

**Emeritus Memories**  
**Graduate School of Education**

I have fond memories of my stay at the State University of New York at Buffalo. I enjoyed a life friendship with my colleagues in the Department of Educational Administration and with my doctoral students. As recently as 2002, I joined several of my former colleagues in Seattle, WN for an informal reunion at a national conference. As recently as this April 2007, while attending the AERA (American Educational Research Association) meeting in Chicago, I enjoyed dinner with my former UB student, Dr. Behrooz Saghafi, now professor and chair, Department of Management, Marketing and Information Systems at Chicago State University. Also when in Los Angeles, I get to visit with a former student, Dr. Joan Wise, associate dean of students at UCLA; when in Buffalo, I visit with Dr. Muriel Howard, president of Buffalo State College, and with several of my former students while visiting Doha, Qatar in the Middle East. I also look forward to hearing from scores of former students who are now school principals, assistant/associate superintendents and superintendents, and college professors. I also became friends with colleges in other departments in School of Education, and always look forward to seeing my colleagues and students.

**Frank Brown**  
**Professor 1972–1983**

\*\*\*\*\*

Prior to serving for three years on the faculty of OAP (Department of Educational Organization, Administration and Policy) from 1983–1986, I had spent ten years as an administrator at Erie Community College. Four of these years as academic dean at the City Campus, one year as division chair of Liberal Arts and General Studies and then five years as the vice-president of the City Campus. These last five years provided me with an opportunity to apply much of what I had learned both in graduate school at SUNY at Buffalo and as an organization development consultant for several years prior to that. I served as the facilitator and point person for the transition of an unaccredited ECC/City Campus from broken down quarters at Main and Riley streets in the center of the city to an accredited, historically restored new campus on a former post office site in downtown Buffalo. This experience served me well as a faculty member in OAP.

OAP gave me a splendid opportunity to work with students who in many instances were teachers in the Western New York area, mostly Buffalo. Some of these students have become colleagues and/or friends; a good example of which is Dr. Don Jacobs, the director of the Center for Applied Technologies in Education. Other students already had experience in education related work, or had made a commitment to pursue teaching once they completed either the master's or the Ed.D. program. These three years were both fun and challenging. Since much of my career found me working mostly as an administrator in post secondary positions, I knew that my time as a faculty member in OAP had a discernible beginning and ending point. Accordingly, after three years, I moved on to a position with the University of Maryland, Baltimore heading up its Office of Planning, Organization Development and

Research. These days I work with the same university on a retainer basis and I maintain a consulting practice with my partner, who is also my wife.

**Lee Butler**  
**Assistant Professor 1983–1986**

\*\*\*\*\*

### Happy Seventy Fifth: A Hedge Against Insularity

For as long as I can remember I thought of myself as a teacher. After all, I belonged to XYZ—a math tutoring society in high school. In college I was a member of the college tutoring society. One small event while in college, however, should have given me a clue that I had a lot to learn.

In my senior year at college, I was a substitute teacher one day for a friend of mine who was a teacher of a third grade class. After about twenty minutes of doing mathematics with them after lunch, the kids began to clamor for their homework assignment. I had not actually given any thought to homework, but since they wanted it, I made something up on the spot. I felt good about the fact that third graders were so interested in what I was teaching that they wanted more. As soon as I gave the assignment, the class rose in unison and walked out the door. When I spoke to my friend that night, he told me that assigning homework was always the last event of the day, and that once they had gotten the assignment, they knew that school had ended and they were free to leave!

Of course, the fact that I had tried to impart to third graders the wonders of finite dimensional vector spaces—a topic I was studying in a graduate mathematics course in college at the time—may have had something to do with their desire to exit as quickly as possible. As I said, I had a lot to learn.

### UB'S GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION: A "MOVING" EVENT

Some of that learning took place as a graduate student and faculty member at Harvard's Graduate School of Education between 1960 and 1972. It was there that I began the transformation from teacher (naïve at best) to educator. The bulk of that transformation, however, took place between 1973 and 1998 during my tenure as a faculty member of the Graduate School of Education at UB. What impresses me most is how much I was encouraged to use those years as a hedge against insularity. One of the most significant contributory events occurred in 1982 under the direction of our new dean, Hugh Petrie. It was the laborious and painful act of the reorganization of GSE.

When I first joined the faculty, I was a member of the mathematics education area. It was one of about ten disparate areas, each with some degree of structural autonomy. That reorganization streamlined these disparate subprograms into three main units: (1) Learning and Instruction, (2) Educational Organization, Administration and Policy, and (3) Counseling and Educational Psychology. Being the Hamlet that I am, I was not able to select just *one* department that best defined my interests. I chose (1) and (2).

These two departments captured my interest in mathematics education and philosophy of education, respectively. Consolidation and name change could possibly be viewed as pouring old wine into new vessels. That was not the case for me. It had the psychological effect of breaking up fiefdoms, encouraging greater scholarly and teaching collaboration with colleagues and graduate students, and (in my case) validating an area of interest (philosophy of education) that was perceived by many as tangentially related to mathematics. A dual commitment, however, was not without its tension, for it limited the number of meetings I could attend and it encroached upon the time I could spend on activities in each area. I was fortunate to have received generous support from many of my colleagues, who may have felt slighted by my decision.

Even before formal reorganization, however, I had begun to collaborate in teaching and writing with Gerry Rising, as we sought alternatives to what was then a highly quantitative and limited view of research in mathematics education. The collaboration was both joyful and supportive.

## MATHEMATICAL THINKING

One aspect of the dual affiliation is that it provided me with the courage to pursue and expand upon a more robust view of mathematics itself in relation to education. This was so regardless of the specific department within which my course work was eventually taught. Implicit in this robust view is a challenge to mathematics as rule driven, impersonal, dependent exclusively on logical analysis, lacking in drama and conflicting points of view, sharing little in common with other fields of inquiry. When mathematics is viewed in relation to the “real world,” it is usually seen as being applied to some real world situation. That is, it is seen as a *model* to explain, predict, and cleanse rather than as a discipline that shares important qualities with the ways in which we view the “messy” world.

Mathematics is often perceived (especially by scholars in other disciplines) as a field in which intelligence and hard work are the coin of the day, and if problems have not been solved, it is popularly believed that it is not because they are unsolvable, but rather that they may not have been well formed. Such a view has been rigorously demonstrated to be mistaken. In the 1930s, Kurt Gödel proved that within any “interesting” mathematical system, there must exist true statements that cannot be proven. Furthermore, we often cannot tell if the recalcitrance of a problem is a result of ignorance or its “Gödelian” quality.

## Math as Problem Posing

One way of softening the above perceptions of mathematical thinking and of personalizing it as well, is to shift a focus from problem *solving* to problem *posing*. Much of the coursework I have taught at GSE had its origins in that domain. My early thinking about the topic derived from my co-teaching a course at Harvard with my colleague, Marion Walter in the 1960s. A defining moment occurred as we reflected upon an event in one of our classes. Having in mind a conclusion that we wanted the students to explore, we presented them with an algebraic statement: The Pythagorean relationship ( $x^2 + y^2 = z^2$ ). Expecting students to come up with some well-known triples (like 3, 4, 5; and 5, 12, 13) we asked them for some answers.

In our discussion afterwards, we realized that we were asking them to “solve” a problem that had never been posed. In fact, it would be possible to view the equation as an inert statement, not requiring any reaction at all. At the time, we thought we had hit upon something interesting, but relatively minor. In fact, we had created a lifetime’s worth of investigation.

This new focus led to questions such as: Given a problem, what can one do with it other than solve it? How can we go about posing problems? What are different starting points for posing problems? One of the many schemes that we came up with is one we deemed “What if Not” thinking. We investigated how we can perceive what we are “given” as being otherwise.

## Math and X

One way in which I collaborated with graduate assistants was in teaching courses that acknowledged connections between mathematics and the real world—connections that highlighted qualities shared between mathematics and other ways of experiencing the world. Several different x’s became the subject matter for math and x connections.

One of the earliest ones was Math and Magic. This was taught to students with an interest in early childhood education, as well as those who viewed themselves as focused primarily on more advanced subject matter. The purpose was to find wonder and surprise in a field that was frequently perceived as devoid of these qualities. We made use of card tricks, and concrete materials, events with

unexpected probability, and a variety of anti-intuitive situations. The interaction between students who perceived themselves to be miles apart in terms of mathematical sophistication was itself a source of surprise. By use of models, some who were petrified of formal symbolism were able to understand and predict better than their supposedly more sophisticated colleagues what would happen when concrete materials were used to exemplify the symbolism. Eventually the students created a “math and real world” carnival as a culminating event to which the entire GSE community was invited. Students who helped organize the carnival were Joan Eschner and Betty Krist. Doctoral students who accompanied me in expanding ideas of this course later on were Dorothy Buerk, Bernard Hoerbelt, Maureen O’Grady, and Fran Rosamond.

Another Math and X course was Math and Humor. I explored philosophical analyses of humor in general, and eventually applied those theories to mathematical areas. First, we sought to find common qualities that humor and mathematics enjoy (some being those from the Math and Magic course). Then we moved in another direction. Instead of asking what qualities math and humor share, we explored in a frontal way the humor that can be found in mathematics *per se*. An example of a “howler” is what turned out to be the first crack in solving a long time problem in number theory: that every even number greater than 2 can be expressed as the sum of two primes—a 1742 conjecture of Goldbach. No headway was made for nearly two centuries. Then Schnirelman proved that any even number greater than 2 can be expressed as a sum of not more than 300,000 primes! What theory(ies) of humor might explain what is so funny about that theorem?

Finally, I designed a course that selected  $x$  to be just *one* element from within the larger well established system  $\{1,2,3,4,\dots\}$ . What was behind this choice was the realization that courses are frequently defined in terms of a gradual accretion to include a wide variety of properties or topics. The implication is that once you have “covered” a topic, you move on. But what is involved in “covering” a topic? In order to push the envelope for reducing content as normally defined, I designed the entire course around one concept as *foreground*, while others were background and used only to illuminate something about the foreground. I chose the *distributive property* as my example, and then spent the entire semester seeking what it might reveal about the nature of mathematics, and understanding/creating ideas. [If you answer the question “What is  $(83*62) + (17*62)$ ?” completely in your head, you have used some form of the property]:

Some of the issues we discussed in Mathematics and Distributivity were:

- The rich interplay of algebraic and geometric thinking.
- An intuitive, playful, and non-technical exploration of the concept of “same-different” in mathematical thought with an implicit focus on the concept of isomorphism.
- A challenge to what is normally believed to be the logic of extending number systems to new territory.
- The role of imagery and metaphor in proof and understanding.
- The consequences of shifting background and foreground in our thinking.

[Tom Giambrone, a graduate student at the time, assisted me in teaching this course.]

### Humanizing Mathematical Formats

As significant as content may be, the manner in which subject matter is learned has the potential to redefine the nature of the discipline as well as one’s perception of self as student. My dominant model was that of class as editorial board—intended to place the student in the dual role of author and critic. I borrowed that from one of my most powerful educational experiences as a graduate student: member of the editorial board of the journal *Harvard Educational Review*.

Though selected by professors on the faculty, the editorial board of the journal is composed, not of seasoned academics, but of a dozen or so graduate students, who remained on the board for

approximately two to three years. The board met bi-weekly for five to seven hours at a stretch in order to discuss and evaluate articles that had been submitted by scholars from throughout the world. The identity of the authors was not revealed to us until after we had evaluated their essays. The discussions were invigorating, and we were all expected to operate as if we were competent to judge articles that were usually outside each of our areas of specialization. In each case the board would decide whether to accept, reject, or require revisions for each article. With the “chutzpah” of neophytes, we rejected over ninety percent of them. What was humbling, however, is that we had to compose detailed letters of evaluation for each article we read, and especially for those we rejected. What was particularly embarrassing was the occasional need to craft a letter of rejection when an author turned out to be a doctoral advisor for some of the board members.

Though it went through many stages of revision, I adapted major pieces of this model in the teaching of several courses. I organized the class into three or four editorial boards, and the students assumed the roles of both author and critic. As authors, they submitted their articles anonymously to editorial boards of which they were not members; as critics, they read and evaluated articles submitted by students from other editorial boards. Each board then created a journal that consisted of articles they had accepted, which sometimes included earlier drafts of ones that had been revised based upon initial criticism.

What was particularly challenging was dealing in an open way with the organizational issues that arose in teaching it. Students were sometimes concerned about matters of compatibility with their editorial board colleagues. They also occasionally found it difficult to evaluate articles written by their classmates. Though everything was done to temper the unusually high rejection rate of articles submitted to the *Harvard Educational Review*, in some courses, students wanted recourse when they felt their articles had been judged unfairly. Frequently they came up with excellent suggestions for revising the format of the journal they produced. The issues raised by these conversations were personal in nature and were frequently as educationally valuable as the actual subject matter of the course. In recent years, Tom Schroeder and Deborah Moore-Russo in the Department of Learning and Instruction adopted versions of that format for their own problem posing courses, and they have offered some valuable criticism and improvement.

I introduced two other formats in course work that had the potential to redefine not only classroom discourse, but a conception of knowledge in mathematics. In one (with my graduate assistant, Fred Reiner), we explored the use of the Talmudic format—a text that was devised over two thousand years ago for the study of religious issues—and applied it to secular study. The format is particularly interesting because the actual page of the Talmud has dialogue and debate built in. A conflict is presented in the center section of the page and, around that, text layers of commentary appear that attempt to cope with it. We created positioning of the commentary on each page to indicate by its location the category of the conflict.

I designed the second “novel” format for students in the undergraduate honors program. In an effort to expand their view of mathematics, my graduate student Raffaella Borasi and I created several vignettes dealing with youngsters who are trying to understand such non-intuitive ideas as the following: “If I were a very small bee crawling along a number line from zero as a starting point, what would be the first number my feet might touch?”

Such thinking seeks a common theme in mathematics and theology. In both cases, we are flirting with some form of the question: “What is the first?” There is much possibility for debate here. We can explore questions like: “Are the two situations analogous?” The mathematical question assumes a starting point, 0. The one about the first act in the creation of the universe appears not to. “How does that difference affect how we view the two questions in relation to each other?”

Eventually I introduced them to a mathematical novel I had written entitled *Posing Mathematically*. It involves a number of different perspectives regarding what is or should be expected of students and

what is involved in mathematical thinking. The protagonists are two teachers who come across the value of thinking of mathematics as problem posing, and wonder how to introduce their ideas to teachers. In self-referential spirit, the protagonists decide to write a novel on problem posing. Students then wrote their own short stories based upon different mathematical ideas that had intrigued them for one reason or another.

## NON- MATHEMATICAL CONTEXTS

Once GSE had been re-organized, there were a number of collaborations that enabled me to continue to expand and redefine my interests. Within the Department of Educational Organization, Administration, and Policy (whose name was subsequently changed to Educational Leadership and Policy), philosopher of education, David Nyberg, and I began sharing both published work and drafts of work in progress. We decided to co-teach a course on ethics and education.

At about the same time, having just become a member of that newly formed department, I designed the first department-wide required course together with Marjorie Hanson (professor from educational administration) and my graduate assistant, Randy Hollister (philosophy of education). It was entitled *The Nature of Inquiry*. As much as we enjoyed teaching the course, the most intellectually stimulating part of the experience was our semester long preparation for it, especially as we considered and rejected many competing orientations among ourselves and in interviews with colleagues. That course has since undergone numerous transformations, but our version started with the assumption that how each of us inquires is largely a function of explicit as well as unarticulated *beliefs* about teaching, learning, the place of subject matter, our personalities, the comparative roles of education in formal and informal settings, and the sort of control we feel we need over a domain of inquiry (to name a few). We created research strategies to enable our students and ourselves to uncover implicit beliefs and prejudices that we all held in many of these categories.

Another course I devised in the newly formed department had the effect of tempering the seriousness of *The Nature of Inquiry*. The course, *The Philosophy of Humor*, divested from its intimate relationship to mathematics, was actually inspired by a wonderful compliment I had received many years before when I first started teaching. It turns out that my appointment as a junior faculty member at Harvard was to replace the brilliant satirist and songwriter, Tom Lehrer (of “That Was the Week that Was” fame). While still a graduate student, I sat in on some of his classes, and I looked forward to his display of humor. Surprise: There was none! It was as if his popular performance, and his teaching persona were disjoint pieces of his personality. I vowed then not to hide myself as a person from my students, and in particular, I learned to share my humor with my classes not only as a form of integrating elements of my personality, and as a way of relaxing students, but as a vehicle for better understanding the development of ideas. I was successful to a degree (no pun intended) since my students who had taken course work with Tom Lehrer and with me told me that I was funnier than he...in the classroom. Unfortunately, I could not hold a candle to him on stage.

I began the humor course with a half a dozen jokes that I heard the philosopher Max Black of Cornell deliver. As he had done at the lecture, I challenged the class to come up with one coherent theory that covered what was funny in the disparate jokes. After trying to come up with a theory, we then read a number of philosophical essays that sought a unifying perspective, and again approached those jokes to see if we could find one that covered them all.

Another course I was able to create in the new department was entitled *The Educational Potential of Problems*. We explored philosophical perspectives on the concept of problem itself and on “near relatives” of it. Literature in the philosophy of science, as well as in social sciences was helpful. We dug deeply into personal issues related to differing levels of abstraction, inclinations to share problems, and interconnections with other problems.

A poignant letter written by Tamar Jacobson comments about the course:

As I put [my] scrapbook together, I think about the ‘journey’ of this past semester as we talk about the nature of problems: whether we need to solve them, neutralize them, be perplexed by them, be confused by them, how to deal with them, how to solve them, what they look like, what they do not look like....Didn’t we all learn from experience and experiencing this semester?...We were encouraged to think, deeply, about so many issues and problems. We had lots of responsibilities with and for each other and Steve shared equally in all. He taught us the spontaneity of confusion and neutralization. He helped us make life messy. What a relief from the illusion of sterile control...

Towards the end of my tenure at UB, I collaborated with Bob Stevenson on a course that is his specialty: Action Research. It was a field I knew essentially nothing about, and I learned an enormous amount—including something about resistance to new paradigms. My experience in assisting him in the course suggests that it might be quite valuable for an experienced professor in a field to invite a more naïve colleague to co-teach a course. Such feedback can be enormously helpful to a colleague who is deeply entrenched in the field.

In the early 1980s I began not only to expand my collaborative efforts, but chose to do so by integrating my teaching and scholarship in new ways. Having begun to mature in my evolution from teacher to educator, I had become interested in the philosophical underpinnings of the progressive education movement. Shortly after joining the John Dewey Society, they asked me to edit a collection of readings from their defunct journal (1924 through 1957) *Progressive Education*. Since the once popular journal had become inaccessible, but nevertheless timeless in its analysis of educational issues, I took on the daunting task of culling the best of articles from its thirty-four year history.

Influenced once more by my experience on the editorial board of the *Harvard Educational Review*, I taught several classes over a two-year period in which I essentially “anointed” advanced graduate students as the editorial board of the collection. I selected students with an interest in education from fields as diverse as philosophy, psychology, science, reading, foreign languages, administration, and mathematics. The last time I taught the course, it turned out to be the final UB course that most of them were taking. To a person, they commented on the value of the course as an opportunity to integrate disparate threads of their specialties. This observation surprised me since that was not the intention of the course, but it does challenge popular beliefs about what are useful integrating experiences following several years of specialization.

After significant input from these different editorial boards, I solicited the help of two people to assist me in preparing the final collection for publication. My co-authors of the published collection were Mary Finn (an historian of education, who taught a number of *ad hoc* courses at GSE) and Eileen T. Brown (a social psychologist and wife extraordinaire). They helped pare down the collection, and joined me in relating the articles to each other and to the field. Students involved were Raffaella Borasi, Laurie Castiglione, Sharon Cichocki, Robert Dishner, Larry Feldman, Randy Hollister, Herbert Hough, Hyacinth Iwoha, Larry Heikkila, James Hilty, Nancy Monaco, Ann Marie O’Donnell, Yael Paley, James Rank, Bruce Reopolis, Fay Roe, Margaret Stempien, and Sindy Vertlieb.

#### BOTH CLOSURE AND OPENSURE

In closing, I would like to thank the numerous students and colleagues who contributed their own memories of GSE experiences in a 2006 book (edited by Frances Rosamond and Larry Copes) commemorating my retirement entitled *Educational Transformations: The Influences of Stephen I.*

*Brown.* Though my recollections here are focused a bit narrowly on my teaching as a source of memories, some may have a more universal quality. I have highlighted elements that were conducive to collaboration, to integrating teaching and research, to fostering personal growth, and to relating to students in a way that honored them as both specialists and generalists—even when many of them initially had reservations about their competence in both domains.

I am left not only with fond memories of friendships acquired with former students and faculty, but with an infinite number of cartons in my basement. They contain treasures of student-produced material, my letters to them commenting on their papers, all the assignments for each course, notes that I have gathered to suggest further exploration of ideas raised in each of the courses, and student evaluations and criticism of the teaching strategies that were sometimes perceived as bizarre. I look forward to culling through this material over the next few years and to unearthing potential treasures, given the perspective of time, and of new as well as recurring educational mantras. On the other hand, either a new life or a flood that would render all those cartons mildewed and unusable might be a welcome alternative. Perhaps it would lead to a state of nirvana to be able to experience a clean basement AND a clean slate as integrally connected.

**Stephen Brown**  
**Professor 1973–1998**

\*\*\*\*\*

Thank you for the kind invitation to share my “fond” memories in celebration of FES’s (Faculty of Educational Studies) 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary. In order to do this I will need to put my memory in context. When I arrived at UB it had just gone public. In its earliest years it was group oriented. In my department (educational administration), we dealt with groups which we called “phases.” For example, we had a phase I and phase II group of entering students who met on Saturdays from 8:30 to 2:30. They were adventurous.

Our next experiment was the “learning modules.” These were one credit mods of instruction that would provide the academic base for continued learning in larger, units of instruction that we would call courses today. This model or structure lasted for about ten years as we tinkered to refine the concept. It was after this had run its course that I found the structure for me most satisfying. We spent time as teams of faculty, student assistants, and students with the real problems of experience working together to create techniques for working on said problems. These units of applied experience we called “concentrations.”

We had divided our faculty into three teams: one to deal with the school as an organization, a second that worked mainly with the school at the district or control level, in this case it was a political concentration which was primarily for superintendents; thirdly, we looked at the intermediate level where the role was on school business and the economics of educating. This included operations analysis, etc.

I continued with the school organization concept, working mainly with and for principals. During this period, we developed an understanding of “organizational behavior” (and in essence, created the East Coast specialization or concentration called Organization Development). I found this to be my most rewarding year due mainly to the close collaboration of students, practitioners, and faculty both within and external to our department. We met during this course time twice, sometimes four times per week each of



two semesters. Most of this was “voluntary” on the part of all participants. The camaraderie was what I felt then and still remember.

**James Conway**  
**Professor 1967–2000**

\*\*\*\*\*

My three-decade plus tenure, initially at the School of Education, then the Faculty of Educational Studies, and finally the Graduate School of Education was a joy. I recall stellar leadership and mentorship from such top-drawer deans as Bob Fisk, Rollo Handy, Gil Moore, and Bob Rossberg. I remember very many splendid students, stimulating colleagues, and wonderful support staff. I fondly recollect the thrill of building on an already fine program and helping to bring the department to national prominence. I do not miss the Buffalo-area weather (as I sit here in sunny Florida). But all else about the Buffalo experience was extremely positive.

**Stan Cramer**  
**Professor 1965–2001**  
**Interim Dean 1972–1973, 1980–1981**

\*\*\*\*\*

I came to UB in the fall of 1969 as a “higher ed rookie.” I had just finished my dissertation and had only taught high school for two years, so definitely felt like a novice. The School of Education had attracted a number of “senior stars” in the rush that followed the conversion to SUNY in the early 1960s. I recall several faculty meetings when key issues and decisions were being discussed/argued by the likes of Paul Lohnes, Bob Harnack, Bill Eller, and Ollie Gibson, to name only a few. What erudite, elegant, and eloquent wordsmiths “my colleagues” were. I questioned whether I belonged here. This was nothing like my old high school in Minnesota. I “hung in there” and listened and learned much in my years at UB, but never achieved such academic heights.

Within our LAI (Learning and Instruction) department meetings, I always admired the contributions of my friend, Bruce Miller. He would sit quietly, listening to a wide ranging discussion, perhaps taking a few notes. Then, as the discussion seemed to end, Bruce would calmly, quietly summarize the discussion and present a compromise solution to what was a confusing quagmire. Another example of the power of words, so slimly developed in my science training.

Shifting to another “playing field,” I have great memories of our FES softball team, during the time when we were called the Faculty of Educational Studies. We only had a team for a few years, but I do recall the teamwork among the students, staff, and faculty that composed this team. The captain/leader/organizer of this modestly athletic group of course was Roy Callahan, of considerable athletic skills. I remember Gerry Rising and Ed Jenkins were “regulars” on this squad. While I may not remember how many games we won, I do remember how great it was to see friends in a different context.

One of my first memories of joining the education team at UB was the fact that our department (then called Department of Instruction) included the HPER faculty (health, physical education, and recreation). Only a few years after I came to UB, they moved to the Health Sciences. My first chair at UB was from the HPER area, Carlton Meyers, a fine scholar from the physical education area. One of his doctoral graduates, David Pendergast, is now a professor in our much acclaimed physiology department. Other members of that HPER group were John Piscopo, Gerry Greenberg, Diane DeBacey, and Len Surfistini (who also coached the UB basketball team). At that time, music education was in our department, represented by the senior scholar, Irving Cheyette, who was the advisor of Maria Hale Runfola, who is now the chair of LAI. Another senior member of that department was Harriet Montague, professor of mathematics education.

Arriving in the fall of 1969, I experienced the chaotic year when we had protests and National Guard troops on campus. I was not totally shocked as I had been at the University of Wisconsin the year before when the Madison campus had similar problems, maybe even worse. I recall one evening class (I believe in one of the “annexes”) when a young female student came into class, upset and crying, saying “I have just been hit in the back by a tear gas canister.” I quickly said, “Class is over.” I may have forgotten the name of that student, but shall never forget the incident.

**Rod Doran**  
**Professor 1969–2002**

\*\*\*\*\*

There were thirteen faculty in the School of Education when my father arrived there in 1953 from Syracuse. The first faculty member he hired and the most revered was Robert Rossberg. Dr. Rossberg stepped up to the deanship when my father served as active administrative vice president. He traveled to each of the 48 states to recruit more faculty. My mother said that when my father brought someone home for dinner he would call ahead and suggest a good or bad menu depending on whether he felt that particular individual was a strong candidate.

My father took the initiative in setting up a work group consisting of “Four University Deans.” Along with Virgil Rogers from Syracuse, Bill Fullager from Rochester, and another dean (whose name my father can’t recall) from Cornell, they worked together to approach foundations to request funding for graduate education faculty. The Ford Foundation was one of the responders, without which my father could not have grown the faculty at Buffalo. The Ford Foundation also funded he and Ken Rehage from the University of Chicago to go to Pakistan in 1957 as consultants to design the secondary school system for that country. My mother went along and received a battle-ax from a chief at the top of the Khyber Pass. That evening when they were out for a walk it began to get dark and my mother felt uneasy. My father reassured her that they couldn’t get lost because the hotel told him to ask directions from anyone wearing pants. Pants meant they were educated and knew English. There weren’t very many men with pants. Just then, down the way across the street, there came such a man. Before they could hail him, the man held up his hand and said “Why! Dean Fisk, what are you doing here?” As it turned out, the man was a former student of his from Buffalo.

My father remembers the substantial growth he supervised during the 1956 summer session. He taught at Eugene, Oregon that summer and continued to supervise the summer session budget by phone.

The foremost transformation came when the school became a state school. It was that change and the early foundation funds that allowed the growth that occurred.

What attracted my father to Buffalo was the reputation and history of strong academic freedom that was the university environment. He attributes that environment to Vice Chancellor Capen, for whom Capen Hall is named.

My father doesn't miss the snow, but does miss the academic environment.

**Robert Fisk** (as told by his son, John Fisk)  
**Dean 1953–1967**  
**Professor 1967–1978**

The following are John Fisk's childhood recollections:

We moved to Buffalo in 1953 and from then on the School of Education and its activities became the center of my family's lives. I was ten at the time and struggled to explain to my boyhood friends what my father did. One day he helped me explain by providing this phrase, "I teach teachers to be better teachers." I remember unlimited use of the university pool on weekends, playing softball at the summer time department picnics, and having dinner interrupted because the football coach was at the door pleading to have a player taken off academic probation before Saturday's game.

We watched the department go from a small private institution single discipline to a large state university major player. School busing, integration of Buffalo schools, a strong relationship with Buffalo State College, and influence in Albany were some of the issues emanating from my father's office.

The one area I am most proud of is the initiation of a medical education task force. One day George Miller, M.D. (later writer and director of medical education at the University of Chicago) came to my father as an internist at Buffalo General asking for help because he had to teach some medical students and didn't know how. My father brought together faculty members Adelle Land and Steve Abrahamson (later director of medical education at USC), to help George Miller. Abrahamson and Miller are now the historical underpinnings of medical education principles nationally. I did my M.D. at Buffalo and am now a professor of surgery at Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, where both my wife and I are very active in the Department of Medical Education.

*(Editor's Note: In a separate phone conversation, Fisk focused on the accomplishments of Adelle Land, including her role integrating the teacher education program into the curriculum. Fisk noted, "I can't stress the importance of her influence on the school...she was the finest lecturer on topics of education." On a personal level, Fisk described Land as "...a wonderful person...we became very good friends.")*

\*\*\*\*\*

One of my fondest moments—and one for which GSE can take much pride—was the 1978 graduation of 80-some Nigerian candidates for the Ed.M. degree. These faculty and staff of Alvan Ikoku College of Education (AICE) in Owerri were involved in the monumental task of preparing teachers for a new Nigeria, only a few years following the cessation of their civil war. Initiated by Professor Charles Fall in 1975, in collaboration with UNESCO and the Nigerian government, this program (known as the SUNY/B-AICE Program) sent GSE faculty to Owerri for 3–8 week intensive sessions to teach courses ranging from social foundations to educational psychology to instructional methods, administration, and research. Each student also wrote a thesis, read by a UB advisor and at least one other GSE professor. As director of, and teacher in, the program from early 1976 to 1981, I witnessed the dedication of both the GSE faculty and two additional cohorts of Ed.M. candidates from AICE. We also welcomed a dozen or more of the alumni of this program to doctoral programs in GSE departments here in Buffalo. The program, directed in its last phase by Professor Gail Kelly in the 1980s, finally died of success in the sense that master's-level teacher education programs, modeled at least in part on ours, became viable in revitalized Nigerian universities.

**Ron Gentile**  
**SUNY Distinguished Teaching Professor 1969–2004**

\*\*\*\*\*

I was fortunate to have become a member of the then faculty of the School of Education in 1964, which was just after the private UB became a graduate center of the SUNY system. It was a very exciting time to be part of an organization on the move toward greatness. There were many highlights during my tenure of 34 years but two in particular stand out for me. Being involved in the planning, designing, and move to Baldy Hall on the Amherst Campus from Foster Hall on the Main Street Campus was a wonderful experience for both the faculty and students. Number one for me was when the Department of Educational Administration was recognized by the American Association of School Administrators as the number one administrator preparation program in the nation in the late 70s. The quality of the faculty, program, and student body in educational administration at that time was exceptional.

**Robert Heller**  
**Professor 1964–1998**

\*\*\*\*\*

Your use of the word fond in soliciting our memories of GSE was somewhat baffling. The word, meaning to cherish with affection, didn't strike me as a particularly useful guide. I know you didn't want colleagues to drift off into nostalgia but I haven't been away from UB that long. I'm just now beginning to get nostalgic about my days in the Navy, ca. 1948–52.

So I thought I'd take my lead from your opening paragraph—creating and shaping the history of GSE. Reflecting on my first year at UB, working with Gil Moore was a solid

introduction to the place. It added to the knowledge I'd gained as Harry Porter's assistant in Central Administration. A few years later, as the old Department of Educational Administration worked through a complete reorganization of its programs, I came to realize that Gil had gotten it all underway with his searching questions. Thus, I have tried, in a few short paragraphs, to recapture what I believe was the beginning of a revolution through the following decades—change would be a constant in our thinking.

I have sanitized the story, leaving out the more dire problems, regarding administration personnel, hung over from the time before the state bought UB. There are still folks around who thought UB was doing fine as a private institution!

Gil Moore

In the summer of 1967, Dean Fisk hired me as assistant dean. By the time I left Washington and got to Buffalo, many changes had taken place. Mr. Meyerson had become president at UB, Dean Fisk was on leave in Israel, Rollo Handy had been appointed provost of the newly renamed Faculty of Education—he was also on leave for the coming year. Gil Moore had been designated acting provost.

Gil called Nancy Broderick (Budget) and me into his office and poured three sherrys. He gave us a brief rundown on the confusion across campus as Mr. Meyerson was issuing conflicting fiats for change every day. With the next round of sherry, he went over the problems in the Faculty of Education, including a new, thin, temporary administration—the three of us.

Gil also posed the larger questions: what does it mean to be a Faculty of Education vs. a School of Education? It might have been easier to leave that to Dr. Handy but Gil wasn't going to be just a place holder. He thought that, at least, he should get colleagues thinking about the question. We decided that Gil would glean what meanings he could from meetings with the president and provosts. I was to research the question in whatever literature I could find. Gil would then quietly lobby, in his words, those colleagues open to change.

While we never arrived at a clear, concise meaning of "Faculty of Education," Gil concluded from the information we had that change was necessary. Our departments were islands unto themselves and many of our programs looked like those of a teacher training institute. A revamping of our programs would require them to have more depth and stronger links to philosophical and conceptual bases. There had to be more inter-departmental coordination and reinforcement of a "wholeness" across the field of education.

I believe that the one year with Gil Moore as acting provost was the beginning of GSE as it is today. The several reorganizations of the department structure, the redevelopment of programs and, of course, the openings to new cutting edge activities, reflect Gil's conclusions. His lobbying began the shift in attitude needed to start the processes of change.

**Robert Jennings**  
**Professor 1967–2000**

\*\*\*\*\*

The day I was interviewed for the position at UB, tear gas was being used on the Main Street Campus. The interview was in Foster Hall.

The opportunity to teach and advise master's and doctoral students was a gift that I always will treasure.

Being promoted to full professor (1982) and professor emeritus (2000) will long be remembered.

Hooding my doctoral graduates was always special.

Observing the success of those who studied with me over my 30 years at UB. This included some 70 Ed.D. and Ph.D. graduates and about 150 Ed.M. grads over a 30 year career.

**Al Pautler**  
**Professor 1970–2000**

\*\*\*\*\*

Here are the top 11 of my fondest memories (I couldn't keep it to 10):

11. Driving to the airport late at night with a large federal grant application to meet a midnight deadline (unfortunately, we didn't get the grant).
10. Helping to establish and nurture an active alumni association.
9. Living through some very difficult retrenchment in the 80s to see GSE emerge stronger and better.
8. Hosting the winter "Banish the Blahs and Blues" brunch.
7. Writing successful promotion and tenure letters for the faculty.
6. Playing tennis on Friday afternoons with some of my colleagues and friends.
5. Shepherding the first distinguished professorship in GSE through the SUNY process with several more to follow.
4. Participating in the Holmes Groups that helped us to see the compatibility of scholarship, research, and teacher education.
3. Preparing with the faculty new promotion and tenure guidelines for professional schools that emphasized practical research and scholarship; later adopted by the whole university.
2. Working with an absolutely outstanding staff of professionals and secretaries in the Dean's Office.

1. Leaving the deanship after 16 full years to the best position in GSE: full professor.

**Hugh Petrie**

**Dean 1981–1997**

**Professor 1997–2000**

\*\*\*\*\*

In 1963, I was evaluating a few opportunities in various cities, and was leaning strongly toward the position at the University of Buffalo. Several folks had said to me, “Certainly, you aren’t thinking of going to Buffalo, are you?” I said to my colleagues, “Well, I’ll try it for a year, and if I don’t like it, I can always go somewhere else!”

So, I came to the university and started the master’s degree program in instructional communication. I was honored to have the opportunity to develop such a program, and after a few years, there was a significant demand also for a Ph.D. program. I was also given the opportunity to develop this, and it became a successful program that attracted many people. As a result, 84 students received their doctorates—students who came from the U.S. and from dozens of other countries—as well as many who received their master’s degrees.

I am grateful for the privilege of designing the program, and for working with it as it grew and developed over the years. It was a challenging job, but a most rewarding one, and I remain honored that the Graduate School of Education gave me the chance to make it happen.

In 1967, the university provided me the opportunity to take a sabbatical year, and I began work with UNESCO. It had always been my desire to provide better education for the world in some way, and this was a chance to contribute to a global effort. It opened the door to a future consulting experience that gave me many ways to provide opportunities for better education to many countries and people.

Through my work with the Graduate School of Education and the University of Buffalo, I came into contact with many promising and talented students. I was able to form a friendship with them that has lasted to this day. They have spread far and wide, positively affecting the lives of many, and I treasure the relationship that I have had with them over the years.

The University of Buffalo, and in particular the Graduate School of Education, gave me the chance to be creative in my work, and to pursue excellence in education both here and in other parts of the world, and for that I am extremely grateful. In that way, my fondest memory of GSE has been the opportunity to personally grow and to become a lifelong colleague with the students with whom I enjoyed working so much. It is that opportunity that I treasure the most today! Congratulations on the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Graduate School of Education, and thank you again for the fond memories I have found within it!

**Taher Razik**

**Professor 1963–1995**

\*\*\*\*\*

My forty years as a member of this education faculty have left me with enough pleasant memories to fill volumes, most of them associated with students and colleagues. I will comment briefly on a few colleagues and I apologize to the many others who should also be included. Please assign those omissions to a mind sliding too rapidly into remission.

Bill Eller sponsored my initial appointment and I only came to realize over time how central and positive a role he would play in my future. At that time I also met mathematics department chair, Dis Mali, whose kindness to me it also took me years to understand. But my favorite interview was with Dean Bob Fisk. Bob told me that, while he appreciated my extensive vita, he wondered how much was boilerplate. "All of it," I thought, but for once I kept my mouth shut.

We were in Foster Hall on Main Street then and those were exciting years. Tear gas in building stairwells, police marching across campus, a faculty sit-in in Harriman Hall. But those activities drew us closer as colleagues. Well-regarded across campus, our chairman, Jack Nelson, gave us useful insights into campus and regional politics. That was also when I first came to know Bruce Miller, who continues to be a trusted friend and confidant. When Jack left for Rutgers, Carl Meyers took over and handily steered our little department through some threatening years.

At about that time, we added four faculty members who would be especially important to me. The first was Steve Brown, about whom I cannot say enough. Quite simply, I consider him the finest teacher I have ever known. Rod Doran and Roy Callahan arrived then too, and I can imagine no finer friends. I say that even though Rod trounced me just as regularly on the handball court as Roy did on the golf course. Tony Papalia provided strong and selfless direction to our programs.

I came to respect colleagues in other departments too. Stan Cramer and I shared a background as English teachers. Jim Hansen enjoyed well-deserved university-wide stature and was a champion squash player as well. The list of co-workers I should thank for so many favors is virtually endless. Just a few others include: Tom Frantz, Charlie Fall, Warren Button, Ed Jenkins, Herb Foster, Don Stover, Betty Krist, Lilliam Malave, Florence Fradin, and more recently Doug Clements, Julie Sarama, Tom Schroeder, Deborah Moore-Russo, and Jim Hoot. I apologize for not listing, too, the many secretaries who served us all so well over the years.

I am proud to be an emeritus member of what was first the Faculty of Educational Studies and is now the Graduate School of Education, and I am pleased to see this group continue to gain in those measures of quality that give it national recognition.

**Gerald Rising**  
**SUNY Distinguished Teaching Professor 1966–1992**

\*\*\*\*\*



W  
O

I came into the Graduate School of Education by default. Having completed the first phase of my teaching career with a rather wild departure, headed by my resignation, I was feeling vulnerable and deeply alienated from anything that looked like a dictatorial administration. Everyone told me, then, that I needed a Ph.D. if I were to amount to anything. I thought of going to the English department, but I had studied English all my life, had taught American literature for 13 years, and somehow I thought that the English department, with its emphasis then on creative writing, would never give me an outlet for the angry energy I had. I also rejected the idea of the philosophy department because I still could feel the total rejection my class of philosophy majors in undergraduate school felt when we were first introduced to the Vienna School of Logical Positivists. I think my professor said, "Hogwash!" Clearly, I was not up-to-date enough to study in a department enamored with Wittgenstein.

I finally came to GSE, believing that I could fit in any department. After all, I had taught for 26 years: boys, girls, co-eds, romantics, transcendentalists, existentialists, hippies, yuppies, and any other "with it" group one can remember. There was little, I mistakenly figured, I did not already know about "education." I had read a raft of articles, and I was ready to get going.

I first went to the psychology of education department, offered myself to the department head and received my initial categorical rejection. I went then to Lois Weis to suggest that I was just the person she ought to want in her sociology of education courses. She, too, pointed out my lack of appropriate background and gently cited my need for a good deal of study before I could even think about aspiring to be a sociology major at GSE. I felt totally defeated. On my way from checking out at the department office, I passed David Nyberg's door. As always, he was in his room, deeply engrossed in a book he was either reading or writing. Either way it was all the same; he was totally engrossed in what he was doing. I interrupted him sheepishly, and much to my total joy and surprise, he heard everything I said inarticulately and, what is more, he thought that he might just be able to help me. He liked the philosophy in my background, my master's in humanities (with an emphasis in English), and, incidentally, my enthusiasm. He said he would talk to the others in social foundations (what was that? I thought). He answered my question without knowing what a breakthrough he was providing when he suggested that I might be a candidate for a degree in philosophy of education (ultimately a subset of social foundations).

Without doubt, my first impressions of GSE were the result of hubris and misinformation, to say the least. Shortly after I started my classes, I began to sense the power that was quietly residing in GSE. I studied with David Nyberg, Maxine Seller, Lois Weis, and Stephen Brown, to mention only a few. The courses proved both stimulating and informative. What is more, I worked with Ron Gentile as a mentor for my Methods of Inquiry program and with Hugh Petrie, who volunteered to teach in my program and help all of us on the Methods of Inquiry team by making significant comments and needed suggestions. He and Ron also became spokesmen in the ongoing university dialogue relating to Methods of Inquiry and our commitment to it. They were strong, positive, and influential. They brought many UB faculty and administrators along with them.

In the course of time, I began to feel that I had entered a new world in GSE. I recognized that I was learning what I should have known all along. To this day I am grateful.

**Susan Schapiro**  
**Clinical Associate Professor 1995–2000**

\*\*\*\*\*

Several things stand out in my memory about my early years at GSE—the mid 70s. No one was thinking about “spousal” hiring when I showed up at the doors of GSE (then FES, Faculty of Educational Studies) as the wife of a physician being recruited to chair a new department in the medical school. I was a historian (unwanted by the history department—wrong field), I had never set foot in a school of education, and the job I had just left was in a community college, not a graduate school. Yet the people in what was then the Social Foundations of Education Department took a chance on me, and I am still amazed, and grateful, that they did. Warren Button interviewed me in his inimitable way, mumbling kindly but inaudibly into his pipe. I don’t remember what he asked me and I’m not sure that I knew even then. A week later I found myself in a classroom teaching something called Social Foundations of Education. I had no idea what the subject was, but someone told me that history was part of it. So I took a deep breath and plunged into a course about American social history, throwing in what little I knew about schools whenever I could. I will always remember how helpful Warren, Mike Simmons, and other veteran colleagues were, providing the advice, sample syllabi, and definitions of “social foundations,” (no two of them alike) that got me through that first semester.

I will always remember, too, the friendship of Gail Kelly, the comparativist hired the same year I was. That first year we shared an office in Foster Hall on the South Campus, an office so tiny that when one of us spoke with a student, the other had to step outside. There was only room for two chairs. Gail and I “integrated” the department, which had been all male before, and caused great consternation by changing the departmental culture. Juggling family and work, we didn’t have time for the then customary drinking parties and out-of-town weekend retreats. Like foxhole buddies, we quickly became close friends and shared what Gail called “sanity checks” about our lives. We laughed together when some of our colleagues couldn’t seem to tell us apart and when someone referred inquiries about sex education in the public schools (which neither of us knew anything about) to either or both of us, whichever woman was handy.

As other women joined the GSE faculty, we formed a weekly “ladies lunch” support group. We had so much fun that friends from outside GSE sometimes joined us (we were “interdisciplinary”). I don’t remember the food, except for the virtuous veggie burger and the California sunshine salad. I do remember the shop talk, the family talk, the (usually good natured) gossip, the political analysis (at every level, from the campus to the nation) and the wonderful camaraderie—although I’m sure our little conclave made some of our male colleagues a bit uneasy.

My unpleasant memories of GSE in the 1970s were the constant reports and/or rumors of massive budget cuts that sent shivers down my untenured spine. Luckily, the axe never seemed to fall, at least not on me. I remember, too, endless discussions (probably still going on) about (1) mission statements, (2) what’s the difference between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D.?, (3) how can we attract more (good) students?, (4) how can we get more lines?, and

(5) REORGANIZATION—which, to my surprise, finally happened. Just when I was beginning to get a handle on what Social Foundations of Education was all about, the department disappeared or, more accurately, was folded into a larger unit. Life didn't change very much. I was still a historian, only now I was working with a larger circle of interesting colleagues and students.

The best thing I remember about my early years in GSE—aside from the great food at Dean Bob Rossberg's famous February brunches—was the freedom and support I always felt in developing my own courses and research based on my own intellectual interests. My friends and colleagues—and perhaps most of all my students—at GSE enabled me to grow as a scholar and a person and made my life challenging and very rich. I am grateful.

**Maxine Seller**  
**Professor 1974–2002**

\*\*\*\*\*

It would be difficult to identify with confidence the many factors that influenced and shaped the history and development of the Graduate School of Education, but a 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary merits congratulations and attention.

My primary responsibility was administrative when I first arrived at UB. While a dean and vice president I was fortunate in never failing to teach one course each semester and interact with graduate students; I later taught full-time to complete my quarter century relationship with our graduate school.

I remain grateful for my involvement in an educational process never set in stone; I profited so much in a unique setting from contacts with congenial colleagues and access to extraordinary resources to keep up with current research.

My most rewarding memories and deepest appreciation revolve around the eternally youthful and optimistic waves of students, always with differing perspectives and fresh ideas. I prepared classroom material that I hoped would be interesting and meaningful to them, from whom I learned so much. Fortunately, I have maintained friendship with some former students, the greatest gift of all.

**Richard Siggelkow**  
**Professor 1959–1990**

\*\*\*\*\*

### GSE and Me: A 39 Year Alliance

Congratulations to the Graduate School of Education as it celebrates the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its founding! It is a pleasure to reflect on the 39.5 years of that history when I was an active GSE faculty member and to recount some of the highlights of those years. While the request was for “fond memories,” of which there are many, I will occasionally refer to memories that were not “fond.” Fond memories are purchased at a price. A great School of Education—or a

great anything is not achieved without extraordinary effort; gains and losses, good years and bad years are part of the mix.

My association with the School of Education (“Graduate” had not yet been inserted into its title) began July 1, 1963, one year after the merger of the University of Buffalo and the State University of New York. Nelson Rockefeller, who did not know the meaning of constrained resources, was governor of the state and establishing SUNY as the nation’s premier state system of higher education was one of his priority goals. Economic conditions were good and there was a general sense of optimism in the country. While there may have been more personal prestige value to be gained in accepting a position at an already established and distinguished university, there was an enticing sense of excitement at Buffalo provided by the opportunity of nurturing a good regional university into a great national university backed by the seemingly unlimited resources of the State of New York.

Achieving excellence was a goal of UB during my entire tenure as I suspect it was prior to my coming because there were a number of outstanding programs already in place when I arrived. Under Martin Meyerson, the first UB president appointed after the merger, we were to become the “Berkeley of the East.” A primary goal of the administration of Steven Sample, which was realized, was to raise the quality of the university to a level where it would be recognized through election to the Association of American Universities, composed of the elite among American universities. The university’s current strategic plan, UB 2020, envisions “achieving enduring academic excellence.” To achieve and maintain excellence in research, teaching, and service requires a conscious and continuing focus on it. This has become a tradition of the university and GSE.

After the merger, the faculty quickly doubled in size with mostly young, but highly qualified, faculty seasoned with a few established scholars. The faculty were well compensated and well supported with secretaries (critical before PCs, copiers, answering machines, and faxes), travel funds, and student assistants. With the increase in size, a unitary School of Education divided into eight departments; one was the Department of Educational Administration (EDA) of which I was a member. At its peak, EDA had twelve faculty, double its current size. There was a heavy emphasis on curriculum development and teaching. With the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, an influx of federal money became available to support research, training programs, and demonstration projects. To accommodate the burgeoning number of faculty and students, temporary classrooms were placed in all of the open space on the Main Street Campus (then the only campus) and additional space was leased along Main Street from Williamsville to downtown, including the “paint factory” next to Bennett High School and the Guarantee Building downtown, which housed the law school.

While the explosive growth was exhilarating, there was a strong desire for permanence and a campus center. Political debates droned on almost endlessly over the location of that center—expanding the Main Street Campus by acquiring the Grover Cleveland Golf Course, creating an urban campus at the Crossroads downtown, or building a suburban campus on 2,000 acres in Amherst. Once the site was determined, construction was further delayed while negotiations took place with construction unions to assure access to construction jobs by ethnic minorities. Until permanent space could be provided, the Ridge Lea complex was built privately and leased to the university—for approximately twenty

years. Many education classes were offered at Ridge Lea and many doctoral students, graduate assistants, and faculty spent hours at the computer center there where the IBM mainframe was housed (still no PCs). Almost every day was interrupted with travel from one distant site to another. Life as a faculty member at SUNYB had strong nomadic characteristics.

Then, the pharmacy and biology towers began to emerge from the Amherst swamp, the law school—and, at last, the education and philosophy building. I was delighted to abandon my triangular office in Foster Hall, which was higher than it was wide and contained an enormous cast iron radiator that spewed forth BTUs at such a rate that even in the dead of winter I had to keep the window wide open to maintain a tolerable temperature. Although there was not yet an adequate social science library on the Amherst Campus (the law library was a big help, especially for EDA students and faculty) and the computer was still at Ridge Lea, there was evidence that things were beginning to come together, and there was hope that academic accommodations would get better.

Meanwhile, events of great significance were taking place off campus that would eventually shake the campus itself. The Reverend Martin Luther King was preaching the gospel of equal civil rights for all, taken up by others after his assassination. The women's rights movement was in its infancy. And in Vietnam, the United States was assuming the cause being abandoned by the French. When I became a member of the faculty in 1963, all faculty in EDA and nearly all students were white and male. The presence of women as students was unusual; the presence of ethnic minorities was even rarer. There were a few foreign students. Personally, I was involved in unsuccessful attempts to voluntarily integrate suburban schools along the models pioneered in Hartford, Boston, and Rochester, and did research that would support the legal challenge to the *de facto* segregation of the Buffalo schools. The number of African-American students in our classes increased only slightly as the decade came to a close; but there was no significant increase until we appointed minority faculty in the 70s and 80s.

I'm thankful that I was on leave at Stanford University during the 1969–70 academic year. Across the country, there were demonstrations and teach-ins motivated primarily by the war in Vietnam; but there were also sub-texts generally challenging those in authority, student rights, and a desire to refresh and broaden our practice of democracy. On some campuses like Kent State, and even UB, the demonstrations turned violent with devastating consequences. Buildings were occupied and vandalized. Classes were interrupted and/or cancelled. People got hurt and even killed. At UB, police were brought onto the Main Street campus to restore order. Students and some faculty were arrested, the university was closed prior to completing the spring semester, and commencement was cancelled that year. When I returned to campus in the Fall 1970, I found a sense of bitterness between faculty and students, each feeling betrayal by the other, and hostility among faculty according to their perceptions of the events that had transpired. It took some time before a spirit of camaraderie was restored.

The events of 1969–70 had at least one positive outcome for the EDA program. Responding to student initiatives, the by-laws of the department were changed, allowing students to participate meaningfully in its governance. Among other beneficial results, student representation led to a total revamping of the EDA curriculum. Students eagerly volunteered

their services through the mid-80s, but then interest slowly dissipated, which was a disappointment to me and other faculty.

While many good things happened during the 70s and early 80s, there were also unpleasant challenges. The economy of the nation and the state turned sour. This was an especially difficult period for New York State because it had seriously over-extended itself during the Rockefeller years. The situation was made even more serious by the bankruptcy of New York City, which would have led to the bankruptcy of the state had it not been for intervention by the federal government. For SUNY, this meant budget cuts and permanent reductions in the proportion of state support. Within UB, it became a struggle for survival with department against department and unit against unit. The spirit of buoyant optimism of the 60s was gone.

The university was now critically split between the Main Street and Amherst Campuses. There was concern that this division would continue indefinitely, further impeding the development of the university. Fortunately, constraints on the state's capital budget were not as severe as for the general fund, and the Amherst Campus continued to build out though at a slower pace. The state's fiscal crisis also led to privatization of services and very strong pressure on faculty to seek external support for their research and training programs. For GSE, the crisis resulted in a reduction in force of about 50%, largely through attrition. With a smaller faculty, eight departments could no longer be justified and the number was reduced to the current configuration of three. Then effects stabilized.

My reflections have focused on the first two decades of my tenure with the Graduate School of Education because they were my "formative" years and, in a sense, they were also the formative years of UB as a unit of SUNY and GSE as a unit of SUNYB. While there were ups and downs during those two decades and the decades that followed, the pluses far outweighed the minuses for me. Looking back on my 39.5 years with the university, I consider myself a very fortunate man to have had this association.

Frankly, I loved my job. The university provides a wonderful environment in which to live. Your colleagues are overwhelmingly honorable, moral, and ethical people. They are intelligent, knowledgeable, and challenging. The students with whom you work are among the best and the brightest. Their energy, enthusiasm, and optimism are contagious; they keep you young in mind and spirit, if not in body. The cultural and ethnic diversity is enriching.

The nature of the job also has highly desirable traits. There is flexibility within structure; I initiated at least three major changes in my job description without relocating or having to seek new employment. In addition to Stanford University, I was able to spend extended periods abroad in research and study at the University of London's Institute of Education in England and at the University of Melbourne in Australia. Shorter periods were spent in Nigeria, Egypt, Israel, and China—all as part of the job. These experiences greatly enriched my research and teaching by providing me with a cross-cultural perspective of the economics and politics of education; at the same time they broadened me as a person. The university is also a superb place for making lifelong friendships and collaborations among your colleagues and alumni.

I am delighted that fate brought me to Buffalo and the Graduate School of Education (perhaps “dragged” would be a more accurate term). While I came with strong reservations, those reservations gradually changed to commitment as SUNYB’s potential was transformed into reality. GSE’s first 75 years were auspicious; one can expect nothing less for the next 75 years!

**Austin Swanson**  
**Professor 1963–2002**

\*\*\*\*\*