

PRESERVING MEMORY: NEWARK AND RUTGERS
IN THE 1960'S AND 1970'S

An Interview with

CECILE STOLBOFF

Conducted by

Gilbert Cohen

February 4 and 19, 1992

INTERVIEW: Cecile Stolboff

INTERVIEWER: Gilbert Cohen

DATE: February 4 and 19, 1992

GILBERT COHEN: This is Tuesday, February 4, 1992. This is Gil Cohen. I'm interviewing Dr. Cecile Stolboff in her office in the College of Arts and Sciences. Dr. Stolboff is dean of instruction in the Newark College of Arts and Sciences and University College—I'm corrected. Okay. I was asking you, Dr. Stolboff, if you could provide a biographical sketch of your academic and professional career before and since coming to Rutgers to start things off.

CECILE STOLBOFF: Well, I was one of those women who read Betty Friedan's book, closed it, and then decided to do something besides stay at home. I had been doing League of Women Voters presidencies for a number of years and was working full time at it. And said, Got to get back into the paid field where you get some respect. So I did my graduate work in New Brunswick and got myself a teaching assistantship at Douglass. Taught there for a little while. And then got my first regular appointment at Newark in...we agreed I think it was 1967. And I should remember it because it was my first term on campus and also the year of the Newark riots.

So it began under fire. And I would like to say probably that I was a little bit fearful of coming to Newark because of the comparison of teaching Douglass students with what I had been told were underprepared students in Newark, by comparison at any rate. And I have to tell you it was a delight. It was a love affair that began a long time ago between me and the Newark students. First of all, they're probably the most appreciative students of any I have come across. I do things that I think are routine, and I get thanks, I get notes. And when I was in the classroom, it just was a very exciting thing to see the growth and development. I love teaching. I continued to do it for a long time after I moved into administration. But then when I became dean of instruction, it just became too pressured to do both, and I haven't taught for a while. I suspect when and if I ever retire, that that will be something that I will do again.

COHEN: The dean of instruction's position. Could you tell how that evolved? I mean at one time there wasn't, if I remember correctly, there wasn't a dean of instruction.

STOLBOFF: Well, you're right that it did evolve because I do have to go back a little bit in history. The first step was the merger of the two faculties: University College with the Newark College of Arts and Sciences faculty into what is now known as the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Newark. I suspect...in retrospect I think it was probably a mistake for University College to go this route. I think that we have not lived up to our obligation to the evening students. And it was why I corrected you. Everybody forgets about University College and the degree of services that we provide, including the number of courses that are offered, has presented a problem. It was always less than what it should have been, which is what encouraged people to go the merger route; mainly that there were few regular faculty compared to coadjutant faculty that were used to provide the courses. But the difference is that you had a lot of coadjutant lines. If you were dean at University College, you had your own budget and your money to spend as you saw fit.

So that the resources that were specifically designated for University College, I think, were greater pre-integrated faculty than they have been since.

Now, getting back to your original question on the dean of instruction, first the merger, then the one dean, and then they didn't know exactly how to administer the two areas. And I started off first as just dean of instruction for University College actually. And at the time, I told the powers that be that I didn't think that this was going to prove manageable, and it didn't. So that after about two years, I was made dean of instruction for both schools and had to set about combining the two staffs. And it took a while, but I think I have finally made it to the point where we are what I would call understaffed, but I have a terrific group of people who work very well. And I sometimes think that everybody's using mirrors, because I really don't know how everything is done the way it gets done. It really... considering that we're dealing [with] and supporting over five thousand students, it is a very small staff.

COHEN: Is this a typical arrangement administratively for colleges and universities to have a dean of the faculty, a dean of students, and then a dean of instruction, would you say?

STOLBOFF: No. And as a matter of fact, I left out one in between thing: For a while the dean of students operation reported to me. And to me that was a happy arrangement. I don't care about the reporting to me. But I think this business of dividing students into two halves—one an academic half and one a student life half—is crazy. The student comes to you with a problem, alright?

COHEN: Yes.

STOLBOFF: They don't think of themselves as having an academic problem or a personal problem. They know that something isn't working. So that there are times now—we used to deal with it. We have somebody in our office, no matter where the need was, that the student can identify—sometimes they don't know themselves. So that half the time you're trying to figure out what it is, what the reasons are that are accounting for the student being in trouble, if they're in trouble from the institution's point of view. Lots of times the way they present the problem, they articulate it, really has very little to do with what's causing them anguish or academic difficulties.

COHEN: So why has this separation between two functions developed on this campus?

STOLBOFF: Well, to be honest, they had a need to staff the housing that was provided. And again, this gets back to mirrors that are being used. There's never any additional staffing that's provided for what needs to be done. They move people around.

COHEN: Housing.

STOLBOFF: Housing. The dormitories.

COHEN: You're talking about dorms, the housing.

STOLBOFF: The dormitories are open, yes. Well, they don't call them dormitories. They call them residential facilities. So they took the dean of students operation, moved it over to the Campus Center, included the housing situation, with it the staffing for the kind of student life programs that you were going to provide at the dormitories, and took that off. Now, the problem is that that left me with far fewer people to deal with the students in my operation. So I can't say that I thought it was a good move, but it was a move that was taken, and here we are, so you make the best of it. I think that it's probably indicative of something else that has gone on for—I don't know when I would date it back to. But at the time in which Rutgers decided that it was going to be a really serious research institution, things began to change on this campus. When I first came, I would say that it was a teaching-first campus. And whatever research was done was second. Not that people weren't doing research. But it was a difference in emphasis in their responsibilities. And certainly people took the teaching role seriously. I can remember spending hours with fellow faculty members on teaching, classroom problems, challenges, if you will. Up until a couple of years ago, in the last decade, that has been unknown on this campus.

COHEN: Yes, I was going to ask. When you first came here...if you could elaborate on the whole—your perception, aside from the official statements and so on—your perception of the mission of the college. When you arrived in sixty-seven, sixty-eight and so on.

STOLBOFF: Well, I think that everybody had a much stronger sense of what the mission was. We had first-generation students coming to this campus. And we took our education role very seriously. I think that the majority of faculty, if you had asked them at that time, would have really been concerned about the quality of education that we were offering and the relation between the faculty and the students. It was an exciting place to be. I mean I really enjoyed it. And I think we have gone through a period... and I have to tell you, I have not been in the majority. I mean I have really been a dissenting voice. And my vision of what we should have been becoming, if you will, is quite at variance from other people on the campus. I sometimes am surprised that I've survived and have stayed in a position like this. I know that... I mean it doesn't end. I continue to be a really dissenting voice, and I think it's because graduate education and research have moved to the forefront on the campus, on things that represent prestige and certainly represent the way people are rewarded. And consequently it's been at times a rather lonely voice. Undergraduate education, in my view, and all the support staff that's needed for it on a campus like this, has been undervalued. My mission has always been very clear—unfortunately I have not been too persuasive—and that was to be the best urban university that it's possible to create anywhere in the good United States.

COHEN: Now when we spoke last time before we were taping, you said Urban University, and of course that's a term that's used over and over again. And I asked you at that time, what is an urban university? And if you could recap that.

STOLBOFF: Well, an urban university recognizes where it is, first of all, and doesn't try to escape or hide it. I think that a place like Newark offers tremendous opportunities for the university and for our students. In effect, it's a laboratory for everything that's right and everything that's wrong in society today. And these days, I will admit that you have to fight to look for what's right. But it's an opportunity. I think we could be doing research and things that are important. I think the students would be much more interested if we were focusing on real

problems instead of abstractions. Internships are increasing, but it's fighting tooth and nail to get them; but the students love them. It serves a very important purpose in terms of their preparation for careers. It enables them to deal with diverse groups, which they're going to have to do in their professional lives when they go out into those professional lives. It gives them a head start in seeing that communication is important. We were talking about it before in reference to the accounting field. But you can take any profession. Our students come to us, plainly speaking, a little rough around the edges. And I see our role as one of bringing them up to a much greater degree of sophistication in their personal development. And I think we could do all these things.

COHEN: What do our students need that you as dean of instruction are able to provide—or attempt to provide?

STOLBOFF: Well, attempt is.... first of all, we have worked hard on placement tests. We were one of the pioneers in the country actually. Instead of saying if students can't do the work in the basics, English and math, that's their problem—hello and goodbye—we started giving tests to freshmen from the very.... I mean I was working with Charlie Pine from the time I began running the first special program for underprepared students. And that has to be like in sixty-nine. So that I know that we've made a tremendous effort to place them at the level of the ability that they come to us. Our philosophy always was, you can start with disadvantages but by the time you graduate, you've got to be doing well. And we took that role very seriously. Now in the last few years—tutoring has always played an important part in our ability to deliver on that promise. And the resources haven't been available in the degree that I would like to see them certainly.

COHEN: Now how does the placement program relate to the programs of the Academic Foundations Department?

STOLBOFF: Well, first of all, it says to the student that you can't just begin with your major. Students come with the idea, I want to be a business major and these are the courses that I want. We try very hard, through those basic courses, to be sure that their skills are adequate for going into the other courses they're going to have to take. I think the one thing that has remained constant on this campus is the feeling that a strong liberal arts background is the best preparation for going out into the outside world and being successful. So our requirements have always been very traditional. It's been a broad-spectrum of required courses in a good number of fields. So that the student doesn't have that parochial point of view when they go out. Sometimes we have to lead them dragging. But it starts with the placement tests; because if they get off to a poor start in those areas, they simply don't do well in the other areas.

COHEN: So after a student takes the placement test and it's determined that there's a deficiency in a particular area, then what's the next step?

STOLBOFF: They go into a developmental course instead of a college-level course. Or possibly we created intensive college-level courses in the English for example. So that a student might be required to do extra work, put in extra hours, actually structured into the classroom situation.

COHEN: How are these developmental courses administered? Directly by the academic discipline responsible or Academic Foundations?

STOLBOFF: The Academic Foundations Department offers those courses. And from everything I can see, they are doing a good, creative job in that department. I think that the biggest weakness in that whole area is in the Learning Center and the fact that it's understaffed and under-resourced, of course, is a big part of the problem.

COHEN: Overall, I mean what could you say about just the impact of the Academic Foundations Department in the past—since its founding first as the Academic Foundations Center, and then it gained departmental status. We're talking now I guess, well, for twenty years.

STOLBOFF: Well, a little bit of history again.

COHEN: Yes.

STOLBOFF: We started—the first program was the program that I headed, the Special Entrance Program. And that was about—we brought in about a hundred students in each academic year.

COHEN: Was that your first position?

STOLBOFF: No, I came from faculty. Then when this program was established by the faculty, I went to the dean, and I asked for the position to coordinate it because, well, the person whose job I took came back after a two-year maternity leave. Everybody assumed when she was gone for the second year that she was not going to come back. So that I found myself still writing my dissertation and without a position. So I went to then Dean Blumenthal and said, "Do you have anything in administration that you could give me so I can finish my dissertation while I'm here?" And he said, "Well, it's not much," in his courtly way. And he said, "But if you think you'd like to do this, it's yours."

COHEN: Special Entrance Program, yes.

STOLBOFF: Right.

COHEN: Okay.

STOLBOFF: And at that point, you know nobody had any experience in dealing with this. All we knew was at the end of the demonstrations, there were a handful of minority students on this campus in the heart of Newark, and we had an obligation to reach out and bring more black and—at that time the emphasis really was just on black students. But it very quickly expanded to Puerto Rican students and then the broader Hispanic constituency. So we did that. And then the state in its infinite wisdom decided that there should be one Educational Opportunity Fund program. And the first year that they started the alternate program, it brought in over four hundred students. It was terrible! That was a disaster. I mean nobody here was equipped handle that.

COHEN: That was what year, nineteen— Can you remember that?

STOLBOFF: I don't know. You'd have to look it up.

COHEN: Well, the Conklin Hall takeover was February sixty-nine, so....

STOLBOFF: Well, then it must have been seventy.

COHEN: Must have been seventy, yes. Okay, okay. Thanks.

STOLBOFF: Okay? And here is where everybody had panicked in trying to.... Instead of responding to the demands when they were reasonable, it became a cause célèbre, and they agreed to something like taking any student that was in the top fifty percent of their class. And as I say, the first year it was an enormous number of underprepared students and underprepared faculty who didn't know what to do with them. And it took a while for the program to evolve. But I think it's been years now in which you had a group that have had a very good idea about what kind of services are needed. And certainly in terms of the Academic Foundations Department—and again you'd have to go back to the record and see when it was made an academic department. Because by that time you had faculty who were very, very dedicated and knew what they were doing. Some of the people have gone now that were pioneers in the group. Bea Segal started with my program and then moved into the Academic Foundations Department. So that we have some very good people and certainly people who are dedicated to working with this population. And by this population we soon proved it was not just minority populations. What people don't realize is that a lot of other ethnic groups need additional help. But once they get that additional help do extremely well.

We attract a number of students that are still admitted on the special basis even though they don't qualify for EOF. And if anything, this group, which tends to be people who have low SATs, therefore don't meet the regular admissions criteria but are in the top ten percent of their high school classes, if anything, have done better than the regular entering freshmen class. So nobody's going to convince me that you can't do things as long as students are motivated. That became clear. How you measure that is up for discussion. But I mean when I ran the Special Entrance Program, I did it a number of ways. I went so far as to interview each and every student that was admitted into the program. And if you've worked with students for a long time, I really am convinced you can separate out those who are just in it for fun and games and those who really understand that they have to work hard to get what they want.

COHEN: I was interested in what you said before about the students in the top ten percent of their classes who came in ill prepared, at least in certain areas, and who then....

STOLBOFF: They're not necessarily ill prepared. I mean by traditional standards.

COHEN: Yes.

STOLBOFF: I guess you would say it. But it would be maybe the same student who was ill prepared in the verbal area, might be extremely skillful in the math area. And what it says to us is

that there's certainly nothing wrong with their brainpower. Okay? They need some support in a particular area. And certainly we don't want close the door to such students. They contribute enormously.

COHEN: What you're saying is it's consequence of the support that was given to them, that therefore they're...by tracking them you were able to—they actually did better than the students who came in without admission to the—well, what would you call it?

STOLBOFF: Well, we just.... Right now it's no longer a special program for them per se. But we say there's a special—we admit them to University College. Okay?

COHEN: Mm-hmm. [Break in recording] If you could, during the early period and particularly the seventies, if you could describe—it's difficult to characterize—the social and economic background of the students that you were bringing along during that period.

STOLBOFF: Well, certainly the students that were in the program that I ran were primarily black, a small percentage Puerto Rican. And the fact that it was a small percentage is what led to a takeover of my office at one point.

COHEN: Oh, yes. Mm-hmm.

STOLBOFF: However, I have to tell you, whether they believe it or not, we took anybody that was Puerto Rican that graduated from high school that we felt had a good enough academic record to do it. The problem was you had so few at that time that were finishing up in a college preparatory program. And if you bring somebody in and the gap is too big, my feeling is you are not doing that person a favor.

COHEN: These were Puerto Rican students who took over your office?

STOLBOFF: Yes, yes.

COHEN: Do you remember that year? I think I remember reading something about that. Okay.

STOLBOFF: It would be a guess on my part.

COHEN: Yes. Okay.

STOLBOFF: But they did take it over.

COHEN: In your office in your capacity as—

STOLBOFF: Dean of admissions.

COHEN: Dean of admissions. That's right, yes.

STOLBOFF: Yes.

COHEN: Okay.

STOLBOFF: So I think—I don't know if you remember Joanne Chernan. But at the time she was the associate director of admissions. And I left my office and put her in to sit there and just be sure that they didn't tear the place apart. And she said she felt a couple of—felt foolish for a good couple of hours before they finally got up and left, having made their point.

COHEN: How have the interests of students changed? How did they change during the sixties and during the seventies and into the eighties? Can you characterize that?

STOLBOFF: Yes, because that was the beginning of the tremendous surge towards the business/management/accounting programs, decreasing interest in the sciences, social sciences, and even more so in the humanities. So more and more.... I think it always was perceived that this was a campus that would help you get ahead in the outside world, and more a preparation for professional careers. But the concept of profession changed significantly. Teaching became almost nonexistent as a career. And that of course got the final death knell as opportunities opened up for women later on. That became a critical factor. But whereas we used to have much more interest in the sciences as a steppingstone into pre-health professions—you still have it; a good number of students are interested in it. But the percentages changed. I think right now we're going through another cycle, and I'm beginning to sense a decrease in the business and accounting area. And while the percentage decrease in majors is not ten percent yet, it's happening. And to me that's all to the good. I would like to see students focus more of their—certainly their undergraduate education—on the liberal arts.

COHEN: Do you feel that this move into this basically business area, was it an inevitable development on this campus?

STOLBOFF: It isn't just this campus.

COHEN: Yes, yes.

STOLBOFF: In this respect this was a national trend.

COHEN: I understand.

STOLBOFF: And I think it was in view of the population that we're talking about. If you say that students follow the jobs, then it was inevitable. I mean I think they perceived that this was the way to get ahead. And now they're finding out that, like everything else, the jobs are not in these areas either. So that they're thinking in terms of graduate opportunities and going on with their education.

COHEN: But during that period, in the seventies, in the eighties, what effect—we were talking about your role as dean of instruction—but how effective was the whole advisement effort on this campus? You talked about tracking students. I was wondering if you could get into that.

STOLBOFF: Well, you've got to realize that during much of that period, I was dean of admissions. So I wasn't involved directly in the advisement. One of the first things that I did when I took over as dean of instruction, first to change the advisement for the University College students. And then when I took over for the undergraduate, to radically revise the undergraduate so that right now every freshman that comes into the school has an advisor from the first day that he comes to register. And that advisor only has about twenty-five students that he or she is responsible for. And in addition to that, we have an OWL assigned to the advisor. That's OWL standing for Orientation Workshop Leader. And serves as a peer counselor to the students all through that freshman year. And to me that's the way to go with advisement. As soon as the student declares a major, as has always been in the past, the academic department takes over the responsibility. And that's sometimes where we fall down.

COHEN: You say fall down. I mean in what respect?

STOLBOFF: Not all departments are equally responsible in the way they advise their students.

COHEN: I see. Yes, yes.

STOLBOFF: So there are some students [departments] that have always done a fantastic job. I take great pleasure in pointing to my own department, political science, which is really very, very proud and with good reason. The English Department is another one. Among the most overworked departments on this campus, and yet they've always done the most conscientious job of advising their majors. So that there are success stories. And on the other hand, I think the biggest department, the Business and Accounting Departments, have not done a good job. And I don't know what's going to happen when we move to the new school of business arrangement. So I'm concerned about that point of view. And it's why I have tried to use technology, so far not with great success. But I'm trying to get a computerized curriculum worksheet program in place, so that a student would get the report each term showing what requirements have been met and which requirements still are outstanding. This is not something that's a figment of my imagination. Other schools have been doing it for ten years. What I have done, because I cannot—

[Break in recording]

COHEN: Okay. I think we're in business again. Again, this computerized....

STOLBOFF: In lieu of that what we've done is all the preparatory work, and we've put out curriculum worksheets that have the requirements for the students. So that any student that wants to can take it and fill it out for themselves. We help them when they come in for advisement. But it means that you've got to take a traditional transfer now, which is by term. And take the information which shows which courses have been taken and transfers it and puts it onto the curriculum worksheet. What the computerized program would do is give the students a report that was very specific. And when it came time to register for new courses for the next semester, they would know what they had to choose. It's going to be particularly important as we go into touch-tone telephone registration, which is only about a year away.

COHEN: Hmm, oh.

STOLBOFF: So that's the battle that I lost. I wanted this program to precede the touch-tone telephone. And it really, from a rational point of view, makes all kinds of sense. But what they were trying to do in New Brunswick was eliminate the lines that they have down there. And that was their overriding concern. So they're only going to use the touch-tone telephone system to drop/add. Whereas we want to use it for registration as well as the drop/add period.

COHEN: I want to go back for a bit to 1969 when the Conklin Hall was taken over in February of 1969 for four days. Let's just put the question: What was the grievance?

STOLBOFF: The basic grievance was the few number of minority students on this campus. Plain and simple. I mean that was it. And the students, many of whom I've known even though I don't remember too many of their names, really were a very, very reasonable bunch of young men and women, and nobody would listen to them. So they took over the building and got the newspapers involved. And then, as I say, the administration really flipped and went.... I don't think that anybody was more surprised at what they got than the students were. Instead of putting some limits on the number of students that would be brought in and tying it to resources that would be made available, though, it was just left open-ended. And we had a rough couple of years because of that.

COHEN: At the time, what was the faculty's perception of what was going on? I mean if you can assess that.

STOLBOFF: It was very mixed. There were some who were two hundred percent behind the students; and others that were totally appalled that a bunch of students would take over a building and create all this nonsense. Many of the faculty said they agreed with the goals. But they really had a hard time dealing with what they perceived as violence. They didn't know what was going to come next, when it really was quite peaceful and manageable in retrospect.

COHEN: You've mentioned the students—you characterized them as reasonable. And I'm wondering if you can remember any of the students, if not their names. Did you have any dealings with the students at the time?

STOLBOFF: Yes. Some of them I'd had in my political science courses. And they were basically very middle class. I mean these were not students that were deficient in any kind of way. They were very, very bright. And very strong. You had to be strong to be a black student on this campus with only a handful like yourself. I mean typically in class after class they walked into a situation in which they were the only black in the classroom. And right or wrong, they perceived hostility from the other students, from the faculty. It was a lonely existence.

COHEN: Did you have conversations with the students about their experiences or about their feelings, thoughts about what was going on?

STOLBOFF: No, not really.

COHEN: It was just you surmised what was going on.

STOLBOFF: Yes. At the time, no. I mean when it began to come out afterwards, after the takeover, then, yes. But, you know, it's a dilemma. If a student is a single one in your class, you hesitate to reach out and emphasize the fact. I mean it's a fine balance. You can try very hard not to make them feel peculiar. But it would never occur to me to go up to somebody and say, how do you feel about being on this campus when you're the only one? You know that's putting it crassly. You know there were some of us that they came to when they were talking about their demands. Okay? And certainly at that point we talked to them about their demands.

COHEN: You mean after the takeover.

STOLBOFF: Well, no, I think it really began before because that was where I got a sense that they were really very, very reasonable. And I think that it was very soon after that that the faculty voted to change the admissions policy and set up the special program, which I think indicates that the faculty certainly believed that what they were trying to do was justified. I mean as I say.... There was a hard core that sought in terms of going to lesser standards, lowering the standards. But I would say that they were the minority.

COHEN: Yes. This question of standards and scholastic standards. Just how legitimate an issue was that at the time? What was at stake?

STOLBOFF: Well, you know, there's always a conflict in people's minds between the excellence of your programs that you offer and the quality of the students that you're admitting. So they say that in order to widen access opportunities, it's automatically decreasing the quality of the academic program. I think that's a bit too glib. I think, as I indicated earlier, that there can't be too much of a gap between the students that you're admitting under a special program and those that are here because then they really can't do the work. And at some point the state did something that from a pedagogical point of view was really very unsound. They mandated that a student have to take two college-level courses. So that you couldn't even bring these students in—I don't know whether you realize this—you couldn't bring the EOF students in and give them a total developmental program except over the summer. So what you were trying to do in a six-week summer program for these students was prepare them to take maybe two developmental courses, but then two regular courses.

COHEN: They had to take two regular courses for credit?

STOLBOFF: For credit.

COHEN: Before—and had to pass those courses—before they were admitted to matriculate? No.

STOLBOFF: Oh, no, no. They were admitted but they couldn't get the EOF financial grant.

COHEN: Until—

STOLBOFF: Unless we enrolled them—

COHEN: Enrolled them in regular college credit. Oh.

STOLBOFF: Enrolled them. So we had to put them right from the start in the developmental courses. A typical package was developmental courses in communication skills and math, and then maybe an art course, a language course. You tried desperately to give them something that they would stand a chance of passing.

COHEN: Otherwise, if they were just taking developmental courses—

STOLBOFF: They wouldn't qualify for the grant.

COHEN: Is that still in effect?

STOLBOFF: I believe so.

COHEN: I never understood that. I thought that once the student went into a developmental program that the student was qualified for EOF.

STOLBOFF: First of all, they have to have twelve credits to qualify. They have to be considered full time.

COHEN: Carrying twelve credits.

STOLBOFF: Have to be carrying twelve credits. So sometimes you manage to come up with just one course. But there's no way you can get twelve credits in the developmental program.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. Yes.

STOLBOFF: What the legislature was trying to do was to be sure that the students weren't too deficient. Okay?

COHEN: Yes.

STOLBOFF: I mean you know it's not...I don't want to say that the people didn't have some reason for going that route. But there were times when you would have been much better off.... Like when somebody is learning a language, it makes much more sense to put them in an immersion program and be single-minded about the language that they have to do. And that's the way we do with the Pals Program where students really don't have the command of English. But we weren't able to do that.

COHEN: Again, going back to the Conklin Hall takeover, what was the lasting effect?

STOLBOFF: Oh, enormous. Enormous.

COHEN: Suppose it had never happened.

STOLBOFF: It would have happened. It wouldn't have been as dramatic. It wouldn't have been as fast. But there's no question in my mind that the way society is going and the way the schools are going—you would have called it something completely different. But you've reached the point where... I mean if you look at the results of the basic skills tests, you see what a high percentage of students, not just from the inner-cities but all over, are not graduating from high school qualified, really qualified, to do college-level work. So we're in the developmental business. You know it's not a happy situation. But my feeling is, in terms of responsibility, if you admit a student to the college, you must be prepared to meet his or her needs. Not the needs that you think they should have, but the way they come to us. Their obligation is to work on those deficiencies and graduate as competently as any of our students. That's my philosophy. And if you're not going to provide the resources, we shouldn't be admitting them in the first place. To me that's just cynical.

COHEN: What's the level of preparation of students coming from the high schools? Can you trace the development from the late sixties, through the seventies, and into the eighties? Is there any change that you can find?

STOLBOFF: Well, I think we probably plateaued some time ago. The inner-city schools, real inner-city like we have right here, are a disaster. I mean each year I say they couldn't get worse. When I went into the schools recruiting, I couldn't believe it could get any worse. But it's reached the point where even the students that want to learn find it very, very difficult to acquire the background that they need. So that we find that we're—even with our special programs—we admit very few students, let's say, from Central High School. They simply aren't following a college-level track. And we've noticed that even the special schools are not giving us the strong students that they did ten years ago. So that the inner-cities are I think just simply reflecting all that's going on in society, are continuing to present the same kind of problems or worse. But what's happened is the outer rim—I mean we are drawing from an even wider circle now because of the highway connections that enable us to recruit further away and the dormitories that now permit some students to be residential. And in spite of that, you find that a good percentage don't go directly into college-level courses.

So it is a problem. And it goes beyond just looking at the basic skills. If you ask the faculty what they see as *the* key problem in terms of students being able to deal with their courses, they would say that they're not thinking on a high enough level. They're not—what we call the critical-thinking skills aren't there. They don't make the connections. They don't bring the kind of background that they should have. They're teaching American history or American government, so that there is just no question about the fact that even if we didn't have a special program, we would still be in the developmental program. Or we would have to be a much, much smaller school. Now, if we continue to go with the decrease in the budget the way it's been going, that may be an option that you're going to get back to. And then you're going to have serious questions in terms of diversity.

[Break in recording]

COHEN: Okay. This is Gil Cohen, and I'm back again with Dr. Cecile Stolboff in her office on the Newark campus. This is Wednesday, February 19, 1992. And we are continuing our interview. When we left off last time, we were talking about the students, the student body, at the college, their preparation and experiences there. I wanted to, since we're on that general subject of preparation of students, I just wanted to ask a question about the Academic Foundations Department which started off as the Academic Foundations Center, if I'm not mistaken, and eventually became a full-fledged department on the campus. And I just wanted to ask how its assuming or attaining departmental status affected its mission, its effectiveness.

STOLBOFF: That's a very complicated question, and I'll do my best to deal with it in a number of parts. Let's look first at the reason it was created as a department, what some of the hopes were. Most important was the hope that the activities of the Academic Foundations Department would become fully integrated with the rest of the academic departments. That the chair would be a member of the meetings of the FAS and chairs on a regular basis. That the faculty, even though they were involved in different kinds of academic pursuits, would nevertheless be encouraged to do serious research and publish the results of what was going on in the classroom. I personally think that this is one of the most needed kinds of research that we have. In part, that has been realized. There are a few people that have been connected with the department that have not only been good teachers, but have taken their research mission seriously and have published. Unfortunately, we have continued to rely too much on part-time people; not too many have turned out to be tenured faculty. We've retired a couple of people who were strong members of the department. So I would say that that hope has only been partially fulfilled. That's in terms of the research.

In terms of the integration, I think we've done a really good job of getting closer ties between the English Department—the writing people in the Academic Foundations and in the English Department. I think we've been less successful in terms of easing the transition between the developmental math courses and the college algebra course. But I'm not sure where the fault lies. We have enormous problems in the math area, with the department, with the fact that you've got faculty that really are research-oriented; and yet the bulk of their teaching is with students who aren't as well prepared as they would like them to be, who aren't going to go on to major in math certainly. We have very few math students—math majors—on this campus. So you have this wide gulf between where the faculty are coming from, what they want to do, how they think of themselves professionally, and where the students are and the kind of help that they need. So that what we find happening is that the students may pass the developmental math course, and yet get into an environment that is very, very different from— Even though it's math, they may have had the skills, but there's been something about the situation that has been very discouraging.

COHEN: The developmental math course now is administered, is given, by the...

STOLBOFF: Academic Foundations.

COHEN: Academic Foundations and not the Math Department.

STOLBOFF: No, no. That's what the department does. The Academic Foundations Department teaches the developmental courses, communications skills in the writing area, and developmental

math courses in the math area. And then the student has to pass those courses...if they've been placed in them based on the placement test, they have to pass those before they go on to the college-level courses. And as I say, we have a wonderful experience going from communications skills. We've worked out all kinds of transition things. And I find that the people with the writing program in the English Department have just done a superb job. So they have reached out. It's been a two-way thing. And I don't get the feeling that you have this self-image thing with such a tremendous variance between what it is the people are doing and what they would like to be doing with their lives. And what's expected of them professionally. In all fairness, the bulk of the writing program is actually being run by co-ads, part-time people. But they're serious people. I mean they're really, you know, many of them have been doing this for years and years. We are so fortunate. I can't tell you how important a role I think these unrecognized, poorly-paid people contribute. I mean it is a phenomenon that I appreciate, but I really don't quite understand. We are very, very lucky to have them. I tell them it all the time. I do what I can. But the institution really doesn't appreciate, I think, in a tangible way what they do. And if you compare what they're doing with what's happening on the math front, you would see the difference in the kind of support.

And I think it's a total environmental thing. I don't think it's necessarily the course itself even though I think the college algebra course needs a complete overhaul. And it's taken me years and years, and I've put dollars into it. And they keep telling me I'm going to get an alternative course. And supposedly it's ready to go before the Courses of Study. But I'll believe it when I see it. And I'm not sure that that will make the difference simply because of who is teaching it and the whole environmental situation.

COHEN: Well, didn't the college algebra program relate to Charlie Pine?

STOLBOFF: It was never.

COHEN: It didn't have any influence on the college?

STOLBOFF: Virtually none. Charlie and I used to have long arguments about that. He was reforming the world. And the students that took college algebra from him benefited enormously. But he taught in the Physics Department. Okay?

COHEN: That's right. Yes, that's right.

STOLBOFF: And there was no receptivity on the part of the Math Department to accept his ideas and approaches.

COHEN: Right.

STOLBOFF: And he never even ran a workshop for the Math Department here. Okay? And as I say, I have tried. I've tried bringing people in that are accomplishing things outside of Rutgers-Newark even on the New Brunswick campus. There's experimental groups going on at NJIT. And I get very few of them to get involved in it. So it's a discouraging thing. And that's why I

say I am not about to say that this is an Academic Foundations problem. That's the main point that I wanted to make.

COHEN: I wanted to move into another area, namely the whole question of the status and the progress of women faculty on this campus. And I guess my question is, what was the—how did the status, the career paths of women change on this campus from the time you got here, late sixties, through the seventies?

STOLBOFF: Well, I'm smiling because when I got my first appointment as an assistant dean, I was the only female dean in the university outside of Douglass and the College of Nursing.

COHEN: In the entire university.

STOLBOFF: That's how extreme it was.

COHEN: What year again—1970?

STOLBOFF: It was about...it was the early seventies that I got my appointment. As a matter of fact, I think it was the same time I got my Ph.D., which was in seventy-two. You think that would be engraved on my heart, wouldn't you? [Laughter] Anyhow...and I really had to fight for it. I mean I can remember going in with Gil Panson who was the dean at the time. And I had been running the special program for students. And when I saw this job, I felt that it was—it looked as if it had been written with my background in mind. And yet I never got a call. Nobody asked me whether I would be interested. So I, in effect, knocked on his door and said I was the most qualified person. And I got it! But we've come a long way. I never knew what it was during my tenure there to go to meetings and have other women be present. I was almost always the only woman in a given situation. So there's no question about the fact that.... Now, I would say that the strongest players in the university—and without getting to my theories about why it's so—there's just no question in my mind that some of your best people are in office and doing a terrific job. I just wish there were still more of us.

But I mean in my office, it reached the point where somebody jokingly said, "I think you need a male affirmative action program." But the truth is that when you have an opening in higher education administration, if you would take a look at just the resumes without knowing the people, you would see how much stronger the women's resumes are. Now, I think in part it's because we don't pay that well, and the women are willing to take it. Whereas the better candidates for administration have moved out into the corporate world and are doing their thing outside. So that what has become somewhat of a loss in that the better men have moved outside, we have attracted very good women.

COHEN: Do you have any recollections of overt manifestations of sexism, either or your own personal experiences or other people's?

STOLBOFF: Well, I really think the most extreme hit me when I was not yet a graduate student here and when I applied to the political science graduate program in New Brunswick. The first time I did it, I was told that my records were vocational because I had gone to a teachers' college

first, Stanford University second. But within Stanford University it was the—I don't know what they called it then, but it was the school of business. That was for my master's. And thirdly, since my husband had a good job, I couldn't possibly be a serious Ph.D. candidate. It took me a year to recover. It really took me a year to recover. And I've often thought about how many women they must have discouraged with this kind of approach that don't have my determination and stamina. But I mean I finally just reached the point where I said, no way am I going to accept this. And the second time I applied I was accepted, given the privilege of working too hard for something. But that was it. But I think that part of my not being considered for that assistant dean's job was that they simply didn't think of women. I had never gotten any one job without having to fight for it, including this one.

You know often in the boys' network, the boys reach out to other boys. Okay? But I don't even say that it's necessarily a conspiracy. They just don't typically think of women unless the women—this is why I tell the younger ones and wherever I'm performing a pseudo mentoring relationship, the one thing you've got to accept, you're going to have to toot your own horn. We're just not part of it. They're not comfortable in asking you out to lunch, seeing you on a daily basis. We haven't moved into that at all. And in talking to my daughter who is a lawyer, she's encountering the same thing. When she was in the prosecutor's office, it was a disaster for women. I mean that is really a male province. And now she's in a private firm. All kinds of little things intended to undermine you. So we're a long way there. What disturbs me with the women students, is that a very, very high percentage don't think it's necessary to join any kind of women's organization. They think this is all behind them. They don't realize how institutionalized it still is.

COHEN: You're talking about joining them, right? In the late sixties, early seventies, the Women's Caucus got started. Were you a part of that?

STOLBOFF: I guess I was from almost the beginning. I wasn't the original starting group because I was too junior at that time, you know.

COHEN: Yes.

STOLBOFF: But as soon as it became open to the public, I've been part of it, and I still am.

COHEN: How did the—Do you have recollections—

STOLBOFF: I take pride in being on their letterhead.

COHEN: Oh, oh. What recollections do you have of the initiation of the class action—was it 1972? Any recollections at all of that?

STOLBOFF: Not really.

COHEN: The chief players for instance?

STOLBOFF: Well, I remember Helen Strauser. I know that Lillian was involved. I know that Dorothy Dinnerstein was involved. I really was not part of that thing because by then I'm in administration, don't forget. And that was really aimed at faculty alone. And it took a while before the faculty really opened the doors and tried to reach out to women administrators. The reason that I was included was that I had started here as faculty. You move relatively late into the development before the mailing list was broadened to include some of the higher-level administrators on campus.

COHEN: What was the impact of the class action—the winning of the class action suit? Do you have any assessment of that?

STOLBOFF: Well, great joy. But I'm not sure that it made tremendous waves at all. I mean I think that it established legitimacy. I think they were taken more seriously from that point on. But it's a long, hard battle. And in part I think that women are unrealistic about how you play the....

[End of Tape #1]

COHEN: Alright. We're back with a new tape. You were on a note of reconciliation or....

STOLBOFF: Well, no. I'm saying part of the problem is that women object to the rules of the day because it works against them. And my theory is that if you're going to get to the top, if you're going to win, and you're going to be in a position to do something about changing the rules, you have to first play by those rules. You can't cry foul because you didn't get a promotion because you don't have a Ph.D. The truth of the matter is there is absolutely no reason for me to have to have a Ph.D. for what I do on a day-to-day basis. The kind of background that I had with my master's degree and my development career-wise in the outside world before I came here gave me more than enough of the background and skill. So aside from the legitimacy in establishing me as equal and same as the faculty, the Ph.D. is really not a requirement. But I said to myself, if I'm going to do anything in the field of higher education, I have got to pay the price. I have got to get this. Now, it was at enormous cost. I had two small children while I was doing this. Now, some women can't make that choice because it takes tremendous energy. There's no way, for example, that I could see—my daughter is holding on for dear life. She doesn't have my energy level or my organizational skills to be able to balance a lot of things. And that's true of a lot of women.

Now, when are we going to change the rules? There's no short circuit. I mean I've gotten pretty high up on this campus. If I had started earlier there's no question in my mind that I would have made dean of a college or president of a college or vice president someplace. But I chose not to do the research and not to publish because something had to give. Okay? But I don't cry about the fact that I didn't make the final leap. So you get somebody now. And as you look at some of the faculty that are moving up, take a look at Mary Hartman at Douglass College. She's done it all. I mean somehow she has balanced the thing. They're beginning to emerge. If you look at the full list of people who have made it to the top positions, it's beginning to happen with women. It's not going to happen overnight even now, even though we've got lots more coming up, simply because it is so very, very difficult to balance all these roles. And there's no way that the

full thrust of having a baby, bringing a baby—it can be shared, and men can do more. But the primary responsibility still goes with the woman. And that makes a big difference. So I say the most essential ingredient to be able to do it and to make the kind of changes that we're looking for is a very high energy level. I mean it sounds silly, but it's true.

COHEN: Lots of chutzpah, too.

STOLBOFF: Well, you know, women make up for it by and large not so much by chutzpah, but by just being thorough. And sometimes this is even a mistake. They put too much energy in. And they think if they do the job right, they're going to be immediately rewarded for doing a super job. This is what I mean about having to reach out and let the world know that you're qualified for the next position. If you're not keyed into that male network.... It's essential. And yet so many women feel abused, feel that they're being taken advantage of because they don't get rewarded directly. And that still exists here.

COHEN: Talking about male networks, I'd like to move into the area of the administrations and sort of get your assessments of the various administrations that you've worked under. When you came to Rutgers, Mason Gross was still the president of the university. And if you have any insights you could share on his contributions.

STOLBOFF: I really came at the tail end of his administration. And, you know, I had no sense of connectedness to the center at that point. It takes a while. I mean most faculty don't. I don't know whether you realize to what degree faculty really have almost no connection to the administration at the center, less connection to the administration on the campus. The connection really is to the academic department.

COHEN: Yes.

STOLBOFF: And part of the problem in trying to administer is that it is totally un-hierarchical. There's no such thing as my giving an order and having something happen. You truly have to persuade people. Okay? So this is why you get very impatient with the pace of change. And it cannot be done overnight.

COHEN: Can you say anything about Ed Bloustein's contributions?

STOLBOFF: I think that Ed was wonderful in the beginning years. I remember a great sense of energy. I always respected the fact that he continued to come to our campus and to teach a course every single year. I don't know whether he did it in Newark every year; but it was frequent enough so that many political science students, including my daughter who came up from Douglass to take his course, really felt that it was a tremendous experience. I thought his ability to know people and reach out to people was terrific. I think the only mistake with him is he stayed too long. Because he reached a point where the very qualities that I admired began to move into the background. And I thought he was quite isolated toward the end. And really not aware of the degree to which the university, in building up its research reputation, was undermining the undergraduate education. And consequently, because the administration on this campus decided that the way to build Newark and see that we survived was to go along with that

image, I felt that the combination really was detrimental to the undergraduate colleges on this campus.

COHEN: That seems to be a leitmotif in many of these interviews. Malcolm Talbott was vice president and acting dean until Henry Blumenthal took over as dean of the college. What can you say about his contributions?

STOLBOFF: Well, I liked Malcolm. I thought he in many ways was an inspirational person to many of us. I think he made one terrible, terrible mistake, and that was in the settlement he agreed to as a result of the takeover. I think he gave far more than the students expected. And by agreeing to let in such a large number of underprepared students when we were underprepared in terms of dealing with them was a legacy that we struggled with for at least a decade. I mean a lot of harm was done in that period. Nobody knew how to handle this, and we should have been doing it on a small, controlled group. And certainly four hundred plus students was more than anybody was equipped to handle. And resources that were made available weren't adequate. And even if they had been, the people that were doing it didn't know how to. It's not even a reflection on them. Everybody was struggling. When I look back on it, it's amazing that we did as well as we did.

If it isn't too much of a diversion, I would like to tell you something nice about what's happening with one of my students from that first special program. I am going on Monday to a swearing-in of a young man who was one of the students in my Special Entrance Program. And he's being sworn in as a judge for the Workmen's Compensation Board. And he is somebody who I admitted to the program. And I don't know if you remember I said that I interviewed the students, and as often as not, their parents at that time. And then when the summer program started and I saw him and listened to the way he was responding, I thought I was crazy. His language difficulties were so enormous. He was a refugee from Cuba. By the end of the summer he was probably the best student in the group. And he graduated from here, went on to law school. And now I'm going to honor him for his appointment as a judge.

COHEN: What is his name?

STOLBOFF: Roberto Alcazar.

COHEN: Mm-hmm.

STOLBOFF: And he has remained in touch with me throughout the years. Periodically he's popped in. And that's what makes it worthwhile. It really does.

COHEN: The first provost after Malcolm Talbott left as vice president was Jim Young. And what can you say about his administration?

STOLBOFF: I would say I never figured out what the provost's office was or was supposed to do.

COHEN: [Laughs] Okay. Deans. Let's see, the first dean.... Malcolm Talbott was the acting dean at the time when you came in.

STOLBOFF: Blumenthal.

COHEN: Henry Blumenthal was really the first regular appointment as dean.

STOLBOFF: And Henry gave me my first job as director of the Special Entrance Program.

COHEN: The Special Entrance Program, yes.

STOLBOFF: I loved him! I had nothing but respect for him. I thought he was a scholar. I would say that he was able to be a good dean because he was working at a time in which the faculty were much more self-propelled in terms of what needed to be done for service and teaching. I don't think that Henry would be happy in today's environment trying to run the place.

COHEN: Acting Dean Gil Panson for a year. Any comments there?

STOLBOFF: Not really.

COHEN: Then the next regular appointment was Richard Robey. And what can you say?

STOLBOFF: There was a lot of anti-Robey feeling. I don't know whether you recall it. I can't say that my dealings with him were that direct. I thought that he unfairly ran into the kind of situation that any new person coming from the outside tends to encounter. I thought he had a lot of good ideas. And people by and large didn't give him a chance to get them off the ground. I think that if he had had a little bit more time, that he might have recovered from it. I think there was a matter of style much more than substance that was alienating people. But it was so different. I mean he was so young and energetic. To go from a laid-back era to somebody who was really trying to come in and make a name for himself, I really did not share the negativism, I would have to say.

COHEN: Why was he forced out?

STOLBOFF: Well, he alienated a lot of people, you know. He, I think again, made the mistake that people think you're a dean that you can do things by decree. And the system doesn't work that way. That's what I mean. In the days that Blumenthal was running the place, the faculty attitudes were very, very different. I mean I remember serving on committees, and people really did things on committees. I mean the committees were a very important part of the administrative arm. That's no longer true. Very few committees are really very, very active. And the faculty tend to not want to serve if it is a committee that has a reputation for a lot of work. You get very few kudos.

COHEN: And you say this change came about as a result of—

STOLBOFF: As a result of the reward system changing. If you knew that your promotions or getting tenure depends upon your research and has very few points awarded for service. I mean this is considered service, you know.

COHEN: Yes, yes.

STOLBOFF: That's part of the supposed triangle. And it makes for a very, very difficult thing. The faculty pay lip service. They don't want the administration running everything. But they are not activating themselves. And which comes first? I mean unfortunately you're going to have to live in this transition period. I think that it's changing. I think that the president is serious about changing the reward system. But again, it takes time.

COHEN: What can you say about Norman Samuels's deanship since he succeeded Richard Robey?

STOLBOFF: Well, you know, Norman's style is very different from mine. Norman and I grew up, if you will, in the same department—Political Science Department. I like him, I respected him. I have problems with the fact that he really does not know what it is to build a consensus on something and to find out where people are coming from before a decision is made that impacts on a wide area. Unfortunately, I regard this pretty much as a male management style if you will. This is why I think that people are learning that in many ways a woman's style of managing an area is more comfortable for the people that work for her. Now that isn't across the board. There are women who have gotten where they've gotten by accepting everything about the male decision-making model. And that's a total disaster because then you can end up with the worst of both worlds. Okay. But I mean I think that a much more natural style is for women to consult with people and try to build a team, rather than just going off on their own. Now, the ideal to me is somebody who does that but still has the guts to make the hard decisions. It doesn't work if all you do is continuously go through consensus building.

But Norman is pretty much a loner. And has resources—you know if resources are expanding, I think that that doesn't hurt too many people. I mean for example I didn't feel it when I was dean of admissions and Norman was dean of NCAS. Our paths really didn't cross in ways that involved resources or involved things that I wanted to do. So I didn't see that as a limiting factor on me. Pretty much I was able to have a set of autonomy, an area autonomy in the things that were important. But now you get into a situation in which you have to go through a provost or you have to go through a dean in order to do what you want. So that instead of some of these offices serving a supporting function for the people who are on the line, if you will, in dealing with the students, you're.... I mean the budget, the budget is a perfect example. I have no say in my budget.

COHEN: Hmm. No kidding! No input?

STOLBOFF: Virtually none.

COHEN: I mean you have a budget request, though.

STOLBOFF: Oh, I have.... I mean I can, within what I get, I can make decisions. But nobody uses the budget process as a policy-making process.

COHEN: I mean aren't you required to submit a budget request for your operation?

STOLBOFF: But it's in such broad.... I have to take the university categories. You cannot possibly tell what my office does based on the budget. Okay? Now the saving grace in my case is that I make money for my continuing—not big—but through my Continuing Education activities. So I'm able to supplement and do the things that I think are important through that budget. But not through the one that really is the official budget. So what happens to this operation if those funds dry up?

COHEN: This is what I want for wrap-up questions. Is there anything that we haven't talked about that we should have talked about? Any questions I haven't asked that maybe I should have asked?

STOLBOFF: Well, you haven't even gone into the whole question of the merger for UC in any great way. And as the school of business is created and separates from FASN, my feeling is that the evening school and what it offers can become a much more crucial part. As I think we mentioned earlier, in retrospect I think that the evening school has definitely been shortchanged by the integration. Students have been shortchanged. Because as I look at what was done, what were the kind of courses that were offered, the number of sections, there's no question about the fact that we're offering less. What is happened is that the FASN was very happy to take those resources. But the departments think first about the daytime offerings. And the faculty, even though there've have been plenty of faculty hired since the integration took place and every contract says you're able to teach and you have to teach at least two in the evening as well as the daytime, it just hasn't happened. I mean it really requires my saying to an individual faculty, please teach a course at night. We need something in your area. I mean how much of this can you do? Now, as a matter of fact, for example, David is going to meet with me and the four science chairs because I'm recommending that the science requirement be dropped for evening students simply because they don't offer enough courses. The students cannot take it. We get enrollments like a hundred plus in a Saturday course.

COHEN: Oh, boy! Oh, wow!

STOLBOFF: Simply because the students are trying to meet the requirements.

COHEN: Meet the requirements, yes.

STOLBOFF: That's an extreme case. But it's not an isolated case. So right now Gary Roth, who's the associate dean of instruction for University College, and I are starting the thinking process of what the school might look like, how we could do things that are different that might encourage some of the younger people to come and want to teach in the evening, as opposed to being forced to do it, and to create something else. Because the number of students you're going to bring into the day school are limited. I mean your traditional high school population has been shrinking. The area that you draw from is limited. The number of students you can put in a

dormitory, even that is limited; it helps a little bit, but not that enormously. So where are you going to get the number of students that we want to maintain the breadth of offerings and to not have to further reduce the faculty to the point where you're not truly a liberal arts college. I mean the evening operation, even though the faculty don't recognize it, is a very critical part of their future. So....

COHEN: You mentioned the business program, too, some area that we didn't touch on that you wanted to touch on.

STOLBOFF: Well, it's happening. I mean the decision has finally been made after all the anguished meetings and everything. Not much meat has been put on the skeleton in terms of how it's going to work. But there's no question about the fact that by this summer, the school of business will be on paper a reality. What it's going to mean for the students and how they're going to be served is what has to be worked out. In effect, what they've done is similar to what happened with UC. The faculty are being merged. And all the questions about how the students are going to be supported is an open book. As a matter of fact, there is absolutely nothing in any of the recommendations that mentions the word 'students.' It's as if you can create a college and only be concerned with the faculty. And that's where we're at right now. But the one point that I was successful in, the waters have not been muddied, at this point, by including the New Brunswick faculty. The first proposal and recommendation to the president was to merge all business faculty, including the New Brunswick operation.

COHEN: Oh! So that's not going to be?

STOLBOFF: Not right now.

COHEN: Not right now.

STOLBOFF: At least it's been put off for the future, and let's get a structure in place and how the organization is going to work. And then if we've at least ironed out—and believe, me, there are monumental organizational difficulties in this merger. The graduate school of management really does not want to be merged with the undergraduate because they have so many part-time people. I mean they're really.... And no additional resources being put up at this stage. So I'm not sure how without additional resources this represents much of an improvement. But it's taken it out of the debate stage right now, and everybody's been told, go. But that has to have a very serious impact on Newark College of Arts and Sciences and University College, what they're going to look like going to the future. And as a matter of fact, I'm going to a conference this weekend to deal with the question of reforming the majors.

COHEN: Oh!

STOLBOFF: And I'm hoping I get some fresh insights into how other people are doing it. Because we're now going to be down to humanities, social sciences, and sciences. And I think we're going to have to find more exciting ways to reconfigure them than we have at present.

COHEN: Thank you very much.

STOLBOFF: You're very welcome.

[End of Tape #2]

-----[End of Interview]-----

Reviewed and edited by Catherine Carey 5/7/2013