?

**Curry:** His name was Weissman. He had been a Biologist and Chemist, trying to be a biologist at Rutgers-Camden. He did not have much background in administration. He had been chair of a department with four people in it and had participated in some of the governance activities there. But he managed to alienate people pretty rapidly. That didn't help Heussler. Then at the end of the first year that Heussler was withdrawing more and more from faculty and even from his own administration, there was an incident that just galvanized the faculty. The recommendations for promotions and tenure and reappointment were reviewed by Weissman and Heussler and then they were overturned. I participated in that meeting and was just aghast. I said this is going to tear the place apart and was told, well, you'd better go home and have a beer. They didn't take it very seriously. But it really did. They split the faculty and the administration and became



disaffected. There was virtually no one in the administration that supported the two of them. So after a while Weissman decided that he would leave and Heussler was here alone. Then after six months when the students got into the battle Heussler resigned. It was a very painful experience. And there were some people who supported Heussler because they were worried that this would give such a boost to the Union and to the people in the faculty senate who were confronted and who were very destructive in their comments about the college. It would give such a boost to them that they could not get out of the wind. (?) I guess it was fortunate that so many issues followed hard upon that which changed the alliances that people almost forgot who was on which sides in the Heussler affair. I know when disruptions occurred first from racial tensions and later when the Vietnam War came to the campus the alliances were just completely shifted. So the people who were on one side of the Moser affair and on one side of the Heussler affair would be on another side of the Vietnam War, the racial issue and still another side of the issue of governance and it just didn't happen that there were two parties that remained together on every issue.

**Anderson:** It's interesting that you say that because the other day, and especially not to have parties, and one could take from that the sense that there are parties and I think that there is the sense that there are faculty parties, and maybe another party.

**Curry:** I think that that's changing. I felt for a long time and I give Phil Ollio credit for changing that, that there were really harsh feelings between the School of Education and the School of Arts and Sciences but Phil Ollio is so skilled in human relations he almost never makes the situation worse. He almost always can get people to work together. It seems to me that he's oriented towards what is best for the institution is best for the students. There was a long period in which it seemed...to me looking at it from the outside real defensiveness in the School—of - Education and the faculty there were seeing the faculty Senate as a way of protecting themselves and that it seems to me has changed to a great extent. It seems to me now that the parties are breaking down and it's possible to achieve something.

**Anderson:** I hope so. Let's turn to a subject more directly connected to what we have done for the past decade or more and that is the School of Arts and Sciences. Maybe you can tell us a little bit more about how the School of Arts and Sciences came into existence.

**Curry:** We grew out of the plan that Clayt Brower came up with. A number of colleges had accepted a plan that Ralph Dungan had presented to them. Dungan did not want any schools of education. We wanted if it was at all possible to break up the school of education and we would have been happy if there was an alternate route and nothing else. So what he wanted was a school of professional studies and a school of arts and sciences. He wanted schools other than teaching to dominate in the school of professional studies. This did not seem to make sense to us because you want a leader of each profession who knows that profession thoroughly so that it made sense to us to have a school of education and divisions for the other professions with a director of those divisions reporting directly to the Vice President who had a good deal of authority and then after a time it was decided that these divisions could legitimately be called schools. I was apprehensive about that because the school of arts and sciences was bound to be

representative of any good that came out of that since it has 55 per cent of the faculty, since it has 60 per cent of the student registration it seemed to me that it ought to have more than 1/5 of the votes, but it seldom had more than 1/3 in almost any organizational structure that came up. At any rate that's how the structure came about in 1971. Actually Heussler had started the structure that Dungan wanted and there was a search going on for a Dean of Arts and Sciences when Heussler was still here. I could not put my name in the ring because Heussler had bounced me out of the administration. By the time I had found out he had sent me back to the faculty. It was pretty obvious that I hadn't a chance of being named Dean of Arts and Sciences with a President that I would try to get rid of. So I didn't put my name in the hopper for that. Joe Vena was serving as Acting Dean of Arts and Sciences when Heussler left and I very quickly put my nomination in and the Committee decided to appoint me. The Affirmative Action guidelines weren't quite as strict as they are now, but that came about in 1971 and I used the department chairs as my advisers pretty much. It seemed to me that a lean structure in which the department chairs could come directly to me to discuss things both on a one to one basis and as a group that that would be the best kind of advisory structure that we could come up with. So what I tried to do was tell them everything. I was permitted to tell them that what was going on campus to get their advice on it so that I could convey their views when this was being discussed. And the decisions that related only to the School of Arts and Sciences would be made as much as possible in that group. It didn't seem to me possible to make budgetary decisions that way because first of all the chairs didn't really want to decide other people's budgets and it's very difficult to play both hats, play both roles, being a department chair, fighting for your budget and deciding other people's budgets, so I never had a budgetary committee but I had to inform them of the wishes that they were dealing with and keep them informed of the decisions that I had made.

**Anderson:** One of the things that Clayt Brower said that grew out of that Heussler affair that really stuck with me; I thought it was so wise, he said "The thing that I've learned out of this is that you've got to force the decisions out into the open." You've got to know who makes the decision.

**Curry:** I think the --while I was Dean of Arts and Sciences, I tried as much as possible to let the chairs know who was making the decisions. And if I was making the decision they knew they could come in and tell me I was making a mistake. If I was not making the decision I tried to tell them who were making the decision and I couldn't really change it. One of the things that happened over those years that I felt very good about --I don't know how much I influenced that - I went to in 1979 the Institute for Educational Management at Harvard and I came back and discussed something with Tony Di Giorgio and the then Vice President Gordon Goewey that seemed to me to indicate the direction we could move. There was a case study that we were looking at at the Institute for Educational Management in which a manager would get involved in the same way that Hill and Martin did. Knowing everyone's name, having breakfast with people, and the institution as a result was no stronger than he was, and the people kept bouncing the . decisions up to him. They felt kind of helpless to make their own decisions. Well, he was

replaced by a person who had a public administration background, this was for Mass. (1) who handles the airport and didn't want to have that kind of responsibility, but Massport today is a much stronger institution as a result. Under Gordon and to a much further extent under Tony that model was introduced here. I don't know whether I had any influence on that but I felt good about it. Then in the last five years that I was a Dean I had far less influence on the policy of the College but far more control over the School of Arts and Sciences and I think that the department chairs felt that they had more control over their programs so that it seems to me built a strong institution when a person really feels that he can address issues in an entrepreneurial sense and get something done. I think that's the reason this college is a much stronger institution than it was 10 years ago.

**Anderson:** I'm not sure what our time situation is now but I'm going to ask you a few questions that are related to what you just said, if you only name one thing that you are most proud of, what would that be?

**Curry:** The thing that I'm most proud of is not something that I've done but something that the group has done together. There's one department after another that is really a strong living atmosphere living in the sense of: the faculty, discovering things, publishing, defending them in front of their colleagues, having discussions with colleagues of renown across the world; also, learning in the sense of students taking responsibility for their own education; A feeling that there was a kind of atmosphere in which they did feel comfortable in asking embarrassing questions, putting a professor on the spot. A second thing that I am proud of is the beginning of the Honors Program has done a fine job in putting it on. Bill Demerritt has done a fine job of carrying on. I just got it started, ran it for a couple of years and then realized that you can't really do a good job running it out of the Dean's office. Bill went on and created the sound (?) program within it and the social atmosphere that exists there, and I'm really proud of that. The third thing that would come close to that is the beginning of the co-op program. I think that's part of the atmosphere of power in the classroom, the power of students. They really come back very different kinds of people having had that co-op experience and it's not quite the same as having a job because you're approaching it in a thoughtful fashion, you're discussing it with your professor, you're seeing it as it relates to your program. You have to find a way in which you can analyze it and defend it. It's quite different from just talking about it. I think there's a kind of atmosphere that I'm proud of that developed in the Arts and Sciences Department. One after another, a faculty program that I'm very, very proud of now.

**Anderson:** Is there anything else that you would put up there high that you've done yourself? I can say myself that while you were Dean of Arts and Sciences you were one with the broad sense of direction and detail.

**Curry:** I didn't feel that I controlled them. I wanted the chairs to really feel that the controls were in their own hands. There were several things that I did like writing grants, the Challenge Grant and the Humanities Grant --those were really a collaborative effort, the way in which the challenge grant was written was asking my advisers, the department chairs what was important and get their ideas into it, so even though I wrote it, it was not all in my head. It was the ideas

that had come from them. Remember that --it was exciting -participating in 4 meetings, the chairs of the Arts and Sciences and the proposals that came out of the School of Arts and Sciences was the core of the proposal that got funded for two million dollars. I hope that it is going to vitalize the college for years to come.

**Anderson:** Well, I don't think there is any question about it. I think we're forgetting the time. I wonder if I have time for one more question, maybe for two more questions. If there was anything you could do over again, what might it have been?

**Curry:** Well, I don't think we did a good job of helping the chairs get started. Frequently they would say "I'm just lost here. I don't know how to do all these things. I'd say, ask your secretary. We didn't do a good job for helping the chair get over the rough spots. I think that I would have tried to do a better job of that, if I had it to do over, to some extent tossing them in the water and letting them swim. Made for people like John Karras who'd say he didn't really need a Dean. That was rather pleasant to see and we might not have had that if they felt that there was centralization for training. I would like to have seen the development of the Center for Improvement of Instruction and that was something we kicked around for about ten years before it got started.

**Anderson:** We're just about out of time. I would have liked to ask you some questions about where we've gone or where the future will be but maybe we can come back and do another tape on future history. I would like to thank you for coming and sharing some of your experiences with us. Thank you Wade.

**Curry:** Thank you, Bob.