Myers  This is Lois Myers. Today is March 27, 2002. This is interview number nine with Dr. Bill Lamkin. We are in his home in Brookesmith, Texas. And this interview is sponsored by the Baylor University Institute for Oral History, and it’s part of our project on the history of Baylor. Dr. Lamkin, we've been talking about those early years in your deanship of the school of education at Baylor in 1981 and kind of the state of affairs at that time within the school and what you were looking forward to accomplishing in the years ahead. We talked about the faculty and a little bit about your desire for them to grow and develop better communication skills with each other, and opportunities. But we didn't talk about the students yet. Tell me what you recall about the students in the school of education.

Lamkin  When I became dean in 1981, the school of education had just gone through a period of decline in enrollment, not major, but a decline in enrollment. And we were gaining enrollment at this particular time. Of course, this kind of follows what the demand for teachers might be at that particular time. And we had gone through a teacher shortage period, and so that was turning more individuals into teacher education as a result. Of course, I had been teaching there for a number of years and had undergraduate students and had been working with some undergraduate students in classes and such, and so I was familiar with the students. There was no—as this new influx of an increase came about, I didn’t see any major changes that were occurring. We did, during that time, during the early part of the time that I was dean, increase the requirements for entry into teacher education programs and entry into teacher certification. To enter into a teacher education program, students had to have a 2.25 overall grade point average. And to enter into student teaching, to do student teaching, they had to have a 2.5 grade point average in their teaching areas, what we call teaching fields; or for the elementary teachers, it was called the academic specialization. And they had to have a 2.5 in their professional education courses. And so, there were a lot of crises that came up as we made these changes, because, of course, the requirements for graduation was, at that time, and I guess still are, a grade point average of 2.0, which would be
a C average. And we were requiring a C+ average. And we had to do a lot of work with some students, not a very large number. There were some students who did not have that average. And, of course, as they had built up courses, it's very difficult to raise that GPA very much. And we tried to catch them early and tried to make certain that they had the opportunity to change their major. We did not, except in very unusual cases, allow students to graduate with a BS in education without doing their student teaching and getting teacher certification. And so, we didn't have a non-certification program in the school of education at that time, except in physical education where students, of course, could just major in physical education without going into teaching. So, that was one crisis we had. That really was not a major thing, but it did help to ensure that the students, as they came in, were strong both in their chosen field of teaching and that they continued to be strong in their professional preparation for teaching. We tried to do some things to try to encourage more males to go into teaching. I don't know that we were very successful in that, but we wanted to try to get more males into the teacher education programs because of the demand for males in the public schools, particularly in the elementary area. We did this primarily through our advising office. Drs. Herrington and then later Mr. Berryhill, in their contact with students, tried to tell them about the opportunities in that area. And there was a slight increase in the number of males going into teacher education at that point. Up until that time, most of the males who went into teacher education were those who were preparing to be in physical education or coaching and those who were teaching either mathematics or history. Those were the major areas where they would go in. And very, very few were entering into elementary education. It just wasn't the career for a male at that time. It's become stronger, but still there's much of a shortage of males in the elementary schools except for principals. Students were, generally, I think, strong students interested in teacher education. I guess I became more convinced in that position as I saw a wider spectrum of students than I had seen previously. Many of the students or most of the students were in teacher education because they wanted to be teachers as opposed to a way to get a degree and get out of college. And we did have a large number who—well, I think most of them were there because they really wanted to be teachers. Not all of them went into teaching because career changes came about as they graduated and such.

Okay, I have some questions to follow up on that. You mentioned you could have a PE major without certification. What did these students hope to do with their PE majors?

Okay, most of those who went into physical education and did not get teacher certification were hoping to go into areas such as YMCA work, YWCA work, other kinds of recreational kinds of things, fitness areas, health areas. These
were the kinds of things that they were preparing for, and they did not need the teacher certification in order to go into those particular fields. Some of them just were majoring in physical education because they enjoyed the physical activities and later on would go into areas that were totally unrelated to what their major was. They might go into sales, into manager trainee types of things. During I guess about 1988 or ’89, the physical education department developed a pre-medical program for students, so that they worked in the medical requirements for medical school along with the physical education major. And so, they could graduate with a degree in physical education but have the requirements for going into medical school. And this was a very good kind of major that they could follow. Also, we have a training program within that for emergency medical treatment, the EMT, the ambulance types of things and so forth, which were becoming more in great demand. And our department actually serviced the university with the EMT workers that were on call twenty-four hours a day.

**Myers**

Did this program attract athletes? Were there athletic students attracted?

**Lamkin**

There were a good number of athletes, yes. Most of them were there because they had visions of becoming a coach. And so most of those that were in athletics did get teacher certification because they hoped to become a coach. And that was the way they would go. And so, they could teach physical education. However, we had a large number of athletes, probably an equal number, who were interested in coaching, but their teaching fields were in other areas that they were interested in, everything from music to art, history, English, any number of different fields that they might be interested in teaching. But they still wanted to use their athletic skills as coaches.

**Myers**

And you mentioned a lot of male students who are being attracted to administration and master’s degrees and so forth. Had they—did they have an undergraduate degree in education? Do principals pretty much have to go through the classroom to get on that route?

**Lamkin**

In Texas there is a requirement that administrators have three years’ experience of classroom teaching before they can become an administrator, or before, actually, they can get an administrative certificate. And so, the route to any position in the schools, with the exception of a school nurse, school psychologist, and maybe one or two more, the only route into the schools is through a teacher certification. They must have teacher certification first, and then after that they can add the other certifications. And that would be counselor, supervisor, principal, superintendent, diagnostician, and so forth. Any other position can be added to that. Now, there are ways in which that three years can be shortened. For administrators, it seldom is. Most
administrators serve three or more years as teachers before they are appointed into an administrative position. And that is primarily because of the credibility among the teachers. A principal who has never taught doesn't have much credibility among teachers. They see that person as being naive, not knowing really what goes on in the classroom and such. But for other positions, such as counselor, that three years’ teaching experience was not always viewed as being that essential. So in Texas there is a provision whereby a person can get a temporary certificate for two years until they fill all requirements, whether they be requirements for classroom work they haven’t finished or whether they be the lack of experience. So, actually, a person could teach one year and then be appointed as a counselor on a temporary basis. And then after two years, that counseling experience counts as teaching experience, and so they could have their full certifications and be appointed as a counselor. And that would be true of any of the other positions in the schools.

Myers Were male students attracted to the counseling?

Lamkin A good number, yes. Yes. Before the changes of the laws in the late eighties, counseling was the major graduate program in the school of education. The school administration program was the second most popular. Many teachers who wanted to remain in the classroom but needed the master’s degree for qualifying for an additional stipend would take a degree in counseling. This just seemed to be the thing that appealed to them, working with students and being able to communicate better with students. They felt like that developed their skills in that area. So that was very popular. Now, in the late eighties the laws were changed so that increments in salary, at the state level, were based upon the completion of graduate work in an area related to what the teacher was teaching. And so, a master’s in counseling would not necessarily qualify them for an increase in salary. If they were elementary teachers, at that point, they tended to go more into the reading program and take a graduate degree in reading, because this was obviously related to what they were teaching. And secondary people who wanted to become counselors, and this was still a significant number, went into the counseling program because that was their goal and that’s what they wanted to accomplish. And then you had the group who wanted to become school administrators, and they went into that. Whereas others went to degrees, master’s degrees, in the area that they were teaching: English or math or whatever it might be. The difficulty there was that the school of education had offered master’s degree programs in the evening school and in summer, whereas the academic departments at the university did not offer any evening classes. And so students were limited to taking courses in the summer or they had to take off from school, which very few of them were willing to do at that point. So there was generally a drop in
the master’s program after that law change in the late eighties.

**Myers**

What about international students? I think once you mentioned a student from China. Were international students at Baylor attracted to education?

**Lamkin**

Only at the graduate level. I do not recall any undergraduates who were in teacher education at Baylor from international students. We did have a small number of students who came to Baylor at the master’s level in school administration and in counseling, educational psychology, that draw from that international group. And each year in our master’s program we would have from one to five students. In the doctoral program, we usually had three or four students, international students, who were interested in pursuing a doctoral degree. (clock chimes) And these were primarily from China, and Japan, Thailand, because of our connections there with the university—one of our graduates was the president of the university in Thailand—the Philippines, and then we had a few students from the Far East, from Pakistan and India, a few in that area, and a few from Africa, primarily Nigeria. And most of them were finishing degrees in education so they could go back home to continue to work in the schools, primarily in higher education and in teacher training.

**Myers**

That’s interesting. As we entered the eighties and nineties, Baylor did get a little bit more diverse and we had more Hispanic students. Did the school get involved in bilingual education?

**Lamkin**

We did have a bilingual education program. When that bilingual education program began, it was very difficult to find students who qualified, because in order to teach—that was in the late seventies, the early eighties. In order to teach in bilingual education, the student had to show a proficiency in a second language, which in our case would be primarily Spanish. And they had to be judged by a person in the Spanish department or someone who was proficient in Spanish as to whether or not they actually had the oral skills in that language. And to do this, you’d almost have to have a Spanish major. And the demand for bilingual teachers was no greater than the demand for Spanish teachers. And so they had very little to gain by coming back and getting a bilingual certification. It was just a four-course certification that they could add. But very few of them came back. Now, that was later changed so that they no longer had to have that proficiency. It was recognized that to help a person—well, the bilingual was not considered to be so important as the teaching of English as a second language. And so the greater approach taken beginning in the middle to late eighties was training teachers to teach English as a second language. So this did not require them to have the skill in the language of the students. And, you know, there were several reasons for
that. I guess a very practical reason was you could not find speakers of the many languages that there were in our schools at the time. We had had a large influx of Mideastern, or Far Eastern students. And we had, of course, a Vietnamese group. We had the Cambodians as well as Chinese and Japanese. And that group coming in—and you could not possibly find teachers who were proficient and could teach those students in their language, particularly when the school might just have two or three students in that language. So that was a very practical thing. But secondly, the public generally said that English is the language of the United States, so what we should be doing is not teaching these students in their own language but teaching them in the English language. And so, early childhood education in the early years, the emphasis was upon teaching students English as opposed to teaching them in their own language.

Myers

Anything else, generally, about the students?

Lamkin

I can’t think of anything at this particular point. You know, it was so good to work with the students. And I always enjoy this at Baylor, because not only were they academically qualified but almost invariably they were students who were very dedicated to what they were doing and to serving people. And I don’t mean to imply that they were always studious and came to class without anybody being concerned about them. Certainly those kinds of things existed. And you always had attendance problems and such. But as a whole, they were very interested in what they were doing and in wanting to learn and did not resist the kinds of activities that teachers planned for them.

Myers

I may have asked you this before. Baylor being fairly well known for its school of education, did you have some second generation students come to Baylor?

Lamkin

Oh, yes.

Myers

—at times?

Lamkin

Many, many second and third generation students who came back that had—their grandparents had teacher training at Baylor and their parents, one or more of their parents, and then this generation coming in. So, yes. It was not uncommon at all. Many of the children, when I first came to Baylor, particularly, many of the children of people that I was in school with were coming through at that particular point. And then later I had the children of students that I had taught who were coming through. And as dean, I saw
many of these.

**Myers**

That’s interesting. Well, one concern for students is paying for Baylor. And I have here a list of scholarships from the school of education. This is a scholarship list from your last year as dean. You might look over that and just tell me anything that strikes your mind about scholarships and what you recall.

**Lamkin**

We made a major push to get scholarship help. One of the things that I did soon after becoming dean was to create an advisory board for the school of education. This was made up of mostly our graduates, graduates from the school of education, and in a few cases, individuals who had shown an interest in Baylor and also in education. So they were not necessarily educators themselves but most of them were. And that advisory group met twice a year, and they helped to spread the word about the school of education. And they helped to create contacts for us so that we could get some scholarship assistance. And so we emphasized that. Of course, raising money for the school of education is very difficult because of the fact that we tend, primarily, to be a female group. Teachers as a whole do not accumulate large estates. Females tend to marry males who have business or law degrees or medical degrees or whatever. And very often, the allegiance is more toward the professional school of the husband than it is to the wife’s profession. However, it was always refreshing to find some people that just almost out of the blue gave money. They would say, We want to form a scholarship. One of the first ones on here is the Martha Ware Bass and Philip Wade Bass Scholarship. This was established by David Bass. Martha was his wife and Philip was his son, and they were killed in an automobile accident. Martha was a graduate of the school of education. They were very involved in international students, with international students, in their church in Dallas. And they—he established this scholarship in their name with preference given to an international student. But if an international student was not qualified, then for any other student. And, you know, it was totally unexpected, and it was a very fine gift that they made to us at that particular time. Wallace Davis and his wife, Janis, were Baylor graduates in the middle of the 1950s. And Wallace was on our advisor board. He had remained very close, within close contact with Baylor. He himself was dean of a school of education and later became president of Wayland Baptist College. And he and his wife established a very nice scholarship while he was serving on our advisory board. And they continued to develop that scholarship. Actually, his wife had died, but he has continued to be very supportive of Baylor. He retired as president of Wayland just a few years ago. Of course, many of the scholarships that are here are related to faculty members. One of our board members was a very close friend of Dutch Schroeder.
Myers

Let me turn the tape.

Lamkin

Okay.

_Tape 1, side 1 ends; side 2 begins._

Lamkin

As I was saying, one of our board members was a very close friend of Dutch Schroeder's, and she started a scholarship for Dutch well before Dutch retired. And she took it upon herself to write all the various ex-students and to collect money so that the scholarship was available shortly after she established it. And then we have the one for Dr. Kappes, Kappie, as everyone knew. There was also for Olga Fallen, of course; Dr. Stretch and Dr. Goetting. So several of the faculty members that either they themselves started the scholarship or someone else started it in their name. Dr. and Mrs. Herrington gave a nice scholarship to the school of education as well. I'm not sure that they're on the list I have here, may have come shortly thereafter. So, it will have that group. I mentioned, I think, in an earlier interview that Dr. Strickland and Mrs. Strickland had left their estate to the school of education to establish the first chair in the school of education and scholarships in the name of their deceased son. The largest gift that the school of education received was from Fred Hale, Mr. Fred Hale's estate. And that fund was not designated all for scholarships. Actually, it was designated for our graduate program in school administration. And as we set it up then, working with Dr. Williamson, who had been the primary contact with Mr. Hale, we agreed that 50 percent of the income would go for scholarships to students in the master's in school administration, which we were re-establishing at that particular point, and 50 percent would go to support the other activities of the department of school administration. That was a gift of a million dollars that Mr. Hale made to the school of education. So that was a very wonderful gift at that point. I could talk about each one of these, but I don’t know a lot of detail on all of them. One of the most gratifying ones to me was the gift from the Hickeys. The Drs. Hickey were professors in the mathematics department. And we had had a good relationship with them through the years, and when they retired they established the scholarship in their name for the school of education, the Jim and Pat Hickey Scholarship. But it is specifically for a student in the school of education, and not designated for a person in mathematics. They left it open for anyone in the school of education. That was very gratifying to see a scholarship from some other faculty from some other department of the university.

Myers

Generally, how would you say your relationship was, as an administrator in school of education, with those who were in the scholarship office at Baylor,
who actually administer that?

**Lamkin**

We had a very good relationship with them. And they listened to us and they did try to help us recognize the difficulty that some students would have and such. I never really had—I don’t think there was ever a major conflict here. In fact, they consulted us about scholarships. All of the scholarships that were designated for the school of education were—let me go back. If a scholarship was designated for a student in teacher education or in the school of education, the school of education was asked for recommendations for students to receive that scholarship. And so, we had a scholarship committee that each year received a memorandum from the office of financial aid telling them what the scholarships were and how much money was available from that scholarship fund. And the committee then accepted applications from students and made recommendations to the financial aid for the awarding of those scholarships. Financial aid had the last say, because they had to balance things. Because some of the students that we might recommend might be recommended by other departments or other scholarship sources. And so, to be certain that all of the money was not just given to one person, well, they screened them and so forth. And occasionally, they would cut out one person completely. But most of the time what they did was just to change the amount that we had awarded so that the person still received a scholarship from the school of education, although it was not as much as we had originally suggested. But it was a good working relationship.

**Myers**

Okay. That’s great. I’d like to move into some of the goals you identified last time and even before that, that you wanted to accomplish, and we’ll kind of talk about how it worked out, how it came to a conclusion. One of the first things you told me was the need for financial autonomy for the school of education. This was a transition period when you came in as dean. It was also the first year for Herbert Reynolds as president at the university. And when he came in he brought in James Netherton as vice president for executive affairs, and he was—things changed from McCall to Reynolds, especially financially. So tell me how things worked out, how that proceeded.

**Lamkin**

As I mentioned earlier, when I became dean in 1981, the school of education was operating in the red. I’m not sure just exactly when financial autonomy was declared, but I think it was probably beginning in that 1981–’82 school year. It may have been the year before. But I remember the first time I worked on the budget—well, actually looked at the budgets from a different perspective, perspective as dean, noting that we were operating in the red, that our income did not cover all of the budget expenses. The university was very helpful during that time in the fact that they continued to cover our budget and did not cut us back and say, Next year you’ve got to live on what you
bring in. And so they worked with us, and that was always there that the goal was to see if we could develop the school that we wanted within the framework of the income that we were getting. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, we were in a period of growth as far as students were concerned. And this was very helpful in reaching this goal of living within our income, because in most cases we were able to increase our students without increasing the personal expenses, for example. We had enough space in classes to take care of students that were coming in. So that was helpful. But we did have to look overall at what was going on and what we were doing and whether or not we were using our funds in the best way. And so we examined the budget very, very carefully each year to see what it was we could do to make certain that we were getting the most out of our money. I guess primarily what we did in order to reach that goal of operating within our income was to look at how we were utilizing our faculty and whether or not we were equalizing course loads and such to make certain that all faculty were carrying equal loads. But at the same time we wanted to be certain that we were not overloading faculty, because we were presenting some new expectations of faculty being more active in their professional organizations and making presentations and doing some writing and things of this nature. And you can't do that if you have too many classes to teach. But we did look at those and we did make some adjustments in that area, particularly in the physical education area. Physical education was particularly difficult because of the fact that the university policy says that faculty will teach twelve semester hours, considered to be the load for undergraduates. And in physical education, their activity course carried one semester hour, so that would mean that they'd be teaching twelve courses. And this was just an unreasonable kind of thing, you know, that they would be teaching that many courses. So we had to work out some systems there where we could equalize this. Of course, the main thing that we did there was to shift more of those activity courses to graduate assistants and to give faculty some course credit for supervising the graduate assistants. And so, rather than teaching all of the classes in tennis or swimming or whatever it might be, a faculty would be responsible for supervising graduate students who were teaching in those areas. And the graduate students were much cheaper than professionals in that. So that helped us considerably. We also looked at the way in which we were using student workers. We recognized that we probably had too many student workers. We wanted to be sure that faculty still had the secretarial types of assistance that they needed. And so we kind of reorganized some of the things in that area to be sure that we were getting what we needed there. Otherwise, it was just looking at every item in the budget and seeing what we could do. And, as I say, the increase—I would not underestimate the importance of the increase in the number of students we had in the school because that brought in the money that we needed. And within about three years we were able to show that we were operating in the black, not with large surpluses but with enough that it was comfortable. And the nice thing about that under Dr. Reynolds's leadership was that as we operated in the black, that
money was made available for us to use any way we wanted to that was contributing to the good of the school. And so, we could increase some of the things that faculty were particularly interested in. Travel—we could increase the amount of money that we would put into travel. We were able to increase significantly our contribution to the library in the purchase of materials for the library. With the surplus we could do those kinds of things, and became very, very helpful. Of course, we were not at liberty to use that for salaries, because the university set an amount or percentage that we could use as far as salaries were concerned. We could use it, however, to justify a new faculty position. And so, if we had the people for classes, and we could show that we needed a new faculty, if we had the money there, it was more readily approved than if we didn’t have the money there. And so that helped us in the faculty area as well.

Myers  
Well, I think of those years when you were dean as the time when the computer was kind of moved out of the basement of the science building and into our faculty offices. You know, they became more affordable and more useful. Were you able to accommodate those needs as well?

Lamkin  
I think we worked very well in that area. Of course, as I mentioned earlier, I had been interested in computer applications in education for many, many years. And I tried to keep up with what was going on, and we did not jump immediately into the personal computers. The early ones would use tapes and were very slow, and bunglesome and really were not able to contribute a great deal. We did buy a few of that type just so that our students would be able to become familiar with some of the capabilities. But we started it as soon as we could to just get the computers into our faculty offices as soon as they became practical to get them in. And we employed a person in the media area whose responsibility it was to work with the faculty and with the university in making certain that we kept up with what was available and what was going on and so forth. The first individual we employed did not work out very well, and after two years we had to put him on a terminal contract. But then we were able to employ Dr. Rogers. And he was the one that really took the leadership in making certain that our faculty became computer literate. And he made the recommendations to me as to what we should purchase. And the university was very helpful during that time too, because as they saw this increasing, a lot of times they would make available additional funds, not from our budget but from the university, to make purchases for faculty. But, again, yes, this surplus that we were developing allowed us to make purchases which were not ordinarily being made at that particular point, not only in the basic personal computer area but also in the larger media kind of thing. And we developed a pretty good group of video cameras and video recording equipment, which at that point we were using in classrooms with our student teachers to video tape them and let them see themselves and such. And so we
were able to get that kind of equipment, also. But very quickly, as we got into this, everyone of our faculty members who desired it had a computer in their office. And we developed a computer lab in our school of education Learning Resources Center. And we worked with the university because at that point, well, two things happened. First of all, the university as a whole was putting much more emphasis upon the development of computer skills among students and faculty, so students in many areas were being required to take computer courses. And the state had put in a requirement that all teacher education students have a basic course in computer technology. (clock chimes) So we worked with the computation center and the university center for computer operation to convert a classroom adjoining our Learning Recourses Center into a computer lab, which the people in computer science used for teaching the basic computer course during class periods. They had several scheduled during the day. And when it was not used for that, then it was available for a lab for our students. And so we had that facility that was right there with us, and faculty could use it when it was not being used for classes. Well, our faculty could use it to take students in there and show them things or whatever they wanted to do. So that was very, very helpful, too. And even though we were a Macintosh campus at that particular point, we also introduced some PCs into the—we had a few in the Learning Resources Center so our students would have the opportunity to become familiar with other types of hardware, knowing that when they got into the schools they might have any number of different types of computers available to them.

Myers Really was a transitory time there, wasn’t it?

Lamkin Yes.

Myers I can’t imagine an education student now not having computers. It has become such a part of it.

Lamkin That’s right. When I became dean in ’81, I don’t think there was a single office that had a computer. I think I mentioned in one of our earlier interviews that Dr. McNamee, through a grant, had been able to purchase an Apple computer to work with his reading students. And it was one of the ones that uses the tape input that he had used. But that was about the only one, and I think the only one that was in the school of education at that time. As I left the—well, I personally was on my third version of computers at the time I left the deanship. So in a very short time I had had three different computers that had been upgraded one after the other one. And, of course, all the faculty were computer literate at that point. We had the facilities for E-mail, not only within the department but across campus and such. We had E-mail within our own school before it was available campus-wide. And it was
interesting, as I attended meetings of the deans in the state of Texas, how far ahead we were of all of the schools in Texas, state schools as well as the private schools. And the school of education had far more equipment as well as training in the utilization of that equipment than any of the schools did. I remember in 1991, I believe it was, the legislature became interested in the utilization of technology in the schools. And they set up a program to give grants to schools of education for the training of teachers in technology, using technology in the schools and so forth. And we made an application for that but our application was not accepted at that point, and I found out later why and it was the fact that we were already so far ahead of everybody else they felt like they needed to help some of the others. We had schools at that particular point who had one computer for the entire school of education, you know. I’m talking about state schools in Texas.

**Myers**

What do you think accounts for Baylor’s being ahead in that area?

**Lamkin**

Well, Dr. Reynolds, of course, had always been interested in the data processing possibilities. And he, I think, pushed this in many ways. Dr. Harcastle, who was head of that, administratively, head of that division, also was interested in pushing this. So I think those are the major things. Of course, the departments that were interested were able to push this through. The school of business was right along with us in this area. But even as late as 1990, there were several departments on campus who did not have any computers because their leadership did not want any computers. (laughter)

**Myers**

Well, that’s interesting. You mentioned Dr. Reynolds and his interest in computers and how that helped. And I just want to ask, on the listing of school of education faculty, under the department of educational psychology, we have Herbert Reynolds. Tell me how he was listed as a faculty member in education.

**Lamkin**

Well, I would have to be honest just to say that he just showed up on our faculty list. He never taught anything in the school of education. I believe, in fact, later at some point he was listed also as a professor of educational administration.

**Myers**

Uh-huh, I think so.

**Lamkin**

I guess this was just the administration seeking academic—an academic home and such. I’m sure he’s listed in the Department of Psychology as well, but he never taught any classes for us. And that was not an initiative from the
school of education so far as I know.

**Myers**  Okay. So he didn’t come to your faculty meetings or anything—

**Lamkin**  No. No.

**Myers**  —at that level. Okay. One of your goals was to strengthen the faculty especially in their involvement in professional organizations and in the area of research. I had more list—(laughs, static noise)—just knocked over the microphone. There were some honorary professional organizations that benefited the students that are listed here, but I’m sure they’re different ones than maybe what the faculty was involved in. But tell me some of the primary organizations that were good for your faculty to be involved in.

**Lamkin**  Okay. Each one of the—okay, overall there were two or three groups that represented faculty that cut across various smaller disciplines within. There is, of course, an organization of school administration, American Association of School Administrators. Under that, there’s an elementary principals’ group and a secondary principals’ group and such. Then there’s, for those who were in the area of curriculum, there is the American Association of Curriculum and Supervision. And this was, again, an umbrella organization that covered a number of different—well, anyone who was interested in any area of curriculum. Then there was specific curriculum areas under that. A reading association, I don’t recall the exact title of that, but there was actually about two different reading associations that were national groups. There was a national council for the mathematics educators. So those of our faculty who were interested in mathematics were members of that particular group. And then for secondary teachers, there are groups for English teachers, history teachers. Almost every area has its own group. And then in physical education, a large group there, and I guess that would be the main thing, the umbrella organization of physical education, and then the health education group.

**Myers**  I need to turn the tape.

*Tape 1 ends; tape 2 begins.*

**Myers**  This is tape two of interview nine. Continue telling me about the professional organizations.
What we were primarily pushing at this particular point in the school of education was for our faculty to be involved in the Association for Curriculum and Instruction [Supervision]. That was a major one because this cut across elementary and secondary teachers. Now, within that larger group, then, there are subgroups where you can identify with one particular group. But that was an overall, and this is a national group that’s recognized throughout the United States and very influential and had good publications and such. And then in the school of administration, we were pushing there primarily for the American Association of School Administrators, for them to get involved in that. In educational psychology, one of the major groups at that particular point was the—what was called the American Personnel and Guidance Association, APGA. It later changed its name to—I can’t tell you exactly what it is. It dropped out the guidance and I think became just the American Counseling Association or something of that nature. And that group had a—all of these groups had national groups where there were meetings. They also had regional groups, southeast or southwest and such. They had state groups, and then in many cases there were local groups. And so the faculty could plug in at any of those particular ones. And then overall we encouraged as many faculty who were interested to join the American Educational Research Association, AERA. This covers all areas of research in education. So any faculty member who was interested in research and interested in what was going on in research, this was a place where they could, through the publications, get the information or, of course, attend the annual meetings of the AERA. I was active in the AERA primarily, also in the American Psychological Association. Those two were the ones I was primarily in, other than those that represented schools of education where the dean was a part of that, the American Association of Teacher Education. And there were several other subgroups that I mentioned earlier that we were interested in. But we tried to encourage participation in these. And we did this, of course, through trying to increase as much as we could through support for travel and encourage them to be a part of the program. As funds began to tighten up again, we started basing our support for travel on the fact that they were presenting a paper, and this encouraged some to submit papers for presentation at the meetings.

How about participation on committees and offices and that sort of thing? Were our faculty involved at that level?

Yes. We have a good number of faculty who have been active, primarily in the reading associations. We’ve had several faculty who have had state and national positions in those organizations. There’s another group that’s called ATE, Association of Teacher Education [Association of Teacher Educators]. It’s a little different from the others in that it cuts across administrators as
well as teacher educators. It’s primarily teacher educators wherever you are, Association for Teacher Education. And through the years, Dr. Barrett and Dr. Curtis had both been very active and have had many positions on the committees as well as offices in that organization. And so that’s been very good for them. As dean, I served on several committees for the American Association of Teacher Education, and AACTE, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. And I served on several committees in that organization and also was president of the state group at one time.

Myers
What do you think these professional associations and involvement with them contributed to your faculty?

Lamkin
Well, I guess the primary thing is that it broadens your vision of what is possible and what is going on. When you’re just confined to your own campus and that becomes your world, you’re limited by what you can even imagine because you don’t know what else is out there. And I think the major thing that you get is just a broadening of your vision about what is possible. And you get some inspiration from that. If they can do that, why can’t we? And so it’s a very good way of bringing new things into your program.

Myers
When you think about your faculty and needing to strengthen them in areas of research and so forth, how important was that to the tenure process in those days?

Lamkin
Written policy at the time, I mentioned earlier, just said that teaching is expected and research is appreciated. (laughs) It’s very difficult to quantify and just say how important it was. I guess that as I looked at it and as the tenure committee looked at it, they were reaching a point where there had to be some indication of scholarly participation. For the school of education, they recognized that some of this might be in terms of presentations as opposed to publications. Also, there was some provision made for the fact that faculty took leadership roles in in-service training of teachers, and this was considered to be scholarly activity. Now, as time went on into the latter parts of my tenure of dean, many of the tenure committees were looking for publications in the journals. And so it became more and more important even though it was never stated as such. And on one or two occasions I went to the tenure committee, at their request, to justify tenure for an individual who was fulfilling the role that had been assigned to them and a part of that role was not the publication of papers. For example, the director of field experiences—and that’s a very big job—they have to keep a lot of contact with schools and so forth, and there’s really not time to do much publication in a position like that. But that’s what the person was employed to do. Well, they listened to me in both cases and the persons were granted tenure. But I
would say initially when I became dean in ’81, primarily, had to justify the person’s teaching abilities, and this was reflected in student ratings and evaluation by other faculty members and such. By the latter part, you had to have not only that, but in addition you had to have publications.

Myers Uh-huh. How did you view your role as dean and walking or mentoring someone through this tenure process?

Lamkin Well, I thought it was a very serious kind of thing. Now, when we employed someone, a part of my talk with them said, We don’t employ people unless we think they will gain tenure, that we don’t employ people to say, Well, let’s just see what happens. So if you are employed we have the full intention that you will gain tenure. And then on the yearly basis their departments met with them, other department chairs met with them, but I met with them also. And we tried to be very honest and say, This is what is lacking or this is what you need to do, to make certain that they understood where they stood as far as the tenure process was concerned. In the time that I was dean, I never had anyone turned down for tenure that we had recommended for tenure. I did, as I mentioned earlier, recommend a terminal contract for one individual in the pre-tenure year. But I believe that’s the only one in that. Now, we did have a few faculty who left of their own accord during that time, at least two of which probably would not have gotten tenure, I would not have recommended for tenure, but they left of their own accord.

Myers All right. Anything else about tenure or that process? Did you ever hire ABD [all but dissertation] folks?

Lamkin Not as tenure track persons. We did hire them, but they were hired as lecturers. And then after they completed their doctorate, we might move them to a tenure track. But we did not employ anyone ABD on a tenure track. Faculty members, at that point, were not difficult to find. We had a large selection of people to choose from, and so we could screen very carefully and generally find some very strong people.

Myers Uh-huh. That’s interesting. That’s helpful. You mentioned that there had been an endowed chair from the Stricklands, right?

Lamkin Yes.
Myers And there were some more by the time—

Lamkin Well, Dr. Hale—

Myers Hale, okay.

Lamkin Mr. Hale had that—a part of that was a part of the endowment of the chair in that area.

Myers Okay. And then there was the school of education professorship.

Lamkin And that is not endowed at this point. That’s an open area that I hope we’ll build up some point to where it will be a fully endowed chair. It’s a place where we just encouraged people who want to make gifts to the school of education can make it, and it would be an endowed chair then.

Myers Okay. Well, that’s interesting. So chairs were a nice thing, but it wasn’t something that you pursued as much as scholarships—

Lamkin (speaking at the same time) I guess we really felt like we needed the scholarships more than we needed the chairs at that point, because as Baylor tuition was going up, we felt the press to provide as much scholarship assistance as we could. And this was particularly true at the graduate level, although we don’t have very many graduate scholarships. Then that’s the reason Mr. Hale’s gift was so important to us. And then we had another relatively large scholarship fund that was given to us, and I probably will not be able to tell you what it was at this point. But it was another one that approached a million dollars where they had scholarship funds for graduate work. So we had two very large gifts that would help us with the scholarships for the graduate program.

Myers Okay. Anything else about your goal there to strengthen the faculty?

Lamkin Well, I guess as unpleasant as it is, a part of the strengthening sometimes involves seeing what you can do to move some faculty on. (laughs) And so we had some rather unpleasant kinds of situations. One faculty member we had to buy out the contract because he was tenured and he was not making a contribution to the school of education. And the influences were more
negative than anything else. And then in a couple of other cases, we did some reassigning of individuals from where they were to a place where we thought they could—I guess one way of putting it is—be less harmful. But I think in the new assignments they were able to be more effective than they had been previously and such. So we did some reassignments of people. And then a few timely kinds of retirements helped. And so we were always looking at what might happen, you know, how we could move faculty to bring in the strength that we needed. So, you know, it was kind of a jigsaw puzzle kind of thing that you worked to put together.

**Myers**

How much did your counseling training help you as a dean of a faculty?

**Lamkin**

Well, I think it helped a great deal because, of course, I guess a major portion of what deans do is to listen to people who have complaints, students, staff members, or faculty, and try to work out differences. And also to make these changes that I was talking about, you know, you have to—you can't always persuade people what they need to do. And I think it helped—well, through the counseling training and so forth, I guess I developed a little bit better understanding of individuals and human beings and how they operate. So that gave me a little bit better way of knowing how I could approach them in making suggestions about how we might change their assignments.

**Myers**

In a way, I guess a dean is that gateway between the faculty and the administration, and then the other way is kind of the conduit for communications from above to the faculty. How did that go for you? How did you feel about that?

**Lamkin**

I think it went very well. You know, there certainly is never a 100 percent agreement with any leader, and I know that I did not have a 100 percent support of my faculty. I think in most cases President Reynolds was very honest with me in reporting to me the things that faculty—complaints the faculty might have had or such. And he was very supportive of me in those. There was one occasion after I had been dean for about three years, I guess, in which the faculty were asked to evaluate me. And, of course, this is done routinely now. It was not done routinely at that particular point. And I found out later that this was because a couple of faculty members had complained about me. I guess they had complained because they didn’t like my leadership style. They felt like that they were not being consulted enough. I generally worked through department chairs and such. And so all the faculty were asked to evaluate me to determine whether, and make a decision, whether I should be reappointed. Of course, appointments were for three years. And whether I should reappointed. It didn’t frighten me, particularly. As I say—I said earlier, I don’t think I would ever want to be in a position
where I wasn’t wanted. And so it didn’t frighten me. It just kind of took me by surprise. And I was not told I was going to be evaluated. I was told by a faculty member that they had received the letter that they were asked to write them and evaluate me. (laughs) And so I felt like I should have been informed and I felt like Dr. Reynolds and Dr. Belew had both not followed through on what I thought they should do. I talked with Dr. Belew about it, and he agreed with me but said that he had been given this letter and this charge from the president marked very clearly confidential. And as a result, he could not say anything to me. So anyway, well, you know, there was no problem. I got a letter after about a month from the president that said—he gave me my appointment for three more years, and said that 90-some-odd percent of the faculty supported you and so forth. So, you know, it was a reaffirming kind of thing at that particular point, although it was a little difficult at the time to go through that. But you know, I guess that being human, I always wanted to have everybody pleased with what I was doing, but I also had to recognize that they were not. In most cases, it worked very well though. And I felt comfortable in going to Dr. Belew and when necessary, to Dr. Reynolds with faculty concerns. I felt comfortable in bringing back to the faculty anything from the administration.

Myers

How did—how was it having been a colleague in the faculty and now you take leadership above them? How did that work?

Lamkin

That probably was one of the more difficult kinds of transitions. I think that, very fortunate in the fact that I had gained the respect of the faculty before I became dean, and the fact that they selected me as dean as opposed to the administration selected me as dean. In other words, I was the recommendation which the faculty made to the administration. And I think in doing that, that set the stage for both of us to fit into that relationship of me moving into the boss over them. But I felt like that I continued a collegial peer relationship with all the faculty, with almost all of the faculty, while I was dean. There never was a separation, so to speak, there. If it came down to it and decisions had to be made and I was the one that made the decision, well, then I made it, but I made it with the counsel of those that were in other leadership positions within the school. But that was an adjustment for the first year or two trying to work out just exactly how that relationship was going to be.

Myers

Is there—were there any moments when you wished you could step aside or wanted to go back to the classroom full-time or any moments like that?

Lamkin

Not until I did it. You know, I made up my mind that I was going to retire in the fall of 1992. That’s when I made up my mind. We were in the midst of
our reevaluation from NCATE. We had had the original evaluation of NCATE when I first became dean, and we were now in the process of completing that—of doing the second one. At that point it was every ten years you had to go through this process. And so, we were in the midst of our self-study. And everyone was involved in doing that. They set up my schedule for the spring of '93, and so I made up my mind that I was going to retire at the end of that year because we would have gotten through that. And it was a good time to get it done. And so, I guess that when you make that decision there are things that come up that then tend—you tend to see as something that verifies or substantiates or convinces you that you made the right decision. And at the time, after I had made that decision, there were several changes that were being made that I did not agree with, and I guess I was saying to myself, Well, I'm glad I'm not going to have to do that. In '92–'93 was the time when the provost decided that we would go to a merit-based salary system. And he was putting out the guidelines how we would, each school, the department, would develop their own guidelines for how they were going to determine who was to receive merit raises. So we were going through that, and I did not agree with that particular approach. And I was saying to myself, Well, I'm glad that somebody is going to have to do that and I'm not going to have to do that. Of course, I knew that Dr. Reynolds was going to retire pretty soon. In fact, when he got my letter of resignation, his response was—well, he had thought that maybe I would stay on one more year because, then, since we came on together, well, we could retire together. (laughs) So it's—because I believe he did retire the next year after I did. The changes that were coming administratively were not the kinds of things—a lot of them were things that I was going to have a difficult time adjusting to. And I recognize change comes along, and because I didn't want to adjust to them doesn't mean they were bad. It just meant that I didn't want to adjust to them. (laughter) And it was time for somebody else to take over. But during the time I was dean, oh, I'm sure there were some days when I said, I wish I didn't have to go to work today. But I don't recall ever saying, I wish I could get out of this. I enjoyed it. It was a most enjoyable time.

Myers That's great. Do you have some—okay. We have some more goals here. One of them was to give more attention to specific teacher education programs. And part of that you said was a better coordination in communication. And this may not be part of that, but I wanted to ask you in relationship to that about the teacher education council. Was that a part of that communication?

Lamkin Yes. I guess what I was talking about there was trying to bring a closer working relationship between the academic departments that work with teachers and the professional education department that does the training in
the professional areas. And the teacher education council had existed for quite some time. In fact, there was a state requirement that there be quote “teacher education council” that would have the final say in teacher education programs. But in the past it had been more or less a rubber stamp kind of thing that very few people attended, and we just said we had a meeting of the teacher education council members and such. And we tried to bring people in from the various departments and had the departments represented where most of our teacher education people did their major work, their academic work. We always had a representative from mathematics, history, from English, from physical education, from music. Those I can think of, but also others that were part of that teacher education council. And we met not often but several times a year reviewing programs and listening to what ideas came from other schools and other departments and such. So I think this was a way in which we tried to reach out to and improve communication there so that other departments would know what we were doing and we would know what they were doing.

**Myers**

Let me ask you about some departments that you haven’t mentioned, for instance, family consumer sciences. Did you have a relationship with the people who were going to be teaching in schools?

**Lamkin**

Yeah, yeah. This, of course, was home ec [home economics] when I was there. And the relationship there was very, very limited because of the acts in vocational education which were passed in the 1930s, okay. And so the training of teachers in home economics became a function of that particular department only. The people in that area took one or two courses in the school of education only. And they did their own supervision of student teaching. Everything was there. And so we had a good working relationship with them, and we talked with them. But their programs were completely separate from ours.

**Myers**

Okay. I need to turn the tape.

_Tape 2, side 1 ends; side 2 begins._

**Myers**

All right. What about speech and language therapy?

**Lamkin**

Okay. In that area they did their professional education with us, in the school of education. There were certain requirements for their professional education. They had to do work in the human growth and development, adolescent psychology, and so forth. They had to do courses there. They had
to do a course in special education, I believe, at that particular point. But most of the rest of the work they did in the speech therapy area. We did supervise their student teaching. However, we employed a speech therapist to do their supervision, okay. So we had a speech therapist who supervised their student teaching. So they were registered for student teaching with us and we employed the person, with their help, of course, to do the supervision of their student teachers. But most of the program was handled within that department. Again, we had to work with them closely. We were the focal point for any programs that were approved by the state department of education. So, you know, if speech therapy, home ec, wanted to change their programs any way, they had to submit those to us. Teacher education council had to approve them, and we had to send them into the state for approval.

Myers So a student in speech and language therapy would get a certificate—would have certification through your department—

Lamkin That’s right.

Myers —and student teaching.

Lamkin We would be the one that recommended them for certification after they completed the approved program.

Myers It’s complicated, isn’t it?

Lamkin Yes. (both laugh)

Myers Well, how about business, the school of business?

Lamkin The school of business was no different from any other of the departments on campus as far as—there were several basic certifications in business, and I don’t remember all of them at this point. But there was general business. There was a business communications. I’m not sure all that would include at that point. And these things are all out by now, but that would include shorthand and typing and things like this. There was an accounting, I believe. So there were about three or four different certifications. But they developed their programs just like the English department developed what would be an English teaching field. They developed those. They were submitted to the school of education, but the people in business had to take the basic
curriculum courses, methods of teaching and so forth, in the school of education. Music was another one which was a little bit different. Most of the music people took their growth and development courses within the school of education, and then also we had a course that both the music people took and the speech therapy people took, which was a methods of teaching. But it covered all twelve grades. It was “Methods of Teaching in the Schools.” It covered all twelve grades. The rest of their music methodology and so forth they took within the school of music. And then the school of education supervised the student teaching. Now, one of the things I did as dean was to work out with the school of music a method whereby their music education people would supervise the student teachers but we would reimburse the school of music for the salary of those people, the time that they used.

Myers  Tuition would go to the school of education and then—

Lamkin  And then we would reimburse. We would reimburse them. So they used their music education people to supervise their music people, which was much better than using a generalist, we might say, to supervise music because it’s a much more specialized, just like the speech therapy.

Myers  I guess music had its own faculty for music education.

Lamkin  They had music education faculty, yes.

Myers  Yeah, I guess a department within the school. I don’t know if anyone else had that. Did business have a business education faculty?

Lamkin  Business had some courses in business education. I don’t think they had it separated as such.

Myers  How about fine arts?

Lamkin  Fine arts served two roles as far as we were concerned, just like music did, too, and some of the others. All of our elementary teachers had to take a music course, and there was a music for elementary teachers. And there was also art for elementary teachers. And of course, as a part of their degree requirements, students might take the drama course for a part of their fine arts and such. But then we had, of course, certification programs in drama, in
art, and in oral communications, speech. We had those certification programs which worked the same way that the programs in other academic departments worked. They had a teaching field here of a minimum of twenty-four hours that their students had to take, was approved by the teacher education council and by the state. And they did their methods courses and foundation courses and such in the school of education and we supervised their student teaching. Now, we tried on occasions—we were never able to work it—we tried to encourage the teachers in all of the departments, whether in fine arts or English or anywhere else, to visit their teachers and turn in reports of their observations and such. But we just never—they never could find the time to do it. I can understand this. This is very time consuming. To visit a teacher takes almost a half a day, because you’ve got to drive out to the schools and get there at the time, and the rule is if it’s an hour class you stay for the whole class. You don’t go in and come out and such. Then you write up your report and go back. And so, you know, you’ve used almost a half a day and it’s hard to do that.

Myers: So they let the school of education do that.

Lamkin: They let us do that. That’s right.

Myers: Any other folks on campus that we haven’t talked about that you’d like to mention a relationship with?

Lamkin: I can’t think of any others at this point. I would say, and I want to reiterate, I feel like that during the time I was dean we had a very, very good relationship with all the departments on campus. I felt comfortable in talking—if a problem came up, I would call the chairman of the department or whoever was involved and talked with them. They called and phoned us to do things for them in time. For years, Mr. Cornelius first and then Dr. Hunt asked me to come in each year and do a half-day training in teaching for their teaching assistants as they came in and to talk a little bit about methodology and things of this nature and such. You know, I thought that was a very good utilization here across campus. It worked very well. And our faculty brought in faculty from across campus from time to time. Through our University for Young People, the program for gifted students in the summer, we used faculty from across the campus to teach in that. We had mathematics; we had physics; we had drama and speech. We had faculty from all over the campus teaching these elementary and junior high school students. And it was a good, again, a good relationship there. So I felt like that we had a very good relationship with the departments across campus.
Myers  Let me just ask you one more. You talked about early on a lot of religion—people who were interested in religious education might come through the school of education. Was that still happening?

Lamkin  Yes, it was. With the seminary there, now, it may be changing a little bit now. I'm not sure. I think there is some cooperative programs that are being worked on between the school of education and the seminary. But, yes, it was still—it happened all the way through. We had a large number of students who saw themselves as going into religious education, and they would come through. Of course, they would liked to have had a teaching field in religion, but the state would not approve a teaching field in religion. However, when certification plans were changed in the late eighties, the state started allowing secondary students to have one teaching field. Up until that time, students had been required in the secondary level to have two teaching fields, which meant that they had to have two majors, basically, as well as their other courses. So they allowed them to take one teaching field. So at this point, a student could go through and take twenty-seven hours in history and then they could take religion also if they wanted to and complete their degree requirements. So that helped some of those. But it was a very common thing to have those who were preparing for not only just religious education but for any area of ministry to come through the school of education. And this went on into our graduate program, too. We had a good number of people who would take the counseling program and who had goals of moving into religious work of some kind.

Myers  Okay. We’ve covered a lot of territory today. I thank you for your help today, and we’ll pick it up again next time. Thank you.

\textit{end of interview}