

**Transcription of Oral History Interview with  
H. FRANK WAY**

July 10, 1998

The following oral history interview is being conducted on Friday, July 10, 1998, with Professor Emeritus H. Frank Way of Political Science.

My name is Jan Erickson. I work in Chancellor Raymond L. Orbach's office. He is the eighth chief administrative office of the Riverside campus.

Erickson: Professor Way, would you start, please, by telling us where you were born and a little about your family?

Way: I was born in Chillicothe, Missouri. My mother was a homemaker and my father was a baker. I had two sisters and two brothers. I lived most of the time in Chillicothe, but after the death of my mother when I was seven, I went to live for a few years in New York City with an aunt and then returned and lived with a grandmother in Missouri.

I went to what was then-known as Northeast Missouri State and now known as Truman State University, then went down to the University of Missouri and taught there two years. No, went to Oklahoma A&M, which was then A&M and is now Oklahoma State University. Then I went up to Columbia, Missouri and taught there two years and was going to get a Ph.D. there but had the good fortune to get to know the dean of the college, and he said don't get a Ph.D. here. So he helped me get into Cornell. And I went to Cornell.

Erickson: Did he think that would take you farther, the degree from Cornell?

Way: Yes. He did not think their Ph.D. program was a strong program, which I am sure he was correct. Then I was at Cornell until 1957 and started looking for a job and got the one here in Riverside.

Erickson: Tell me how that came about. Did you find an advertisement of a job opening?

Way: No. Things weren't advertised in those days. It was pretty much word of mouth. How this happened was, there were two positions in this area that were open that I knew about, one here at UCR and the other at Pomona College, then-known as Pomona Men's College.

John Veig, who was then-chair at Pomona, was teaching that summer at Cornell, and he told me about both positions. I applied for both and got the Riverside position. I think some place you say "What did you find attractive about that?" (Dr. Way was referring to a set of possible questions submitted to him prior to the interview.)

Erickson: Yes.

Way: What I found attractive about that was that it wasn't the University of Nebraska, which was my only other offer.

(laughter)

Way: And I didn't want to go back to the Midwest. I knew the University of California and thought perhaps it would be a good move, but I didn't know anything about this small campus. But a couple of people at Cornell did, because there had been a young man in the early days of political science here who had come from here, Dick Longacre. So I came out.

Erickson: In 1957.

Way: In 1957.

Erickson: In the meantime, had you married?

Way: No, I was engaged by then. I did not marry until the spring of 1958, so I was out here by myself for a year.

Erickson: Well, how did you find the city of Riverside? How did it appear?

Way: Small town. Um. I didn't have a car. I had a bicycle that first year.

Erickson: So you lived nearby?

Way: I lived near the campus, yes. The town was fine. I didn't find it ... there was smog, but I was attracted by all the orange groves and the fragrance of orange blossoms in the winter. There were enough movie houses and a few things to do on campus, so it was a good year.

I was finishing up my dissertation until December in any event, so I didn't have a lot of time to do anything.

Erickson: Well, how did that work, then? Did you go back to Cornell then when you actually ...

Way: I had to go back and defend the dissertation in June of 1958, yes.

Erickson: And then everything was official.

Way: Then everything was official, yes.

Erickson: Who was the person you talked with at UCR to get ...

Way: Arthur Turner. He was Chair of the Division of Social Sciences. I was never interviewed other than on the telephone.

Erickson: Oh, that's interesting.

Way: So it was truly an “old boys network.” John Veig from Pomona called Arthur, Arthur called my senior mentor Robert Cushman, who by then was in Washington, DC, and that’s how it came about.

Erickson: He didn’t ask you to submit papers or ...

Way: Nothing. Not a thing.

Erickson: It really is different now.

Way: Quite different, yes.

Erickson: Well, what were you asked to do when you came? You were an assistant?

Way: No, I wasn’t even that. I was what they call Instructor. We don’t have that title any longer, I don’t believe. And I wasn’t even a full instructor. I was an acting instructor until I got the degree, and then the acting title was removed.

What did I have to do? Well, teach six courses the first year.

Erickson: Is that right?

Way: Yes. We were on a semester system, and I taught The Presidency, two semesters of Constitutional Law, Introduction to Political Science, Public Administration and Comparative Government. They wouldn’t ask anyone to do that today. That doesn’t make a lot of sense. Many of those are quite different fields. Small classes, though.

Erickson: What size?

Way: Maybe a minimum of twelve to up to twenty five at the most, thirty.

Erickson: And where were those classes?

Way: All in Watkins Hall.

Erickson: Is that where your office was, too?

Way: Yes.

Erickson: In '57, were you requiring undergraduate students to do a paper as they had done in the very first years?

Way: You mean for graduation?

Erickson: Yes, for graduation.

Way: Yes. They had to do an undergraduate thesis. And I was one of those who led the movement to get rid of it.

Erickson: Oh, you did. Tell me about that.

Way: I think I only directed a couple, maybe three. And I found the students so ill prepared to do that extensive a research paper that I thought it was a waste of their time and of my time.

Erickson: Typically, how many pages were they required to do?

Way: Oh, 75 to 90 pages. So it was like a master's thesis. We can talk about it now or we can talk about it later. I think it was one of the problems of this campus as it emerged those first three years with too many assistant professors fresh out of graduate school who were so, I think, sometimes unsure of themselves. Now this doesn't speak of all the faculty by any means, but for a lot, that they expected students to perform almost at a graduate level.

We had a problem of retention, and I don't think we wanted to face up to it. We certainly wanted to give them a good liberal arts education and there may be some departments where that senior thesis requirement worked well. I don't think it did in our area of political science.

Erickson: Well, how did you go about the process of eliminating that requirement?

Way: Made moves within the division. I can't really recall the politics of it.

Erickson: Well, I guess what I am getting at, Frank, is did you have to go through the Academic Senate?

Way: Well of course, in the first couple of years, we didn't have an Academic Senate. We were an adjunct, I believe, of the UCLA Senate.

Erickson: Oh, is that right? I never heard that before.

Way: Yes. I am not sure on this. It's a little fuzzy, but no we didn't have a senate. We just had a college faculty and they set the graduation requirements. So it depends on when this actually occurred and I am not sure when. It would either have gone first to the college and then to the senate or just maybe to the college.

I mean, we were autonomous of UCLA, but I can't remember what the relationship was. We had maybe representatives on the UCLA Academic Senate. You'll have to ask somebody else if it's ever important to know. I don't remember.

Erickson: Well, just in the history of things, it is important.

Way: So you know, we had good students, but I think one of the things people sometimes forget is that, of course, we had extraordinarily good students because we lost a lot of able students who perhaps were not extraordinary, but they were certainly college material and should have been retained. I don't blame necessarily the senior thesis requirement.

I think there were other things going on such as very, very rigorous grading and high expectations, and I think that comes with a young faculty. I mean, they are just out of graduate seminars themselves where people have pushed them.

Way: They come here and are told that we are going to be the Swarthmore of the West, and no one ever suggested to them that perhaps their expectations were more appropriate for graduate students than undergraduate students. Not a lot of people shared my view, but certainly some of them shared it because they went along with it, you know, in getting rid of some of these requirements.

Erickson: Um hmm. You talked a little bit about retention a minute ago. In my research of your information, I read that you conducted a survey in 1966. Would you want to talk about that?

Way: Sure. By that time Ivan Hinderaker was Chancellor, and I am not sure what my position was. I was probably Associate Dean of the College of Letters and Science. At some point, Ivan must have mentioned to me that he thought retention was a problem on this campus. And I said there was only one way to find out. We didn't have a computer program then, of course, it had to be done by hand.

And I said what we need to do then is just find out how many students we are retaining from matriculation to graduation and of those students who leave, can we find out what the conditions are. Well, that's very difficult to do, but one thing you can certainly find out is were they dismissed for academic reasons, or was there an immediate time frame in which they had been under suspension, returned or on academic probation? So I looked at all those conditions.

I haven't seen that report for quite a while but I think we concluded at that point that we were losing a lot of good students. Ivan used that report when he addressed the issue of enrollment and retention to the Academic Senate at a general meeting of the senate.

By the way, I don't think that our failure to retain students or to grow was a direct causal relationship to the low enrollment always. I think there were some other factors, such as Riverside had a reputation as kind of an uninteresting town with not a lot of amenities for students. It didn't have a beach. It

Way: didn't have a big urban life. And we had failed to provide very much for the students in the way of their own social life on campus. We weren't doing very much for them. We didn't even have proper dorms at first, places for them to live.

Erickson: Where were they living, Frank?

Way: Oh, they were living in student housing. They were living in homes. A lot of them were commuter students. And they were living in Canyon Crest Housing project, which we still have, which is housing that Provost Watkins got from Camp Hahn. It was old Army barracks.

Erickson: And that's now married student housing?

Way: And has been for over twenty years.

Erickson: In that survey, did you ever interview the students themselves or did you find everything from the records in the Registrar's office.

Way: No, we just used records. A better survey probably would have been to have gone back, but it would have been very expensive and time consuming. I was doing that while I was trying to be an associate dean and to teach and to keep up with my scholarship. So I didn't have the time. We didn't have a lot of resources.

Erickson: Well, right, and it wasn't as sophisticated as it would be today.

Way: It would have been pretty difficult.

Erickson: Um. Did you play a role in recruiting students?

Way: No, that had stopped by the time I got here in '57. There may have been some faculty that occasionally still went out, but it's my recollection that was a one or two year drive when our enrollment simply didn't go up very much. When I got here, I think the enrollment was about 800. We remained in sort of "enrollment crisis" from that point on.



Erickson: Really?

Way: Yes.

Erickson: Well, the crisis is because the dollars are tied to the student enrollment? Is that a fair assessment?

Way: Yes. Yes. I think what Provost Watkins and Bob Nisbet failed to make clear to the faculty is that we weren't entitled and weren't likely to get special funding as a small liberal arts college. In other words, a lot of faculty were recruited with the notion that this was to be a unique experiment in the broader multicampus system of the university, that this was indeed going to be a small liberal arts college.

I have never seen anything in writing from The Regents or the President's office that made such a commitment, and I don't think it exists. Perhaps it does, but I am not aware of it. And we certainly discussed it a lot in the early days of the campus.

In any event, even if there were such a commitment to special funding for this campus, the campus, I think, was in some sense poorly administered and it didn't have a sufficient infrastructure. If you are going to be a small public liberal arts campus and you don't have a commitment from the Legislature, the Governor, The Regents for an unusual funding pattern, then you are going to have to go for private funding if for no other reason than fairness to the students. You need to bring to the students some kind of cultural life that can be supported independent of ASUCR funds. And we didn't do that. Indeed, until Jim Erickson came, we didn't have much of an operation.

Erickson: Well, the concept of that ... using private dollars for a public institution was probably unheard of at that time.

Way: Oh, I don't think so ...

Erickson: Is that not correct?

Way: I don't think so, but whether unheard of or not, the whole concept then of a small liberal arts college within a large mega university was unheard of.

Erickson: True.

Way: And I don't think it was thought through. What are the implications for this for the student or the faculty for that matter? If in the long run your expectations of the faculty are going to be the same on this campus as at UCLA or Berkeley or San Diego, then you cannot expect the faculty to do the things they were doing then that they should not have done, such as doing their own book ordering for the library.

Most of us each year would process individual book requests probably in the neighborhood of 300 or 400 books at a minimum. Or in my case, there was nothing in the legal area except a set of U.S. Supreme Court reports. I started going into Los Angeles to the Los Angeles County Law Library, to Boalt Hall to get gifts from them, which we did and still have on this campus now. I made sure I got myself on the Senate Library Committee when that was formed. I made sure that we got appropriate funding for the legal collection. But those are things that I don't think an assistant professor should be doing.

Erickson: Well, do you think that a delay in the opening of the campus would have been more appropriate then to take care of some of these details?

Way: I am not sure that a delay was the thing. I think we just needed to think through this a bit more. Can we, in fact, pull this off? Do we have enough support in the Legislature and within The Regents? And I don't think we had that. We had our own Regent at that time, Phil Boyd. And Phil was a very, I am sure, influential Regent, but he still was one voice.

We had such an enrollment crisis, I think, that the leadership on campus was addressing, or trying to address the enrollment crisis more than anything else. Frankly, by the early or mid '60s, when things in Vietnam became disruptive on campuses,

Way: I think just the fact that this campus was quiet meant that we are not going to rock the boat by pushing the university too much. And I think that was the position of some of the early chancellors. Just let us solve this enrollment crisis and not take too many resources away from us, and we remained quiet.

Ivan was very good to the students, being fair to them; he built the speaker's mound there, tried to channel dissent. I think I am drifting a little here. I think we were unrealistic about the funding for this campus.

Erickson: Do you think that if Provost Watkins had stayed for a longer period that maybe some of these things would have been worked out? That is not fair because you weren't here.

Way: I shared an office with Gordon Watkins when I first came.

Erickson: So he was still here in 1957?

Way: He had just had a brief illness and came back to campus.

Erickson: He was not Provost?

Way: He was not Provost. No, Herman Spieth was Provost. No, I don't think so. I think it would have been more of the same. Yes, I just don't think Gordon had ... he had a vision, but I don't think he understood that he needed to get some things down in writing perhaps and get a commitment from University Hall about the funding for this campus. And in looking back, there was no way that was going to happen. They were not going to give that kind of commitment.

Erickson: Then why do you suppose they allowed this four-year liberal arts college to be formed, if they weren't willing to support it?

Way: Well, I think they were willing to support it, but I think that they expected at some future point it would come within the budgeting standards of the other campuses, namely Berkeley and Los Angeles which had been established and Davis. Santa

Way: Barbara was just barely getting started. Of course, the other campuses weren't there at all, hadn't been formed.

No, I think they wanted to start a new campus, but I think if you went back to The Regents at that time and interviewed them, they would not have memory of saying, "Yes, we anticipate that this will be a small liberal arts campus in perpetuity." No, I think they anticipated at some point it would look very much like the rest of the University campuses. And certainly internal to this campus, that's what many people here thought. The people who bought, I think, into the vision of a small liberal arts campus were large number of people in humanities, and some in the social sciences, perhaps a majority even, and a few in the sciences.

The scientists, by and large, were not comfortable with that idea. They wanted graduate students. They didn't think that they could meet the demands of scientific output without running a full scale graduate program, in order to get the grants for outside, extramural funding, to have the type of person-power necessary to do major research projects.

I think if you looked around the country then, and perhaps even to this day, small liberal arts campuses often have very strong people in the humanities and social sciences, where scholarship isn't dependent on the presence of a graduate program. Whereas, I suspect if you look at Amherst, Dartmouth and Swarthmore, or Reed, or Pomona, that it's not quite the same in the sciences. They need Ph.D. programs, or at least that's what the first divisional chair in the physical sciences said.

Erickson: Who was that?

Way: Oh, my memory, there's a hall named after him, the chemistry building. He was chemist. We'll think of it here in a moment.

Erickson: We will. Well, give me your assessment of students over the years, from the time you came until.. I know you're teaching now, aren't you?

Way: No, I'm not teaching.

Erickson: I'm sorry, I thought you were teaching. Well, then to the time you retired, in 1991 was it?

Way: Seven years ago, in 1991, yes. Well, as I indicated to you a few moments ago we had extraordinary, good students. That's because we got rid of some less than extraordinary, but certainly very capable students. So in the early years, naturally the fact that it was a small campus devoted to undergraduate education, the faculty spent long hours in counseling students and preparing them for graduate and professional schools. So of all the campuses of the university, in those first few years, we had a much, much higher proportion of students who went on to graduate and professional schools than the other campuses.

But the other side of that coin was the students that we lost who should have been retained. I am not saying that we never legitimately dismissed a student. Obviously we did. But I am always saddened by the idea that youngsters left here that we should have retained. So there were good students and small classes. I have stronger memories today of those first few classes than I do of subsequent classes.

Erickson: Were they serious for the most part, would you say?

Way: Yes, I think so. (pause) There really wasn't very much else to do around here. On the non serious side, we weren't a big sports campus, we didn't have big sports facilities and things like that. No, they were pretty serious students. Working class, children of working class families from San Bernardino and Riverside, this general area. Many of them first generation college students.

We sent a lot on to graduate school. I know in my own area in political science we certainly did. Turned out a lot of young people who went on to law school. We probably still do that. What we don't do probably as much anymore is send them on to graduate school.

Erickson: Would you talk about the students in the unrest period?

Way: You mean during Vietnam and Cambodia?

Erickson: Yes. Yes.

Way: Well, I don't have any great memory of a lot of student unrest. The best person to talk to about that and what it was like would probably be Francis Carney, since I think he was very helpful in working with Ivan trying to .... well, Hank and a lot of other faculty members probably. I just wasn't directly involved. I stood watch from a distance. I was in campus administration by that point.

Erickson: As the vice chancellor?

Way: No, I was either Divisional Dean of the Social Sciences or Associate Dean of the College, probably Divisional Dean of the Social Sciences. As I said, I thought Chancellor Hinderaker did a good job in making sure that students had a forum for expressing their outrage about American policy in Vietnam and Cambodia.

Let me give you what I would now consider amusing but I didn't consider amusing at the time. The Free Speech Movement did a lot to change the way faculty and the administration looked at the rights of students. That, of course, had nothing immediately to do with this campus, but everything in the world to do with Berkeley. It filtered, indeed it filtered to a lot of campuses throughout the nation. Our first Chancellor, Herman Spieth, a good man, and I liked Herman a great deal. Herman was naïve, I think, in politics. Herman tended to see radicalism where it wasn't, especially did he perceive (and I think falsely) of a danger of communism.

I think he got into some dispute with a very distinguished professor in our History Department on the House Committee on Un American Activities, as I recall. I was then active as a faculty member ... well, not active but knew a lot of people at

Way: the Newman Club. The Newman Club approached me and asked if I would give a talk on the House Committee on Un American Activities, which I said I would do.

Somehow or other they decided to hold it up at what was then the Faculty Club which was an old Army barracks where the University Club is now. When I arrived that evening to give that talk, the place was packed. There was standing room only and people were standing outside and opening the windows.

There was a deputy sheriff there who was going to record what I was going to say. Didn't ask my permission! Or anyone's permission. He was just going to record it. There was also a representative from Federal Home Savings & Loan, who had a political branch, and they were going to record what I had to say.

Erickson: Interesting.

Way: I went ahead. I had a prepared talk, and so I gave it. The years go by, and I can't remember what year that was. The Free Speech Movement led eventually to a change in the Regental policy, and we were allowed to have a wider range of speakers on campus. We even brought the chair of the California Communist Party on campus. That would have been unheard of in the prior period I was just talking about.

So things changed for the better there, not because we did it so much on this campus. But I think The Regents and President Clark Kerr saw the necessity for recognizing that these are young adults, not children, and not to be so paternalistic with students. I am not sure how I got to this point.

Times have changed with students a lot. I don't think the quality of ... as I looked back ... people used to say to me as I grew older and neared retirement, "Well, students are not as good today." I never really thought that to be the case.

Erickson: Oh, good.

Way: I still had good students. I still found that they needed a lot of help in learning to write and to structure arguments. And I continued to teach pretty much the same way I did at the outset. Some statistics would suggest that as we grew, we had a less qualified student, because, I think, the SAT scores went down. In fact, I know they did. But that doesn't mean that there are not large numbers of good students out there who were eager for an education and who were willing to work. I always found that I had those students. So I never felt that we had lost it.

Erickson: That's great. Well, I may not have the date correct, but I believe that in 1988 you were awarded the Distinguished Teaching Award. Is that correct?

Way: Yes. Sometime. I don't know when, but sometime in the '80s.

Erickson: But obviously from our conversation and from your award, you are, in fact, dedicated to undergraduate teaching. Would you just basically give your philosophy?

Way: Well, I don't know what the basis of that award was. Hank Carney, from my department, was probably instrumental in making sure I got it. He had already received the award. As I recall, he probably was motivated because of what I did. I was pre-legal advisor and had been from the outset until I retired. I taught a rigorous course two, three course sequence in Constitutional Law. Each quarter, students did a certain number of what we call "briefs." They learned how to frame a legal question, how to ask, which is probably the single most difficult thing. But once you know how to ask a legal question, it seems so simple.

So the first assignment, which is the most intimidating assignment was just a one sentence. You must turn in next week the legal question in response to this set of hypothetical facts, which would be based then on lectures from the preceding week. And then the next week ... we had seven of these in the course over ten weeks ... they went a bit further until finally, the final product was to turn in a full three page single spaced typewritten brief. I did that for thirty-some years.



Erickson: That's wonderful.

Way: By the end I was tired of doing it. I really was. I had grown weary, not of students, but of grading papers. And I couldn't imagine teaching without doing a lot of paperwork with students. I think they need the writing exercise. Indeed, if I had had my way as we were growing, I would have insisted that each department designate certain courses as writing courses and require a certain number of those for graduating seniors.

Ok?

Erickson: Yes. If you don't mind, I'd like to go back to the atmosphere in the early days when ... I realize you came in '57 and the campus had already been established, but in '57 what was the atmosphere or the tone between the faculty of the Citrus Experiment Station and the liberal arts college?

Way: Well, of course, there was no faculty as such up there. They didn't have academic titles.

Erickson: Oh, Right. Thank you.

Way: That didn't happen until we organized the senate. Well, so far as I can recall, it was amicable. I made a lot of good friends up there. They already had pretty much set up a faculty club. It wasn't a place to eat, but they had social events. I think in the first couple of years, I participated in some of them—bridge, and Christmas parties, something like that.

What I think you may be hinting at a little bit was the administration of the Citrus Experiment Station and the college administration. I wasn't really aware of those things until probably the early '60s. Certainly, one of my best friends from the Citrus Experiment Station who died quite young, Skip Sher—he said that he believed we should not have established this college here. He thought that there was a fear among people at the station that funding this college would detract

Way: from funding the Experiment Station. I don't think that ever really happened.

Erickson: That is what I was getting at.

Way: Yes. I don't think it ever really happened. As you are undoubtedly aware, the Director of the Experiment Station did not report to the Provost.

Erickson: Well, I am glad you brought that up, because I have heard conflicting reports. In some of my interviews ... well not some, but at least one. I was told that Provost Watkins was responsible for both the Citrus Experiment Station and the liberal arts college. But in other interviews, I heard exactly what you are saying, so ...

Way: It wasn't until Ivan became Chancellor. I am fairly sure of this, but I could be mistaken. But I think I am sure of this. When we were declared a general campus, surely that must have been the point where it changed.

Erickson: That would have been 1960 probably.

Way: Well, that was before Ivan came. But until that point, the Director of the Citrus Experiment Station reported to the Vice President for Agriculture. I believe at that point it was Harry Wellman. Anyway, I certainly knew of instances where the Director of the Experiment Station did end runs around the Chancellor.

Erickson: Really?

Way: But that's probably not an unusual thing given the fact that he had had a lot of independence. He had a good station with a world-wide reputation, and it probably was difficult for him to know that he would no longer have access.

And that, by the way, wasn't just the director who had that idea. There were lots of faculty members up there who entertained

Way: the notion that they had a good relationship with Wellman's office and could go directly to Wellman about problems.

Now, I never had heard the Chancellor complain about Harry Wellman. You know, saying that Wellman should stop this or something, but I know ... As a matter of fact, I won't say specifically who, but some of the chancellors did suggest that this was a problem.

Erickson: Ok. I see. Well, let's talk about the original structure of your division. Who was the chair?

Way: Arthur Turner.

Erickson: How many faculty were in that division? Approximately.

Way: Oh, probably twenty five or thirty.

Erickson: Did you hold meetings?

Way: Yes, we held regular meetings.

Erickson: Once a week or once a month?

Way: More like probably once a month, yes.

Erickson: Could you submit items for discussion for an agenda, or how did that work? Or was it all from Arthur?

Way: No, we could submit things. Course proposals, for example. Changes in major requirements. That all came informally from the faculty working in that area. I am not sure whether we had a committee structure then or not. I don't recall.

Erickson: You mean Academic Senate committees?

Way: No, within the division. And then it went to the college level and on up to the Senate, once we had a senate on campus. (pause) I can't remember when we got rid of the divisions.

Way: When we established departments, then the divisions were abolished.

Erickson: I see. Would you describe a typical day in those first years.

Way: Well, the first year I spent a great deal of time getting courses organized and finishing up the last chapter of my dissertation. So I was put on the Committee on Committees the very first year. We spent a lot of time doing committee work.

End of Side A on Tape 1

Way: Well, because we should have been establishing our research programs and many of us neglected that. Instead of doing that, we were doing the teaching and the committee work. And the excitement of trying to be the pioneers building a new campus and worrying a lot about making tenure.

One of the things I think was difficult in Gordon Watkins plan for this campus, was not having enough tenured faculty to act as mentors and role models for younger faculty. I mean, we were all virtually assistant professors.

Erickson: Was anyone hired as a full professor that you know of?

Way: Yes. The heads of the divisions, except Arthur, who was hired as an associate professor.

Erickson: Incidentally, the name we were looking for earlier was Pierce.

Way: Yes. Conway Pierce. Conway Pierce was hired as a full, I think. The man who was head of physical education had a professorial title. Jack Olmsted in humanities and Herman Spieth in life sciences. There were a few others. I think in the

Way: foreign languages there was one and maybe elsewhere a few, but so very, very few that it was incredible in those first five or six years the stress up and down the hall.

Young people are always stressed about making tenure. Very few at least are casual about it. Those who may get it, have usually not been very casual.

We spent a lot of time of necessity working evenings. I worked virtually every week night in my office and usually part of Saturday and maybe a couple of hours on Sunday. So you put in very long hours.

Erickson: Did you feel competitive in any way because everybody or most everyone else was the same assistant professor as you?

Way: I didn't. No, I never felt competitive with the rest of the faculty.

Erickson: It was just your own record that you had to achieve to get a tenured position?

Way: Yes. The first year, I wanted to get the dissertation finished and I did. Defended it. And that first summer, even though I was just getting married that first summer, I would manage to get out two articles mined out of my dissertation. No one here told me that I was to be doing that, although they should have. My senior professor at Cornell told me in straight terms that's exactly what you must do. "You must mine that dissertation and get as many pieces out of it as possible. It's good research, and it will be publishable." I don't remember how many pieces. I think I got four out of it eventually.

Erickson: What was your dissertation title?

Way: It was ... (laughter) I don't remember.

Erickson: What was the subject?

Way: On the law of arrest, search and seizure. So I did separate pieces on various aspects of the law—arrest, search and seizure.

Erickson: Where were they published, the articles?

Way: Washington University in St. Louis published one of the pieces, The Journal of Criminal Law published one of the pieces, University of Tennessee Law School published one of the pieces and I can't recall where the fourth one was published. (pause) I don't look back on any of those pieces with great pride necessarily, although one of them was ultimately cited in a Supreme Court opinion.

Erickson: Oh, really?

Way: Yes. The one where it's published I am not sure. Increasing Scope of Search Incidental to Arrest. I remember that title, but I can't remember who cited it, whose opinion.

Erickson: Did they notify you that they were using it?

Way: No, they never notify you.

Erickson: I see. Well, back to the tenure track. Would you explain that process, please?

Way: Well, we have a lock-step system pretty much today as we had then. You moved in progression. Things that have been added since then...I think it is the fifth or sixth year review, we didn't have that, a preliminary assessment on whether you're likely to make it to tenure. The campus sent for outside referees to look at your work.

Erickson: At what year was that in this process?

Way: Probably in the seventh year, maybe sixth, I can't recall. And some attempt to measure the quality of your teaching. We had an instrument at least in our college at looking at teaching, giving the students a chance to review you. Those were never turned over to any one.. The professor just kept them. I took

Way: them quite seriously, because I think like a lot of assistant professors, I wasn't a very good teacher in the first few years. And I needed all the help I could get from students to tell me where I was wrong and to get a balance of expectations.

I am most proud in teaching of what I did in the con law courses. But I didn't perfect those courses until ... I thought I had them down, probably for five or six years. You always had to kept revising them, every lecture was a new lecture.

I taught large numbers of students in a course called the American Presidency, but in the end I was never very happy with that course. It isn't a research area within my discipline, although it is a common course that at least at that time was taught in the department of politics and political science. So you didn't have a lot that you could depend on in research materials which were written about the American Presidency. It tended to be historical, not political science, so it tended to tell stories more than anything else. In fact, I don't think they teach that course here anymore, since I retired. I think it's off the books now. And I certainly didn't want to teach public administration

Erickson: Because?

Way: I thought it was very boring. They didn't have anyone to teach it, and I had quite a bit of course experience to prepare me to teach in that area, but I knew I didn't want to teach there. I enjoyed finally teaching the lower division American politics class. I taught that for ... oh, 20 years. I enjoyed that too.

Erickson: How did you get into administrative work, and what was the first position that you assumed?

Way: Well, I had been away on sabbatical in England and had been finishing up a major research project.

Erickson: What was that Frank?

Way: That was a study on prayer and bible readings in public schools. It was what we call an impact study. Well before the days of PC's, I had to go out and draw a national random sample of elementary school teachers and that was very, very difficult to do.

Erickson: Why did you choose England for that study?

Way: I compared religious instruction the English system, in their quote, unquote public school system., the government school system. That's why I was over there, but before that, I had started this other study and finished it actually. Then I came back and was finishing up my work on that and finding a place to publish it. And I guess Ivan must have said something. I really didn't know very much about this, if anything. I simply got a call from Carlo Golino. I hardly even knew the man.

Erickson: And what was his position?

Way: He was the new Dean of the College of Letters and Science, and I went in and talked to him one afternoon, and he said, "How would you like to be my Associate Dean?" And I said, "Well let me think about it." Because I had already been offered a new administrative position and had turned it down.

Erickson: What was that one?

Way: I was offered by Bob Nisbet to be Chair of the Department of Political Science, and I wasn't even associate professor. We were walking across campus when he made that offer to me.

Erickson: When would that have been?

Way: Well, it would have been the time when they were setting up the departments.

Erickson: Sixtyish?

Way: Somewhere, yes. And I said, "Would you do it, if you were in my position, Bob?" And he said, "No." And I said, "Well,



Way: there's your answer." I was much too young to do that. Anyway, that's what I did. I worked with Carlo for a number of years, enjoyed working with Carlo.

Erickson: Oh, good. What kind of things did you work on?

Way: As Associate Dean for the first couple of years, I did all of the student work and worked with the executive committee on student petitions, and students on academic probation, and set up what I think on this campus was the first contract system with students on academic probation. If they went on probation more than once, I put them on a contract, and they had to fulfill that contract, not drop classes, not drop below a certain grade level, etc. And that's customarily done, I think, now.

Erickson: Oh, is it?

Way: Yes. And then under the leadership of Hinderaker, we abolished the college in favor of ... Well, first we went to divisions within the college. Again, that was at Hinderaker's insistence, I think. Both Ivan and Carlo were familiar with that structure from UCLA. They had divisions, well they had divisions at that time at Berkeley, too. They still do as far as I know.

So I became Divisional Dean of the Social Sciences, and somebody else took over student affairs for me, and then I started doing budget work and hiring and budget allocation. I always did for Carlo a lot of staff work, doing campus responses or college responses to things from the President's Office. So I did a lot of that, and did a lot of special assignments that Ivan would have me do, even though I was over in the social sciences.

Then when they abolished the college and went to several different colleges, I went with Carlo, not immediately, but within one semester. I came over here and was his assistant. The title was Student Academic Services. The Librarian directly reported to me, the Registrar and the Admissions Office. I also handled basic liaison with the budget office for

Way: Carlo, worked with John Hineman, although that was not in the job description, for Carlo was not a budget person.

Erickson: And you were.

Way: Well, I knew how the budget system worked. I was comfortable working with numbers and could make numbers work for me and work for Carlo. Did lots of special assignments for Carlo.

Ivan's basic charge to me as Assistant Vice Chancellor, I remember, was to make the Registrar's office user friendly. I got the cooperation of Mr. Gurll, who was the Registrar. I made it clear to him that we are here to serve the students and without the students, we wouldn't have jobs.

Erickson: What was his name?

Way: Frank Gurll. The first Registrar and Admissions officer. Those offices were together at that point. He (Ivan) also, of course, charged me with trying to step up the recruitment effort in the Admissions office. The Admissions office wasn't geared up for recruitment at all.

Erickson: How did you do that?

Way: Basically I looked around and saw what other institutions were doing in recruitment. We probably made it a hire notice in the Chronicle of Higher Education or something. And I discovered someone at a small liberal arts college in Los Angeles, Sacred Heart, as I recall. I just thought that what he was doing there in recruiting students was pretty impressive and we finally hired him ... which was a big mistake.

Erickson: Oh?

Way: I got warning signs when he didn't want me to contact his immediate supervisor and when he said that he wanted the Chancellor to come in and interview him in Los Angeles and not to come out here. This doesn't make a lot of sense. I am

Way: not to contact the people on campus and talk with them. So I told Ivan I thought we ought to back off on this, but by that time the recruitment was taken out of my hands and he was hired. He eventually got into some trouble. But he's the one who configured downstairs.

Erickson: I see. And we are talking about Hinderaker Hall now.

Way: Yes.

Erickson: I am saying this on the tape for someone listening later. So that was an Admissions staff person.

Way: Yes, he became our new Director of Admissions. He wasn't interested really in evaluating high school transcripts. He was hired as a recruiter. That's when Ruth Comly was still here. He worked with Ruth. We had a good staff in Admissions at that point.

One thing ... let me back up just a little bit. Someone needs to put in the record. Not only was I charged with making sure that the Registrar was user friendly for students, I was also charged with looking in and making sure that the Registrar understood that he did not set educational policy.

The Registrar, with the best of intentions I am sure—when a question would come up about whether, especially transfer courses from other institutions, would meet our requirements for graduation—he did not, as a general rule, refer those things to the Committee on Educational Policy in the senate. But rather, he had a habit of talking to Bob Nisbet or making the decision himself. And one thing I did change was that. “From now on, you will talk to me, and we will refer these to the senate. They make educational policy, we don't. That's their job, not ours.” And that improved a lot.

Back to admissions, I wasn't very happy worrying about things like admissions. It really wasn't my strength and I didn't mind the budget work so much. And I didn't like the library at all.

Erickson: Now was Mr. Coman still here at that point?

Way: No, he had gone. And I can't even remember the man's name. He's dead now, poor fellow. He was a member of the Dean's Council. He really wasn't interested in what we did in the Dean's Council, and he fell asleep most of the time. No, I didn't think the library had great problems at that time. It was moving ahead. I just didn't find it interesting work. It wasn't challenging, not to me.

Erickson: During these administrative positions that you held, were you still trying to do research or teaching, or both?

Way: I was only half time in those years.

Erickson: As administrator.

Way: So I was expected to continue to teach three courses a year and to do my research. And I always did.

Erickson: My goodness. I should ask you what a typical day was then.

Way: Well, it was hard to do the research, and I'm sure that I didn't meet the standards. But I continued to publish an occasional article, and then I did a book called Liberty and the Balance.

Erickson: Let me go back. What do you mean when you say that you didn't meet the standards?

Way: Oh, I am sure that Ivan made sure that I got my normal merit increases. I made my tenure on my own.

Erickson: At that time you were tenured?

Way: I was tenured by then. (pause) Oh, I am not sure. I think I went up for tenure the first year that I was in administration. I am not too sure.

Erickson: Well, close anyway.

Way: Close. Thereafter, often I am sure that I did not meet or have enough publications, but I always got my merits.

Erickson: Is there a number actually attached?

Way: No, but I am sure that the Budget Committee at that time probably thought that. My department always recommended me.

Erickson: Budget Committee is now ...

Way: The Personnel Committee. So I was spending too much time. Then when Ivan retired—no, that's not true. Carlo left, and he was going to get a new vice chancellor. And it was not going to be me.

Erickson: Because you would not accept it?

Way: No, that's not true at all. I probably would have. (chuckle) But he didn't think I was acceptable to the faculty. I had made too many enemies by this time doing some of the administration's dirty work, which I did. And that's the price I had to pay.

So anyway I went back to the department and very quickly became chair. It was the best thing that ever happened to me.

Erickson: Is that right.

Way: Oh, it was wonderful.

Erickson: That's great.

Way: I rediscovered scholarship and rediscovered that I could write. And teaching was always fun for me. So I was chair for ten years.

Erickson: When you accept that position, is there a timeline?

Way: Three years usually. And then you are reviewed.

Erickson: By your colleagues within your department?

Way: Well, it's a kind of informal process. They are consulted on it, but the Dean is the one who takes the initiative. And the appointment is the Chancellor's. Today, I am sure that effectively, it's the Dean's appointment, but I think the appointment letter still comes from the Chancellor. But it was the best thing that happened to me.

Erickson: Good.

Way: It introduced some sanity in my life. The most productive years of my career, research wise, came in those years.

Erickson: Now by that time, of course, we had a graduate program. Did you have graduate students working with you?

Way: Yes, I did, but not very many. I never had many graduate students. I didn't really try to recruit. Some professors want graduate students. I wouldn't reject them, but I wasn't anxious to have graduate students. The kind of research that I did didn't require that. Eventually, I met a graduate student that I married.

Erickson: Oh, really?

Way: Well, my present wife.

Erickson: Oh, is that Barbara?

Way: Barbara. But we had no relationship then. She simply worked for me. She was not my graduate student, but she worked for me as a research assistant. And I ran out of money, and the project wasn't finished. She said, "I'll work for you for nothing. I enjoy what we do." So she helped me, and I gave her co authorship of that piece.

It was published in the American Political Science Review, the most prestigious journal in my field. It was on marginal religious groups and the free exercise clause of the First

Way: Amendment. That was a big plus for her. It helped her get a job at Texas A&M.

Just as an aside, she came back at Christmas time, and I took her out on a date then. She was now an Assistant Professor and (pause) ... it went on from there.

Erickson: The rest is history.

(laughter)

Way: The rest is history.

Erickson: That's a nice story.

Way: No, I didn't actively recruit graduate students.

Erickson: Let's talk about the community a little and the groups that probably asked you to give talks or give some kind of political analysis.

Way: Well, churches. I was never really terribly comfortable with that. Churches wanted to hear about freedom of religion or separation of church and state. I did a few of those. Student groups like the Newman Club. I didn't do political analysis for anyone other than John Tunney.

Erickson: What position, was he Senator then?

Way: No, he was running for the House and I sort of helped him with some of the issues. But again, that's not an area that I am very strong in doing.

Erickson: Well, how did that come about?

Way: I wanted him to be elected and I started working for him and got to know him and met with him several times. Then I was involved when he was running the Robert Kennedy campaign out here. I headed up one of the wards, get out the vote campaign or something.

Erickson: Did you enjoy that?

Way: I enjoyed that. It changed over the years, that kind of ... you know, more money was put into the media. More money was available and the nature of campaigning changed a lot. They didn't need that kind of grass roots, or at least those kinds of offices.

The last political campaign I worked on, on a grass roots level, was for Walter Ingalls, who had been a student of mine and had been in the District Attorney's office and he ran for the Assembly. I worked for Walt that first year.

He went on to be elected to the Assembly and to head the Assembly Transportation Committee. He became a very powerful member of the Assembly for a while. He also became a bit notorious for speaking out sometimes and saying things he shouldn't have said. That's another story, too.

(laughter)

Anyway, that's all I did there.

Erickson: Let's talk about the political philosophy of the community and how it has changed over the years.

Way: Well, let's see how I should put this. The city itself was always a conservative Democrat city and the county, conservative Republican. We had some good Democrat clubs here in the city and something called the CDC, California Democratic Club, that Hank Carney was quite active in. I was less than active. I think the conservative nature of the community sometimes made them skeptical of university professors. Tended to think of them as liberal, perhaps being extreme leftists.

And there was a nasty incident that I don't recall too much about involving the public utilities commission and a member of our faculty in Economics and Phil Boyd. I am not sure he



Way: was a Regent then, he may have been in the Assembly at that point. Where I think the message to the faculty was, “Don’t be too prominent out there in community affairs. Keep your voices low.” And I certainly thought that was wrong. If, and I’m not sure this is true, but if that in fact was Phil doing that, he shouldn’t have done it.

But he was a good friend of the campus in any event, a very good friend. The community was always conservative and probably is to this day.

Erickson: Ok. As a faculty member, what are some of the systemwide committees you served on?

Way: Oh, let’s see. Scholarships, I served on that. (pause)

Erickson: Or here locally, too.

Way: Educational Policy, Library, Drama Lectures and Music. Got myself in trouble with the Chancellor on lectures and music once.

Erickson: Which Chancellor?

Way: Chancellor Spieth. He was then Provost Spieth. I was Chair of Drama, Lectures and Music and in charge of getting speakers here. I invited someone who was a member of the Democratic Party. I am not sure if it was an elected officer or what to come and speak on campus. And there was then in the California Assembly a very conservative gentlemen, I believe from Orange County or maybe Los Angeles. His name was Joseph Shell. And I guess he was Minority Floor Leader.

He called the Provost and objected to what I had done and said that I needed to balance, I had to have Democrats and Republicans. On a Sunday evening, the Provost called me and said he wanted me in his office the next morning. I was an Assistant Professor, and I was being called on the carpet—something that I don’t think would happen today. At least if it happened, it would be handled with more tact than it was then.

Way: I was told point blank, “Get out there and get a Republican speaker.” And I resented that. I thought that was wrong. I didn’t expect the speakers to come here and to use the platform of the university to give partisan talks. That’s not my purpose. But that certainly has changed. No chancellor would do something like that today.

Erickson: No, I don’t think so. The purpose of your doing that, was that both for the faculty and the students? You said earlier that you wanted to bring things here.

Way: Yes, it was for faculty and students. We didn’t have ASUCR money then. You know, we didn’t have enough support in the arts, we didn’t even have a facility to create symphony orchestras here. We didn’t have a cultural life for the students independent of the curriculum, and so we had a small budget for dramas, lectures and music.

I’m not really sure where that money came from. It may have come from the students, or it may have been something from the Chancellor’s discretionary funds. All I know is that eventually I recognized that we’d never be able to afford the kind of cultural life I think students need, especially the Riverside campus until we grew in size, enough that we had a large ASUCR fund to do it.

Erickson: Are there any of those committees that you preferred over the others?

Way: Oh, Educational Policy.

Erickson: That was your favorite?

Way: Oh, yes. I served on that for ... oh, five years, I think.

Erickson: How would you compare being a faculty member in the early years to that of later years?

Way: Later years were better, I think.

Erickson: In what ways?

Way: Well, I think we were expected to do too much committee work in the early years, to do things we ought not to have been doing. In later years, it was easier. There were more people to do the work. I really resented having to order books for the library. I thought that was wrong, and yet we had stacks of library cards that would be given to us. And if we wanted to get books in our area, we had to do the ordering. I mean, we took them to the library. They did the entry and the actual ordering, but if you wanted to build up your area, you had to do the work. That certainly was wrong.

They had an insufficient library staff. They didn't have a blanket order policy. Today, well, I'm not certain today, but a few years back, we purchased every book published by the major university presses. I had to spend time, for example, we were not a depository library, and in my area, not just in the law but in political science, there are a lot of government documents you need to do research. So I worked with the congressman from this area to get partial depository status, which we finally did. Well, the librarian should have done that. I shouldn't have to have done that. No, I think that was wrong. Things are a lot better.

We didn't have a good infrastructure. Faculty are always suspicious, not only just on this campus but probably on most campuses, of a rich administrative structure, that is, a rich mix. And I think too many chancellors were too sensitive to that, and we didn't have the infrastructure necessary to support a growing campus and to do the things for the campus that needed to be done.

We didn't, until your husband was hired, we didn't have anything really in development. We had an alumni list that was very bad. Nobody was really working the alumni. We had a few alumni affairs, but we didn't try to do anything. And nobody was working the corporations. I think the chancellors didn't think that was their job.

When Jim came, I said to Ted, “You’re going to get flack on Erickson’s operation. Don’t pay any attention to it. You must give him the support.” I didn’t think Jim was funded sufficiently in those first few years. I thought that if we are to get over this and get to the next stage of development, we had to have a full complement of development officers. And within a short time, that happened. But you look back on all those first years on this campus when we should have been doing that.

We learn from our mistakes, I guess. But surely you wouldn’t start a campus the way you started this one, or at least I don’t think so. There are lots of good things about it, but that wasn’t one of them.

Erickson: Well, let’s talk about some of those administrative officers. You’ve known them all, am I correct? You said you had an office with Provost Watkins.

Way: I shared an office with Gordon for a couple of years, yes. Of course, knew Herman and Ivan and Tomás, Ted Hullar, and

Erickson: Rosemary.

Way: Rosemary. Don’t really know the present Chancellor very well. Know him to speak to him, but I’ve never worked with him.

Erickson: Well, you don’t have to get into individual ones, but are there some individuals who made major contributions to UCR that you would single out?

Way: Well, I certainly think Ivan realized we needed a richer professional mix on this campus. And I would certainly have to applaud him for getting the biomedical program here. It took a lot of effort with Wally Ingalls, our local Assemblyman, and I can’t remember who our Senator was at that time, shepherding that through.

Shepherding through the senate the original Administrative Studies Program which eventually led to an undergraduate

Way: major in Administrative Studies, later a Business major. I am not sure what the title is today.

Getting the School of Administration started, although I think the leadership there was probably not as strong as it should have been. Some mistakes were made that we are paying for to this day.

Yes, I think Ivan. Because I worked with Ivan most of all.

Erickson: And he was here longer than any others.

Way: But in fairness to others, I would say that Ivan was shortsighted on fundraising. I think Ivan felt that keeping the campus cool during Vietnam, worried and tried to do something about enrollment growth. Those were his strong areas. I think his weak area would be the failure to see that we needed more extramural funding beyond professors going out and getting grants. We needed development money. And I don't think Ivan felt that was his job. He wasn't comfortable with it, at least.

Erickson: You held some administrative positions. What do you look for personally in a CEO?

Way: Well, someone who is good at selecting subordinates to run the campus internally and to spend enough time internally on campus that his vision of the campus is implemented. Powers of persuasion to work with the Academic Senate, faculties, the deans, to move forward with some kind of vision for the campus.

But I don't expect a CEO to be the vice chancellor. I expect the CEO to be an outside person, too, to work with the Riverside community, with the Legislature, with University Hall, to enhance the reputation of the campus and to seek opportunities for the campus outside of the campus—not just here in Riverside by the way, but throughout the state and nation. He or she should be a visible academic leader, not just on campus but elsewhere. Tough job description, I am afraid.

Erickson: But a good one. You talked about a gentleman earlier. I was going to ask you if you had a mentor or someone who's been a great influence? You had mentioned your professor at Cornell. Is he one you would classify as that?

Way: No, not really. I am very fond of Robert Cushman. He was a very distinguished professor at Cornell, but I didn't realize until after I got out of Cornell that I had received very weak graduate training. The discipline was changing as I was coming out, and it was becoming much more quantitative in its orientation, and the program didn't give me any training in that area. It was more behavioral in its orientation. I had to go through a lot of retraining. Now probably lots of faculty members had to do that, but I think I was a bit unusual in that sense.

No, I didn't have a mentor on campus either. There wasn't anyone. We were all the same age. We were all in the same boat. And I am not even sure that the concept of mentoring was around then. That's probably more from the '70s.

Erickson: What do you think about the campus today?

Way: Well, I think it's a stronger, better campus today. When I look around and see the minorities on this campus that weren't there then. I mean, in the first few years that I was here, I can only remember one Black student, Henry Ramsey.

Erickson: Oh ... who is now a ...

Way: A dean. Judge Ramsey. I think that's all to the good. I think we have a broader range of programs, a more diversified faculty. I think that's all to the good. And I think the quality of undergraduate life is much better now. It's still probably not what it should be. But we have a Chancellor now, the current Chancellor, who seems to be concerned about things like that.

I'm not sure what they call it, whether it's University Village, down on University Avenue, trying to find a place for students to go and feel comfortable.

Erickson: It is University Village.

Way: We didn't even have a place to eat on this campus.

Erickson: You mentioned that about the Faculty Club not being a place to eat.

Way: Oh, no. There was no food service there. The Barn had food service, and that was it. In back of the Barn, you will see a little addition that's attached to the old barn itself. Phil Boyd paid for that. That became a place where the faculty could eat lunches.

End of Side B on Tape 1

(audio lost for a few feet)

Way: ... until my son was born and then I wanted to go home and spend more time. I would have lunch at home. But that certainly has changed and all for the better. There are places to go on campus.

Erickson: How about the professional schools. When I was reviewing this information about your background, I noted that you authored a paper on the UCR proposed law school.

Way: Well, I always felt we should have a law school here. Ivan asked me to put together a proposal. I went up and consulted people at Davis who had just gotten the school going there.

Erickson: What time period would that have been?

Way: Probably late '60's. And I talked to people at UCLA, and I still think we should have had a law school. I don't think it is in the cards right now.

Erickson: You don't think so?

Way: No, I don't think so. I'm sure the present Chancellor would disagree with me on that. But he may have, I'm sure he does, lots of information that I don't. I just look at the number of attorneys we have in the state. I was the one who drew the line and said there isn't a public law school, except on the coast, except for Davis.

But we have nothing in the Inland areas. We didn't need any more professional schools to be a truly university campus. We didn't get them. Indeed the word went out that the President had made a deal with Santa Barbara that if a law school, as a quid pro quo, that if a law school was ever approved, it would go to the Santa Barbara campus.

I thought that mobilizing the local community was a good idea. It was better PR work than what we had done. We worked entirely within the framework of the university in trying to get a law school here. But the established law schools certainly didn't see any particular need for another one.

And I made an argument both to Rosemary when I made a similar proposal, as I had made to Ivan Hinderaker, that we don't have enough well-trained attorneys in California. We have a large number of attorneys in California. If you look at the pass-fail rate for law schools in California, I think you'll quickly see that it's Berkeley and UCLA and now Davis, along with Stanford that really lead, using that as a measure of the quality of legal education.

What I think we need, still do, is another University of California-level quality school. I would not be very happy, however, with the proposal for any law school that was less than the University of California standard.



Way: And I am also uncomfortable with the idea of locating it off campus. Deans who live off campus, those schools' deans often tend to be rather independent. They have a constituency that isn't necessarily on campus. And I think the CEO might want to think about that a little bit in having a constituency that is downtown. I've never told the present Chancellor that, but if he ever asked my opinion, I would tell him that.

(laughter)

Erickson: And how do you feel about the growth, the student growth?

Way: You mean where should we be?

Erickson: Yes. And how do you feel about the present-day 10,000 students?

Way: I think we should be higher.

Erickson: Higher.

Way: Yes. I really do, to support graduate programs, to support the quality of student life, culturally. We just need a certain mass of students, and we haven't reached that point yet—15, 18, I don't know what it should be, somewhere in that neighborhood, but a lot of growth yet. I would think that we want to make sure that that growth is growth within the standards of the University. We have a reputation that is sad almost of not being a strong academic campus.

Erickson: Which is so different from how we started out.

Way: Yes, from how we started out, and that needs to be corrected. And my understanding is that the Chancellor is sensitive to that and wants it to be corrected. Although, again, I haven't talked to him about that. But our SAT scores, I think are the lowest in the system.

Erickson: Are they?

Way: We were taking, perhaps at one point, maybe too many special action admissions. I'm not sure if that's what brought it down, but we were a campus who took everyone who was qualified under the A through E requirements. I understand now we're not, as of a few months back. We will be more selective and perhaps that will rectify that image. No, I don't want us to become the campus in the system where both the faculty and the students are looked down upon by other campuses. That's not the kind of reputation we want.

So that I would say to anyone who's wanting to build new schools on this campus, make sure that whatever you do, you don't do anything in trying to build a new professional school that would lend credibility to people thinking that this isn't a strong academic institution.

Erickson: As far as reputation, are you talking about the assistant professors starting out, rather than the full professors?

Way: No, let's go back.

Erickson: Well, I don't remember exactly how you said it, but I got the impression that Riverside is not regarded as highly as some of the other campuses, so I wondered if that was a reflection?

Way: It is not as rigorous in our promotion and merit increase standards. And we probably weren't for a while. We had more of a reputation as being more of a civil service campus. Now that would be an unfair charge, I can assure you, because I spent a lot of my life going over academic files. And there may be some areas where we were weak. We just need to be careful there. The standards are consonant with other campuses of the University.

And what monitors that, and takes care of that, by and large, is the Senate Personnel Committee. They, probably more than anyone, try to hold up a high standard. And it is rare for a

Chancellor to override a decision that is negative there. And that's, I think, by and large, the way it should be.

Erickson: What led to your retirement?

Way: Growing weary of teaching. As I said earlier, I was just tired of grading papers, and I couldn't bring myself to restructure my courses so that I didn't require as much writing. I didn't want to go out that way. And then the offer was so attractive—cash, extra years of service—so I sat down and worked out the finances of it. It looked to me as if I was going to be paying for the privilege of teaching, which I no longer wanted to do.

Erickson: Was that the first VERIP that you're talking about?

Way: Yes, it was the first VERIP. And it's worked out well for me. I'm enjoying retirement. In fact, just a month ago, or less than a month ago, I finally closed my office on this campus.

Erickson: Oh, you did?

Way: Yes. It's been very nice over these years to have an office, although once I moved to Claremont, I came increasingly less to campus, and fewer times. I'm finishing up a book right now, and it's really not necessary for me. I've spent a couple of days recently in the library, but I don't need an office for that.

Erickson: Do you have everything on a computer now, is all your writing done on a computer?

Way: Somebody puts it on there for me. I don't do that, I write by long hand.

Erickson: Oh, you do?

Way: Yes, I have a typist who does the disk for me.

Erickson: And I was going to ask about the internet. Do you get a lot of information that way?

Way: No. The book I am finishing up has twelve chapters, and it's the development of religious liberty, and it's called Religious Liberty and the End of Community. It's about the interaction between Christian community and religious liberty. I've worked on it for seven years.

Erickson: And when would you expect that will be out?

Way: Well, I'm finishing up a chapter on Jehovah Witnesses, entitled, "Aliens in a Foreign Land." And that's the role of the Jehovah Witnesses in bringing about major legal change on the free exercise of religion. I'm almost finished writing that chapter, and then I have a chapter to do on the role of the Supreme Court sometime next year. I'm in no rush. Then there will be a long editing process, because I've written too much.

Erickson: Now does Barbara help you?

Way: No.

Erickson: You haven't co-authored anything other than the first one?

Way: Barbara helps in the sense that she is a wonderful sounding board. If I'm struggling with something, I come home and talk to her, and she's a good listener. Sometimes all I need is not advice, I just need to verbalize what I'm struggling with. And then I see the solution often myself. She doesn't have time to work, though she is a very busy person herself.

Erickson: Is she still at Cal Poly?

Way: She's at Cal Poly as a Dean. In fact, this week she's in Zimbabwe. We had gone there in February. She's working on extended learning. Well, she's working on a lot of projects between the University and Zimbabwe and Cal Poly.

Erickson: What is she Dean of?

Way: The College Letters, Arts and Social Sciences. I told her I could not face another 24 hour trip to Zimbabwe!

Erickson: You're each keeping busy with your own work?

Way: Well, I do volunteer work. I teach phonics to first and second graders at Vista School in Claremont. I volunteer at Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden where I am on the Board of Directors for the volunteer organization. And I have a young at-risk child who is ten years old, an Afro-American in Pomona.

I go to Pomona twice a week and pick him up and take him home with me and tutor him in reading and math, and then he stays and has dinner with us. I sponsor him in sports. Next week, he will be in baseball camp. And then I sponsor him in the fall and winter in soccer, which means I go to two soccer practices a week, and I go to the Saturday soccer game.

Erickson: Uh huh.

Way: Next week I will pick him up at 7:30 every morning and fix his lunch for him. He's now like a grandson to me.

Erickson: Oh absolutely. I can tell. How did you meet him?

Way: He was one of my students at Vista School in Claremont, and he was the biggest challenge I had ever faced. He was so angry and so mad all the time. And he has every reason to be angry and mad, but it's self defeating, of course. He's Afro-American, he was a "Crack baby," he has Dyslexia, he has no father, his mother isn't around, and he's being raised right now by a sister. So I put him in therapy, and he goes twice a month to see a psychologist. He was angry yesterday at the tutoring session. He wanted to go swimming, and I said, "No, you do the reading first." And so he did his reading, and then I let him go swimming, and then I took him to a jazz concert.

Erickson: Oh.

Way: He didn't like that though.

Erickson: He didn't like that?

Way: No. We left after a while, but I wanted him ... We talk about Black music, and I had gone in to see "Bring On The Noise, Bring On Da Funk." He listens to that tape a lot. But he likes rap music and I don't, so I don't play that for him.

(laughter)

Way: He's a nice little kid, he's at risk, and he's got a lot of anger in him. I don't know what will happen to him, but I am going to stick it out with him.

Erickson: You will make a huge difference in his life.

Way: I don't know.

Erickson: I think so.

Way: He's just at the stage where he will be entering a lot of peer relationships. When I took him home last night, there were a bunch of peers in front of the apartment house, and that's not good news. My voice will increasingly be less important to him as he gets older now.

Erickson: That's true.

Way: But I am a voice still ...

Erickson: That's right. And you are trying. That's great. Is there anything else, Frank, that we haven't talked about that you would like to bring up?

Way: I don't think so. (pause) Let's see. Oh, yes. I did come back to teach one quarter—an honors seminar.

Erickson: Since you retired.

Way: Um hmm. Didn't like it.

Erickson: Oh, you didn't like the honors students? I mean, I'm sure you liked the students, but you didn't like working with that particular group?

Way: Well, I loaded them up with papers and then realized, "Look Frank. You retired because you were tired of grading papers. And what have you done again?" So I didn't do that again.

Erickson: Did you ever hire a graduate student to read papers for you?

Way: You can't in Con Law, that's just not possible. Did in the Presidency. Didn't like it but did occasionally when a class got up around ... oh, over a hundred.

Erickson: Gosh.

Way: So I did do it there. And then, of course, you had graduate students helping you in the lower division American Politics class. So I didn't grade papers there. I suspect if you surveyed faculty members, a very large percentage, a significant number would say that the least pleasant part of being a professor is reading papers and grading papers.

Erickson: Um hmm. But then that's the only way you can truly ...

Way: That's the only way that you can teach students to write, if they are to be literate. At least I think that's the way I could do it. Others may be successful in doing it in other ways.

Erickson: Well, thank you very much.

Way: Ok.

Erickson: This has been a wonderful interview.

Way: My pleasure.

END OF INTERVIEW