

ACM Professional Biography

March, 1990

Arthur C. MacKinney

I was struck by Stagner's (1981) comments about the role of chance in determining his respondents' entry into the field of I/O Psychology.¹ It certainly was true in my case! I had just enrolled in a course in Economics when I was an undergraduate at William Jewell College. The year was 1948 or 1949. I had taken one previous course under the professor who was scheduled to offer the course, and I respected his abilities and professionalism. Unfortunately, however, he received a late-breaking job offer and departed the scene. The substitute instructor was educated in a different field and commented at his first session that he knew little about the subject. I immediately began searching for an alternative.

Purely by chance, there was a course called "Psychology of Advertising" offered at precisely the same hour as the Economics course I had enrolled for. Since I had already taken Introductory Psychology, did moderately well in it, and found it to be passably interesting, I made the switch. I guess it isn't very necessary to note that I was captivated by the subject matter, did very well in the course, and went on to take other psychology courses.

This chance event clearly set one of the themes in my professional life: the study of psychology. But there were also other themes, both earlier and later.

Elementary School

-A second theme began to emerge quite early in my life, the satisfaction of assuming a leadership role. I recall incidents from my earliest years of schooling that involved being given leader roles in various school and playtime activities. These went on to become more formal, resulting from elected offices and school assignments. I recall frequently being a class officer, being a spokesperson for one event or another, working at "safety patrol" and the like.

I recall one incident that occurred during a class visit to the State Capitol in Jefferson City, Missouri. At the last minute before meeting the Governor, our teacher remembered that no one had thought to designate a spokesperson to thank the Governor for meeting with us. I got the assignment, without warning and without any opportunity for preparation of any kind. I was a scared kid, and when the Governor appeared I stammered out something inane. But the Governor was gracious, shook hands, thanked me for my comments, and then addressed the class

with his hand on my shoulder. My interest in taking responsibility didn't suffer from the incident.

As time went on, I was fortunate to be given other leadership roles which provided opportunity for learning more about the management of human enterprise. I like the centrality of it, the problem solving that is intrinsic to it, the strong interpersonal elements, and I suppose there are some power needs involved also. As for the political elements, there is anxiety, of course, but also challenge. Being in a position of responsibility, and especially with being a practicing manager, became a central theme in my life.

It seems clear to me now that I/O Psychology is in part a merger of the two themes explored so far, psychology and leadership. I think of higher education management as one kind of professional practice in I/O psychology.

High School

The beginning of my high school years coincided with the start of World War II, and the beginning of major changes in my family life. What had formerly been a fairly limited sphere of operation suddenly grew by a continent. I was switched to a large junior high in a different city, and suffered the typical traumas of adjustment to new everything. I was faced, of course, with the need to carve out a new niche, but without any real sense of how to go about it.

One of the important things that happened during these years, and only because an assistant principal said it should, was that I got exposed to good science instruction for the first time. I recall vividly my first science course; it was called "General Science" and it was fascinating. I liked the substance, but I also found the methods impressive. This was the beginning of a profound respect for what was known and how it came to be known.

That first course in General Science taught me things about diverse subjects as weather, rocks, plants, mechanical devices, the human body. I also began to gain a genuine appreciation for the fact that one didn't have to depend on reason and logic, or authority, for what is known. I began to sense that there was a world of empiricism "out there" although I didn't gain insight into how it operated until later. I did recognize that I wanted more and consequently went on to other high school science courses.

It is not clear to me now what lead me into debate. But I found high school debate competition to be an interesting combination of work and satisfaction. I remember the euphoria of winning, and the extreme importance of studying the subject from all sides so as to anticipate the arguments of the opposition. I discovered early that I could have no success in debate without working hard to know the subject. And the satisfaction came from using words to influence opinions and gain points.

Although I felt anxiety at the start of debate competition, once underway and into the substance of the arguments, confidence grew and I felt something akin to thrill with the competition. In my senior year of high school, my partner and I won second in the state competition debating both sides of whether the U.S. should join the United Nations.

In the hindsight resulting from intervening years, I see these high school experiences as adding several themes to my life. One of these was an interest in empirical science. A second was an interest in the power of language. And a third was the importance of examining ideas in verbal interaction.

Military

During my first year of college, I thought I wanted to study medicine. In fact, during that year, I thought seriously about only two career choices: medicine and engineering. But I realize now that I mistakenly thought that engineering and Civil Engineering were synonymous, and that interest never amounted to much. I knew positively that I didn't want to study for the ministry; my Father was a protestant minister and an attorney (later, a judge) and I found most of what he did in his career to be uninteresting to me. And I knew I didn't want to be a retailer; my Grandfather was a food store owner and I spent deadly dull days trying to find something interesting and exciting about the grocery business. The only thing I liked about working at the grocery store was driving the delivery truck. I liked planning routes, and making deliveries. In fact, planning a route to minimize time and miles, and to avoid backtracking, was a challenge. I liked that. I also liked that Dodge pickup with its "C" gasoline rationing sticker. That truck was a wonderful friend during the war years.

But the GI Bill was expiring, my parents had limited means, and I saw in the military a chance to gain a paid education, get away from home, and add some excitement to my life. Indeed, it was all these things! I spent about a year and a half in the Army during 1946 and 1947 (I was later to spend another year during the Korean War), most of it in Japan. This experience was wonderful. Just the fact that it was foreign travel with some exposure to another culture was enough in itself. But it also exposed me to personnel work.

My main duty assignment during this stint was as a personnel NCO; I gradually worked up to Sergeant with some limited responsibility. I did a lot of mindless stuff like morning reports and duty rosters, but I also got a beginning acquaintance with subjects like personnel records, classification, and performance evaluation. Although I had no insight into the matter at all at the time, I now believe that this experience was one of the reasons that I gravitated to the I/O specialty in psychology. I began to see the potential of enormous organizational gains to be realized from proper utilization of people resources.

College

With some military experience behind me, I found I really liked college! I attended William Jewell College, a small liberal arts institution near Kansas City, Missouri. With some exceptions here and there, I enjoyed my work. Even the required courses, such as religion, were interesting. Some turned out to be challenging. So, I did some work, and earned a respectable but not outstanding academic record.

I was into a lot of things during these years. In addition to a regular course load, I worked on the yearbook, got deeply involved in student government, held various offices including president of my fraternity, worked a few hours a week as an undergrad TA and as a dorm counselor, MC'd some shows, worked on many committees, attended dozens of parties, etc. I had a real ball!

My fraternity experience was not only unique, it was my first real management responsibility. I had to budget, exercise financial control, appoint people to jobs, make sure they did them, plan, work all the political angles, settle disputes. It was fascinating intrinsically, and it was also wonderful experience.

My college years significantly influenced my decision to go on with the study of psychology. My first course, as noted earlier, was Psychology of Advertising, taught by a University of Minnesota graduate, Constance Nelson. She was excellent, and she was very complimentary about the U of M. My desire to attend Minnesota dates from that very first course in psychology.

But it was more than that. Our small Department of Psychology was a close one. The majors and the three faculty members did a lot of educational things together in addition to regular course work. There was the Psychology Club, which became a Psi Chi chapter later on. And there were regular field trips at the rate of five or six a year. We visited all kinds of places that applied psychology. And there were regular special events in-house. The Kansas City area in the 1950s was rich in such opportunities. I recall a practicing clinician who was doing research with group psychotherapy, clinicians from Menniger who were reclassifying behavior disorders, dedicated professionals who worked with mental retardation, personnel people from local industry, a clinical researcher who was working on weight control, and another who was researching implosive therapy. There was a banquet speaker whose doctoral study was on psychodrama. So, it was an intellectually rich environment, both in class and outside. While training in the hard science and methodological aspects of our field were limited, we had a lot of exposure to the glamorous applied stuff. I finished a B.A. degree pretty well convinced that I wanted to be a Clinical Psychologist.

But the Army intervened again, and I couldn't plan ahead well enough to apply for clinical programs. So when I was discharged on rather short notice in the fall of 1951, I quickly applied to the University of Minnesota for admission to graduate school. I was accepted, but their acceptance was heavily influenced by faculty recommendations from William Jewell. My undergraduate grades and my test

scores weren't bad, but they weren't at the levels typical for the U of M Department of Psychology. But I got admitted, loaded up my '47 Chevy Fleetline, and headed north.

Graduate School

When I got to Minnesota, I discovered "real" psychology and "real" statistics. Let me review my first quarter there. First, there was a course on Motivation Theory, taught by a Spence graduate from Iowa, Wallace Russell. That was my first good exposure to S-R theory, and I learned a lot about "motes" and "excitatory potentials". I didn't like it much, but I learned a lot. Second, there was a course from Donald G. Patterson called "Individual Differences" (we called it "I.D.'s") and it was at the same time fascinating and impossible. I found it impossible to memorize all that stuff he knew and thought everyone should also know. But apparently no one else memorized it either so I got an A. I learned a tremendous amount about human behavioral differences and where they come from. I also found in Donald Patterson my favorite professor of all time. Third, there was a course in Abnormal Psychology, a topic I thought I knew a lot about already, taught by Charles Bird. I found out that I had only scratched the surface to that point. I also learned I couldn't diagnose worth a darn and did not want to be a Clinical Psychologist. And finally, there was biostatistics, taken in the School of Public Health. It was a whole different world. I found extraordinarily useful stuff that was extraordinarily difficult to pound through my nonquantitative head. I made a B in Stat.

It went on from there through the typical rewards as well as tribulations of a graduate school experience. Jim Jenkins, who was then an assistant professor, got me involved in my first true research project during that first year. It was a readability study that resulted in publication in the Journal of Applied Psychology. I got darned weary of counting words and syllables, but it was a good intro, and set me on the course of future research and publication. Here was realization of that junior high interest in empirical science.

As noted above, I abandoned the clinical aspiration about as soon as I started at Minnesota, and latched on to I/O right away. My study in I/O was heavily differential and measurement in orientation. I had lots of work in statistics, experimental and other basic science courses, vocational and personnel psychology, and human factors. (There were no courses in organizational or social in my program although I later spent quite a lot of time studying on-my own in those fields.) And I took a collateral field in Industrial Relations, getting acquainted with such people as Dale Yoder and Herb Heneman.

I was appointed a TA at Minnesota, and did all the departmental routine work required of TA's in those days. I ran an IBM scoring machine for, literally, thousands of intro psychology answer sheets. But when I finished my Master's degree at the end of two years of graduate study, I was made an instructor and assigned to teach two sections of Intro Experimental Psychology. All the instructors used the same

text and tests, but otherwise we had a lot of freedom. I found another theme in this experience; I really liked to teach. It was clear then, as it is today, that my future was tied to academic institutions.

My dissertation was suggested to me by Jim Jenkins, and it was a field experiment evaluating tachistoscopic training for clerical workers. The question was whether perceptual training via tachistoscopic projection would improve perception and thus clerical performance. It improved perceptual speed and accuracy okay, but these improvements didn't transfer to the job. Nevertheless, it was a great experience to do a true experiment, using both experimental and control groups, in a field setting. Such field experiments weren't all that common in those days, in spite of earlier famous examples.

But that study, like dozens I carried out later, dropped into the bottomless abyss called the psychological literature, and most were never heard from again. In fact, the studies I have done that attracted any attention were the ones I regard as the most pedestrian; studies in personnel selection and training, and longitudinal studies of student attrition. The studies I regard as my most innovative and important, such as studies of psychological scaling and of factor structure changes with experience, have never been heard of since.

General Motors

When I finished my degree in 1955, I interviewed with several organizations and accepted a job with Orlo Crissey at the General Motors Institute in Flint, Michigan. I spent two years there, doing some fairly routine personnel evaluations, but also carrying out some interesting studies of supervisory job design and performance measurement. Along the line I had acquired a continuing interest in the dependent variable side of I/O research, and this consumed much of my professional activity during this period. The GM folks, Orlo, and others such as Bill Chew, Dutch Landen, and Harry O'Neill (Harry was later killed in a plane crash), were accommodating to my research interests. But I came to realize that I really valued the investigative freedom that came with University work, and I made a move back toward academe. In addition to research, as noted earlier, I really liked to teach.

Iowa State University

I was invited to join the faculty at ISU in the Fall, 1957. Bill Owens was then Department Head, and he became one of my valued colleagues and friends. Except for three retired former members, the total faculty at that time was four persons including Bill. That fall, three new people were added; myself, Lee Wolins, a Quantitative Psychologist holding a joint appointment in Statistics, and Ed Lewis, a Counseling Psychologist, holding a joint appointment with the Counseling Service. Both were Ohio State graduates and excellent professionals. Both became close friends and colleagues as well as research collaborators. I later published papers

with both of them, and we did organizational consulting together. It was a very happy set of associations which continued for 13 years.

In 1957, Iowa State was broadening from the original A & M role and scope, into a comprehensive university. At that time, it was **PAGE 13 from hardcopy is missing**

course, many models around the U.S. We put together a proposal, and in early 1966 the Industrial Relations Center was approved with authorization for the M.S. degree and a hunting license to seek outside funding. Mainly through the efforts of Ed Jakubauskas, a Labor Economist, we received a substantial Department of Labor grant, began accepting students, and we were in business. Of course, my efforts within the Department of Psychology continued unabated at the same time.

In 1967, I was appointed Head of the Department of Psychology. I had been Assistant Chair under Bill Layton for several years prior to that time, concentrating my administrative time on managing the burgeoning graduate program in the department. This new appointment fit my interests in management and leadership, as well as my commitment to higher education and research. It set me on the road to further higher ed management roles to come.

Visiting Professorships

Before commenting further about my higher ed management experiences, it is important to report other associated events, or series of events, that accompanied my tenure at Iowa State University. The first deals with visiting appointments. In 1960, I was invited to spend the summer at the University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, and teach a course in personnel psychology. The teaching experience was largely forgettable, but the associations with Marv Dunnette, Rene Dawis, Bill England, and Herb Heneman were memorable. Roger Bellows was also there that summer and I got acquainted with him. I also got time during those short weeks to do a lot of writing, and to experience the professional stimulation of a visiting appointment.

In 1962, I was invited to the University of California, Berkeley, for the Fall Semester. Like the Minnesota experience, it was an incredibly stimulating experience, with the extra bonus of ample free time for writing. The memory is still vivid of how excellent the UC students were, and, of course, having the opportunity to interact with Ed Ghiselli, Mason Haire, and Lyman Porter was rare and wonderful. I learned a very great deal from them, and from their students, one of whom was Ed Lawler.

Consulting

Another significant aspect of the Iowa State years was the development of an active consulting business. Our first two clients were Meredith Publishing and The Maytag Company, for whom we did large scale selection/validation studies. In general, with

exceptions of course, the approach was an applied research one, with which an empirical solution to one or more problems was identified, systems for application of findings were put in place, and employees were trained in their use. This has been the general tone of most of the consulting I have done; I think of it as research on company identified issues. Many of the projects I have worked on have resulted in publications.

Over the years, I worked with a variety of organizations including publishing, insurance, and manufacturing industries, privately held utilities, and government agencies. Probably the predominant type of work was the selection and validation kind mentioned above, but there were other projects touching on attitude measurement, training, and assessment. I have always felt best about the projects that were based on research, and that resulted in empirically proven outcomes.

The Owens-Illinois Study

In the latter half of the 1960s, Lee Wolins, Bill Layton, and I began the search for a research grant for a longitudinal study to investigate the nature of change in managerial performance as job experience is accrued. This was to be a basic research endeavor, with implications for application but quite fundamental in nature. In any event, our searches led to a substantial commitment from the Owens-Illinois Company, primarily in the person of John Rapparlie, not only to support the study financially but to provide a pool of second level managers as subjects. It was a large commitment on their part.

The study continued into the early 1970s, a number of publications resulted from it, and since the data set is still very much in tact, it might be thought of as still open and viable. However, the principals all went on to other things, and the full realization of the data remain underdeveloped. We regard the main hypothesis as still largely untested, although the indications point in the direction of performance being qualitatively different at different levels of experience. It is of tangential but important note that Mike Kavanagh was the key RA on this project during his doctoral study at Iowa State.

Accreditation

It was in the late 1960s, that I first became involved in accreditation work, leading to still another theme in my life. At that time, I was invited to make a site visit for APA to the University of Minnesota. This was to be the first of many site visits, first for APA, but somewhat later for the North Central Association

The former was program oriented, of course, and the latter institution wide. I found all my accreditation work, which continues today and has covered an enormously wide range of programs and institutions, to be incredible learning experiences for someone deeply immersed in academic administration.

In the 1969-71 period, I was asked to serve on a special APA task force on accreditation, during which time we re-examined the association's policies governing accreditation. I was subsequently asked to Chair the task force and in that role wrote the final report. Several, but not all, of the recommendations found their way into APA policies and procedures. And, as a sort of a repeat, I was asked to serve on another accreditation task force in the mid-1980s. This latest excursion into APA accreditation policy is the Task Force on the Scope and Criteria for Accreditation which continues today.

In 1971, I first got involved in institutional accreditation with the North Central Association through my work as Dean of the Graduate School at Wright State University. Wright State was then on a five-year review cycle with NCA and a scheduled review was upcoming. I chaired the University's efforts in this regard, the review turned out well, and I subsequently was invited to become an evaluator for NCA. This led to perhaps 25 or 30 site visits, a five-year term on the Commission for Institutions of Higher Education of the NCA, and just within the last few months, election to the Board of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). Clearly accreditation became and continues to be a major life theme.

Division 14

As I recall, it was as early as the late 1950s that I was first invited to get involved in Division 14 committee work. I was appointed to the Education and Training Committee by, I believe, Ray Katzell, with Dick Barrett as chairman. I don't recall too much about the work of the Committee during that year, but subsequent years are vivid memories because I became chair of the E & T Committee, appointed first by Orlo Crissey, and subsequently by others. It was during this time, when Lyman Porter was on the Committee and I was a visitor at Berkeley, that we published in the *American Psychologist* the first published version of the Division 14 guidelines for doctoral education in industrial psychology. There were other official position papers growing out of that effort, and, of course, there have been several subsequent versions of the guidelines done by subsequent committees. But I recall that first published version, building on other unpublished recommendations and committee drafts, initially drafted by Porter and me. At one time or another, Jack Bartlett, Ben Schneider, and various other later Division 14 luminaries worked with me on that committee.

I suppose it was because of those years of working on E & T that I was elected to the Council of Division 14, and was still later appointed Editor of TIP. TIP was in bad shape. It appeared only irregularly and it had very little of substance in it when it did appear. So, I began the building job, getting information together, getting contributors of articles, finding advertisers, writing, etc. I must have written 100 or more feature stories during my four years as editor, none with a by-line. And I did all the scut work. I did the before printing trips to the printer, I did the paste-ups, I picked up the printed newsletters and delivered them to the mail room. There weren't many individual subscriptions in those days, but I handled those too. I

constantly searched for sources of revenue, and managed thereby to defray a substantial amount of the cost. I also squeezed everywhere I could to hold each issue to 28 pages and thus keep costs down. I really enjoyed those four years with TIP. It was gratifying to turn it into something attractive and useful, and set it on the course it is on today.

And, I suppose it is obvious, TIP is the reason I was elected President of Division 14. It certainly wasn't my published research that did it.

University Administration

One of the colloquium speakers we had at Iowa State was our former student, Dave Campbell. He spoke about his work with the Strong, and asked all of us to retake it for his research. We did so, in return for our profiles. When Dave visited, one of his comments to me was, "So you want to be a Dean!" He was right, of course.

I became a Dean of Arts and Sciences at Wisconsin-Parkside in 1970, but that job was not to last. I got caught in the middle of a power struggle between an authoritarian Chancellor and a weak but obstinate faculty. So, chaulking it up to experience, which it clearly was, I moved the next year to Ohio. I became Dean of the Graduate School at Wright State University, Dayton, where I spent the next five very enjoyable and useful years.

It was a satisfying experience. Wright State was then a new university, very much in a growth mode. Most of the growth during my time there was at the graduate level, so I got to preside over many new Master's programs, plus contributing to development of new schools of medicine and professional psychology. I learned a great deal about management and politics during those years, and Wright State's programming moved ahead several important notches. Working with the other institutions in the state system and with the state-level higher education authorities was a difficult but valuable preparation for later work.

In 1976, I was invited to become Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the University of Missouri at St. Louis. UM St. Louis, like Wright State, was a relatively new campus, serving a grossly underserved area, and with high aspirations to do a lot more and do it well. As typical for such situations, the resistances to doing more under conditions of scarce resources is always challenging and sometimes crazy. But we forged ahead, and added quite a number of new programs and emphasis areas. As I look back, though, my sense is that the most fundamental change in that institution during the ten years I was there, and over which I had only marginal influence, was in quality. UM St. Louis was a good place in 1976 and an even better one in 1986. I hope I had something to do with that, but it's hard to say.

Psi Chi

In 1983, I was invited by Paul Lloyd, then President of Psi Chi, to accept appointment as the Psi Chi Historian for one year. That was the beginning of yet another substantial managerial commitment. After one year as Historian, I was elected Midwestern Vice President, and subsequently to the three year rotation of Presidentelect, President, and Past President. It turned out to be a six year tour that I found personally rewarding, and an opportunity to do something useful for the organization. Psi Chi was and is clearly in a major transition on several dimensions, including examination of mission, modification of organizational form, rotation of leadership, relocation of the Central Office, and so on. That transition continues as these words are being written with the imminent retirement of long-term Executive Secretary Ruth Cousins, with the consequent changes that will bring. Psi Chi has been an organization that has contributed significantly to psychology, and the potential for additional future contribution continues to be substantial. What new forms that will take remain under consideration.

Tulsa

In 1986, when a new Chancellor was appointed at UM St. Louis, I resolved that I should move on to something different. I wanted to give the new Chancellor an opportunity to appoint a new staff, but I wasn't satisfied with leaving administration. An entirely different and quite unexpected opportunity came along.

In the spring of that year, someone stuck my name in the hopper for CEO of an unknown consortium in Tulsa organized to bring some public higher ed opportunity to that grossly underserved community. After Wright State and St. Louis, and based on dozens of conversations with Tulsa community leaders, I came to the conclusion that maybe I could handle another development job. I became President and CEO of the University Center at Tulsa.

UCT, where I am today, is a four public university consortium, offering upper division and graduate programs. Development and growth are the watchwords, often against substantial resistances from outside the community. Resources are very short. Suspicions are very high. But student response is strong and we continue to experience heavy growth rates. We have a new campus, beautifully designed and well located, paid for by a City of Tulsa initiative. Given a modicum of state support, and continuation of the wonderful community support experienced so far, the future can only be positive. I am deeply immersed in it and I look forward to continuing.

UCT is a difficult concept for many people to grasp, because it doesn't fit the traditional modes. It is significant to note that while most urban areas in the U.S. received attention from the state higher education establishments during the two decades after World War II, a few did not. And Tulsa is perhaps the largest and most obvious example. In 1982, largely through political pressure from the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, it was decided to make a push for a state university in Tulsa. When it was determined that passing a free-standing university was not politically

possible, a consortium was established as a compromise. However, it wasn't a typical toothless consortium run by the participants. This one had its own Board of Trustees with defined authorities, and the participating universities were assigned programmatic responsibilities. There are many unresolved policy and operational issues yet today, but by and large the venture has been a success in bringing the initial set of 80 undergraduate and graduate programs to Tulsa. A major issue now underway is how to bring the additional 80 or so that are needed but not yet available.

The political issues are central in the UCT development, probably to no one's surprise. The rural influences fear that urban developments, including this one, will detract from their already limited programs. The other higher education institutions, particularly those in smaller communities, fear that growth here will limit their growth and resources. The conservative elements fear anything that appears to have potential for costing significant amounts of tax revenue in the future. And so it goes. There are fears and resistances, but the need is compelling and gradually progress is being made in addressing it.

Somewhat to my surprise, but very much to my subsequent satisfaction, a new personal dimension has emerged from the Tulsa experience. When I first began talking and thinking about moving to UCT, one of the main elements of the new position was to be community affairs, community relations, and community involvement. I had always had a modicum of involvement in various community service activities, but they had never been central and never before defined as part of my job description. Everything I learned about Tulsa pointed to the fact, subsequently confirmed, that it was a community that welcomed people interested and willing to get into things.

It has been nearly four years now of direct and highly interesting community activities. Soon after I arrived I accepted election to a local community action agency. It went on from there into the Urban League, United Way, a local psychiatric center, the Salvation Army, various arts and cultural groups, and the like. Coming at this stage in my career, these organizational involvements, while difficult to merge into a schedule, have added an important dimension to my life. It is my hope that these and similar activities can continue indefinitely regardless of what my job description says.

Themes.

The themes in my lifetime, with the insight of hindsight, look like this to me:

- psychology
- management
- research
- spoken and written language
- human resources

- teaching
- consulting
- accreditation
- professional involvement
- community involvement

It would be very pleasant to be able to say that the history cited above has been "enough". I can't say that. The fact is that I continue to be generally unsatisfied, but not dissatisfied, with the record so far. My wish is to keep things running as long as possible. With retirement in the formal sense in the not too distant future, one begins to consider how to make that phase of life interesting and meaningful. My present thought is to fill it with some combination of avocational activities and professional work. Maybe it is time to reactivate my earlier interests in teaching and consulting.