



Cornell University
ILR School

Cornell University ILR School
DigitalCommons@ILR

The ILR School at Fifty: Voices of the Faculty,
Alumni and Friends

Publications about the ILR School and Faculty

January 1996

9. Parts of the Whole

Lois Gray
Cornell University

Gordon Law
Cornell University

Charlotte Gold

Leonard P. Adams
Cornell University

Donald E. Cullen
Cornell University

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/ilratfifty>

Thank you for downloading an article from DigitalCommons@ILR.

[Support this valuable resource today!](#)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Publications about the ILR School and Faculty at DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in The ILR School at Fifty: Voices of the Faculty, Alumni and Friends by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact hlmdigital@cornell.edu.

9. Parts of the Whole

Abstract

Includes: The Extension Division; The Catherwood Library: 50 Years of Service; Publications; Industrial and Labor Relations Review: Its First 48 Years; Graduate Program History; Student Services: The Office of Resident Instruction; and Career Services: Then and Now.

Keywords

Extension, Catherwood, Cornell, school, labor, law, work, relation, industrial, faculty, student, ILR, program, graduate

Comments

Suggested Citation

Gruenfeld Goldberg, E. (Ed.), McKersie, R., Miller, J. Gormly, Aronson, R., & Julian, R. (Compilers). (1996). *The ILR School at Fifty: Voices of the Faculty, Alumni & Friends* (pp. 127-164). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
<http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/ilratfifty/10/>

Authors

Lois Gray, Gordon Law, Charlotte Gold, Leonard P. Adams, Donald E. Cullen, ILR Review Board of Editors, Lawrence Williams, James E. McPherson, and Karin S. Ash

9.

PARTS OF THE WHOLE

The Extension Division

by Lois Gray

Born in a time of intense labor-management conflict, ILR Extension survived early skepticism and controversy to emerge as a leading center of industrial and labor relations education. Today ILR Extension is widely accepted by practitioners as a vital source of education and technical assistance. The vision for an ILR extension service came to State Senator Irving Ives, the school's founder. When Ives served as the chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Industrial and Labor Conditions of the New York State Legislature, he observed that labor and management witnesses who testified before his committee were poorly informed about their rights under labor laws and seemed unaware of or indifferent to their responsibilities to the public. This inspired him to write into the legislation establishing the ILR School at Cornell that the school should "disseminate information to practitioners." This mission was to be carried out by the school's Division of Extension and Public Service. Since extension service was an integral part of Cornell University, it was not surprising that ILR Extension took hold and blossomed.

In 1946 in pursuit of this mission the school's founding professors, Jean McKelvey and Maurice Neufeld, traveled to Buffalo, one of the state's leading industrial centers, to confer with employer and union representatives and recruited Lois Gray, a young National Labor Relations Board field examiner, to head the first off-campus office. In Ithaca headquarters, veteran labor educators Effey Riley and Eleanor Emerson and industrial training specialists Lynn Emerson and Alpheus Smith developed plans for a statewide outreach. Their philosophy of designing ILR educational programs to meet the expressed needs of practitioners has prevailed through the 50-year history of ILR Extension.

The first off-campus programs consisted of itinerant faculty lectures on labor relations issues of the day. While attracting large audiences, the lectures sparked controversy, with charges and counter charges that the ILR School was "pro union" or "pro management." The combination of charges and the combined response were interpreted by Cornell's President Edmund Ezra Day as "striking the right balance." Thus the ILR School was introduced to labor, management, and the public throughout the state.

In the early years, ILR Extension services were provided without charge and there was minimal state support, which meant borrowing office space from other state agencies and classroom space from local educational institutions. Advisory committees formed in each community not only helped to design and publicize programs but often provided volunteers as instructors. Soon public lectures were replaced by custom-made classes offered at the request of organizations—labor unions, corporations, and government agencies. Initially, grievance handling was the most frequently requested subject for union programs and supervisory training for employers. When requests exceeded resources, ILR designed teacher-training materials, which enabled organizations to educate themselves.

Dissemination of ILR-related information to high school students prior to their entering the labor market was another legislatively mandated function. The Joint Legislative Committee published *The American Story of Industrial and Labor Relations* (1943), which was designed to serve as a textbook. ILR Extension has pursued this legislative mandate through continuing courses for social studies teachers.

A shift in subject matter emphasis from the broad societal perspective of the early lectures to more pragmatic training, along with the logistics of statewide travel, cooled the ardor of resident faculty participation in extension work. Dean Martin P. Catherwood, who was committed to the "triple threat" concept that ILR faculty would contribute to all three of the ILR missions (resident teaching, research, and extension), persuaded Duncan McIntyre, one of the school's founding faculty, to spend a year on the extension circuit, testing the possibilities of faculty involvement. McIntyre's experience was reported to the other faculty in an essay, "The Mouse in the Experiment," which concluded that ILR Extension was a specialized function that should recruit its own faculty and rely on the resident faculty in Ithaca only for those assignments related to their specialized research and teaching interests.

Ralph Campbell, who directed the extension division for a period of time, built on the acceptance of the first off-campus office in Buffalo and established extension branches in Albany and New York City, and later in Rochester and Long Island. These branches were staffed by faculty with adult education as well as industrial relations expertise. In addition, part-time instructors were recruited from local academic and practitioner communities. Prominent among these were ILR alumni. Thereafter, Ithaca-based faculty taught in the growing number of summer institutes that ILR Extension sponsored on campus and collaborated with Extension in research projects on topics of mutual interest—for example, *The Local Union* by William F. Whyte, *Union Democracy* by Alice Cook (1964), and *Power and Politics in Organizations* by Sam Bacharach (1980).

Labor-management conferences on cutting-edge topics have been a mainstay of ILR Extension. Some deal with controversial issues, featuring debates, for example, among competing viewpoints on such topics as Labor and American Foreign Policy, The Value of Human Relations Training, and, more recently, Labor Law Reform. The proceedings of many extension conferences

have been published. *The Duty of Fair Representation* (McKelvey 1977), for example, emerged from a conference that brought union and management leaders together with labor law attorneys to discuss the implications of court decisions on labor practices, and *Cleared for Take Off* (McKelvey 1988) captured an interchange between employer and union representatives on the impact of government deregulation on the airline industry.

Observing the potential for in-depth education of union leaders who are intellectually curious but lacking in formal academic credentials, ILR Extension experimented with one- and two-year courses of study that had the equivalent of college credit requirements (testing, reading, and term papers). A taste of academic stimulation inspired student demand that the ILR School offer full degree programs off campus. After protracted faculty debate and involvement, ILR Extension responded in the 1970s with a network of labor studies credit and certificate programs throughout New York State that carry Cornell credit and are linked to degrees offered in local educational institutions.

Over the years, increasing professionalization of the field of industrial and labor relations transformed the emphasis of extension offerings from in-house custom-made training in basics, such as grievance handling for shop stewards and human relations training for supervisors, to more sophisticated subject matter designed for full-time union officials and corporate and government human relations professionals. In New York City, for example, management certificate programs provide in-depth coverage of labor relations, human resource management, and equal employment opportunity and counterpart programs for union leadership feature functional training in organizing, administration, and bargaining. ILR's Executive Education programs draw corporate labor relations and human resource leaders to seminars on the Ithaca campus. And within unions, government, and business, executives are served by specialized extension services that combine research, training, and technical assistance.

ILR Extension has always responded to the changing scene in industrial relations by sponsoring programs that reflected key issues of the times. For example, the growth of the civil rights movement in the 1960s inspired leadership training for national and community-based organizations representing minorities, and a Latino Leadership Center was established. The women's liberation movement of that period was served by such programs as Union Women's Studies and Career Development for Women, as well as conferences on Women in Management, which laid the groundwork for the Institute of Women and Work that ILR established in 1974 under the leadership of Barbara Wertheimer. National concern with poverty gave rise to an Urban Affairs Program, which conducted demonstration projects dealing with a variety of social problems ranging from School Drop Outs to Health Care. And the manpower projects of federal, state, and city governments involved extension staff in both training and evaluation of the effectiveness of these antipoverty efforts.

When public sector employees achieved bargaining recognition in New York City (Mayor Wagner's order) and then in New York State through passage of the Taylor Act, ILR Extension responded by organizing statewide training programs

for officials of state, county, and city government and public employee unions through the Institute of Public Sector Labor Relations. This institute trained thousands of practitioners in grievance resolution and dispute settlement, emphasizing, as always, "training of trainers" to multiply the impact and institutionalize the continuation of education in public sector labor-management relations.

Training for neutrals, from the earliest years, has been a major extension activity. For established arbitrators and mediators, ILR conducted briefing sessions on new issues like substance abuse and sexual harassment. For those aspiring to be accepted as neutrals, the school provided intensive training that supplemented classroom sessions with on-the-job assignments. Notable are the neutral training programs pioneered by Alice Grant and Jean McKelvey, which are designed to integrate the dispute resolution profession by special outreach to minorities and women.

"The State is our Campus" was the way ILR Extension described itself to the public in its early years. Over time this mission has broadened from statewide to national and international. Today many programs are beamed to national headquarters staff of corporations and unions, as well as to policymakers in Washington, D.C. In fact, ILR now sponsors programs throughout the United States and abroad. For example, on-site training and consultation, which was provided to Latin American organizations in earlier years, is currently underway in Poland, Russia, and Czechoslovakia.

While advocacy training dominated early extension offerings, recent years have brought union-management cooperation to the fore. Of special note are two major program centers within ILR Extension that specialize in employee involvement and build on mutual labor-management interests: (1) Programs for Employment and Workplace Systems (PEWS), which provides technical assistance and training for organizations seeking to restructure work and employee relations, and (2) The Institute for Industry Studies, which translates research on the economic and technological developments in specific industries into employee education on their implications for labor-management relations. In addition to these centers, extension district offices offer numerous courses on win-win bargaining and seminars on the advantages and limitations of union-management cooperation. Other extension programs that target specific objectives deal with services to the disabled, occupational safety and health, and alcoholism.

From its inception 50 years ago to today common themes of ILR Extension remain (1) practitioner service and orientation, (2) adaptability to political, social, and economic environmental change, and (3) linkage to resident faculty teaching, research, and publications. What has changed are program emphases and formats, which continuously respond to trends in the ILR field.

From modest beginnings, the school's extension wing has grown in size and influence, currently enrolling more than 30,000 adults each year in a broad range

of educational programs. ILR Extension is the largest program of industrial and labor relations education for practitioners in the United States.

The Catherwood Library: 50 Years of Service

by Gordon Law

"It will be essential to develop at the earliest possible moment a comprehensive library, both of standard works and periodicals and of documentary materials." This mandate of the Board of Temporary Trustees in 1945 guided development of the preeminent academic research collection of its type in the country over the last 50 years as staff have endeavored to maintain a "comprehensive library." Dean Irving Ives assigned this responsibility to J. Gormly Miller, who had recently returned from a tour of duty with the armed services in Europe. Shortly after Gormly arrived on campus in July 1946, Ives instructed him to establish a library for the school and have it operational by November of that year. Gormly began at once to meet the expectation of the dean and Board of Temporary Trustees.

What was established by November 1946 may have been the first "virtual" library of its type. It was "virtually" all over campus in the early years of the school. The first reading room was located in Warren Hall prior to its more permanent home in the barracks on Sage Green, where the Cornell Engineering Quad is now located. The librarian's office, along with the serials and catalog librarians, was initially located in the stacks of Myron Taylor Hall. As more books arrived than space could provide for, creative solutions had to be devised. Within 18 months, fewer than half of the 10,000 volumes acquired could be accommodated in the barracks. According to the *I&LR News* for January 1945, "J. Gormly Miller...arranged with the Law School for space at Myron Taylor Hall to house the overflow. This will take care of those emergencies when I&LR students find they have nothing left to read." At various times, until construction of a library in 1962, materials were also housed in the Quonset huts on Sage Green and in the women's dormitory.

The materials budget for the library was \$40,000 per year (the equivalent of over \$300,000 in 1994 dollars). This represented a phenomenal commitment by the school to its library, making it possible to acquire retrospectively as well as to obtain currently published titles. An important historical collection of convention proceedings and union journals came early on from the Rand School of Social Research in New York.

It was especially challenging in the immediate mid-1940s to build a collection of this type because publishing and distribution of books had been curtailed due to the war. In addition, many of the prime documentary materials were not commercially available. Some labor union periodicals came from the office collection of Cornell professor Royal Montgomery. That collecting project was initiated by Sumner Slichter during his years at the university (1920-30).

These holdings were enriched by the personal collections of Maurice Neufeld and Milton Konvitz, who were able to convince some trade union publishers to add the ILR Library to their mailing lists. In a short period of time, labor journals began to come in regularly with the mailing label, "Laboratory of Industrial Relations." Although originally devised as a means of facilitating mail sorting, that label accurately reflects the ILR Library's role in the research process to this day.

Staff traveled throughout the state and region to establish relationships with the labor movement to assure that their publications became part of the comprehensive collection; and Howard Dyer, a 1948 graduate of the school who worked in the Buffalo regional office of the NLRB, visited unions in the Cleveland, Chicago, and Detroit areas to acquire collections of historical materials. Aggressive collecting policies assured the library of substantial holdings of materials on trade union administration and structure.

A strong service orientation, which extended beyond the immediate user population on campus, has always been a hallmark of the library. In addition to providing the specialized reference services expected from such a quickly developing national resource, the library produced a variety of publications to make information more widely available. The *Key Issues Series; Abstracts and Annotations*; and "Recent Publications," a section of the *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, were all Gormly Miller's creations. This last feature, which included books and journal articles categorized by subject, served as the national bibliography of industrial relations material from its first appearance in 1948 until 1984, when it was discontinued because of the availability of online services. This broad service orientation was maintained over the years by Bernard Naas, whom Miller hired within his first few months on campus. In fact, ILR's *American Labor Union Periodicals: A Guide to Their Location* (by Naas and Sakr) was the Bible for locating union journals in the nation's research libraries until online services were developed in the 1970s. The firm of G.K. Hall photo-reproduced and published the library's entire card catalog so that researchers around the world could verify the literature. This service, in its original form plus supplements ran to 30 volumes. The last supplement, published in 1981, included items added to the collection through the end of 1979.

The Labor-Management Documentation Center (LMDC) was formally established within the library in 1949 with the purpose of assembling a "comprehensive collection of primary source material on labor relations, personnel programs, and union organizations and activities in the United States...." The initial focus was collecting manuscript materials relating to social security and protective labor legislation. A second emphasis was labor arbitration, the result of which has been the development of what may be the most significant repository of its type in the country. Holdings of records relating to the American needle trades are of special significance, and our photographic collection documenting the labor movement has developed substantially in recent years. Today, the LMDC is ranked as the third largest labor archive in the nation, with over 15,000 linear feet of manuscripts, pamphlets, and related documentary material. It attracts researchers from around the globe.

Planning for better facilities, including a building for the library, began in the early years of the school. Gormly Miller was selected to supervise both the design and construction, and, after more than ten years of effort, the decision was made to demolish part of the old School of Veterinary Science and replace it with classrooms and a 30,000 square foot library. Work began in September 1959, and construction was completed in 1962. In 1970, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the ILR School, the name of the library was changed to honor one of its early deans: it became the M.P. Catherwood Library.

Shirley Harper became director of the Catherwood Library in 1975 and within two years began planning for an addition to accommodate growth in collections and programs. Under her leadership, plans that were developed ultimately resulted in a commitment to double the size of the library to 60,000 square feet. This project is scheduled for completion in 1997. Shirley's vision of the library as a learning laboratory further strengthened Catherwood's service orientation while incorporating the latest advances in electronic technology for the delivery of information.

By any standard, the library's open-door policy has been exceptional. Several times in the Quonset hut era, cars parked on the incline outside the library slipped out of gear, rolled down, and crashed through the wall, striving for the California drive-through effect on their way to the reading room. Although the idea never really caught on, ease of access has always been an important objective. Increasingly, researchers around the world are able to consult our holdings because the online catalog is available over the Internet. The World Wide Web is yet another mechanism, developed and maintained by the library, to make the services of the Catherwood Library and the ILR School available to an ever-broader audience.

Publications

by Charlotte Gold

For those of us who began our careers at ILR in the old Quonset huts, there was life before creation. It was a hazardous netherworld, too cold in the winter, too hot in the summer. We spent our days dodging water buckets in the halls and avoiding chasms in the floorboards.

But then New York State Governor Nelson Rockefeller descended from Albany and blessed our exodus to the new campus—casting an avuncular eye out over the assembled crowd, in search of willing constituents. Laden with books and pamphlets, we began the laborious trek to our new quarters.

The Research and Publications Division was to be located in a building that had previously housed the Veterinary School's Small Animal Clinic. From the moment we arrived, we were faced with a minor problem: nobody knew our name. The first week, a purveyor of animal feed deposited a load of hay on our front lawn.

The second week, an elderly man appeared on our doorstep to inform us that he wanted to kill his dog. Could he bring him in here?

Life should come with a set of blueprints, but it rarely does. And so, in their absence, you simply grow. In academia, institutions grow and flourish or flounder based on the drive and character of specific individuals. Divisions are formed and projects are undertaken because of these individuals' special talents.

Among the early founders of ILR was a group of faculty members who had a penchant for research. In a true test of commitment, their passion persisted even after they were granted tenure. (Queried about an academic who had written an unfavorable biography of him, Labor leader George Meany is reported to have said, "When faced with the choice of publishing or perishing, he chose the wrong alternative.") The natural complement of research is, of course, publication.

Leonard Adams, the first director of the ILR Research and Publications Division, monitored research activities at the school, encouraged new studies, and helped to put the completed work of ILR faculty members into print. The school had come about from the unlikely union of academics and practitioners. Their diverse writings were equally welcomed in the division. When Adams's mantle was passed on to his successor—and the name of the division was shortened to Publications—an emphasis was placed not only on publishing quality research from ILR, but also on publishing quality research from elsewhere throughout the industrial relations community.

Faculty members became our skills. They directed us to the work of talented graduate students and colleagues. We knew that our reputation had grown when we began receiving manuscripts from as far away as India—although our confidence in one submission from that country was not particularly enhanced when we noticed the title addended to the author's name. It read "Failed Economics."

We were insistent that we would not operate as a vanity press. Thus, every publication was subject to scrutiny by a juried panel, a tradition that persists to this day. And while the present list of offerings has grown dramatically, many of the early classics published by the school are still available to the public.

In one further metamorphosis, the Publications Division was transformed into the ILR Press, in recognition of its growing stature in the field. It currently functions under the leadership of Frances Benson, a modern-day Wizard of Oz who is able to project to the world a portrait of a major university press while in reality functioning with only limited resources. In the past ten years, with authors from all over the world, ILR Press has become the publisher of choice for industrial relations research.

Another Perspective*by Leonard P. Adams*

The funds originally allocated in the fall of 1947 to the school's Research and Publications Division were used to develop a series of bulletins or leaflets written by experts on the ILR faculty for use by practitioners in the labor-management field. Following a model developed by the College of Agriculture, these were distributed without charge, except for unusual cases in which the cost of publication was considerable. These publications helped establish the school's reputation early on as a respectable source of information. Among these were "You Can't Hire a Hand" by Temple Burling.

There was also a series of publications dealing with research done by the ILR faculty. Some of these manuscripts became books, co-published with the Cornell University Press, a procedure that eventually led to ILR's starting a book series under its own control.

A third type of early publications was an in-house series circulated only to students and faculty of the school. Its source was graduate student work and it was intended primarily to encourage good work; but it was a short-lived series, as other means of publishing high-quality work became available.

Our early staff included Frances Eagan, a Cornell English major who was the first editor hired to work with the publications division, and Bob Aronson, a Princeton Ph.D. who was hired to help conduct certain research projects. As the school's second director of research, I saw myself as a facilitator rather than a director, whose primary task was to help faculty members do what they wanted to do rather than to tell them what they should do. Dean Catherwood apparently saw me as a kind of academic handyman whose job description included helping him write speeches, accompanying him when, as chairman of the board of mediators, he went to settle the Longshoremen's Strike of 1951-52 and developing information for him and the board in this endeavor; and keeping in touch with the New York State Department of Labor and its Division of Employment. My job was intriguing, diversified, and very different from my 1990s' counterpart! Later on I became more involved in teaching labor economics and social insurance programs at home and abroad.

Industrial and Labor Relations Review: Its First 48 Years*by Donald E. Cullen*

Among Milton R. Konvitz's many "firsts" in the history of the ILR School was his service as the school's first director of research and publications. It was in that capacity that Konvitz met in 1946 with Dean Martin P. Catherwood to discuss the launching of a scholarly quarterly. Thus was born the *Industrial and*

Labor Relations Review, the first editor of which was, most appropriately, Milton Konvitz.

In the journal's inaugural issue of October 1947, Edmund E. Day, then president of Cornell, wrote in a foreword:

The establishment of [this journal] is a logical extension of the function which higher education is assuming in the area of labor-management relations. Thorough and unbiased investigation, objective analysis, and calm discussion by responsible authorities serve an especially useful purpose when applied to controversial problems of great importance to society.

I have high hopes for this new journal. Though sponsored by Cornell University, it will be national in scope and comprehensive in its range of interests. It will, I trust, enjoy the cooperation and support of our colleagues in other colleges and universities and of the leaders of labor and industry....

Have President Day's high hopes for this journal been realized? I like to think so, but—as on all interesting questions—opinions will naturally differ among observers, both within and outside academia.

One problem in evaluating the journal's record is that great changes have obviously occurred since the late 1940s in the "area of labor-management relations." In those years that term usually referred to union-management relations, reflecting the absorption of practitioners and scholars alike with events such as the continued growth of union membership, the great postwar wave of "national emergency" and other strikes, and the adoption of the controversial Taft-Hartley Act. Also, scholarly analysis of the issues raised by those events was primarily "institutional" in nature, often based on field interviews and case studies and presented in straightforward prose with little, if any, high-tech statistical analysis.

Alas, times have changed—and so too has the *Review*. The steep decline over the years in union organization, particularly in the private sector, has shifted the interests of many scholars and practitioners away from traditional union-management subjects toward issues such as the effects on employee relations and labor markets of the civil rights revolution, the adoption of employment training and occupational safety laws, the rise in foreign competition, and the emergence of new human resource management policies and techniques. Simultaneously, research techniques in the social sciences have undergone a profound change with the advent of computers that enable scholars to analyze large data sets far more quickly and with far greater statistical sophistication than before.

Those trends have been reflected in the *Review*, just as they have been in the curriculum of the school. Most of the journal's articles in recent years have tested hypotheses about a wide range of subjects, often far afield from those of interest in the 1940s, using statistical techniques largely unknown to the first generation of ILR faculty and students. This development represents to its critics a deplorable move of most industrial relations scholars from tackling real-world problems through first-hand investigation toward "arid" quantitative analysis of questions that interest only a handful of other scholars. To its supporters, this development represents progress toward achieving better answers to the perennial questions in industrial relations than could be achieved by the relatively "unscientific" methods of case studies and field work.

The *Review* has struggled to satisfy both the critics and supporters of those post-1950s trends in industrial relations research. On the one hand, of the many unsolicited original and revised manuscripts we receive—well over 200 per year in the last decade—most are of the "new school" of research. And the quality of the 15 to 20 percent we accept for publication after peer review has consistently earned the journal high ratings in the *Social Sciences Citation Index*, which tracks the frequency with which scholars cite articles from various journals in their own

research. On the other hand, the *Review* annually publishes a "Notice to Potential Contributors" emphasizing that the journal welcomes submissions of institutional or nonquantitative manuscripts; we have also encouraged, and sometimes solicited, manuscripts summarizing and appraising in prose accessible to all readers the quantitative research literature on particular subjects; and the journal continues to publish in each issue more reviews of books on every aspect of industrial relations than are published in any other journal in the field.

Interestingly, the rapid growth of interest in recent years in international and comparative labor relations offers a capsule history of the trends described above. A steadily increasing number of *Review* articles today deal with questions such as the developments in social policy within the European Union, the new roles of labor unions in Eastern Europe and Russia, and the industrial relations policies and impact of multinational corporations. Many of those articles employ the research techniques of earlier years and can be easily read by those without any training whatever in statistical analysis—but some of these studies are also now beginning to employ sophisticated statistical analysis in an attempt to "hold other things equal" while searching for the reasons why countries differ or are

ILR Review Editors

Oct. '47-July '52	Milton R. Konvitz
Oct. '52-July '57	Robert H. Ferguson
Oct. '57-July '62	Robert L. Aronson
Oct. '62-July '65	Kurt L. Hanslowe
Oct. '65- Oct. '72	Robert H. Ferguson
Jan. '73-July '75	Donald E. Cullen
Oct. '75-July '76	David B. Lipsky
Oct. '76-April '82	Donald E. Cullen
July '82- Oct. '82	David B. Lipsky
Jan. '83-April '88	Donald E. Cullen
July '88-Oct. '88	John F. Burton, Jr.
Jan. '89-July '94	Donald E. Cullen
Oct. '94-	Tove H. Hammer

similar in matters such as union membership trends, mobility patterns, and child poverty.

Three final measures of change deserve mention. As might be expected, the price of the *Review* has soared over the years, from \$3 per year for all subscribers in 1947 to \$26 for individuals, \$43 for libraries, and \$13 for students in 1995. Also, paid circulation soared from about 2000 in the early years to 4000 or more in the 1967-90 period—but with the growth in competition from an increasing number of journals in the field, both domestic and foreign, the journal has recently experienced some of the same "downsizing" that has afflicted so many other enterprises, with paid circulation falling to 3300 in 1995. Finally, the journal, again like so many other enterprises these days, has radically revamped its managerial structure. Through most of its history, the *Review* has operated with a single editor handling articles, an associate editor handling book reviews, and a policy-making editorial board composed exclusively of ILR faculty members. In 1994, however, the two-editor structure was replaced by a four-editor structure, with each editor representing a different discipline within the field, and the editorial board was expanded to include scholars from other universities. The hope is that this new management structure will benefit the school, as each editor will have more time to continue his or her research and teaching activities than did previous editors, and will also enable the *Review* to reach out more effectively to some of the industrial relations specialties that have not been adequately represented in the journal in recent years.

Tribute to Don Cullen

by ILR Review Board of Editors

With the publication of [the July 1994] issue, Professor Donald E. Cullen ends his tenure as Editor, completing an association with the *Review* that has encompassed nearly 90 percent of his professional life. No metaphor or analogy can adequately describe the dedication with which Don has served this journal in various editorial capacities. In the past 22 years alone, during which he has served as Editor..., more than 4,000 new manuscripts and more than 600 revised manuscripts have crossed his desk. Besides giving manuscripts an initial review, assigning them to referees, and rendering final decisions on them, he has guided hundreds of authors through multiple drafts of their papers. His determination to make every published article clear and accessible even to readers who do not know how to perform a regression analysis is widely appreciated in the industrial relations community. These achievements are the more noteworthy given that Don has meanwhile maintained, for most of his editorial tenure, an eminent career in scholarship, teaching, and public service and an enviable performance on local tennis courts.

No editor whose decisions sometimes affect careers of individuals can entirely escape the slings and arrows directed by some of those authors—at this journal, more than four out of five—whose submissions fail of acceptance. That there has been virtually no criticism of Don testifies to the care, fairness, and respect for authors with which he has performed as Editor. He has carried on with distinction this journal's concept of the editor's primary responsibility, established at its beginning, to advance and improve scholarship in the field of industrial and labor relations. Attesting to the esteem in which he is held are letters from authors who learned of his impending retirement; characteristic of their parting words are "(your) wonderful leadership" and "Editor without peer."

All of us who have served on the board of editors under Don's editorship appreciate the superb quality of his contributions. Under his guidance, significant changes in manuscript evaluation, content, and style have been effected. We are confident that the new editorial structure will have a solid base, largely attributable to Don, on which to continue this journal's important role in the field of industrial and labor relations.

Graduate Program History

by Lawrence Williams

The ILR School started awarding graduate degrees in 1946. Its first, an M.S., was received by Donald Strauss whose thesis, "The Impartial Chairman System of Arbitration as Illustrated Principally by the Rochester Men's Clothing Industry," may have established a record for the longest title without a colon. Strauss's thesis was supervised by Royal Montgomery (Collective Bargaining) and Phillips Bradley (Labor Legislation).

The school's first bachelor of science degrees were awarded in June of 1947, when eleven undergraduate degrees, two master's degrees, and one doctorate were awarded. Felician Foltman, who went on to become a professor in the school, earned one of those master's degrees. The doctor's degree was awarded to John Brophy whose thesis was entitled "Education and Training in the Industries of Upstate New York." Brophy's committee consisted of Lynn A. Emerson (representing Industrial Education), who was its chair, Clyde B. Moore (Supervision), and John W. McConnell (ILR).

Between the late 1940s and the early 1960s, the school's doctorates and master's degrees were degrees in education, with the last master of education degree given in 1961 and the final doctor of education degree awarded in 1963. The professional master's degree, currently entitled the MILR degree, was first awarded in September of 1950. Its first two recipients, Mary Lou Dappert and

Theron Fields, went on to professional careers and are still active members of the ILR Alumni Association.

To illustrate the trends, the number of degrees awarded by the school in each of the past five decades are displayed in Table 1. The table also provides a differentiation between professional and thesis degrees. For Ph.D.s, the peak production period was between 1975 and 1984, when 82 Ph.D.s were awarded. The major subject matter areas for that period were Collective Bargaining and Organizational Behavior. Many of the leading academicians in our field received their Ph.D. degrees with us during that period.

Table 1. Number of Graduate Degrees Awarded by ILR School by Decade.

Degree	'45-'54	'55-'64	'65-'74	'75-'84	'85-'94	Total
MILR & MSILR	59	111	108	257	340	875
M.S. & M.S. Ed.	117	110	101	105	91	524
Ph.D. & Ph.D.Ed.	32	46	71	82	69	300
Totals	208	267	280	444	500	1,699

The M.S. and Ph.D. programs have remained in a more or less steady state for the last 30 years, but the MILR program has practically tripled in size. The average census of the graduate program in the 1950s and 1960s was between 70 and 80 students. By the late 1970s, however, the typical enrollment was closer to 125, and in the late 1980s and early 1990s the average enrollment was closer to 150 students. Nearly all of this growth was accounted for by the MILR program.

An annual survey conducted during the 1980s by the offices of IBM shows that the MILR program continues to be ranked as the number one program of its kind in the country. Since that survey's confirmation of our number-one ranking there has been general agreement among recruiters and competing programs about the prominence of the Cornell ILR program.

The last ten years have also been marked by increased cooperation with other colleges on campus. The Johnson School of Management, for example, administers a dual MILR-MBA program with us that is becoming increasingly popular.

On the international front the ILR graduate program has hosted approximately 360 foreign graduate students, nearly all of whom have stayed active in the field. The school's newest degree, the master of professional studies, consistently attracts a number of international students who spend a very profitable year with us improving their research skills and contributing significantly to the intellectual side of our graduate program as well as to their sponsoring institutions throughout the world. As funds have become more and

more restrictive, however, the school's hospitality has necessarily diminished even though the Cornell program continues to receive a large number of foreign applications.

As we conclude the ILR School's first 50 years, it is important to note that with nearly 1,700 graduate alumni the program clearly leads the country, and in fact the world, in the production of both practitioners and research scholars. Our graduate alumni continue to make their mark in every aspect of the field of industrial and labor relations.

Student Services: The Office of Resident Instruction

by James E. McPherson

Throughout the fifty years of the ILR School, an office variously called Student Personnel, Resident Instruction, and Student Services has had responsibility for maintaining student records, advising students, providing counsel, and administering the school as faculty rules and regulations require. In those five decades two patterns seemed to emerge. First, and from the very beginning, faculty and students in the school looked to the office to develop and distribute information about courses of study, to ascertain the issues that were emerging and in need of attention, and to identify problems and opportunities in order to collaborate on their resolution.

The school's records evidence a second repeating occurrence: many of the same issues have faced one generation after another, and often the same responses were provided for them even though one generation was likely to be unaware that "their" problem or their solution to the problem had been recorded by a previous generation. Changes in the undergraduate curriculum; new plans for advising of students by faculty; claims by students that faculty were inaccessible; the irritations posed by a student lounge that was always unsightly and occasionally locked as a remonstrance; concerns about teaching and its evaluation; the involvement of students in decisionmaking; and the vicissitudes of student organizations and publications all appear again and again in dean's reports, minutes of faculty meetings, and student publications across the years.

Among the triumvirate left to run the school while Irving Ives ran the Republican Majority in Albany and later ran for the U.S. Senate was Donald Shank, the school's first director of student personnel. Shank set his mark on the office and those who followed him: he was the record-keeper, rule-keeper, general factotum and, according to many, "Good ol' Don," for Don could and would "take care" of students who were confused, unsure, anxious, or in difficulty.

An article in the "Faculty Corner" of the June 1947 *I&LR News* described Shank as a "solid mid-Westerner" from Ohio who did graduate study in Sociology at George Washington University and the University of North Carolina and worked for the American Council on Education in Washington, where he came to

know Cornell's President Edmund Ezra Day. During World War II, Shank was loaned to Roosevelt's Armed Forces Committee on Postwar Educational Opportunities for Service Personnel where he helped to draft the educational provisions of the GI Bill. In great measure, too, he was the architect of the ILR School's then unique requirement that students engage in a series of summer work experiences.

In the fall of 1945, Shank had an interesting task ahead of him: dealing with an absentee dean and a university president who took real and continuing interest in the new school, collaborating with a faculty that was just beginning to come together, and developing a unique program of studies dealing with industrial peace and productivity in rural upstate New York for a student body composed mostly of veterans returning from World War II.

Of the 145 students who completed the 1945-46 year (with 11 graduating), 125 were veterans. Living in "Vetsburg," the married student housing on Maple Avenue, with wives and children, on a GI Bill allowance, and going to class in the school's corner of Warren Hall (the third floor) on the Ag quad, those students were highly motivated, working to complete degrees begun elsewhere, impatient to learn and then to enter the jobs awaiting them. Many of them had been attracted to the new school by an article in *Stars and Stripes*, the military's newspaper; others came because they remembered the strikes and strife that preceded war mobilization of the American economy; and a good number were likely induced to enroll because of the low cost of this contract institution.

In short order, the school moved from Warren Hall to what was known as Sage Green, the area now occupied by the College of Engineering, across from Sage Hall. The Quonset huts of fond alumni memory were not—for the most part—those demi-spherical metal structures to which the Quonset name is attached. Most of the seven buildings were temporary, rectangular, and unsubstantial barracks occupied by the Navy V-12 Program during the war; only the library was in a Quonset hut. (Yet those "temporary" buildings housed a good part of ILR for 16 years.) Roofs leaked, buckets to catch water proliferated, cold air came through drafty windows, and there was little or no sound proofing or partitions substantial enough to provide privacy in conversation.

For all of those reasons, many of ILR's earliest students wanted to complete their studies and degree requirements with a minimum of backtracking, confusion, or missed opportunities. They saw themselves as mature individuals (many as old as their professors) seasoned by war, no-nonsense in their approach, and ready to make their mark on the ever growing industrial order. Donald Shank's job was to help them through Cornell, ILR, and school, thus—as is still the case—the Office of Student Personnel had to be cognizant of issues and opportunities both on and off campus. Courses offered in Cornell's colleges and by ILR's faculty had to be scheduled, posted, and recorded. Students had to be advised about requirements and transfer credits, about finances and marital problems, and about employment they might pursue.

Faculty interest and involvement in the school's early students were intense. Maurice Neufeld and Jean McKelvey, for example, were not too much older than their G.I. Bill students, and the veterans were not much in awe of anyone in authority after their experience in the European and Pacific theaters of war. Together in their "Quonset huts," they constituted a small and close-knit community governed by faculty committees with names and responsibilities such as "Advisers of New Students": "This committee is expected to make recommendations concerning development of a school policy on undergraduate advising and student counseling....the individual members of the committee are asked to serve as advisers for new students."

The Committee on Standards and Regulations (for students), in addition to admitting new students, was to be advisory to the Director of Student Personnel on: "standards for the student body and in the policies to be followed in the acceptance, retention and dropping of students. It is also to consider various problems in connection with the grading system."

Donald Shank was chairman of the standards committee and a member of the committees on advising and curriculum, placement, and scholarships. Maurice Neufeld chaired the curriculum committee and served on the standards and placement committees, while Jean McKelvey chaired the advising committee and served on the curriculum committee. Those early committee lists carry many other names that appear in minutes and reports for decades thereafter: Vernon Jensen, Earl Brooks, John McConnell, Milton Konvitz, N. Arnold Tolles, Leonard Adams, Martin P. Catherwood, and C. Arnold Hanson.

In the 1947-48 year, there were 283 students in ILR, many of whom were veterans (the average age was 25); about half were from upstate New York, 12 percent from out of state, and 12 percent were women. About 150 of those students had completed one of the three summer work assignments that were required (with 50 percent in management, 35 percent in state and federal government offices, and 15 percent in labor unions in that year).

Toward the end of his first year as dean (in 1948), M.P. Catherwood had to find a replacement for his director of student personnel as Donald Shank had resigned to join the Institute of International Education as vice president and secretary. Shank's successor, C. Arnold Hanson, had been assistant director for a year, so there was continuity in administration of the office. Hanson, who became director of student personnel in 1948, remained in that position until 1960 when he left Cornell to become president of Gettysburg College. His tenure in the position lasted through the Korean conflict and discussion of the possible cessation of the school's classes for the duration, through the planning and construction of new buildings on the site of the Veterinary College, through changes in the curriculum and the student body, and into the next phase in ILR history, the Ives Hall Quadrangle.

In 1951, the ILR Student Organization Newsletter introduced its readers to "The Other Side" of the Office of Resident Instruction (a name finally changed

after first being proposed in 1948 and 1950): Barbara Cleveland, Laura Keenahan, Kathleen Anderson, and Anne Dimock.

When Hanson left for Gettysburg (in 1960), James Campbell became director of the office. His death in March 1962 was a profound shock to students and staff alike. Tributes to him from the students and James Huttar's remarks at the unveiling of a portrait commissioned in his memory gave testimony to the respect and affection in which he was held by undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty. Campbell's colleagues, Donald Dietrich and Floyd Irvin, carried on the functions of the office until a new director was named by Dean McConnell—Professor Frank B. Miller, a member of the Department of Manpower Administration.

Into Ives Hall

In the decade of the 1960s, as the school moved into its new quarters in the Ives Hall Quadrangle, events and developments coincided to transform the school from what it had been in its first 15 years to what it would become in the next 30. Student movements for free speech and civil rights and protest against the war in Vietnam led students to become more aware of and to want participation in school governance and course curriculum. The academic and career interests of students changed, along with the composition of the undergraduate population as the result of efforts to increase the numbers of minority students, transfer students, and women enrolled. In most areas of the school's life, whatever had been the case in the '40s and '50s was transformed in the '60s and '70s. The efforts of ORI to deal with those transformations were guided first by Frank Miller and then by his successor, Donald Dietrich.

The ILR Student Newsletter Orientation Issue in 1962 reviewed the roster of ORI for new students. Thumbnail sketches were provided of Frank Miller (B.A. in Psychology from Reed College, M.S. from Cornell, back to Cornell in 1951 after work as a guidance counselor at Reed and Gonzaga, Ph.D. from Cornell in 1953); Donald Dietrich (M.A. in English from Cornell in 1948, followed by work in Ithaca's office of the N.Y.S. Department of Labor, to ORI in 1956); Floyd Irvin (Ph.D. from Cornell and prior experience as a residence counselor and program assistant for the Sloan Institute); and William H. Allen, Jr., placement counselor (West Point, Columbia, and Cornell, to the ROTC Program at Cornell in 1957, then to placement and alumni activities in ILR in 1960).

Recruiting

The admission of undergraduate students changed from an earlier picture of receiving and reviewing applications to efforts to recruit the best possible candidates for the school. In the earliest years, the school relied upon university efforts to encourage applications to review, merely requiring an extra essay that was to demonstrate the maturity, interest in the school's field, and "ability to collaborate" that was deemed necessary for academic and professional success. Counselors in the Office of Student Personnel met with individuals when asked to do so. As the numbers of veterans with G.I. Bill benefits decreased, applicants

from high school became the focus of interest and the school began the practice of meeting with high school counselors to inform them about the school's program. When active recruiting got underway in the 1960s, efforts were made to work jointly with counterparts in Home Economics and Agriculture.

Faculty interest in the quality of entering classes of students was evident from the beginning. An Admissions Policy statement from 1948 noted the twin determinants of admissions: limits on the numbers of students who could be admitted and impressive academic credentials. To be admitted in 1948 one had to either be in the top half of one's high school class or have at least a B- average on a college record. Since there were so many who cleared the first hurdle, candidates were compared to one another to decide on selection of those who would receive offers of admission. The September two-day meetings of the school, which began that year and continued until the late 1970s, always featured reports on the size and the academic credentials of the entering class.

In April 1962, Associate Director Don Dietrich reported that freshmen entering in the fall term would number about 122, of which 20 percent would be women. The median SAT scores were "in the neighborhood" of 600, with one-third to one-half holding Regents Scholarships, several National Merit and two Cornell National Scholarship winners.

On that occasion as before, beginning in 1948, Professor Konvitz voiced his concern about the small number of women being admitted. Instead of receiving a reminder that university policy limited the college to no more than 20 percent of its entering class, because there was not sufficient residence hall space to accommodate larger numbers of women, Konvitz was told that the university was planning to increase the number of women who could be admitted. It finally did so in 1970.

In those days of quotas and limits, it had not been easy to be a woman in ILR, even though women tended to be quite successful as students. A 1947 article in the *I&LR News* analyzing academic standing at the end of the spring '47 term concluded: "The women consistently beat the men in every category." A 1960 survey of alumni to which 86 women responded, however, indicated that nearly 40 percent had become homemakers and of the remainder, half were in commerce and industry, a third in education, health and social services, and the rest in government or unions. An Orientation Booklet item in 1963 on "The Female In Industrial Relations" identified the central issue as "how well can women compete for jobs" in a man's world. The author suggested that women take advantage of the breadth of the curriculum in order to be prepared for many different varieties of jobs.

In the same April 1962 faculty meeting in which he had questioned the number of women entering in the next class, Professor Konvitz asked about the numbers of Negro students being admitted. He was told that there had been one Negro applicant, who was not admitted. Konvitz remarked that more effort seemed to be spent on admitting foreign students than on recruiting American Negroes. (He was right: ten years before, there had been 23 West Germans, 16

Turks, and students from England, France, India, Italy, Japan, Sweden and Syria in attendance, due both to faculty research interests abroad and to the Institute for International Industrial and Labor Relations.)

Prior to 1965, as 1962 indicates, efforts to recruit minority students produced rather dismal results. Cornell's Committee on Special Education Projects (COSEP) began in 1965 as an effort to recruit African Americans for admission. It was essentially a central university effort, and ILR was one of the recipients of applications to review. The Dean's Report for 1963-64 stated that "ILR (like Cornell University as a whole) is increasingly concerned and relatively ineffective." One bright spot noted was the efforts of an undergraduate secondary school visiting committee that gave much of its effort to "high schools not hitherto represented here, notably in the educationally disadvantaged areas."

When the school itself became more active in efforts to recruit minority students, rather than expecting the university to do the job, some slow progress began to be made. Following James Campbell's lead, Frank Miller went to New York City in 1963 to meet with members of the Urban League and the Negro American Labor Council. Then, as now, the completion of applications begun was one major issue and assuring minority group members who had heard about the school that they were welcome was another. In recruiting and admitting COSEP students a good deal of attention was given to academic motivation and recommendations from advisers, and less to high school rank and College Board scores.

In 1969-70, only 17 applicants completed applications of the 30 who requested them. In 1970, the director of ORI reported that minority group members were 4 percent of the school's population, up from 1.2 percent in 1965. At that point an African-American graduate student, George Dean, was employed to assist in advising and communicating with COSEP students.

Advising

The practice of advising of all of the school's undergraduates has continually been under construction and evaluation. Shortly after listing the advising responsibilities of faculty in 1947, Jean McKelvey's advising committee changed them. They proposed the elimination of the formal designation of advisees for upperclassmen, the continuation of faculty advising underclassmen, the Division of Student Personnel to handle counseling for registration, and the dissolution of the Committee on Advising. In place of the committee, the Division of Student Personnel was to deal with the advising and counseling program "in all its aspects and decide upon what form of faculty consultation it would find helpful." A year later, the faculty agreed that students should be assisted by both a faculty advisor and the Division of Student Personnel in "the preparation of a study plan covering a choice of electives to meet the needs and interests of the student." The advisor and the student were to be provided with detailed listings of electives "arranged according to vocational interests or subject matter," prepared by the Division of Student Personnel.

In 1954 the pattern was reversed. It was decided to assign freshmen and sophomores to student personnel staff and juniors and seniors to faculty advisors, honoring the student's choice, whenever possible. Then in 1958, responding to a sense that there should be more faculty contact with newer students, a program was developed to assign freshman students to one of 12 faculty advisors, each of whom was to be assisted by an upperclassman acting as a "junior advisor." Four years later, the emphasis was on group meetings, with 19 faculty advisors each to meet with groups of 12 students on September 15 and to arrange for two more meetings with them thereafter. Nonetheless, in 1963 a student writing in the ILR student publication, *Consensus*, sounded the lament familiar among students for generations: "This State institution is supposedly the citadel of close student faculty relations. However, the truth is, that the large majority of the students have never talked to a faculty member on a personal basis. Many do not even know the name of their faculty advisor."

Student publications such as *Consensus* seemed to come and go with considerable regularity. The *I&LR News* first appeared in 1946, changed to *The Commentator* in 1948, and then collapsed from over-expansion. It was followed by mimeographed publications called *Newsletter* and *ILR News*. *Consensus* appeared in 1962, just when "consensus" seemed to be breaking down. The *Forum* emerged in the late '60s; followed by the *ILR Voice*, the *New Voice*, and most recently *The ILR Agenda*.

ILR's student organizations themselves went through similar phases. The first Student Organization collected dues from students, sponsored holiday dances and parties, and helped to orient and integrate students. In 1950 Professor Hanson met with student organization leaders to suggest that the faculty would take them more seriously if the organization changed by giving up its dues collection and extending membership to all ILR students. They put the proposal to a referendum, which passed, turning the Student Organization into the Student Council. Committees with names like Social, Grievance, Placement, Orientation, Alumni, Speakers, Publicity, and Athletics continued under the new system.

Student Governance

Student interest in the Student Council waned in the 1950s, until only one person filed a petition to run for election to office in 1959. The students voted to abolish the council in spring 1959, but that fall an alternative was created: the Student Representatives, one from each class, plus the ex officio editor of the *I&LR Newsletter*.

The checkered history of student organizations did not reflect the presence of student interest or involvement in the governance of the school. One of the most unusual aspects of this unusual school was the provision for undergraduate membership on committees and in faculty meetings. In the fall of 1948 the faculty decided that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee should consist of five members of the faculty, the Director of Student Personnel and four voting members of the student body, designated by the Student Organization. In addition, the President of the Student Organization and a graduate student were to

be invited to attend faculty meetings *with votes*, and the Academic Standards Committee was instructed to consult on policy matters with representatives of the Student Organization. The minutes of January 14, 1949 noted that the faculty members of the curriculum committee had met with the student representatives to bring them up to date on committee business. Thereafter, whenever there were revisions of the curriculum (a regular occurrence) students were involved in the deliberations and their opinions were sought. On occasion in the earlier years, students even petitioned the faculty to restore courses to the required curriculum or to add them as they did with Speech in 1950. Student representatives have been listed annually in the faculty minutes and when the Undergraduate Program Committee has reported recommendations to the faculty, the student members attending the meetings have been listed.

In the fall of 1962, the school's first convocation in the new building was held, culminating in commentary by Dean McConnell on the importance of a sense of responsibility, extending the concept to "care of the new buildings," including "the proper disposal of milk cartons" and "messy places in the lounges." Shortly thereafter the new buildings were officially dedicated in two days of speeches and a symposium.

Curriculum

Alongside the new building was a newly structured curriculum. ILR course work was moved from the junior and senior years into the freshman and sophomore years. The timing of ILR courses changed the content, too: Accounting, Speech and an engineering course were dropped from the list of requirements; a sophomore sequence in math or science was added; a language could be elected in the junior or senior years; and American Ideals became an elective course rather than a requirement. (Appendix C contains the curricula set in 1945-46, 1965-66, 1985-86, and 1994-95.)

In the fall of 1962, the school's enrollment reached 400, with the largest freshman class to date—125 new students, of whom 29 percent were from New York City, 57 percent from "upstate," and 12 percent from out of state. (Appendix A—The Timeline—presents a variety of enrollment data.) They resembled previous classes in academic quality, reporting median verbal SATs of 598 and math SATs of 615.

Placement

Placement and job opportunities had preoccupied the school from its beginning, partially because its first students were earning degrees that they could take to work, partially because the field focused on real problems of real working people, and partially because summer work was a requirement for the degree. Donald Shank had engineered and publicized the summer program that required students to work in union, management, and government operations. He hired Kathryn Ranck in 1946 to handle summer placement and to contend with students and their employers. An *I&LR News* issue reported in 1948 that Professor Shank, Miss Ranck and Dean Catherwood had met with graduating

students who were uncertain about jobs available to them and concerned about the information provided to them. A four-page booklet was "dittoed" to answer their questions and provide direction. Later, in a faculty meeting in 1950, Arnold Hanson tried to state the limits of school responsibility for student employment: "The School trains the students, offers counseling service and assistance in placement, but...each student has a basic responsibility for obtaining his own job." At that time, no one person had the responsibility for placement; but Hanson was working with unions, Felician Foltman with government agencies, and Kathryn Ranck with industry and business.

The Dean's Report for 1949-50, in discussing placement, included the possible exaggeration that "early graduates of the School found little difficulty in obtaining employment in a relatively tight labor market. " (Two of those graduates, in fact, remember considerable difficulty in finding employment as they graduated from a little-known school with an unknown curriculum and a reputation for enrolling "Reds and radicals.") The report further observed:

The School recognizes that it must give continued attention to the development of long-term placement plans. Such plans must establish relationships with increasingly greater numbers of potential employers—labor unions, government agencies, industrial employers—not only in the State of New York but elsewhere in the nation. Moreover, equivalent attention must be given to the effective counseling and development of graduates so that their preparation will reflect the long-term needs for employment and effective living, plus development of individual talents to cope with the unique specialties in this field. Counseling must give proper recognition to the fact that students must contemplate a period of apprenticeship or maturation before they are permitted an opportunity to work on the professional level in industrial and labor relations.

As ILR students graduated and then came back to their alma mater to recruit new co-workers for their companies, it became clear that the most effective advertisement and most effective recruiters were graduates of the school.

The combination of younger, less-mature students and the draft altered the placement picture in the 1950s. Students who had not satisfied their military obligation before graduating from college were not attractive to recruiters. Furthermore, students were not crystal clear about their prospects. The December 1947 *I&LR News* carried a column which rings a bell that still echoes: "Needed: A Purpose." The author stated that many ILR students facing graduation were wondering (1) for what specific jobs do my I&LR courses prepare me? and (2) what type of career do I want for my life's work? He then asked how many people who once felt "that labor relations was their field, now think entirely otherwise?" and how many knew what they were fitted for in the range of possibilities open to them. He concluded that the school was obligated to turn out future leaders and "graduates possessing productive skills in harmony with their interests and aptitudes."

During the next decade, fewer and fewer students were chomping at the bit to go to work after they received their bachelor's degree. Reporting to the September meeting of the faculty in 1962, Director Frank Miller noted that recruiters were showing more interest in master's students, who had satisfied their military obligations, and that the "higher ranking" students were opting for graduate study. He also observed that labor relations positions were declining in number, students were more interested in law, government, industry, research and development, and there was "some dissatisfaction with first jobs and requests for placement within six months of hiring." Clearly, O.R.I. had begun the practice of providing placement assistance to people who had already graduated from the school.

The numbers of students anticipating immediate post-graduate placement "in the field" continued to decline. Some were inducted into the armed services, some went to the Peace Corps, but the upper 50 percent of the class of 1963 went on to graduate study. In 1965, 73 percent planned to continue their education, with only 14 percent "entering employment," although that year 43 companies provided 293 interviews for the 61 out of 88 graduates who showed interest in interviewing. The director judged that most of the activity was "wasted," being used by students as a hedge against rejection by graduate programs, although the recruiters "all seemed to mean business." Thus, placement had become a service offered to alumni, and O.R.I. considered career counseling an appropriate service to provide for undergraduates.

Teaching

On the list of abiding concerns for faculty and students alike, teaching must be added to placement, curriculum, and advising. The encouragement, evaluation, and recognition of teaching appear frequently throughout the life of the school. As far back as December 1950, Professor Alpheus Smith had reported that students were developing a series of questionnaires to assess student opinions about teaching: one would deal with course content, a second with "teaching methods, for the use of the instructor," and a third with a general appraisal of the curriculum. That one would go to the Division of Student Personnel. The advent of the Korean War and the possibility of closing the school for the duration, however, apparently removed the evaluation of teaching from the contemporary agenda. It reappeared with a vengeance in 1965-66, when Professor Duncan MacIntyre wrote an article for the *ILR Voice* suggesting that student course questionnaires could be useful "to get teaching quality." He proposed that questionnaires be compulsory in all required courses and in elective courses enrolling 15 or more students, uniform for all courses, in a format developed by a student-faculty committee. Furthermore, he proposed that once completed, the forms should go to the instructor of the course, with summaries to O.R.I. and the dean, for incorporation in decisions about teaching and teachers. In their next meeting, the faculty adopted a resolution supporting the "basic idea of establishing some system of obtaining student sentiment as to the quality of instruction and that this be done on a regular basis" and instructed the Undergraduate Program

Committee to consider "the ideas contained in the article by Professor MacIntyre in the April 1965 issue of *The Voice*."

Responding to a climate of opinion influenced by the Kahn-Bowers Report on faculty-student relations and by the emergence of Students for Education at Cornell, Dean Moore invited the ILR faculty to meet voluntarily during the summer months of 1965 to consider and address issues facing the school. The faculty did meet and propose a variety of approaches to these issues. One such approach, channeled through the Faculty Committee on Planning and Personnel Policies, resulted in a "Report on the Quality of Undergraduate Education," which contained five resolutions. The first expressed approval of student-faculty lounge facilities and urged faculty to make use of them; the second proposed that undergraduates and graduate students be "carefully informed" that faculty members expected to meet students in their offices, "whether or not these students are enrolled in their classes," and then recommended that faculty be present "for consultation, at times convenient to the students, for at least five (5) hours per week." The third resolution proposed guaranteeing each student in each semester the possibility of enrolling in an ILR course with no more than 15 students in it. It was the fourth resolution, however, that triggered the most heated debate: approval of anonymous evaluations, made mandatory, administered in class, using an instrument designed by a committee. After lengthy discussion and motions to amend, the whole report was returned to committee. (The fifth resolution called for the inclusion of teaching evaluations, derived from direct observation of classroom performance by a department chairmen or a "senior substitute," in promotion decisions.). That outcome led to the observation in the Dean's Report for 1965-66 that "There appears to be a positive correlation between triviality or vagueness and the possibility of a resolution being adopted by the faculty as a whole."

Miller and O.R.I. had busy years in the middle 1960s. A new variation on academic integrity, called "home rule," was introduced in 1963 and ILR produced a code and procedures consistent with university regulations to be administered in the school rather than by a university review board. A Dean's List was re-introduced in 1964, despite arguments from Professor Jensen that students themselves had requested elimination of the practice years ago. In 1965, Professor Cook reported a resolution from the Undergraduate Program Committee proposing a "Junior Semester in New York City" (an idea first broached in a faculty meeting in 1946!). That same committee also proposed another change in the committees dealing with undergraduate affairs: In place of the Undergraduate Program Committee, there should be an Academic Standards and Scholarships Committee and an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (which would have student members), and O.R.I. was to have ex officio representation on both.

Despite the time and energy invested in "The Year of the Undergraduate" (1965-66), student opinion of life in ILR seemed to have become hypercritical. A 1966 essay on "The ILR Experience" reported that ILR students had a great deal of free time, never worked in the library, slandered one another, and complained about courses too narrow or too broad in scope. Another analysis of student

values followed in April 1967 under the heading "The Decline of Activities," with the opening sentence "Student government can't find anything to do and we can't find any students wanting anything to do with it." The decline was attributed to the need to study to beat the draft and gain entry to graduate school, to specialization in activities ("no more three-letter men") and to the claims of "ideological activism," which required singular commitment lest one be thought shallow. In the next semester, *The Voice* carried one article headed by the poignant question, "What The Hell Are We Doing Here?," and a second, "Why No Machines?" The first article reported complaints among students about the decline in the numbers of great courses and great professors; the drive to find easy schedules, easy courses and easy grades among those same students; and the lack of interest in learning reflected by very small turnout for Professor Cullen's report on a year with the President's Council of Economic Advisers and Professor Doherty's report on the most recent strike by New York City teachers. The second article, written by the student government president, was about candy and soda machines being removed from the student lounge, not about automation or the technology revolution. The author noted that the lounge was a mess ("like a pig sty") which explained why Dean Moore had had the machines removed to the basement. (Professor Miller had been even more graphic a year earlier, saying that "the appearance of the lounge was appalling, reminiscent of the hyena pit in a third-rate municipal zoo." Students agitated for a coffee hour to replace the machines, a move that led to some improvement "perhaps to the point of resembling the high school gym at the close of the junior prom.") In April 1968, *The Voice* continued the string of critical comments in "The Disillusionment of the ILR Freshman." Interviewing students, the writer found that everyone knew what he meant by disillusionment and that it applied to the material, the students, and the curriculum. The material was at once too conceptual and too specific, the students uninteresting in their homogeneity and petty competitiveness, and the curriculum too limited in scope for undergraduates who ought to engage in liberal education. The article concluded by suggesting that "disturbed ILRies should voice their opinions to 'the faculty, the members of the Office of Resident Instruction and to the Dean.'"

Frank Miller went on sabbatic in 1967 and his associate director, Donald P. Dietrich, became Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, Director of the Office of Resident Instruction, and Chairman of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee. In February 1968, Dietrich's first year as director, two students interviewed him for the *ILR Voice*, describing him as "a man of keen insight and great personal warmth." In that interview he said that as he assumed his new position, he also became "chief training officer" to the new members of the newly reorganized O.R.I. staff. The counseling staff had been increased in size at least partially in response to a change in the student body, 75 percent of which was now going to graduate school rather than into employment, and to a broader and more flexible program of studies, which required more advising about undergraduate course work and about graduate programs to consider. The new staff consisted of John Blanchard, Laura Eadie, and Ruth Stempel, all of whom were called counselors, without the associate and assistant director titles that were once used.

In that first year, Dietrich added Christopher Shinkman to the staff, abandoned the practice of early decision in admissions, came to terms with a newly revised curriculum that eliminated mathematics and science requirements as well as Government 101, removed prescriptive limits on ILR elective course selection and permitted up to five elective courses in the sophomore year, and took a careful look at the school's participation in the COSEP Program. He noted that there had been a steady increase in applications from minority group members, almost exclusively from African Americans, and that he expected seven of the eight COSEP applicants offered admission (out of 16 who completed applications) to enroll in the fall 1969 term.

The "Dietrich years" in O.R.I. saw both the departure of Dean McConnell to the University of New Hampshire and, in 1971, the arrival of Dean Robert McKersie. They were years of effort to admit women, transfers and minority students, years of reviewing and revising the curriculum and of advising. They differed from the previous decades, however, in a number of ways. The Student Government Association became lively and active; the question of "field work," in various forms, was raised and answered; and placement was moved from O.R.I. to another division of the school.

Into the Seventies

In 1970, the university eliminated the quota system that had restricted the admission of women to the number of residence hall beds available for them. (In the 1950s, reports would mention that ILR had been allocated "two more beds," so, for example, 54 women could be enrolled instead of 52.) Within five years, the numbers of women applying for admissions increased from 58 to 151 and women were 28 percent of the student body in 1974, then 34 percent in 1976.

The admission of transfer students was pressed by the State University of New York, with a formula that anticipated a 60/40 ratio of upper division (junior and senior) students to lower division students. Between 1964 and 1972, 25 students came to ILR from two year programs: 11 of them had graduated by spring 1972, 10 were still enrolled, and 4 had been dismissed. Considerable concern was generated by the admission of transfers from community colleges. The admissions report noted that "more than a third of the four-year transfer matriculants are in the top two-fifths of their ILR class, only 7 percent of the two-year matriculants make the top fifth, and 71 percent of them are in the bottom two-fifths of their ILR classes." Minority student registration increased from five in 1965 to 37 in 1972. Almost one-third of the COSEP students admitted between 1965 and 1972 had not continued in the school, 18 percent of them failing out. The trend seemed upward, however, due in some part to the tutoring, study sessions, and counseling provided by part-time counselors in O.R.I. The number of part-time counselors was increased to two in the next year; peer advising and self-help efforts began to emerge as significant assistance to minority students. In 1976, Ruth Ozkul had staff responsibility for work with minority students. She reported that ILR's difficulty in increasing its minority applications was due, in part, to the increasing numbers of colleges and universities recruiting members of minority groups. In 1977, the Provost's requirement that COSEP be "decentralized" by the

presence of a COSEP counselor in each college brought about the employment of ILR's first full-time African-American counselor, Shirley Harrell.

Student Government left the doldrums of the late '50s and early '60s and in the early '70s offered services and programs intended to enhance undergraduate life in ILR. In 1969-70, some 20 different student initiatives were listed in the annual report from O.R.I., including writing letters to new freshmen; conducting course evaluations; developing a tutorial service; providing student adviser assistants to work with faculty advisors; organizing a senior banquet; conducting referenda on university issues; developing a proposal for a semester in New York City; and bringing speakers to the campus. Working with faculty on committees, students planned to emphasize academic integrity, developed a recommendation instituting the "wild card" or "opt out" enabling sophomores and above to substitute ILR elective courses for as many as two required courses, and lobbied for an increase in the number of elective courses scheduled for future semesters. And, in 1974, after the ILR faculty had decided not to participate in the SUNY Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching two years earlier, ILR students instituted balloting in late spring to select the recipients of an Excellence in Teaching Award.

A great deal of faculty interest and time in these years went to consideration of the Human Affairs Programs (HAP), an informal, university-wide program that enabled students to earn academic credit for work in community organizations and store fronts. That program and ILR's interest in enabling students to engage in field work collided, leading in 1971-74 to two reports—one by George Brooks from an ad hoc committee and one by Ivor Frances from the Academic Standards Committee, both of which asserted the value of relevant "field study" as opposed to the loose controls, loose standards, and questionable value of the field experience provided by HAP. Those considerations provided the context for the final demise of ILR's summer work requirement and the birth of the New York City semester, the forebear of the Credit Internship Program.

The summer work requirement, a burden for 25 years, had been revised as students and faculty made efforts to continue it. The original concept called for ILR undergraduates to complete summer placements in corporate, union, and government offices and activities. Finding places to complete those assignments was always something of a problem, and after the school's first decade many students were not enthusiastic about the requirement. Credit for the requirement was one inducement enacted by the faculty; the requirement was reduced to ten weeks in each area, then to work experience in each area before or after matriculation, and finally, the elimination of the requirement entirely.

The New York City semester, proposed in 1965 but not implemented until 1973, took up some of the slack left by the end of the work requirement by enabling students to participate in internships supervised by ILR faculty for academic credit. Contrary to a HAP, this would allow only well-qualified students in small numbers to be permitted into the program. After a year of operation, however, few students and few faculty were interested in the New York City program. Over 20 years' time student interest did develop, though, to make

internships and "real world" experience an essential component of many ILR undergraduates' education. O.R.I. administered those early years of internships, working with the Academic Standards and Undergraduate Program Committee to review placements and student applicants for them. Robert Risley served as the first academic coordinator of the credit internship program, inviting faculty and alumni to serve as intern supervisors, assisting students in locating internships, and reporting on the progress of the program to the faculty.

Dean McKersie's concern about undergraduate work and career interests prompted a significant change in O.R.I. in 1972 when placement was moved to the School Relations office headed by Jim Huttar. By that time the number of students who were "undecided" as they graduated, combined with those who intended graduate study, had produced a situation in which so few graduates were entering employment that people outside the school could wonder if the school were fulfilling its intended purpose. In the spring of 1973, however, Huttar reported that the number of students seeking work had nearly tripled (from 20 to 57) with one-half looking for work in labor relations, one-third (18) interested in personnel and 8 pursuing jobs in the labor movement. But even a placement office could not alter student interest and interactions immediately, and in 1975 McKersie reported to the faculty that every single student entering that year wanted to go to law school (40 to 50 percent of them actually would). Furthermore, of the 115 seniors who might have been interested, only 10 showed up for a career counseling program sponsored by the placement office.

The next spring, at the May 1974 faculty meeting, McKersie reflected on changes in the school: students were better prepared when they entered; course offerings were becoming "bi-polar" (with some courses very practical and problem oriented and others very theoretical and analytical), with the consequent de-emphasis on courses that surveyed and described the ILR field and state-of-the-art practice in it. This argued for more opportunities for internships and hands-on experience for students. He also reported that "The State" was suggesting that ILR should save the costs of courses for underclassmen and accept only transfer students. Variations on that idea had been broached earlier by Cornell Presidents Day and Malott and by Dean McConnell (when the planning for the new buildings began). It would appear again in the Outside Review Committee report of 1987.

A proposal to change the advising system once again surfaced in March 1976. In the new system, O.R.I. would advise students for the first two semesters and then assign them to faculty advisers. Assignments would be permanent, but students could change advisers at the end of any semester. Students would be required to meet with their advisers to secure signatures on a preregistration form attesting to the advising discussions that preceded selection of the courses listed. Faculty discussions of the proposal expressed a good deal of concern about liability for signing cards and approving schedules that fell shy of degree requirements. As the debate continued, it became apparent that the card-signing ceremony was to be conducted only after students had consulted with a counselor in O.R.I., thus guaranteeing that the necessary courses and credits were recorded.

In September 1977 Frank Miller returned to O.R.I. as director, just in time to restructure the office. The University Provost had just decentralized COSEP, requesting that each college employ a minority counselor at the approximate level of assistant dean. In ILR, the closest approximation was associate director of O.R.I. Miller decided that those staff people called counselors for the prior ten years should become associate directors and that each should have a portfolio of special responsibilities, in addition to those general office responsibilities shared by O.R.I. staff. The staff in O.R.I. that year consisted of Miller; Virginia Freeman, the registrar of two years' experience; Brenda Bricker, associate director for admissions; Shirley Harrell, associate director for minority student affairs; and Robert Hopkins, associate director for career counseling. Bob Hopkins left ILR early in 1977, however, and James McPherson was hired to do career counseling in early 1978.

Graduate records and the Graduate Field Office, where Jo Richards and Janet Frand reported to Bob Aronson, the graduate field officer, were located in O.R.I. until 1979-80. At that time, there were approximately 588 undergraduates and 103 graduate students registered in the school, and ILR was expecting 45 COSEP students the next year.

In the first annual report from his second stint as director, Frank Miller outlined the themes that would run through the next seven years: efforts to recruit and retain minority students, student preparation for employment and/or graduate study, and "consumerism and faculty advising." In the next years, the associate directors reported individually on their activities: Brenda Bricker referred to nine admissions initiatives taken, including travel to community colleges, a "guaranteed transfer" program, cooperative efforts with other Cornell admissions offices, and plans to do more with brochures, study groups, community colleges, and "college nights." She reported an entering freshman class of 144, 37 percent of whom would come from upstate New York and 53 percent from the metropolitan area. Their median SAT scores were 600 Verbal and 630 Math, and 91 percent were in the top fifth of their high school classes. Of the 615 students enrolled that year (1978-79), 45 (or 7.3 percent) were COSEP students. Shirley Harrell reflected then on the "merchandising problem" involved in providing potential COSEP applicants with attractive information about the school and on detailed efforts underway to have matriculated students return to their high schools and to engage in "telethons" and "hosting weekends," and her own efforts to visit high schools in upstate cities to recruit minority students.

Students began to organize around professional interests in the late '70s, expanding the American Society for Personnel Administration, creating the Cornell Organization for Labor Action and Frontlash, the Society for Arbitration and Neutral's Education, the Minority Industrial and Labor Relations Student Organization, and the Women's Caucus. Student Government elections were "ambushed" by COLA in 1978-79, leading to a complaint to the University Ombudsman from other students, who were even less well organized than COLA, and the Ombudsman's suggestion that election procedures be made more rigorous in the future.

Miller's office strategy of making associate directors specialists with generalist tasks to perform worked well in the first few years: admissions yields remained stable, minority student members and services increased, and the proportions of graduating classes entering employment or applying to graduate school came into better balance (closer to 50-50). By effort and interest, the general functions of advising and counseling were maintained in the midst of those specialized job portfolios.

By the fall '79 term, both Harrell and Bricker had left O.R.I. for other positions. Richard Wagner became the associate director for admissions and Carolyn Whitlow became the associate director for minority affairs. Wagner has been responsible for the admissions process since that year; the position in minority student affairs has been occupied by three people who followed Ms. Whitlow. The commitment to increase minority student enrollment made by the school, by Wagner, and by staff involved in admissions recruiting, interviewing, and selection, produced increasing numbers of African-American, Hispanic-American, and Native-American students in ILR. By fall 1984, minority students were 13 percent of the undergraduate student body. The number of completed COSEP applications had grown from 15 in 1975 to 44 in 1984 and from 7 to 25 matriculating as freshmen in that same period. Transfer COSEP admissions increased from 3 to 13 students. As COSEP matriculants worked upwards, the number of women admitted closed the gap to near 50 percent of entering classes. SAT median hovered at the customary 610 Verbal and 630 Math medians.

Minority students began to raise serious questions about the availability of minority faculty, advising, and academic support services in the first half of the 1980s. Some students began looking for increases in the numbers of minority faculty in the school (looking in vain for the most part), while others had been looking for evidence of instruction in trade union practice and activity. Some other students were concluding that the school's policies were far from what they should be when they observed that the numbers of women faculty, union educators, and minority professors were not increasing and that non-union or anti-union firms were being permitted to interview and recruit graduating students.

Two improvements were recorded: the school's diploma ceremony and, again, the advising system. (One may guess which proved lasting and which would be ephemeral.) In 1981-82 Dean Charles Rehms asked Jonathon Levy to revamp the graduation reception, a traditional occasion in ILR, which (according to Dean Catherwood in 1954) was once the model for other schools to emulate. Beneath a tent in the lower Ives courtyard, graduates and their families had been greeted by the dean, handed a diploma and a box lunch, and then left to mingle until deciding to go home. The revised version, a diploma presentation ceremony developed by Levy, featured live music, speeches, and buffet service. In subsequent years that model has been maintained, even when the 1994-96 construction prompted moving the entire ceremony away from Ives Hall into Lynah Rink.

Yet another attempt to institute advising by faculty was launched when the Undergraduate Program Committee proposed that O.R.I. be responsible for the "nuts and bolts" advising, as Gerd Korman termed it, and that two members of each of the ILR departments be named to serve as advisers of undergraduates who wanted information or assistance related to the department's area. This novel approach was regarded as preferable to the prevailing situation, in which faculty who were to sign pre-registration forms were either not asked or not available for signatures. Thus ended the "card-signing ceremony," beginning a short period in which neither faculty nor students were aggravated by the requirements of advising.

In January 1984 Jim McPherson assumed the reins of O.R.I. Asked to prepare a plan for change in the office, McPherson suggested that the "specialist" strategy of associate directors be balanced by recognition of team responsibility for admissions, counseling, advising, and other support services. He also proposed that the name of the office be changed from "Resident Instruction" (which always confused phone callers, visitors, and newcomers) to ILR Student Services; suggested that the office try to identify emerging issues and developing problems, rather than waiting to put out brush fires; and requested renovation of office space to provide better admissions meeting areas and better defined work areas. He was aided in those efforts by Ann Bradley who was early in an office career that involved managing office budgets, producing hundreds of "Dean's letters" for law schools each year, and serving as office manager for ILR Student Services.

In the next few years, in addition to innovations, the office dealt with a rising tide of competitive behavior connected to higher hurdles placed between graduating students and graduate schools and entry-level positions, tensions between undergraduate and graduate students contending for access to graduate level courses (called by Larry Williams, "a range war between cattlemen and sheep herders"), and between the increasing numbers of transfer students and the increasingly pressed numbers of "native" students, those who arrived as freshmen. A revised curriculum was implemented, incorporating Financial Accounting, an Advanced Writing requirement, a "Humanities" requirement, and Statistics in the freshman and sophomore years.

In an unusual move for the school, efforts were made to limit the size of the entering class; only 178 offers were extended in 1985-86 compared to a high of 202 offers of admissions made in 1984-85. This was because university officers had decided that Cornell's student population threatened to outgrow the available facilities and services and that, rather than simply continue to grow, Cornell should focus on a "better, not bigger" strategy. The 126 students who actually matriculated that year came in larger numbers from out of state (24 percent of the class); 28percent were members of minority groups.

Laura Lewis joined the office in 1985-86 as associate director for advising and counseling, working with the Student Government Association, with peer advisers for ILR students, and with students interested in studying for a term or a year in foreign universities. The next year, Schelley Michelle-Nunn arrived as ILR's associate director for minority student affairs and found herself dealing with

a sizeable number of first-semester freshman COSEP students who were dismissed for low academic averages. COSEP freshmen numbered 34 that year, while overall minority enrollment was 128 or 19.9 percent of the 643 students in ILR. In the following year, it became as important as it was accurate to state that "ILR has become visibly and clearly a multicultural and multiracial institution."

Focus that year was on devoting more resources to the recruitment and retention of minority students; expanding the session for parents of freshmen to include a convocation with welcoming comments by the dean, an effort to address the qualms of nervous parents leaving their children to the tender mercies of Cornell and ILR; and improving the training of teaching assistants (TAs).

Aided by the university's President's Fund for Undergraduate Initiatives ILR produced a training program for TAs that had the novel consequences of both working and lasting longer than one year. A graduate student was employed to videotape teaching sessions for review by TAs; to conduct seminars on "leading" sections, dealing with grading, and dealing with multiculturalism; and to implement mid-term TA evaluations by undergraduates. With assistance from the university's Office of Instructional Support, the program has continued and has improved the quality of classroom life for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Into the Nineties

In 1990-91 Dean David Lipsky asked Professor Clete Daniel to chair an ad hoc committee to review student services. That committee concluded that there should be greater faculty oversight applied to admissions and that the director of admissions should report to the associate dean. Furthermore, it concluded that both advising and admissions would benefit if admissions were moved to another office. Both professional staff in ILR Student Services and the Academic Standards Committee (which became the final arbiter of admissions decisions) managed the transition with relative ease even though greater effort was necessary to coordinate the interviewing of applicants and the review of applications.

Consigning the management of admissions to a separate office cleared the field for more and greater efforts to develop advising and counseling services for undergraduates in ILR Student Services. Barry Taylor joined the office in the summer of 1991, replacing Schelley Michelle-Nunn. Taylor reviewed the services and resources available for minority students, made some changes to them, and established himself early as an effective contributor to admissions and advising efforts for minority and non-minority students, alike.

Although the period of the mid-'80s through the mid-'90s has been marked by decreases in funding allocated by the New York State Legislature, by hiring freezes and by requests to limit expenditures, the 1990-91 year saw actual layoffs and reductions in work weeks imposed in ILR Student Services and elsewhere in the school. Nonetheless, the office regrouped to develop multicultural training

programs for peer advisers; to begin "focus groups" to assess student experience and attitudes concerning such issues as academic integrity, teaching, and diversity; to continue a regular newsletter, *FYI*, to inform students about events, achievements, and deadlines; and to make progress on computerization of student records and data. And, after years of uncertainty and ad hoc arrangements concerning Labor Day and its observance, a faculty-student committee suggested that it become regular practice to cancel classes for only a mid-day period that would include a convocation and a picnic before classes resumed in the afternoon.

Revisions to the undergraduate curriculum were wending their way through committees and meetings at this time. Dean Lipsky had asked Associate Dean Robert Smith in 1989 to chair an ad hoc committee of faculty to review and propose revisions to the curriculum, and charged the committee with a full-scale review, from the ground up, not with simply offering a few suggestions for improvements. Deciding that the school's mission provided a context in which the focus of the curriculum should be "all aspects of the employment relationship," the committee proceeded to work through an understanding of sequences of required courses that would provide foundations in the social sciences, natural sciences, history, and mathematics, that would (1) enable student to select courses that met distribution requirements in some of those areas, and (2) that moved into field-specific courses (such as Labor Economics, Personnel Management, Labor Law, Organizational Behavior, and Collective Bargaining) in the later years. A Freshman Colloquium was also instituted. It is a required course early in the first semester, in which new students meet in small groups with a faculty member, to begin their acquaintance with the ILR field, with a professor who becomes their adviser for the first year, and with one another. Harking back to "Bus Riding" ("Workers and Jobs" was one of the titles of the course recalled so clearly by ILR alumni), the first meeting of the Freshman Colloquium is a bus trip to tour work sites such as Corning, Carrier Corporation, IBM, and TRW.

There is a curious, almost eerie, similarity between 1959-62 and 1992-95 in the coincidence of factors that shaped the next phases in the school's history. In both periods, a new curriculum was introduced after lengthy discussion and review; construction plans, preparations and anticipation affected the lives of faculty, staff and students; and a long-range planning process was concluded, providing a sense of "where we go from here."

Career Services: Then and Now

by Karin S. Ash

A 1978 report of the ILR Career Services Office listed four goals:

1. Continue and improve corporate placement.
2. Continue to develop union and government placement opportunities.
(Only four unions requested resumes for entry-level positions within the labor movement in 1977-78.)
3. Develop a coherent and quality internship program.

4. Develop career counseling services for ILR students.

Despite the "generation X" culture, some things don't change all that much. Recently I attended a meeting with labor students who complained that there aren't enough union job opportunities or labor courses. And in the present Office of Career Services, we still continually try to improve and develop full-time and internship opportunities for students.

But some things do change. In 1964 the average starting salary for B.S. students was \$6,300 and for masters it was \$7,800; in 1995 the average salary for B.S. students was \$35,000 and for masters it was \$48,000. Students use our office more: In the fall and spring of 1962-63, 41 different companies visited ILR and held 409 interviews. In the fall of 1995, 48 companies have already visited the campus and held 1,011 interviews, and we still have the spring term ahead of us.

In 1977, WISP (Winter Internship Program) was called SEILRAP (Student Exposure to Industrial and Labor Relations through Alumni Programs). And I thought WISP was difficult to explain to sponsors! In 1980, 45 students were placed through WISP. In 1996, there will be 70 students interning through WISP and 51 freshmen doing a FEX (freshman externship).

Companies that recruited in 1976-77 included Exxon/Carter Oil, Jones & Laughlin Steel, Marathon Oil, Bethlehem Steel, Lukens Steel, National Steel, and Standard Oil of Ohio. A lot of oil and steel. The only oil companies that have recruited in the last few years are Amoco and Exxon. Does anyone remember when a steel company last recruited? This past fall, recruiting organizations included Silicon Graphics, Sun Microsystems, KPMG Peat Marwick, Hay Group, Texas Instruments, Andersen Consulting, and Data General.

Correspondence with recruiters in the 1970s was all done by mail and telephone; today we electronically match and fax student resumes to interested employers within an hour of the request; we list full-time jobs, summer jobs, and internships on the Internet, which means that students can see them all 24 hours a day from home; and we have a home page on the World Wide Web (You can find us at <http://www.career.cornell.edu/ccs>).

Martin P. Catherwood wrote in his 1950 Dean's Report, "Alumni of the ILR School now number 316. An alumni organization is developing: during the past year alumni were informed of the School's activities and of new trends in industrial & labor relations via a monthly newsletter. There is real recognition that alumni of the School can perform important placement referral and public relations services." Dean Catherwood went on to say that although the majority of the graduates worked and lived in the state of New York there were alumni living in the West Indies and the Canal Zone, Canada, Hawaii, and Alaska.

In 1995, there are 8,700 alumni, and the Career Services Office is e-mailed and faxed on a regular basis from alumni in Tokyo, Zurich, London, Singapore, Hong Kong, Australia, Germany, and Greece. No matter the city, alumni are doing just what

Dean Catherwood proscribed: Helping to provide career opportunities and internships for current students and other alumni. The other alumni and career offices at Cornell are envious of the loyalty that ILR alumni have shown to the school. In our fiftieth anniversary year, that is something to celebrate.

The three years before the demolition of the Ives Hall classroom wing were filled by plans, meetings, relocations, and in some cases re-relocations to enable classes, research, and essential activities to continue as much as possible in completely unusual circumstances. Undergraduate and graduate admissions offices were moved from one wing to another, the computer laboratory was moved to a trailer, the fiscal office moved three times in all, and career services moved to a new location in the ILR Extension building. Through it all, the Office of Student Services, office space reduced by one-third, remained in its customary location.

Removal of the structures supporting student interaction—the lounges, the mailboxes, and the tables near the library entry—called for efforts to replace them in some fashion. A mail system, lounge furniture and drink machines were established in a corridor near the library's lower level, called the "Zig-Zag." Class meetings and class councils (to plan for class activities) were instituted. Focus groups, large group meetings with the deans, consultation reports from Larry Williams's graduate course in Organizational Development, and Bob Smith's efforts to negotiate relocation possibilities all contributed to a relatively uneventful passage from the "good old days" into the transition years that will lead to the next phase of ILR's history in the new classroom-library wing of Ives Hall.

In the midst of efforts to contend with the new demolition and construction project, two more factors intervened. First, the newly elected Governor of New York State threatened to reduce funding for higher education by hundreds of millions of dollars. Budget reductions again triggered layoffs, this time reducing staff in the career services office, the undergraduate and graduate admissions offices, and the Office of Student Services, among many others.

Second, a report from an ad hoc committee, chaired by Bob Smith, called for the creation of a new position, director of teaching, and for a teaching advisory committee. This "teaching initiative" had resulted from the ILR faculty's earlier decision to require excellence in both teaching and research of candidates for promotion and tenure. Years of evaluating research had made the faculty comfortable with their ability to judge work in that area; teaching was another matter. For various reasons, among them the core value of academic freedom and the not-so-public nature of teaching (as compared to publishing), Smith's committee was charged with producing a means of recognizing excellence in teaching. Instead of prescribing a device to measure it, the committee reported on a process to encourage, advance, and evaluate it. The process required that there be a director of teaching who was to be parallel in function and in status to the director of research, and an advisory committee of senior faculty members who were to assist the director and their colleagues. Dean Lipsky invited Professors

Blau, Hadi, Milkovich, Salvatore, and Stern to serve on the committee. He asked Jim McPherson to be the school's first director of teaching. The committee began its work in 1994.

Writing this near the work site of the new Ives Hall classroom wing and looking at pictures of the same site in 1961, time collapses into what seems a very short interval, little more than half of the life of the ILR School. This fiftieth anniversary is an opportunity to see again what has gone before, to appropriate it as our own. Those of us who have studied and taught, worked and lived in ILR over the most recent decades have heard emeritus faculty and returning alumni reminisce about Quonset huts and bus riding, about American Ideals, and about particular professors. But they were only other people's memories—mildly interesting, perhaps, but of no particular relevance to the issues of the day. Reviewing the minutes, reports, and articles from over 50 years, however, leads to a different sort of reflection and confidence in the future.

For the greater part of its history, the faculty and staff of the ILR School have devoted significant time and creativity to improving and maintaining the quality of student life and experience. Students were not always on the agenda, but the learning and the advising of students have never been far from the attention of the faculty.

Building upon a remarkably useful base put down by the founding faculty of the school, succeeding generations have not found it necessary or even possible to erase the old curriculum and begin all over. To the contrary, while curriculum revision seems a preoccupation, the changes proposed, debated, and implemented consist mostly of moving pieces on the board rather than changing the board or altering the pieces. Accounting or Government may be in or out; math and science may come or go; "professional" courses may be required early or late; but the greater part of the course work and the overall direction remain much the same. Barring unforeseen circumstances, the next revisions will likely do the same.

"The small school in the larger university," as the admissions brochures put it, is both reality and aspiration. The school is small, but smallness itself is not a virtue. At times one might recall John F. Kennedy's caustic comment about Washington, D.C. ("All of the energy of a southern city and all of the charm of a northern city") in regard to ILR's small size (all of the closeness of a large university and all of the resources of a small college). We have benefitted from that small size, but we have learned as well that it needs effort to make it function. Without that effort, the small school simply reflects the attitudes and values of the large university, to the surprise and discomfort of all who discover that they are as anonymous, as isolated, or as insignificant as those who attend a mega-university. All of the variations on systems for advising are evidence of the effort that has been expended to improve communication, interaction, and relationships. Nonetheless, there always seems to be another person, another class, another group that is willing to give it one more try.

One final observation: despite the claims of undergraduates in every student generation, there does not seem to be a typical ILRie, a stereotypical student who may be recognized instantly in a crowd of Cornellians. Our history begins with veterans studying to go to work, and then features college students who were football and baseball players in the 1950s, as well as leaders and members of student clubs and societies similar to those on every campus. The 1960s saw the emergence of protests and protesters, students looking to improve the world—beginning on campus. ILR's students in the 1970s became activists in their own school, in admissions, and in student organizations, and then shifted their focus toward work experience, internships, and study abroad in the 1980s and early '90s. The origins of those students have shifted, too, with larger numbers coming first from upstate New York, then New York City and Long Island, and then with significant increases from out-of-state, not forgetting the once significant and then disappearing cohort of international students. From a student body limited to 16 percent female and very few minority group members, the school's undergraduate population has evolved into one-half women and one-quarter people of color. Within each generation of students there may seem to be commonalities, which some call homogeneity, but from a longer perspective, the ILR stereotype vanishes into heterogeneity in the students who populate and then graduate from the school.