

**CONNECTICUT 20TH CENTURY AGRICULTURAL HISTORY PROJECT
ORAL HISTORIES**

Interviewer: Luane J. Lange, CANR, Extension

Name of Person Interviewed: John Brand, Interview #3
Date of Interview: May 2, 2001
Draft #: R-1 January 27, 2020
Transcriber: Charter Oak Scanning, Adam Smith, Machine
Contract Firm: Charter Oak Scanning
Interviewee Address:

JB: ...periodically. I can't remember if it was once a month or every couple of weeks, but we met at lunch and this was a time when enrolment was increasing at the university, and we had very limited resources. Faculty and staff were being cut back constantly. With the increasing enrolment, you had all the problems with registration and students getting into courses, and there was a need to have some coordination, people recognizing the impact of changes in one school, especially local laws that have on all the other school's program.

So, I think in those early days, because there's no direction in this area really coming out of [what we saw] and it being we were really not that involved with the mechanics of handling the students and curriculum. So, the [Cadbury Group] was one that sort of brought this along and I think made many suggestions to state committees and to the administration how things could be improved, and this was a time when if you were in the College of Ag and you needed a chemistry course and because they had a limited number of chemistry sections and a student in his or her first two years couldn't get into chemistry and that individual's progress in the four-year baccalaureate program wasn't hampered. And this was trying to bring about fairness among all the students and that each school has to be cognizant of how their rules and regulations have an impact.

We always had difficulty with the School of Business, who'd control carefully who would get into their courses, and yet they were not very willing to have a department like agricultural economics offer business courses. But I would – I think I served as chairman or president of that group chair for more than one year, but then in the beginning, we put note-type minutes that was too formal, people wanted it to be informal. And over time, we met less frequently and then the chairmanship was located among various [groups] and colleges, which was good. But we became so useful that in my last few years, it had become integrated into the university structure and was taken over by the current administration. So, it's no longer this ad hoc group that all those types of problems that we used to feel that are now dealt with by some

vice president. I think during the CEO administration, it was lost forever, and I think whoever replaces [Patrick Steel] would continue directing this group.

LL: This is a [Unintelligible] and that's why you said the woman...?

JB: The woman.

LL: She was in what sort of position?

JB: She was Associate Chancellor, I think?

LL: Okay. For Academic Affairs?

JB: Yes, well, whatever they – this...

LL: Whatever, yes. Yes, okay.

JB: ...[Crosstalk], so I'm not sure what the names are.

LL: They've changed some of those.

JB: She was here three to four years and I think she indicated this formalization of all the associate assistant deans as part of her success. But it goes back to [Kadri] but everything... comes around that goes around.

So that's my experience with [Kadri], but I think at the time when it was an informal coordinating group had added cohesiveness to the university, there were some earlier. People have told me that, "Well, we did that before that." But if it was done previously, it was not being done at the time when we started the idea then, and it was certainly needed then because the students were paying a price for the lack of coordination.

LL: Okay. Now, [I do have your] back and we're going to do some more talking about agriculture.

JB: Yes, the one thing that I think I didn't emphasize in that we talked about the dairy industry going down, but the other development that really deserved attention because I think it will probably have an impact on the future of the college and that's the growth of the green industry in Connecticut. The industry of greenhouse production and nursery production, Christmas tree production, those three activities have become more and more important economically. If you combine those three growth activities, they exceed the dairy industry in economic importance. They are the number one industry in the state and yet at a time when they've grown in importance, the college has diminished its resources to go dairy. I don't think we have one field agent with a horticulture background now. Maybe one but...

LL: Joe Maizano was the last one maybe.

JB: Well, maybe he was the last, but he was one of the last great ones that were in – but there are no Joe Maizanos anymore. There may be one person who has the horticulture background, but within the state, we basically capitulated on biologists here, and my own feeling is it stems from political [improvement] and that it stemmed back from agreements made between the College and the Connecticut Ag Experiment Station. That agreement basically indicated that Connecticut Station would deal with horticultural problem and that Storrs would be an animal-oriented research activity. That perhaps sounded good on paper then, but when we bring in the first [made], there was one common director of both stations and that was Director Slate. So, you have the coordination of the two stations, but then with Slate's retirement or demise, I'm not sure which came first.

LL: When would that have been? I feel [Unintelligible] with that name.

JB: Slate?

LL: Yes.

JB: Earl. Before or probably back in '40s. I'm not quite certain because he was maybe fired for that, but he was the last common director of both experiment station, I think. I'm pulling this out as we're talking off the top of my head.

I think basically that went along for some time, but you were always faced with the situation that the Connecticut Station did not grow the Smith-Lever Fund for Extension, but they still became increasingly involved in outreach activity and they were responsive to the legislature. They were able to make their case known to the legislature. The fact that they were doing research in the horticultural area did not benefit our students involved in graduate programs here in the science department nor did it necessarily fit around horticultural agents in the field in terms of their problem-solving role or the examination activity, but I always felt that had been something that has failed the potential growth and development of the statewide research program.

LL: Well, we...

JB: This is considered one point I had with that legislation and there was a thought, I think maybe the legislation still exists with all state agencies, they read through a lot of it, but there seems to be a political handoff whenever anyone discusses the need to combine both stations for how to create a coordination. It's something that I think needs to be addressed more forward.

LL: But we do have more research in horticulture, so the Extension part has been cut back on sort of some staff that is, but is there not more research going on there? I mean, you get a lot of publicity for the agrarian and so on and so forth research now and so on?

JB: Yes, we still have the research going on, but in terms of what is possible, I think we don't achieve that. But we certainly – there are areas that I think the college does not tread upon because they're in the dairy which is it's [medical explosion] and I think that's appropriate. There's no need to duplicate those things there, but in terms of pursuing social research avenues at Storrs, sometimes I think the interest in pursuing certain areas because of the division between the two stations but it has – I think it has fostered a greater emphasis on the animal field than the plant field. But I think we're paying the price for not having a stronger base in the field in horticulture and part of this has come about because we've lived through a period of diminishing human resources.

The Congress has deemed that funds should be going into other societal problems and we just haven't had the funds beginning way back in the 60s of replacing every position as they became vacant. So, we found ourselves filling or establishing positions in programs that Congress deemed important, but they were not necessarily agricultural programs or horticultural programs. They may have been nutrition programs or child care activity, and those programs weren't filled, and they continued. And with limited funds, even the continuance of certain programs with state fund has always been we put the funds in this position and that position. Somewhere along the line, even though we thought about the great dairy industry, which is certainly important, we don't seem to give the horticultural industry the same support that we give dairy, especially the dairy industry, and I think this becomes a question of where are do you deem the resources would be most effective?

But I think here, the activities of the Connecticut Station, is one that slows down as the allocation of funds to the horticultural field. But one cannot not recognize the growth of horticultural industry in the state. It is one of the true success stories that we check.

LL: Yes, a couple of them are the largest producers in the country.

JB: Yes.

LL: I don't remember who they are, but I've heard this.

JB: Right. We have places like the Pride, Foreman. We have the Imperial mostly. Two of the nation's had horticultural firm here in town and there are others. We probably have 10 that are somewhere in the top 100 firms in the country.

The other thing that happened agriculturally right, we've had to make choices. Do we put the dollars here, do we put the dollars there? And I think if there were sufficient funds, we would have a balanced program. But we've gone through a period when we couldn't fill positions that – positions were closing, we never seem to get positioning staff in.

We only get more positions when they're in new and different programs. So, you have a biotech program or something and you have a specific federal fund that enable you to build a biotechnology position. But in terms of having a broad-based program in agriculture – and this gets into what's the mission of the College of Agriculture.

We really have reduced the number of production-oriented teachers, researchers, specialists that we have. So, every year if you go back to 1950 where you have made the 30% for faculty who are production-oriented, now we have probably less than 10% that are production, that have production experience is teaching or research involves production. I think that has an impact on recruitment, it has an impact on the types of programs you pursue with the limited production people. There's a limited number of activities that you get involved in, there's a limited number of Extension activities. There's a limit to the number of different classes that you teach, so you get consolidations, amalgamations. Instead of offering three courses in a certain field discipline, you offer one because all they can get it all in this and then we'll have the one thing would kill us.

So the students perhaps find themselves taking a more liberal science-oriented program where they take more biology or the social science-oriented, they take more social science or business courses. But in terms of anyone who's concerned about production, production dairy or production horticulture, production nursery or greenhouse operations, we have fewer courses than we did in 1962. Part of that is we eliminated many duplicated courses that has been indicated, but still now we're reaching a point where some courses that I think almost anyone would have seen the importance that it grows as an agricultural student's education are now more difficult to attain but we are quick to indicate, "Well, you can pursue a master's program to get that specialization and, in many cases, a master's degree has become an entry point to employment in many disciplines. So, you can get that specialization with your Master's." Unfortunately, the research orientation of a master's development program does not necessarily give you that broader production place. It makes you a more specialized researcher but not necessarily in a production organization looking at something more specific.

LL: So we have a business college niche because if I want to have production education, all of those are different [units]?

JB: That's what I think is going to happen, whether it's happening now. I think part of it becomes the economic product it's going into, but if a student – if you believe that a student needs to search and look

and have a chance to follow different paths as their educational horizon grows, we don't offer the same kinds of opportunities right now that is used in university Master's or even at Cornell where there are so many more courses and opportunities to choose from. I think most students get involved in the College of Agriculture to [flesh and love advertising] because they developed some interest in a living thing – whether it's an animal, a horse or a cow or a Christmas tree that they grew or their home gardening activity, lawnmowing. But something has excited their interest in science and their interest in growing, and they think they want to become a veterinarian because a veterinarian helped save their horse, or they're interested in horticulture because they just love seeing those tomatoes grow or the roses.

So, they come to the university – and we even went through a period where students had one agricultural course in their first year and the rest of their courses were all basic science, social science courses, or they take biology and economics and psychology but they fulfill all the educational requirement for the degree, the basic curricular requirement and they take maybe one course that was offered in the college but they eliminated all the beginning courses. Then I think faculty began to see that maybe that was a mistake. They needed at least one introductory horticulture course which really gave people some guidance to horticulture, and maybe one introductory animal course where the person would actually learn aspects of the development of a cow or a dairy cow or a horse.

So, some of those courses have reentered the curriculum, but in terms of why the offering would be incorporated into a four-year program, we have fewer opportunities than some of the other major land-grant institutions. We were experiencing a time when if you had the economic means, a person would go out-of-state and would go into North Carolina or Cornell and other major land-grant institutions that became some of the largest college land-grant institutions in the country and part of that was that they attracted students who want this but we don't have these, so we increasingly do not have the ability offer those sections.

Now, there are students that come here with a strong biology background and they become interested in high school in biotech, foundational biotechnology that they had and that's what they want to do. But at the high school level, the guidance counselors, etc., they find it difficult to differentiate between a biotech program that would be offered to a college of liberal arts and sciences and a biology program. And the program that we have, I don't think we even have an undergraduate major called biotechnology even though the preparation for a master's degree could certainly be obtained in this college, but it is difficult for us to attract those students and persuade them.

One of the things that I spend a lot of time on, we talked about the great growth of students numbers that occurred in the 60s and 70s. Well, in the mid-80s, when one faculty member was still saying we have to establish quota, [we must have died enough] it was in the mid-80s. But it was at a time when our zenith, we almost reached the zenith with the student number of '76 or something.

And then – this is Dr. [Alan Zima] and I think he – he and I had discussed these many times, but he wanted me to establish a cap on student numbers and I felt that would be a grave mistake. I felt that in order for the college to survive, you had to attract as many students into the fold as possible and then we take care of them. Somehow, we knew, or I thought we could provide good education where we had to attract students because our very existence depended on having enrolment. If we didn't have enrolment, I was convinced the administration was just ready to chop our head.

And so, but I said, "No, we're not going to put a cap on courses," and within two years, the enrolment began to diminish, and it not only diminished here, we were at the forefront of decreased enrolment. I think we were earlier than the Midwest in building up enrolment, but we were also the first to start going down. Part of this is related to the Vietnam War and [gold], etc., but it was largely demographic. We had gone through a period when high school-age graduates, the basic freshman that goes to college, the

numbers of those students that were out in the State of Connecticut that we had potential students to attract, our potential students were diminishing. The numbers were going to go down every year and that's exactly what happened throughout the country. And the late 80s were a period when the national land-grant college association, all those groups that were the [resident instruction section], we spent tremendous amounts of time nationally securing funds from [Berlins] I think was welcomed to doing that. I think one of the tobacco companies were either in [reward] and advertising, but it was a major effort in magazines, television to attract young people into agriculture; that agriculture was not just being on the farm, that there were many other opportunities that would relate to a person's interest in nutrition, food and human health that were all related. We spent a tremendous time developing – we started the Ag Alumni Group. They increased their efforts in attempting to inform students and the path that leads to college, but that peak that we reached in '76, we still haven't gotten back to that level. And if you look at the demographics, we probably won't. I just looked recently, and I think the number of high school graduates who will not be back to where we were until 2000- until... Where are we now?

LL: 2001.

JB: 2001/2002. It could possibly since 2002.

LL: I know.

JB: Yes, 2002 will be I think that the point is the number of students will again match with the – but it's still in the future. And I think a place like the University of Maine, it's even further down the road until 2010 before they will have the same rebirth of potential students coming forth. So, that was a major part of this. So, it didn't matter whatever you did, the students were just not there.

The other thing happening is every educational institution is vying for the same warm bodies. And for those educational institutions that were in jeopardy of termination, some of the small colleges, etc., they were even far more aggressive. So, if you ever went to high school career fair where those people would be, we would often go, we set up a table. And outside of the university admissions office, about the only individual school that would go to some of those high schools would be Ag because it was so easy to try to attract students. But when I look around the auditorium or gymnasium where you'd meet and everyone would have their table set up, I would always be amazed that the competition would be operating that. The small, private independent colleges that were spending an inordinate amount of money into recruitment material, where we would still be mimeographing materials. Or we have a recon blanket over a table, they would have professionally-made booth and exhibits and photographs and slip papers. I looked at the material that the university puts out now and... it's beautiful, the material that comes out now; I wish we had it then. But that was part of what was done.

LL: You mentioned that you talked with Dwight and Todd.

JB: Yes. I went up, yes. Yes. Those will stop?

LL: Yes. You said there was something, some thoughts you have with the present administration and who?

JB: Well, the one thing, my own relationships with them and... We were having a very difficult time. There was a time when the agricultural community was very upset, so they were not responding to advice the administration. They felt...

LL: By the university administration?

JB: By the university administration and they felt the loss of the [Unintelligible]. They felt the loss was [very ancient]. They felt the loss of retire in faculty in animal sign. They had become very vocal, and I think every administration that I was a part of, I think I mentioned every administration did a study of the College of Agriculture and it was a well [studied advantage], but every president that came in did a study of the College of Ag. Some were major studies that included all the faculty, others were very selective studies where the president would pick people carefully that would come up with his position tomorrow. But I think I was involved in almost every plan of them and, in some, there were people that in my mind were the devil incarnate, they were the enemy. It was almost as if they have marching orders from the president and “these are the things you are going to attack.”

But we survived them all and part of the problem is that administrations don’t last as long as they did in the Jorgenson era. So, by the time you get a report finished and its review, then President X goes to another institution where they’re going to drive those somewhere else and then the co-host goes elsewhere, and you never see a follow-through.

But the last report I was involved was the one with [Mary Pratt] and that’s when the two other schools were up for termination and they had to fight for that.

LL: That was the School of Nursing or College?

JB: School of...

LL: I think it Family Studies.

JB: Family Studies and what was it? Allied Health.

LL: Allied Health.

JB: Yes. I was convinced that the school, they really felt it should be terminated in this time of extraordinarily limited funds. Each time there was a crisis, the university since 1950 has not been blessed with state support of the size it’s needed. So, partly we were able to secure this pot of gold but now it is building a cat hole up here and that it’s just an extraordinary development. But, still in that last report, we were quite concerned with how would the university maintain all its programs with the tremendous deficits the university has experienced year after year? Then from the College of Ag standpoint, we’ve not only given those limitations, we also had the limitations of decrease in Congressional support. So, you have fewer and fewer dollars and that’s the one thing that the Ag community...

LL: The Congressional support.

JB: ...the Ag community never changed a draft.

LL: Right. And the Congressional support was for the Extension and land-grant accessing?

JB: Yes, right. But that was a very important aspect. I mean, without those dollars, when 90% of our funds went to pay people’s salary, we didn’t have a lot of money to go build it, nut, in fact, it was growing, etc. You were lucky to keep the people alive so they could teach or do research or try to get experience or a due extension. If you had to keep the people alive, you had to keep the college alive. But I felt in that property group that it was a large committee and every school was sort of representing [Unintelligible] very important. But it was one that looked at everything. It’s always probably one of the more in-depth review of all aspects of the university, from the financial decision, to student services. Everything was looked at with the thought of: Could this be increased, could this be altered, how could we save money, how could we become more efficient for the university? But...

LL: Well, Harley had written down zero-based budgeting.

JB: Yes.

LL: So he believed that you start from scratch each time and then you...

JB: But it's a time-consuming process...

LL: Yes, you did, yes.

JB: ...if we live and [you can go to] university. But I felt that the grilling that I took during that period of trying to indicate why it was essential to keep the college advisor, college for natural resources a lot if this is going to be a major state university, a national university. We have to evolve and incorporate those faculties and disciplines that are represented in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and it was worthy of providing. It needed to survive, and my thought was that if we ever will publicly put on a pick list, that I could vouch for at least one of those schools that should be terminated. We, being very difficult.

Fortunately, the committee finally decided that we will not want to be recommended for termination, even though the other two survive. And I think for the same reason, that I think those were units that in a state university, it would be a serious disservice to society to have eliminated those units. I can see consolidations, amalgamations for all kinds of finances [setting] in. How I help in the School of Nursing with the medical school or parts of this. There were all kinds of plan were being proposed, but there are many ways to going about consolidation and not always necessarily as effective but to just eliminating certain fields I thought would be in play.

LL: And it's not always [provost] at the time?

JB: It's not always [provost] at the time, but as all these reductions were taking place, the dairymen became very obsessed with some of the reductions. They were sending all kinds of letters and delegations to Todd, Chief Provost Todd, and "You can't do this, you shouldn't do this," and I think that's when enough has been the... I think not as easily, yes.

I was trying to find somebody to somehow calm down the uproar that was taking so much of these times and he called me...

LL: [Crosstalk]

JB: Yes, he called John.

LL: Maybe he was [Unintelligible]

JB: Technically he had on but...

LL: Well, no, that's alright because I'm doing really good.

JB: I'm trying to think of what the stick points that we said was -

LL: In the 80s, what he's doing.

JB: But this would have been the 90s at the time.

LL: Then with the government, right.

JB: I think that was not. It's been -

LL: Then [Casteen] came in there at some point. Or Hartland?

JB: Yes but he was before Hartland.

LL: Hartland, that's right. So, he doesn't wouldn't this.

JB: So, she called John. I think she thought John would have been... far more [presentative] as this has been and would have been dean for much longer if he had not been impaired by a heart attack shortly after he came. I think I mentioned that maybe, but I think the heart attack that he had early his tenure here at UConn affected his well-being, his stamina that he had, and I think it was a period when he was forced to slow down, to do less.

I think even though he gained his health to as far as going to [state], that it still thwarted some of the possibilities that people saw in him when he was selected by the committee to become dean. And I think it was not that he was having difficulties with the Ag team and Ty was in there at that time, but Ty needed someone to keep things, acting dean in each one of them. I was still the associate dean at the time, and he called me in and... "But I have one question," or he had a whole bunch of questions, but he said, "The one thing I want to know is if I appoint you dean, can you handle this problem with the farm community?" And I said, "I think I can. I think I can." Then he pulled out a list. He had something in his pocket. He pulls out this list and he had a number of other things that he wanted to have addressed and this and this. But the one thing I remember – two things I remember, the one was that, "Can you solve these, there are 50 things off my back?" I think program was the word he used. "Get this [damn thing] off my back."

Then I went home and then he called me up at home and he said, "I have some other things that I'd like you to handle if you can do it," and I said, "Well, let me write it down," and I had my own list. I started writing it down and as I remember it, there was a list that had like 25 items that he wanted addressed and solved, and I thought, "My God, do you know this is going to take a lifetime to do this?" But I said, "Yes, but the first thing is the dairy." So, I thought about that and talked with the GT program and he said, "No, no, that would be a mistake." but I appointed Lynn Brown, the Interim Department Head of Animal Science, taking him back. He had already retired, and I called him up. I said, "Lynn, would you come back?" I said, "I can't promise you any money. I can't promise you any big bucks, but I'll try to do whatever I can." I said, "I don't know what I can do with [merit] or what can be done, but would you come back?" He said, "Yes," and that ended the problem with dairy and we didn't do...

LL: He was highly regarded?

JB: Highly regarded and that's the one thing I knew. I knew that everyone else was suspect that they had great respect for Lynn, and I did also. I was convinced that he could solve the problem, whatever. I don't think anything dramatic will happen.

LL: Just trust, was it? Yes?

JB: It was just trust. "We're not going to kill you off, and you will have a voice." I think people wanted a voice, and then since that time of my involvement with the [Unintelligible] Education Foundation and the Farm Bureau, I see now a greater, at least I'm saying, realization...

LL: By the farmers?

JB: Or the realization by the farmers that their problem is in large part of the problem of relating to Congress, and all those years, when I told some of the leaders the best thing you can do is to get involved with your congressman or your congresswoman...

LL: They're the Farm Bureau, you were talking?

JB: Farm Bureau but the people needed to be involved with Congress. They were the ones that were making the rules. They were the ones that were reducing programs of non-supported areas, and I think our agricultural leaders too often expected the administration to resolve all those issues. Even though you would take those people down to the 4-H center and take them around to all the legislators, you had a very select group that were going. They realized that I think it was the ones that I know that went, but so many others that would grab me and say, "You've got to do something about this?" Or "Why? The damn college, they're not doing anything anymore," without any realization of what that meant when you didn't have a 4-H agent. It was almost as if they thought, "Gee, they're taking money away from my 4-H program," that no matter how many times we would say that, it just didn't sink in or they didn't want to accept it or they thought that was the only way to fight, but really that was just one avenue, but the one that I think was not utilized as effectively as it could have is if there would have been more activities aimed at Congress itself, [five] groups.

LL: We went through transition too though where you weren't allowed to address things directly. DiBiaggio came in, and he got his hand slapped. The Board of Trustees used to do this. The first time I took a group down to Washington and I called the university lobbyist down there, he said, "What are you doing here with these people?" The whole the idea of who was allowed to speak to whom was very different 10 years ago, but then you're...

JB: I'm not sure how much it's changed today and I think that still...

LL: Yes. That's a good a point, [Laughter] yes.

JB: Even though I do hear that this administration has permitted people to speak to the state legislature, I'm not sure that they would welcome each and every person trying to get on the agenda and foster their own position. I'm not even convinced that's the best way to handle a university's programs. I think there needs to be some coordination because someone in ag is not necessarily cognizant of all the needs and implications of increases or reductions in programs in another area, but somehow you have to have administrative involvement and direction. It's when you think you're not getting a fair audience with those decision makers that you begin to really get angry [that way].

LL: You're talking about your realization now of Farm Bureau and their education committee.

JB: Yes, the realization to me. When I meet with those individuals that are on that committee and we talked about the college, I find that they're much more aware that it is not necessarily the college's position that 4-H hasn't re-bloomed to the stature it had in 1960 [or '50], but I think there's a new recognition. Part of it is that the old [DAR] is old. The old [DAR] is dying and there is a new group. It's not only a new group. When I think of the graduates that graduated from 1960 to 1990, that is a tremendous number of graduates who leave the college, and the university graduated fantastic numbers of students compared to prior history. I think those students now are decision makers within the state and within the agricultural community, a very broad-based agricultural community, and I think some of that leadership is coming in. I think they recognize some of the new political ramifications of life today, but there was another activity from an agricultural standpoint that I was involved in. I was appointed to the Joint Council.

LL: In Washington?

JB: In Washington which I thought were the most enlightening years of my service to the university and I know people have...

LL: Was that the Council...?

JB: Yes?

LL: Was that the council that eventually did have the ear of the president? There were two different councils down there.

JB: To Congress.

LL: To Congress?

JB: Right. The Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Science, I think, was the full name. It was established by Congress, and the composition was established. They were to provide advice and counsel to Congress on agricultural matters, agricultural policy, et cetera, and I was appointed because of my involvement with the Land Grant Resident Instruction Committee. I had gone through, as chairman, all the hoops going up to the top and then was appointed to the Joint Council where you'd meet periodically. Basically, you were providing advice on legislative matters, on agricultural problems that demanded the attention of Congress, but the involvement in things like the Joint Council or on the various land grant university committees of NASULGC, NASULGC being National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, I always felt important for Connecticut to be represented.

LL: How did what you represent and what you say hit with what was happening with people from other parts of the country?

JB: I think, for the most part, what we would say, they thought we were crazy. They thought we were crazy with the organizational changes we were making. They thought we were crazy with programs that we were eliminating when I talked about reducing the 26 100-level courses. That was unheard of in the Midwest. Basically, we were at the forefront of change that was affecting agriculture throughout the country when we became unionized. When faculty unionized, there was only, I think, one other Northeast land-grant college that was unionized and that was Rutgers at the time, but I think they thought that was crazy. At the time, I had some thoughts that maybe we were crazy also, but looking back, I think our involvement in there that happened – no, that was not part, but the '70s part of it...

LL: The early '70s because – yes.

JB: That was part of the changes taking place, but we were always starting new programs, considering the start of new programs that had not reached the forefront of Kansas University, Kansas State. They were always five years behind. Even though they were progressing, they did not have those forces, those [pressures] unchanged.

LL: Also, they had the large production people out there. It's a dichotomy. They had production people...

JB: That's right.

LL: ...that we didn't have. They didn't have the power. Our production didn't have the power.

JB: That's right, and because of that production base, they also received certain funding that we were not getting because so many of these funds were formula-based, and production was one key factor in the distribution of funds, so that was part of it. The changes came about slowly, the decrease in student

numbers and the lack of funds that we experienced in the '60s and '70s and then after we reached the zenith in '76 and the [decon] taking place. That was also a time when Dean Kersting first started talking to the other New England states about consolidating programs, and he started the discussions, but the other states were not willing because a lot of jealousy and a lot of fear even though we could do things together cooperatively or set up our programs where students could begin at Connecticut and then take coursework at Rhode Island or at UMass or Vermont under President [Gant]. He passed a program where students could go to other programs, not under this New England boarder higher ed program, but the six institutions themselves decided that for certain programs if they went for the next two years, the last two years, they could pay in-state tuition, and yet we didn't give a lot of publicity to that. There was a time when I thought I was the only person on campus that knew such a thing existed, and when I questioned the provost office once, they had to look up the document, and no one could tell me if it was still in effect. Theoretically, it was in effect, but we didn't publicize it because everyone wanted to retain their own students. Faculty are never willing easily say that, "Yes, the faculty up at UMass, they could do a better job in turf than we can." We probably didn't give the publicity that was necessary, but Dean Kersting wanted to have agreements where we would focus on pathobiology, even mentioned pathobiology, but on a given program and that Vermont and Maine would forego the development of a pathobiology department or that the University of Massachusetts would concentrate on landscape architecture. They had the strongest, oldest landscape architecture program of the six states, and we would agree that all landscape architecture would be focused in UMass. We had a lot of discussion but could never bring it to a point of agreement, and then when Dean John came, he resurrected that whole thought, but we were, again, in the period of dire financial straits, and that would almost always lead us to how could we bring this about, some improvement. There have been some agreements. I think there's a research compact between the New England states that dairy research would be done between New York and Vermont, but I'm not fully aware of all the ramifications of that agreement. I think there was that type of agreement that dairy research would concentrate in New York and Vermont.

LL: Would you...?

JB: We did start one program, and I can't remember what team it was, but we did let two ag engineers but one was Bob Aldrich and I can't remember the other. It was the extension [Unintelligible] that's really...

LL: John [Colega]?

JB: Not John [Colega]. The younger extension.

LL: John [Barton]?

JB: John [Barcroft]. I'm not sure about John [Barcroft], but I know Bob Aldrich. We let Bob Aldrich go and teach a course at the University of Massachusetts, an ag engineering course, and the thought was that that would be an example since we were so close to UMass that certain programs could be offered to complement their offerings, and yet they wouldn't have to replace. I think they had eliminated ag engineering, but that our faculty could go there and teach. I think we did that maybe two semesters, but so much of those activities unless you hire people specifically because responsibilities, as part of a specified job responsibility, you cannot always bring about that establishment that someone will drive up to UMass that's...

LL: Would you change the subject?

JB: Yes.

LL: Would you talk about the accreditation of Ratcliffe Hicks for its two-year program because that was going to be tried for many years, and somehow to give it a two-year completion program was not allowed, and then recently within the last, I don't even know, 5 to 10 years?

JB: Ten years.

LL: It finally came about.

JB: Yes. This is all related to...

LL: All?

JB: ...all of this [Laughter] in a way and fear of the unknown, but in the beginning the Ratcliffe Hicks program was established as a two-year, non-baccalaureate program in terms of the will specified that the coursework shall not duplicate baccalaureate coursework. There's always a legal concern there that we want the students to be able to transfer, but yet we are designated by terms of the will to be offering vocational or non-baccalaureate coursework, and so the big fear was how many students. The one fear of the administration was you can't let in all these two-year kids that want to come in, especially during the Vietnam War. There were all kinds of students because the entrance requirements were that you be a high school graduate and that you showed signs, showed evidence that you were interested in the agricultural disciplines, but it did not require that you had to have a 1,100 board scores or 800 board scores. We use board scores as one measure plus high school recommendations, and we were successful in being able to review the applications ourselves, and then we make recommendations to the administration, to the admissions office, but the administration was concerned, "Do you add in 100 Ratcliffe Hicks students? Do you add in 200? Do you add in 1,000? Do you fill up the dormitories with Ratcliffe Hicks two-year students? Where do you get the faculty to teach these? Do you take funds from the university to establish the multiple English courses? Will you limit English to 20 students?" We require an English course and a political science course, and we end up requiring math course, basically a remedial math, but all those activities require faculty inputs as well. The administration was not convinced that they wanted to have Ratcliffe Hicks burgeon the dormitories and resources of the university. I think it was under Babbidge probably, but I'm not sure. I can't remember offhand, but we finally were told that we could limit the admission to 100 students, and students resided at that time in Elizabeth Hicks Hall. I think it's 100 students, but what happened was then we started taking in females. In the beginning, in 1962, there were 64. When I became the director, I think we had a handful of them. I mean a handful, maybe five. Then, very quickly the number of female applications started increasing, and then that was the time when we didn't have mixed sexes in the common dorm. We hadn't reached that point yet. We still had chaperones living in the dorm at that time and all boys and a very active group of young men. The women were in women's dorms, and then slowly they increased, but it was kept at 100 which I didn't like. No one liked the fact that they're limiting us to 100, but in the beginning, we didn't have funds either. The funds that came from Elizabeth Hicks that came upon her death were still not coming to the university, so we had very limited funds. Whatever was used for the school was basically college funds, so whatever we put into the two-year program meant resources were being retracted from the four-year programs.

LL: It was called the Ratcliffe Hicks School?

JB: The Ratcliffe Hicks School, right, but the budget never changed. The budget from the university was always the same or changed a little bit, but it was not an area where they were giving a lot of support to pay for maybe six or seven faculty that taught a considerable portion of their teaching but not all. There was no one teaching there that only taught in Ratcliffe Hicks School. There were faculty that taught in college. Some even taught graduate courses as well, but the feeling was that it was a certificate program. This was before the growth of the community colleges.

LL: Were there other two-year programs in the Northeast?

JB: Yes, almost everywhere. Massachusetts had one.

LL: They also were certificate programs or were they two-year degree programs?

JB: Some were certificate. Some offered both certificate. The University of Maine had a two-year certificate program, I think. UMass had a certificate. Maybe they had an associate degree. I think, New Hampshire had a two-year program and [Crosstalk]...

LL: Then, when did this progress to [Unintelligible]?

JB: Sometime when the students were going up, there were always efforts made that you should be able to give a two-year associate degree. The proposal would go forth to the administration, and then they raised all the questions of transferability, what kinds of credits could be transferred. In the beginning, in early '64, a large part of the credits that you get, you get maybe half of the credits. If you graduated with 64 credits, and you get maybe half of them transferred, but then as we cut out the baccalaureate program and [Unintelligible] the baccalaureate courses, there were 26 introductory courses that we eliminated. You lost the courses, but they were comparable to the two. We took away the hands-on courses, the production courses that the two-year kids used to get transferred with because you'd look at a Ratcliffe Hicks transcript and you'd say Introduction to Animal Science. That's the same course as Introduction to Animal Science in the baccalaureate program. When you eliminate Introduction to Animal Science or Introduction to Horse Husbandry, then you didn't have that comparable course, so how could you give credit? We ended up where a student would graduate from the Ratcliffe Hicks School and the student in certain programs, some of the animal science programs, where more of their courses have been eliminated. Now, I'm not sure about that, but we found in some programs a student was only getting 10 credits, 15 credits, 12 credits, so it was very difficult to attract a student into the two-year program if they could go to [Unintelligible] or Morrisville in New York State because they have an associate degree and where they're the very best students. They finally had an agreement there that Cornell would take their very best students, not everyone, that graduated from [Unintelligible], the ones that were at the top, and that was basically what we were doing. The top students that we felt had a chance of competing in the baccalaureate program to transfer, but then when we tell them you're only going to get 12 credits, that's one semester's worth, a skimpy one semester, they would recognize that it would take them quite a bit longer to get a degree. It would take them another year and a half to get through [besides] the program. I worked out an agreement with Galvin Gall who was the Associate Provost that whole package of educational experience was worth 32 credits, one year, not looking for a specific comparability but that the whole package would be worth so much. Then, that was agreed upon and that was helpful for a while, but then I think, another regime came in. Galvin was gone, and we had to go back to looking at credits as such. I think we still gave basically 32 credits, but increasingly you look at combinations of courses. If you had these three courses in Ratcliffe Hicks School, it would be the equivalent of this course in the college, so that in addition to getting the 32 credits, you've also have completed a certain degree requirement in plant science or animal science, but you must have the [soils] course, so that went along. Then, the question is why didn't we get immediate support from the administration? You had then the development of a statewide board of higher education, whatever its title was, but the overall educational group for all state universities and community colleges, et cetera, and then the program had to be presented to them for their approval, not only support, but they had to approve the curriculum. By that time, we were receiving – in 1984, I think, Elizabeth Hicks died, and we began to receive the residual of the Ratcliffe Hicks funds and her funds, so that funds come every year from her estate, and those funds are to be used for Ratcliffe Hicks programs. That's a big pot of gold. At least, I thought it was big. It was more money than we ever had for anything, and it was a time when there were no dollars in resident teaching and teaching because we didn't have funds to buy microscopes because that was equipment

money. The equipment money that the administration used to give the college was so miniscule that we could hardly replace the [tractor] in the Farm Department. That's how limited funds we were getting, and those equipment moneys had to support all our programs, not just research or teaching but also extension. If you needed equipment, it was part of this little handful of money that they go about to Kersting, Hugo, John, and Knox and myself when I was in there. There was just very little money. The money we were getting from Ratcliffe Hicks became very important and didn't want it jeopardized and started getting comments from some alumni saying that we were not using Ratcliffe Hicks the way we should. My one concern was having that go to court because if it goes to court, his will indicates that the funds will be considered by the trustees which in the beginning was the [Marion] Bank and Trust Company. It now rests with Fleet Bank, but they then and the judge at probate, et cetera, would decide where the funds would go. If the university no longer maintains the Ratcliffe Hicks School of Agriculture as a two or one-year or short course – it can be just short courses. It doesn't have to be a two-year program. It could all be used for short courses, and that was one of my [projects] at one time that we close the school down and we develop some sophisticated short courses similar to what Penn State does where they have a winter short course for dairy or winter short case for turfing, not just the one-day conference or two-day conference but a consolidated period of time.

LL: They used to have short courses, two-week short courses years and years and years and years ago.

JB: Years and years ago, right. We had two-year program here once before Ratcliffe Hicks, and the faculty terminated the two-year program sometime in the '30s. They said, "We don't want it. We don't need it." I'm not sure what the reasons were. I think it was basically lack of students. Students didn't come, and the student enrollment went down, and finally the faculty and Dean Young, maybe the prior dean, I can't remember which one, but they said, "No, we're going to shut it down." They terminated the two-year program. I think it was '38 or '39, and then two or three years later, Ratcliffe Hicks dies and...

LL: Who was he?

JB: Ratcliffe Hicks was a philanthropist who was a Connecticut legislator. He was a businessman. He was a friend of [Unintelligible].

LL: What was his interest in agriculture?

JB: He lived in Tolland which is now the Hicks-Stearns Family Museum in Tolland on the green, the Victorian house, of which I am president of that group, but that was where he grew up, the Ratcliffe Hicks home. Elizabeth Hicks used to tell me that they used to go riding in a buggy, probably driven by a coachman. Elizabeth Hicks, she never married, a spinster, and he would take her on these rides. They'd see all the farms going out of business, and he wanted to keep agriculture alive. He felt there was a need for a vocational program that would teach all the agricultural skills that these people needed to keep from losing their farms, so in his will, he established funds that would establish his two-year school, a school of agriculture, a non-baccalaureate program. He knew the university was here, but he didn't believe we were fulfilling the needs. He died in 1941, I believe, just two or three years after the college said, "No way. No two-year," but then Jorgensen, I think, and Young got together, and Jorgensen held up a bag of gold and said, "This is what's being offered." Somehow by persuasion or force, I'm not sure, the college elected to have a two-year school of agriculture, and \$200,000.00 I think was given in the first packet by Ratcliffe Hicks and they used to build the office part of the Ratcliffe Hicks Building, not the arena part but the front part. That became the building that the Ratcliffe Hicks School moved to. Prior to that time, it was in one of the dairy buildings, I think, that's been torn down in [Unintelligible]. That's how the school started, but I thought of something else.

LL: You know what? Now then, let's jump to the time when it went through the political system and actually became accredited as a two-year associate's degree.

JB: Then, after a lot of preparation, review, the faculty was not convinced that we should be giving the two-year – not everyone was convinced. The administration had great qualms about it. The problem of tying in baccalaureate and non-baccalaureate that's a problem that still exists, and that concerns me at times because the way the college is going, the way the school is going, I have a fear that we may not be fully complying with the terms of the will.

LL: Was that...?

JB: I'm not certain. If you're not involved, you don't know what is happening except I know we're using less than faculty with lower credentials than we once did. That's not necessarily bad because one time I thought we could be best served with professionals with a master's degree that had experience in this, and that may still be the way, but too often when we attempt to do that, we find ourselves using graduate students, and that convinced us not in itself necessarily the best way to go. It's possible you can come up with someone with a lot of experience input. The difficulty is unless you sustain the teaching program with someone who continues and is able to be an integral part of the whole school's program, committees, et cetera, the graduate student who's here for two years is not the solution to the problem.

LL: The whole university is relying on graduate students and temporary adjunct positions and so on in this day and age. Yes, so then were there political reasons within the college system or from other schools about giving this degree?

JB: No, not that I know of. I was more concerned about community colleges offering ag degree, so that's still concerns me because we have, I think, two or three programs now being offered by community colleges and other non-community colleges.

LL: The ag tech schools, would they be doing something...?

JB: No, not ag tech. No, but the school like a two-year community college is offering an ag program in Waterbury, and I think the school – what is it? Post [Unintelligible] or whatever that's called?

LL: Yes.

JB: I think they may have an ag-related program, a course program. Now, whether we should be concerned that they're offering that program, my concern is these programs are being established and not necessarily with the college recognizing what's happening or being given a chance to present [my thoughts]. I say that only because when the program in Waterbury was established, it was approved on the day after – I had been fighting it, and then all of a sudden, they had a meeting on a day when I was out of town. That always bothers me that it was done in that manner, but politics is involved. I think getting all the credentials prepared, it was a time at the end that I was the interim dean doing all those things, and Bob Leonard was the person who replaced me. He was the one who finally completed all the requirements and got it through the state.

LL: Boart of Higher Education, where it had to go?

JB: Boart of Higher Ed, whatever it is...

LL: Whatever it is that goes [Crosstalk]?

JB: I'm not sure it's Board of Higher that's...

LL: I thought – who does?

JB: That's the group, but I think they may have a slightly different name than Board of Higher. Maybe [we could have had]...

LL: Is there anything else you'd like to talk about about your professional...?

JB: Probably but I can't think of what it is.

LL: After we talk...

JB: I've enjoyed it. I enjoy my career, and I think I enjoy the people. I enjoy the students. I think I mentioned that I miss teaching, especially when I was teaching what I wanted to teach. In the beginning, I found myself jumping from one course to another because we're short of faculty in ag economics, and people were leaving, retiring, et cetera, so I was teaching at all three levels. There was a time when I think I taught a different course every year. It wasn't the same course, and that is taxing, especially when you're still expected to do 60% extension and with [Sir Charles there], it was very hard, but you got to know a lot of people. I couldn't have done what I did without some very good faculty and good assistants and good secretaries that were really more than secretaries. I was blessed with some very able people. I would take credit for hiring everyone after the first [right there]. I had very good people, and the deans that I've worked for I found I could work with all of them. It was just they're good and their assistants, the Experiment Station people and such were all very help – we had a very good team. When we talked about teams, I think we got along well, didn't completely cut each other's throats. I don't think anyone was really trying to take from someone else that I think I lived in a period of very open discussion, very open group where people spoke up and were not afraid to speak. Everyone was basically committed to the university and to the college. Even though we did a lot of griping, et cetera, it was good times, good years. The one thing that was not mentioned – and I'm not sure this came up. When we talked about the union, the one thing was – and this shows you how time changes. Faculty were not very well paid in this college, even though I came here and the college offered me more than a lot of other places in the United States at the time. We were [low] paid within the university. We were the only college where faculty had 12-month appointments, and everyone else was on a nine-month appointment. This was before the unions were being [Unintelligible], but the faculty wanted more money. They wanted higher pay raises, increases, more American money but more raises. We just were not paid as well as nine-month faculty. There was an inordinate differential between what a nine-month person got paid from a 12-month person. On a monthly basis, it might have – I don't know what the percentage was but 15% less than a nine-month person got paid per month, and so I think it was Dean Kersting who established a committee to study this. It was studied, and it had people, I think, like Stu Johnson and Lynn Brown and came up with a proposal. This was because we were short of people in a way. I think that might have been related...

(End of Interview)