

8.

THE 1980S

Introduction

The changes at ILR that began in the seventies slipped imperceptibly into the eighties, and those that may have originated at that time have, for better or for worse, left their mark on the present decade. In other words, dividing history into decades is not a particularly precise way of delineating time. Clearly, there was much gaiety preceding and following the Gay Nineties, as there were certainly many roars heard before and after the Roaring Twenties. Moreover, since the speed of change in academia runs at such a leisurely pace, it is virtually impossible to say exactly when an idea found its way into formal practice.

Take research as a case in point. Scholarly research had been a responsibility of the school since its beginning. One has the impression that the research in the earlier period stuck more closely to the industrial relations field than that done at a later date. Facts and ideas were clearly and cogently presented, most of the output being understandable not only to practitioners but to the general public as well. That began to change in the seventies when access to mountains of data became available from various government agencies, often accompanied by generous grants that allowed faculty an opportunity to massage all that information and thereby produce articles and books. The audience for the new publications seemed to be other scholars and, occasionally, policymakers. The emphasis on quantification gathered speed in the eighties when grants from IBM and other organizations made it possible to place computers on every faculty desk. Perhaps more than any single development, the computer caused a change not only in research methodology but also in the topics deemed worthy of study. By the end of the decade, the ILR School was the envy of every other industrial relations research institution in the country, the *ILR Review* the most admired. The fact that this change in focus and style caused some practitioners to grumble that the *Review* had come to resemble the Athens telephone directory more closely than it did a professional journal proved to be a weak and ineffective deterrent to the new scholarship.

Another reason for this change in the research agenda was the changing of the guard. Professors Neufeld, McKelvey, Konvitz, Whyte, Jensen, and others who had been at the school almost from the day its doors opened and who had established the school's reputation as a premier research institution began to retire in the seventies.

Schooled more in the humanities than in statistical analysis and computer science, this group was largely innocent of these new research tools. A comparison of articles appearing in the *ILR Review* and other industrial relations journals from that earlier period with those published in the eighties makes that point clear. The subject matter of those older articles seems more relevant, the methodology (if one may use such an elegant term to describe how they went about their task) more straightforward, and the articles themselves, if one might hazard an opinion, more readable.

The ILR curriculum had undergone several changes since the school's inception. New courses were added and old courses dropped. Sequences were changed in answer to such questions as, Should the course in collective bargaining come before, after, or simultaneous with the one in labor law. And the mix of ILR and arts and science courses was shuffled. (Appendix D contains course requirements from some widely dispersed years, useful for comparison.) A fervently debated curriculum change that took place in the eighties called for the reintroduction of a course in accounting, a requirement that had been abandoned during the turbulent sixties. To many senior faculty, remembering what students had been required to study during the early days of the school, it appeared that the curriculum had come full circle. The story is probably apocryphal, but it is claimed nonetheless that when Maurice Neufeld learned of that change he was heard to mutter, "*Plus ça change, plus c'est la même-chose.*"

The Division of Extension and Public Service had been a vital part of the ILR School since its founding. Beginning in the seventies, the division began to take on a new role, the granting of off-campus courses for college credit, an arrangement worked out with SUNY's Empire State College. By the time the eighties arrived, a similar arrangement was made with Baruch College, City University of New York. ILR resident and extension faculty taught in both programs. Hundreds of working people who might otherwise not have had the opportunity to study for college degrees benefitted from these programs. Meanwhile, extension offices were opened in Rochester and Westchester counties and so the eighties inherited a very vigorous extension program. That legacy, modified in some areas, was passed on to the next decade.

So went the events during the fourth decade after the school's founding. One must recognize, however, that dividing time into units of ten years makes it easy to make artificial distinctions. Sometimes things that look like events are really not events at all, but merely minor developments on a long continuum or new wrinkles on old ideas.

A Dean's View, 1980-85

by Charles Rehmus

Reflecting on past mistakes and successes is an activity we arbitrators ordinarily avoid, but I remember saying to the faculty shortly after I arrived at

Cornell in 1980, "The halcyon days of higher education are over." What was required of my stay at the ILR School, therefore, was largely a matter of finances.

Initially this meant that we had to gear up for a real effort at generating alumni and non-legislative support both for current operations and endowment. We created what is euphemistically called a "development program," by which we were able to increase such support ten-fold in my five years. Jon Levy, whom I recruited, was a mainstay in this effort. The money thus received was split, as much as we could, 50-50 between current operations and permanent endowment. I received great assistance in these money-raising efforts from certain members of the Departments of Personnel and Organizational Behavior and from ILR Extension, especially George Milkovich, Bob Risley, Lee Dyer, Harry Trice, and Lois Gray.

Another accomplishment of my "regime" was obtaining permission and support for three permanent chairs, those honoring Irving Ives and Martin Catherwood, and the one for Jean McKelvey and Alice Grant. Although the first two were largely honorific, with minimal financial support, they did help to retain faculty. The third was originally set up by will, but at Jean and Blake's desire the chair became operational several years ago, after Alice's early death.

By my estimate, these efforts increased by six the number of faculty lines that would currently be available to the ILR School if it were limited to state funding. These development programs have continued to generate substantial additional outside funding in the decade since I retired.

I remember with pleasure the satisfaction that Shirley Harper and I took when our years of planning and lobbying resulted in state authorization for the ILR library and classroom expansion. Shirley had once said, "We'll probably never live to see it completed." Sadly, for her, that's true; but she did see the appropriation finally come and the work get underway.

The cost of all of this for me was that I spent far more time in Albany and around the United States in alumni and money-raising meetings than I had ever contemplated. This divorced me, perhaps unduly, from far too many faculty and student interests and activities in Ithaca. There was, however, one major change in the ILR School's focus during the 1980s that became apparent to several of us and in which I participated substantially. This was the shift in the school's primary emphasis from labor-management relations to a broader concentration on employment relations and human resources administration.

The reasons for this change are manifold; but primary among them is the fact that as the unionized sector of the U.S. economy declined, ILR students followed the labor market. Between 1980 and 1985, 60 percent of the graduates in our professional master's degree program found work in the field of personnel management while only 38 percent found jobs in the labor relations field. This was a complete reversal of where this same group had found their jobs a decade or two earlier. As a function of these trends our students' interest in traditional course

offerings in labor-management relations declined. Although the ILR School did not, like so many business schools, downgrade or eliminate its traditional labor-management course offerings, during the first half of the 1980s its faculty and course offerings in personnel, human resources administration, and organizational behavior increased by roughly half. Labor law and arbitration were, of course, still offered, and some of my great pleasures while at Cornell were the times I taught both to our many exceptional students. During the same years, however, these more traditional undergraduate legal courses became outnumbered by those in employment and antidiscrimination law.

These developments in course offerings and the necessary recruitment of new faculty of course paralleled those in the economy generally, but they were resented or opposed by some ILR faculty and alumni. I remember meetings during those years when the school's faculty and its Advisory Council strongly questioned the need for even these gradual changes in overall course offerings. At one particular meeting with me, alumni from Washington, D.C. argued at length that if the ILR School simply refused to make such adaptations in course offerings, the shift toward non-union employment would be diminished and the school would then remain faithful to its antecedents.

These conflicts were at times deepened by lack of respect among older alumni for contemporary research in the social sciences. The shift from institutional to behavioral research resulted in faculty publications that seemed to them to be of little relevance to *their* interests and problems. On the faculty side, conflict over directions and goals was exacerbated by the struggles of those years, not simply within ILR but at Cornell generally, over the recruitment and tenuring of minority and women faculty.

But none can halt the time and tide. The most important book in our field for that decade was written by two who had been ILR School faculty members during the 1970s—Tom Kochan and Bob McKersie—and a third, Harry Katz, who joined us in 1984. Their work, *The Transformation of American Industrial Relations* (1986, 1994), encapsulates the degree to which New Deal labor legislation of the 1930s and the collective bargaining system it generated had by the 1980s been replaced with a new system of human resources management that everywhere challenged the forms of managerial organization and employee participation therein that we had known and worked with following World War II.

One particular academic program that had been initiated before my time but that brought me great pleasure was the Cornell-Baruch Joint Program in New York City. The time spent in stabilizing the faculty and providing administrative support and funding for that program were well worth it, in my judgment, and kudos belong to Lois Gray, Matt Kelly, and Jack Kaufman as stalwarts in that effort. I think many of the graduates from that program, some of whom have appeared as advocates before me, are among our best practitioners. Hence, I was particularly saddened to hear that financial exigencies in the 1990s forced the school to withdraw from the program. Regrettably, such forced cutbacks typify much of the contemporary labor relations field.

Deaning, 1985-88

by Robert E. Doherty

Shortly after I was appointed dean of the ILR School, one of my colleagues gave me a book on how to become a good dean. It was probably meant as a friendly gesture, although I couldn't shake the notion that word of my appointment was perhaps received by my friend with some misgivings and that he might have thought I could stand to gain considerable profit from the advice this slender volume had to offer. The book stayed on the shelf, largely unread. It took only a few pages for me to realize that this was a treatise aimed at managing a somewhat docile professorate. Clearly, it was not intended for someone who would be dealing with the independent-minded, self-assured free spirits who made up the ILR faculty. At about the same time, another colleague suggested that I might want to ask two or three older members of the faculty to serve as an advisory group to the dean, volunteering himself as a member. "It's like when a little kid got to be king," he said, "and these older guys would sort of steer him in the right direction." He didn't use the word "regency," and I comforted myself in believing that the term was foreign to him. Nonetheless, I was touched by his concern for the welfare of the ILR School, and thanked him for the suggestion. It was not until later that the thought struck me that maybe I ought to have felt a trifle insulted.

Such were my beginnings in the fall of 1985. I have now, ten years later, had an opportunity to survey the ILR School's annual reports for the three years I occupied the dean's office. The first thing one notices in reading these reports is the enormous amount of activity that went on in the school during that period: new resident courses, new heights in research and publication, a burgeoning of offerings for practitioners in the Division of Extension and Public Service.

The second thing one notices is how little I had to do with any of these developments. New courses originated in the minds of individual professors and their departmental colleagues; research from the abiding curiosity and considerable talents and energy of the faculty; the increasing number and quality of extension courses from changing practitioner needs, as well as the desire and capacity on the part of extension staff not only to respond to these needs, but to prepare practitioners for changes emerging on the horizon. One learns in circumstances such as these that the best thing to do is just step aside.

It was an administrative philosophy that served rather well. My unwillingness to interfere led to some rather significant developments during the years I sat in the dean's office. One such was the establishment of the Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies, a consortium of corporate human resource vice-presidents allied with the ILR School for the purpose of furthering research in that rapidly changing field. This was the collective brainchild of Professors Dyer and Milkovich, and it came into existence only through their efforts. My role was to recognize a good thing when I saw it. I am pleased to learn that it continues to

provide a vital link between the school and professional human resource specialists.

The Institute for Collective Bargaining came about in a similar fashion. Primarily the idea of Harry Katz and other members of the Collective Bargaining Department, the institute aimed to improve the school's capacity to deal more directly with top officials in unions and management for both research and training purposes. I was an enthusiastic cheerleader. I understand that it still plays an important role in the affairs of the school.

It was also during my tenure as dean that the school received its first major endowment, a gift of \$2.5 million from the R. Brinkley Smithers Foundation to support research in the areas of alcoholism and other workplace problems. I'd like to take some credit for that, but the circumstances were otherwise. Harry Trice, who had been conducting research on the effect of alcoholism on job behavior for many years, was responsible for bringing the school's interest in this area to the donor's attention. It was Jon Levy who carried on the difficult negotiations that led to the endowment.

During my second year on the job, the ILR School celebrated its fortieth anniversary, complete with seminars and learned papers on issues of the day. The occasion also gave rise to the appointment of an outside review committee to assess the school's performance in light of the mission given it forty years before. Jack Stieber, from Michigan State, headed the review panel. The group's report, which came out a year or so later, had many things to say about how well we were keeping the faith. Not surprisingly, the Stieber group suggested that we had drifted too far from the original mandates in some areas and may have adhered to them far too rigidly in others. Just about everything we did came in for some kind of criticism, from research to extension, from curriculum to standards for promotion. Even so, one got the notion from reading the report that, on balance, the school was in good shape. Outside review committees, I have come to believe, don't think they have done a decent job if they can't find a number of things wrong with the institution under study.

The Stieber committee's conclusions in hand, I asked Ron Ehrenberg to head up a committee to review and comment upon that report. This so-called internal committee was made up of a cross-section of the school: both junior and senior professors, extension staff, representatives of all departments, non-teaching professionals, and so forth. The committee did an unusually careful and thorough job. Although it did not accept the recommendations and conclusions of the Stieber group at face value, neither did it shy away from taking several criticisms seriously. Several recommendations contained in the Ehrenberg report, particularly in the areas of curriculum, research agendas, extension programming, and promotion policy were acted upon by the faculty shortly thereafter. I am told that the report continues to serve as the basis for continuing review by the dean and the faculty.

One section of the Stieber report, the part dealing with the care and feeding of ILR deans, did not sit well with the Ehrenberg committee nor, I suspect, with

the faculty as well. "There is a perception," the Stieber committee observed, "that the ILR Dean does not have sufficient authority to...carry out the responsibilities of the office because the faculty exercises too much authority...The ILR administrative structure has been characterized, [somewhat] picturesquely, as a system in which the Dean is held 'hostage' by the faculty."

The Ehrenberg committee responded to this canard by opining: "It is important to recognize that the ILR School...is a collegial institution. This fact properly imposes constraints on the formal authority the Dean can exercise. The Dean must be faithful to the customs and traditions of the institution and must respect the rights and privileges of the voting faculty."

I interpret these comments to mean that no ILR dean should ever get any funny ideas about who's actually running the place. That should make any how-to-do-it treatise on deaning totally irrelevant as far as ILR is concerned. And it might serve as a warning to any future dean that he or she had best be prepared to deal not with a regency of two or three, but with one of about fifty.

Robert Risley

An Appreciation

by James Huttar ('62)

My favorite story about Bob Risley reveals one major facet of the man—his unwavering respect for and commitment to the forgotten. We were gathered on a Sunday night in the Statler ballroom for the opening dinner of the annual Weinberg Seminar. This yearly event sought to bring together for a week representatives of labor and management for a frank discussion of the philosophical and practical issues that divided them, in the hopes of achieving peace in the workplace. As the years passed, as the number of strikes began to diminish, and as other social problems began to crowd onto America's agenda, the Weinberg Seminar was adjusted to reflect these changes. This particular year the theme aimed squarely at the problem of discrimination in the workplace.

We had had a pleasant cocktail hour and dinner. The provost had welcomed everyone and wished the participants well in their deliberations. The evening was concluded. Or so we thought. But just then a black man, one of the invitees, stood up and asked everyone to remain for a few minutes longer. The man spoke calmly but with suppressed anger. He said he had arrived in Ithaca the day before and had spent his time inspecting all the construction sites at Cornell. (At that time Cornell was in a building boom.) Then, he said, he went down to the foot of the hill to talk with his black brothers and to ask them about their participation in all this activity. To his amazement, he learned that not one black was employed on any of these projects, nor was there a training program in place whereby blacks might learn the requisite skills for any of the high-paying jobs.

The man then announced that there were going to be two Weinberg seminars this year: the one we had planned and, separately, one that gathered together university officials, building-trade union leaders, and the contractors. He further said that if, at the end of the week, a certain number of blacks had not been hired and an apprentice-training program was not in place, he would put out a call to his black brothers and sisters around the state and ring the worksites with black protesters.

The stunner came when he concluded by saying that the only university person he genuinely trusted to work with him to accomplish these goals was Bob Risley. Such was Bob's reputation. And do you know that both objectives were achieved by week's end? It was this event that convinced the university to establish the position of Vice-Provost for Affirmative Action at Cornell, a position that Bob was the first to occupy.

I had the privilege of working with Bob, with blacks and other minorities, and with women in organizing a long series of programs around this theme and around the Risley rule: No phony baloney, no programs that looked good on paper but accomplished nothing in the way of changing the university's complexion and gender composition, in other words, affirmative action.

Bob was a complex man but it was such people who can talk with kings and commoners. He was respected by industrial leaders and yet it was he whom Jimmy Hoffa consented to give audience to in his Michigan home for an extended series of interviews just two weeks before his disappearance.

Then came last winter (1993-94) which will remain, for me, one of the most emotionally engaging seasons of my life. We settled into our Candor home for the purpose of passing several weeks with my mother, who was then residing in Ithaca. We had spent the previous seven months bicycling through Europe and had promised her this as recompense for our long absence. Events coming as they sometimes do unexpectedly, however, she fell, broke her hip, and died soon after. That was January and the question for Emily and me was, what to do?

By this time Bob and I had already established the routine of a weekly trip to Ithaca (always including bloody marys and lunch at the Lehigh Valley House), and Emily and I were card-carrying members of Candor's fiercest bridge club. On top of this, we were having the kind of winter we had not had in years: there was an abundance of snow. We bought cross-country skis and settled in.

As a result, Bob and I were able to pass many happy hours revisiting our adventures, one of the most remarkable of which was the one that resulted in our pulling off a sensational international conference on industrial and labor relations in Tel Aviv (with the help of Gideon Ben Israel), which attracted more than 400 attendees from 22 countries. Bob never thought small.

It was Bob, along with Judge Groat, who conceived the Groat Award for outstanding graduates of the ILR School. The suggestion that I had something to do with Bob's being selected to receive the award in 1989 is only partially correct.

There was—is—this gang of fierce Risley loyalists who determined that it was high time that our leader be properly recognized. If Bob was proud and happy that day, imagine the sheer delight of this gang of rabble-rousers, which includes some of the nation's rowdiest partiers.

I began this commentary with celebration and I end it the same way. When Bob took students to New York, he made sure they learned the street-and-avenue grid so they wouldn't get lost, and he made sure they saw the City's nightlife. Alumni didn't have to be asked twice if they wanted to be part of a Risley evening. Bob drew his admirers around him like a blanket, a magical world of love. One night, after he had worn them all out, he dragged me to the Rainbow Grille for a nightcap. I was beat and the thought of it was deadening. But I went. And, of course, we had a front-row table. And, of course, the pianist, when he took his break, came over to sit at our table.

"Hello, Bob," he said.

It was Duke Ellington.

Jim Huttar served ILR as its director of school relations before going to work for ACF Industries and then Lynch Jones & Ryan in New York City. Currently, he is living in Tunisia, working with local and American industry to help develop a free-enterprise system there.

by James Huttar ('62)

Bob's earlier life as an administrative assistant and Ph.D. candidate under M.P. Catherwood gives some insight into his diligence and ability. M.P., who was evidently tireless, loaded Bob with enough work for two administrative assistants. Only occasionally would M.P. ask Bob how his doctorate was progressing, clearly expecting the dissertation to be first-rate despite the hours he demanded of Bob in other pursuits. Bob, of course, finished his thesis, received his degree, and was later chosen by M.P. to be his labor commissioner for New York City—no mean task, and an indication of M.P.'s regard for Bob.

Further Recollections

by Charles S. DeAngelo ('77, GR '78)

Robert Risley was a true friend of students at ILR. Bob recognized that labor relations students had a keen interest in having hands-on, day-to-day labor relations experience while they were in school not just later, on the job. Although the internship method had been tried before, no one had encouraged and sought

out quality, day-to-day life experiences for students like Bob Risley. Bob Risley placed people in state government at all levels, from the senate to the Department of Labor. He placed people with the National Labor Relations Board, local governments, and private industry, ranging from IBM to the smallest of local companies.

Within the confines of these life experiences, Bob Risley insisted on each student producing a project that would measure both their understanding and results achieved while on the job. In that way, Bob guaranteed that these life experiences would truly be "learning experiences." Our class, the Class of 1977, adopted Bob Risley as our "friend," not just our professor. He had a unique relationship with the majority of the members of our class. Both on a personal and a professional level we knew he was there to stand in our corner and support us.

Those of us who knew Bob will miss him dearly now that he is gone. The truth is, he always went the extra mile for all of us. In many ways, however, Bob lives on through our accomplishments and the opportunities presented to us. Each day we have an opportunity to "show the way" to young labor relations students just as Bob did for us. Every time a young lawyer comes into my office, I remember Bob Risley and the simple rule he taught me. It's quite simple, "help others like you have been helped."

Charles DeAngelo is an attorney with Fessenden Laumer & DeAngelo in Jamestown, New York.

An Advisory Council Perspective

by John M. Baitzell

You can't say Dean Lipsky isn't prescient. In October 1989 he told the members of the ILR Advisory Council that it was not too early to plan for the school's 50th anniversary. Five years later I received an urgent request to create a few pages on my perspectives of the ILR School during the 1980s from the vantage point of the Advisory Council.

Because I have always considered the school to be a national treasure, I am happy to try. After brief kudos, I will present perspectives on eight different categories. The kudos go to Joan Greenspan of the American Guild of Musical Artists and Jack Golodner, the Director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Professional Employees. They are for attendance. Some might argue that these kudos are unfair because members rotated on and off the council during the 1980s; nevertheless, Joan is the attendance winner (with 13 meetings), and Jack is runner-up (with 12).

Reviews New members of the council soon learn that the administration and the faculty are constantly reviewing all or part of their own work in a conscientious effort to improve the ILR School.

In 1984 and 1989, for example, the faculty was reviewing the undergraduate curriculum. The council was invited to contribute to discussions about the need to provide more instruction in basic literacy, accounting principles, and the integration of computer science with statistical analysis. In 1985, the school created an outside review of the whole institution and, upon its report, the faculty responded with six separate reports...and on and on. It always seemed a bit excessive for the best school of its kind in the world, but it's ingrained in the psyche of the academic.

New Programs As an extension of reviews, the 1980s saw their share of new programs at the school. The ILR Associates Program, which draws companies closer to the school, was created by the council. I think it's fair to say that Doug Soutar of ASARCO and Walt Burdick of IBM played important roles in getting it started.

The Program on Employment and Work Systems, or PEWS (an acronym I never liked), was launched with the aid of a \$200,000 grant. The Baruch Program, which appeared to be building toward a solid future, was later brought down by a number of forces. In contrast, the ILR Extension Program as a whole was always booming—ever stronger with more and more students throughout the 1980s, finally reaching about 40,000.

As cutting-edge human resources issues arose, the school developed appropriate programs or, indeed, institutes and centers. Thus, in 1985, the school hired an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) specialist. Tied in with EAP coverage, the Smithers Foundation gave \$2.5 million to make meaningful progress against alcohol or drug abuse or other workplace problems.

In 1988, the council endorsed the creation of the Institute for Social Research Policy and the Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies.

The Use of Computers In the 1980s, the council witnessed the inevitable march of technology in the form of computers. The council heard in 1980 that the library would *eventually* be going to computerized services, delayed somewhat because of their high cost and the difficulties older students had with them. By 1984, however, the computer had become an essential part of the library's operations, including on-line searches. No word on what happened to the older students!

As use of computers grew, Dean Rehmus, to his credit, became concerned that economically disadvantaged students would be further disadvantaged as the school added computer applications into the various courses. By 1988, in fact, computing had become an integral part of studies. During these years, IBM generously provided computers to the school.

Women and Minorities During the 1980s, the administration and the council spent countless hours in discussions about ways to increase the number of women and minorities throughout the school. Suffice it to say that the school made great strides in this regard in both the undergraduate and graduate programs.

The most difficult issue between the administration and the council was the standard for recruiting female and minority tenure-track faculty members. The council had a consensus view that so long as the school could select among a group of qualified candidates, it would do well to select a female or a minority. With traditions of academic excellence and tenure in mind, the administration held, however, to choosing the best qualified candidate, regardless of gender or color. In terms of minority recruiting, the question generally became moot because the list of qualified candidates was minuscule, the demand for them was tremendous, and Cornell's salary scale and Ithaca's winter weather were no match for the likes of the University of Texas.

Judge Groat, who had meant so much to the creation and development of the school, continually pressed this issue. Even at his last meeting (on May 3, 1984—his 39th year on the council), he urged that for the long-run good of the ILR School the administration and the faculty should try harder.

The Budget The Advisory Council was always concerned about the school's budget, which hinged mostly on money from the New York State Legislature. Some years the budget was adequate, but many years it was not, thereby requiring cuts in personnel or programs. Some of us, particularly council members from trade unions, pressed the school's case before the legislature in Albany, where Senator John Lake always tried to help. We also obtained funds from our various employers, of course.

Real Union-Management Events Occasionally during the 1980s, the real world of union-management relations created stressful moments for the council. Once an ILR faculty member, for example, issued research results with which the union representatives took exception. At another point unions were conducting an organizing campaign for certain Cornell employees, and the university was resisting.

The most acrimonious moment, however, arose when some ILR students thought the school, in violation of its charter, was allowing firms to recruit on campus that were—in the students' view—union-busting organizations. The students picketed the recruiters from two companies and harassed both a recruiter and those students going for interviews. To help resolve this situation, the dean and the council agreed to let representatives of the students speak at the next council meeting. A final, tense moment occurred when one student hadn't had a chance to speak by the time the meeting was scheduled to adjourn. The dean was going to proceed to adjourn the meeting anyway, but the chairman of the council overruled him, much to the relief of all but one of the assembled crowd. Subsequently, an acceptable policy was worked out.

The Physical Plant The school's physical plant was frequently discussed by the council. Recognizing the need to double the size of the Catherwood Library, the school requested \$11.5 million in October 1986 for that purpose. In October 1989, that figure had increased to \$16.8 million. By the end of the 1980s, the need for classrooms and other space was rising higher and higher on the council's agenda.

Dean Searches During the 1980s, the council worked with four administrations: until July 1, 1980, Bob Doherty was acting dean; for the next five years Chuck Rehmus was dean; for the next three years the always stalwart Bob Doherty was dean; and from July 1, 1988, to date, Dave Lipsky has been dean.

The council focused much of its attention on the search for the latest new dean in mid-1987. It wanted to be sure that a full-blown, national search was conducted for the best candidate. It obtained a seat on the university's search committee, met with certain of the candidates, and worked closely with the chairman of the search committee, Provost Barker. In the end, even though an inside candidate was chosen, the council was convinced that a superb search had been conducted and the best candidate selected. Certainly the ensuing years have proven the correctness of that conviction.

From 1968 to 1992 John M. Baitsell was corporate manager of industrial relations and regulatory affairs for Mobil Corporation. He served as co-chair of the ILR Council from 1979-80 through 1982-83 and from 1988-89 through 1989-90.