

**Interviews of the Margaret MacVicar Memorial AMITA Oral History Project, MC 356**  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Institute Archives and Distinctive Collections

**Eddie Goldenberg** – class of 1967

Interviewed by Madeleine Kline, class of 2020

April 20, 2020

## **Margaret MacVicar Memorial AMITA Oral History Project**

Edie Goldenberg (SB Political Science 1967) was interviewed via a video conferencing app on April 20, 2020 by Madeleine Kline (SB Chemistry and Biology 2020). Professor Goldenberg was at home in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and Ms. Kline was at home in a Boston suburb.

Professor Goldenberg grew up in East St. Louis, Illinois. After excelling in high school, she was accepted to MIT, where she intended to focus on math but instead became a political science major. Professor Goldenberg lived in McCormick Hall, took up fencing and sailing, and was a close friend of one of her roommates, Margaret MacVicar—MIT's Dean of Undergraduate Education 1985-1990 and founder of the Institute's Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program—in whose memory this oral history project is named. After graduating, Professor Goldenberg studied local and urban politics, and protest politics, at Stanford University, where she earned her master's degree and doctorate.

Professor Goldenberg became a professor of Political Science and Public Policy at the University of Michigan in 1974 and later became the second tenured female professor in the school's political science department. She served as director of the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy (then the Institute of Public Policy Studies) from 1987-1989, before being appointed Dean of Michigan's College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. During her tenure as Dean (1989-1998), she focused on improving the undergraduate experience—for example, by developing first-year seminars and an undergraduate research program modeled after the one developed by Margaret MacVicar at MIT.

Dismayed by the low turnout among young voters in the 2014 and 2016 elections, Professor Goldenberg founded Turn Up Turnout, a student group aimed at increasing voter registration and turnout among college students in midterm and local elections, regardless of political affiliation. In the months following the recording of this oral history, she and other members of a National Academy of Public Administration task force issued a report outlining recommendations for ensuring fair U.S. elections in 2020, and for fostering public confidence and participation. In that role, and in writings and talks, Dr. Goldenberg has advocated for a number of improvements to the voting system, including expanded access to voting by mail.

Professor Goldenberg was elected to the MIT Corporation in 1999 and became a life member in 2003. She has served on or chaired numerous Corporation's visiting committees and is now a Life Member Emerita. As she has done in several of her roles at Michigan, Dr. Goldenberg has helped MIT to improve its curricula, as well as student life for both undergraduates and graduate students.

KLINE: Thank you so much for taking time to talk with me. I've done a number of these oral history interviews with MIT alumnae, and I've loved working on them. It's a special project.

I hope we'll have a chance to talk a bit about Margaret MacVicar, given that this project is named in her memory, and given that you knew her well.

[In addition to serving as Dean for Undergraduate Education at MIT and creating the acclaimed UROP program, MacVicar earned her SB in Physics (1964) and Sc.D in Materials Science and Engineering (1967) at the Institute, taught physics at MIT, conducted research focused on electronic materials, and was instrumental in the revitalization of the humanities, arts and social sciences. An outstanding teacher, prestigious MIT teaching fellowships are named in honor of MacVicar, who died at age 47 in 1991.]

GOLDENBERG: Maddy, what year are you and what are you majoring in? Can you remind me?

KLINE: I'm a senior, studying from home [due to the recent onset of the COVID-19 pandemic]. I'm studying chemistry and biology, and minoring in Spanish. I'm going to medical school next year. I'm still trying to decide which school to commit to, but I'm looking to do infectious diseases.

GOLDENBERG: Really? What are your top possibilities?

KLINE: I'm either going to go to Johns Hopkins or Harvard.

GOLDENBERG: Those are good choices.

KLINE: As far this interview is concerned, I'd like to start by asking how you grew up, including what your environment was like in your family, and what drew you ultimately to MIT. What were some of your influences? Who were your mentors growing up?

GOLDENBERG: I grew up in East St. Louis, Illinois. It's across the Mississippi from St. Louis, Missouri. My parents both graduated from Washington University in St. Louis. They were both first-generation college graduates. I have three siblings. I'm the youngest.

My dad was an engineer. My mother studied French, and she was a stay-at-home mom, though I think in another time probably would have had a career.

East St. Louis was, and still is, not a very affluent community, but I got a pretty good high school education there. It has since declined in quality by quite a lot.

I knew I was going to go to college, but I didn't know where, and MIT came recruiting. They were one of the very few places from outside the area that came recruiting in East St. Louis. It was at a time when they were trying to diversify their student body by geography and reach out to places.

There was, in my high school, a scholarship for the best science student to go to Cornell. It was a four-year scholarship, but women weren't eligible, so I didn't get that.

**KLINE:** Was that consistent with the messaging you received as a high school student, that young women and young men were treated differently? Also, how did you feel about being interested in the sciences—or in political science, if that's what you were interested in most then—and was that accepted at that time?

**GOLDENBERG:** Well, I was a good student in high school. My dad being an engineer really put an emphasis [at home] on math and science, and not too much 'rinky-dink' stuff (in his view). But he also liked architecture and the arts and music, and so forth. My parents were very tolerant about my being able to study whatever I wanted.

There wasn't a lot of choice at East St. Louis, so if you were college bound, you just took certain courses and that was that. The only real choice was which language you would study, and I studied French. That was my mom's language. Our high school didn't teach calculus, so it was just four years of high school math. I thought I was interested in math. Actually, I had better scores in math and sciences than on my humanities SATs. Also, I liked music, and continued to play piano and flute when I got to MIT.

I graduated high school a semester early, which was in January, and I went to Washington University for a semester and for the summer. I got into Washington University, but I didn't know at that point that I'd gotten into MIT.

When I went to apply for colleges, that wasn't a time when people went on college tours, so I didn't go see anyplace. I'd seen Washington University because we had relatives who lived near the campus, and I knew about Southern Illinois University and the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana, but that was pretty much it.

When I went to apply to college, I looked at the Seven Sisters, for example, some of the women's colleges. My parents said those were too far away; they didn't want me to go that far. But when I got into MIT, my dad said that was OK!  
[LAUGHS]

That was really the only place I applied that was away [from where I grew up]. I thought I would go to Washington U, and that would be fine. It's a good school. Then I had a decision to make after I got in. I decided I was going to take the bold step and go to MIT, go to Boston, so off I went. I thought I was going to major in math, so that made some sense for going to MIT. But when I got there, things changed.

KLINE: What was it like when you got to MIT?

GOLDENBERG: Well, that was back in the day when there were 900 new students each year, but there were fewer than 50 women in the class. So it was, in a way, kind of a strange place to be a woman.

KLINE: Were you expecting that going in?

GOLDENBERG: Not fully, and not what it would really mean. They'd just opened McCormick Hall the year that I went. [McCormick Hall, at 320 Memorial Drive, was built to house women and enable MIT to greatly expand the number of female students admitted each year. The building was funded by Katherine Dexter McCormick, class of 1904, a suffragette and reformer.]

The women who were already there were a bit resentful of being required to live in that dorm. MIT had to get enough people into the dorm to make it pay for itself. We caught some of the others' rebellious spirit: we didn't really want to be forced to live in the dorm, either. It just had one tower back then. [Two towers were built eventually.] And they had what were called parietal hours: They had restrictions on when men could be in the dorm and when we had to be in at night. And we had to take the food plan, which we didn't like very much.

There was a woman at McCormick who was kind of the dorm mommy, and she was very proper. There were all these rumors about how the neckline in McCormick's portrait had been raised an inch or two when it was hung! That atmosphere in McCormick seemed to be trying to take MIT women proper young ladies, imposing a finishing school atmosphere, and it didn't go over very well with the women. So we were a rebellious lot, in a way. Also, MIT wasn't all that welcoming of women. We stood out in our classes, so if we missed or fell

asleep or whatever, we were quickly identified. And some professors wouldn't call on us; some professors kind of picked on us.

In retrospect, I would say I got an excellent education at MIT, but it wasn't a particularly happy undergraduate experience. I went off to graduate school at Stanford [PhD Political Science, 1974]. I often thought I did it backwards—that I should have gone to a more broad-gauged university as an undergraduate and waited to specialize as a graduate student. MIT was definitely 'the Institute.' It's not really a university. It's got a very strong technical bias. And at the time when I decided I wanted to change my major, there were not many majors I could finish in the course of my four years there.

There were some pretty awful professors who thought that women didn't belong there, or that we weren't going to be serious. I was recently on the committee that was trying to raise money for our class's 50th-year gift. I selected the women to call because I had known all of them, and I thought that would be pretty easy. But I found a remarkable amount of bitterness toward MIT on the part of the women from that era and an unwillingness on the part of many of them to make any contributions to MIT, even though they were contributing to their graduate schools—which is, of course, just the reverse of what most people do. The '60s was not a great time to be a female student at MIT.

**KLINE:** When you started, you thought you were going to do math, but how did the switch to political science happen?

**GOLDENBERG:** That was kind of fluky, actually. When I started off, I was behind because of my preparation. The people who had come from Bronx Science, Brooklyn Polytech and places like that didn't have to study a whole lot, and I was really struggling with some of my required courses. In fact, in my first physics class I think I got a D, so it was challenging. I placed out a chemistry because I took chemistry at Washington University and I liked chemistry a lot. But because I placed out, I didn't take more chemistry, which was really a shame.

At that time, there were a lot of required classes—a lot—so our first two years were pretty programmed with required humanities, required physics, required math, required chemistry. We didn't have time for many electives.

I had taken calculus at Washington U, and I had gotten an A. And, interestingly, I decided because I was going to be so challenged with physics, having never really had any decent physics before I came to MIT, that I would retake calculus to ease my initial requirements. I got to do that. I took it again. It covered about

a third more material than I had had at Washington U and I got a B, which is a lesson in terms of what the expectations and the curved grading was like relative to another really good university. And, of course, we were required to take the Greeks and the early Romans too. But because I had placed out of chemistry, I had a little slack in my time.

I ended up taking an elective in political science. It was just a fluke. Political science was part of economics; it didn't exist then as a separate department. I had taken economics as well, and I didn't like economics all that much. But the political science course was being taught by four really famous senior professors, and they developed this course. They're called the Mayflower Generation. You may have heard that expression. They were really quite remarkable professors. Professor Poole was one of them, as were Dan Lerner and Lucian Pye.

[Daniel Lerner taught both economics and political science at MIT, and was best known for his work on modernization theory. Professor Poole, a renowned head of MIT's Center for International Studies as well as chair and founder of the Institute's Political Science Department, was best known for his groundbreaking work on technology and its effects on society. Professor Pye, whose chief discipline was comparative politics, was one of the country's foremost China scholars.]

Then, the next year, political science became its own department, so my junior year [1965, Course XVII] is when that department got established separate from economics. I had taken an accelerated linear math class and bombed in it; not a good choice to do the accelerated one. I decided to change majors, so I looked around. I could have majored in humanities. I could have majored in political science. But because I hadn't continued chemistry and because physics was not my thing, and I wasn't really aiming to become an engineer, really, there weren't that many choices. And there was this great course that I loved, so I just switched majors.

KLINER: Were any of your professors female?

GOLDENBERG: No. There were no female political science professors then, and few, if any, in other departments, even in the humanities.

In any case, that's how I got into political science. It wasn't out of a love of politics really. I have come to love politics quite a bit now, but I didn't back then. I wasn't all that politically involved or aware or savvy.

KLING: Being in college during the 1960s, that didn't inspire an interest in politics at all?

GOLDENBERG: Well, I got more inspired as the '60s went on. But I was there '63 to '67. It's really when I got to graduate school that the anti-war movement-- MIT was 'Engineers for Goldwater.' That's what MIT was like.

While I was at MIT [President] Kennedy was shot—that was a big deal. We all went down from MIT, a group of us, and stood in line at the memorial [at Arlington National Cemetery]. It was a difficult time for the country in a lot of ways, and it awakened in a lot of us more political interest.

Then I went to graduate school at Stanford, which was a completely different political scene. I got quite involved out there, in anti-war activity and so forth. So, yes, the second half of the '60s was a time that accelerated my interest in politics.

KLING: Going back to what it was like to be at MIT—and a woman at the Institute—did you find support systems and communities that were welcoming and mentors, or not? What was that like?

GOLDENBERG: I did in political science. Not that there weren't some unpleasant people in political science, but there were some good ones. Ithiel de Sola Poole was my advisor, and what a lucky draw that was. Back then, we all had to do a thesis. I got involved in a project that led me to do some work on the politics of transportation in St. Louis. It was a local politics thing, and that was quite interesting. It was probably because of Professor Poole that I came to major in political science.

Because the department had just been established, as undergraduates, we could take all the graduate courses, and I took a lot of graduate student courses. I took all sorts of things – for example, the politics of Africa. Unlike the science curricula at MIT, political science was a more flexible curriculum. I could then also pursue some of my interests in music on the side, which was nice.

Being down at the Hermann Building, Building 53, was good, but it was also quite separate from the rest of the Institute. We were looked upon as kind of oddballs, but that was OK. I got to know some graduate students, and I think that's what led me to think about going to graduate school. A lot of the people were going to graduate school, and so I applied for a couple of fellowships. I didn't really know what I was going to do. Anyway, I got the fellowships and ended up going to graduate school. So that part of MIT was supportive. It was a lot more supportive down in Political Science than it had been in the more

technical [science and engineering] departments. We didn't study biology then. What a loss! It just wasn't part of the curriculum. I think I would have really enjoyed biology, but it just wasn't prominent at MIT at all at that time.

KLINE: You had to take chemistry and physics and math but not biology?

GOLDENBERG: That's right.

KLINE: I didn't know that.

You must have known other interesting women students while at MIT.

GOLDENBERG: Oh, I did. They were an impressive group, although there weren't very many of them.

The first two years were especially rough, I'd say; we had exams every Friday. It was an extremely competitive place, not so much friendly. Margaret MacVicar was a tutor in McCormick Hall then, and she helped me get through physics without failing. [LAUGHS]

We would have these meals in the dining room, and everybody would be talking about what grades they got on the tests. It was just really not a warm and fuzzy atmosphere—even there, even with the women, although I did have friends.

We use to study all night. I played bridge. We used to take breaks and play four hands of bridge, and then we would go back to study some more, and then we'd take another break. So yes, I developed some good friends back then. I enjoyed getting reacquainted with a few of them on the Corporation. Other than Margaret—we became very good friends—my closest life-long friends I developed at graduate school, not as an undergraduate.

KLINE: I would love to hear a little bit about graduate school and going forward. You alluded to a little bit how your interests developed more in political science in graduate school, and I'd be interested to hear more about that.

GOLDENBERG: Well, I went off to Stanford. I came in with my own scholarships, which was good. It gave me some independence. Heinz Eulau, while I was there, became the president of the American Political Science Association. A very distinguished political scientist, he kind of adopted me from the minute I arrived. He was engaged in projects related to professionalism, and the definition of professionalism and how those groups cohered and so forth. I got involved in that a little bit, but what I was really interested in back then was urban politics,

local politics. I did a paper when I was at MIT on Black newspapers and the news in Roxbury [a neighborhood in Boston]. I went to Roxbury, did a bunch of interviews. It was part of my local politics class.

As I mentioned, my thesis involved this work on St. Louis, so that got me going in the local and urban politics direction. I ended up doing some work on journalists as professionals with Professor Eulau, and that eventually led me into my future PhD work on protests in politics, which was the subject of my doctoral thesis and my first book.

Stanford was just a completely different atmosphere. We had a very close cohort of graduate students, and the faculty became friends as well—we all hung out. We had an old house with offices, and we used to go drink beer every evening. There was a lot of camaraderie, which was different from what I had had at MIT.

Although, what we used to do in Cambridge was different. There was a place called Elsie's in Harvard Square. We used to get hungry in the middle of the night, when we were studying all night, and we would go down there and buy these enormous sandwiches. [LAUGHS] We would sit around and eat and play bridge.

But again, graduate school was a different environment, and I've stayed close with those folks. Some of them are my very good, dear old friends. I was out there [at Stanford], but when I did my work on protest politics, I came back to Boston. I always thought I would move to Boston. I really liked Boston, and I'd done some work in Jamaica Plain and in Cambridge—more of the urban setting, not so much the suburbs. I spent some time working for the *Boston Globe* for the summer, covering city hall, and that was fun.

That all translated into my work out at Stanford. I came back and I did my dissertation work in Boston and actually lived in Boston for a while. My thesis advisor regarded [the University of] Michigan as the end-all, be-all place to go in political science. It's a very good department. And Michigan has an amazing tradition, most famously in election studies, but also a lot of different areas. When I was on the market, I came for an interview. I decided not to interview at MIT, though they had invited me. I got this job working for Michigan, and there was no turning it down. I think my advisor would have killed me!

I'd gotten spoiled in California, and I thought, "I really don't like the cold weather that much." Boston was about as cold as I wanted to be, and that I would stay in Ann Arbor for a couple of years. It's been such a good intellectual

environment for me here in Michigan that I've stayed a long time. I came here in 1974, and I've been here ever since.

**KLINE:** Having the perspective of studying and working at these three different institutions, and being at Michigan for the longest amount of time, what do you think are some of the biggest changes in terms of women in academia, especially for students?

**GOLDENBERG:** When I was a student at MIT, Margaret [MacVicar] and I made a trip in the South. We got some funding to go visit schools in the South to think about whether MIT should have sororities, because we generally thought that the atmosphere for women at MIT stunk and that it would be improved if we had more women at MIT so that we just didn't stand out as such freakish presence. We wondered whether sororities would make MIT more welcoming to women, and we wrote a report based on what we learned from our trip.

My own sense is that life for women at MIT has just improved enormously. Believe me, if I didn't think that I wouldn't have joined the MIT Corporation and stayed on it all this time. I was very happy when the Wellesley Connection developed and when MIT started loosening up their admissions. [Wellesley students are given the opportunity to take classes at MIT. In a five-year double-degree program, they can earn a BA from Wellesley and an SB from MIT. Or they can just take classes at MIT.]

The MIT women generally were better prepared for college than the men were back then. They were stronger students because MIT only would admit a very few. I don't know that I was such a strong student, but I think their effort to diversify helped me get in, frankly. Anyway, I did OK.

So life has changed a lot for women. It wasn't as troublesome when I was at Stanford; it wasn't that big an issue. We had a number of women who were graduate students.

When I applied to graduate school, I applied to Princeton, and they weren't accepting women. Their policy was, for graduate school, that if you wanted to study something that you could only get at Princeton, they might consider it. Otherwise, forget it.

I had gotten into Yale, which was also an excellent, had a very strong political science department, but it had that Ivy League atmosphere. Stanford was very different: West Coast, more progressive. There were more women. There was

more freedom, so it wasn't all that noticeable then. But when I came to Michigan, it was noticeable again.

I was the second tenured woman in the history of our department [at the University of Michigan].

KLINE: Wow.

GOLDENBERG: And there was what's called the Women's Caucus, which was a group of women graduate students at Michigan. I remember that when I came for my interview, they wanted to meet with me. At that time there was considerable uproar over the war in Vietnam, and there had been discord between the faculty and the students at Michigan. I did meet with the women; I had lunch with them. The faculty thought that was going to be so unpleasant for me, and it was one of the most pleasant interactions I had. [LAUGHS] It was just funny.

Michigan is also a fairly progressive place. The students had been demonstrating on behalf of racial issues and the war and what's his name? God, I should remember, but the guy who was married to Jane Fonda [Tom Hayden] was a Michigan student and who started the SDS. That got its start at Michigan, the Students for Democratic Society, all the lefties. But that was among the students, and the faculty were really not prepared for that. Coming from Stanford, I had come out of an atmosphere where that was pretty common, so I didn't have any trouble relating to the students. It's just that the senior faculty took some time to come around, shall we say.

I will tell you that when I became Dean of Arts and Sciences [at Michigan] later, I was completely unprepared for what an uproar it would be to have a woman Dean of Arts and Sciences. I was the first woman Dean of Arts and Sciences. I had been the first woman director of our policy institute [the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy]. That was not a big deal, but this was a very big deal, and people wanted to talk to me about what it meant to be a woman dean. I just wanted to be a good dean—I wasn't really thinking about being a woman dean. So that was still part of the culture.

When I was dean, we didn't have department chairs who were women. I mean, how were we ever going to have women deans if we didn't have chairs of departments who were women? If we didn't acknowledge women in distinguished professorships, if we didn't promote women, how were we ever going to have women who are prepared to become leaders of universities? So that changed a lot while I was dean: I appointed a number of women chairs and tried to mentor people.

We've come a long way. We've had a woman president [at Michigan]. And, of course, MIT has had a woman president [neuroscientist Susan Hockfield, MIT president from 2004-2012]. It was a big deal. Harvard's woman president [historian Drew Gilpin Faust, the university's president from 2007-2018]-- Part of the idea was that as a woman, it should be OK to be above average, rather than exceptional, to be regarded as OK. In other words, we were held to a higher standard. And if women didn't excel in these roles, then people didn't want to appoint more women because they said, "Women can't do a good job." Well, that's not reasonable. I think the idea was it had to be all right to be average in an above-average setting and a woman. That had to be OK and not just that we had to always be at the top of everyone's game in order to be acknowledged as successful.

So that's changed a lot, I'm glad to say, and our department has changed a lot. The profession has changed. I mean, there's plenty more to be done. We did studies of gender equity in pay. We did lots of things where we had to make adjustments in the way we did business.

While I was dean, we had the first policies related to childbearing and child adoption, and it had to be more family friendly. There are a lot of things that have changed in my lifetime.

**KLINE:** It sounds like you've played a very active role in making those changes at Michigan.

**GOLDENBERG:** I did, although when they wanted to interview me as a candidate to become dean, I turned them down at first. I thought they were just monkeying around, that they just wanted to show that they'd reached out, and then they were going to select some guy. I didn't really take them seriously. I talked to Margaret MacVicar, by the way, and she said, "Well, you ought to go through the interview because you'll learn a lot, whether you get the job or not." So I decided to go through the interview, and lo and behold, they offered me this job. It was a big decision on my part because it really represented a career change.

Arts and Sciences at Michigan has two-thirds of the undergraduates at Michigan. And we have half of the graduate students at Michigan. So it's like a college within-- I had between 1,000 and 1,200 faculty who I was responsible for, lots of staff, tons of departments and programs, and thousands and thousands and thousands of students all over the place.

There's no way that I could have done that job and maintained the research activity that I had been engaged in, and that made it a big decision. It wasn't an easy decision because it's not really why I got into this; I really liked teaching. But I didn't teach the whole time I was dean. I did other kinds of mentoring, but it was different. And now I'm teaching freshmen again. It's kind of nice.

KLINER: That's wonderful.

One thing our oral history project is very interested in is the development of the UROP program by Margaret MacVicar. [MIT's Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program, which supports research partnerships between MIT undergraduates and faculty] I love the UROP program—I'm so grateful for it. I've heard some things about a similar program at Michigan and am curious to hear about that.

GOLDENBERG: I thought UROP is a great program. It wasn't there for me when I was a student.

KLINER: When it was developed at Michigan, were you still in close contact with Margaret?

GOLDENBERG: Oh, yes. And we named our program UROP as well. That really got going under me when I was dean. It seemed so sensible for a research university. We have 19 schools and colleges at Michigan. We have a medical school, and we have pharmacy and nursing and all these different fields. A lot of these programs, like medicine, don't have undergraduates, but it opened them up. We have a law school, and the program opened them up to undergraduates by doing research with faculty.

We started our UROP program initially to help first-year students, get them engaged right away. There was a fair amount of research going on for juniors and seniors once they declared their major, but not for first- and second-year students. So that's where it got its start, and we ramped it up pretty quickly.

KLINER: That's great.

GOLDENBERG: That's something that got adopted really from MIT. You know, there are many good things and a lot of creativity coming out of MIT, and my MIT education gave me credibility with our science departments when I was dean.

Interestingly, chemistry at Michigan really came into its own [during this period]. I spent a lot of time on chemistry—I could have moved into the chemistry department! Now it's really a much, much improved department.

But having that MIT background did help in lots of ways. That's why I say I got a really good education at MIT. I don't fault MIT at all about my education. It wasn't a happy-go-lucky, warm environment, but I value very much what I learned in my classes. And I look to MIT. I learn from MIT all the time from my activities on the Corporation.

KLINE: Would you mind saying more about your time on the Corporation—how that came about and what that's been like?

GOLDENBERG: Yes, well, there weren't many women on the corporation [when I joined].  
[LAUGHS] But let me back up.

The provost at Michigan who hired me as dean was Chuck Vest [Mechanical Engineering Professor Charles M. Vest, MIT president from 1990 to 2004; president of the National Academy of Engineering from 2007 to 2013]. I had the great pleasure, when he went to MIT as president, of roasting him. I really did a job on him at the dean's meeting!

I was a presidential nominee to the MIT Corporation: Chuck brought me onto the corporation. I didn't quite know what I was getting into, but I said sure. Chuck and I were friends, and I thought, "OK, it's my alma mater after all." I did my five years, which would normally have been my term on the Corporation. It was just when MIT needed to do a search for a new president. I had been on the executive committee for a couple of years, and I think the other members found it useful to have an academic on the executive committee. (I still think it's important for MIT to have academic presence on our executive committee.) Well, they decided to make me a life member. In part, I think they wanted my help with the presidential search, which is the one that brought Susan Hockfield to MIT.

Chuck was a very decent man. I had worked for him at Michigan, and got to know him well. One thing he did as president of MIT that not everyone knows is that he had the discretion to direct some major gifts, and he directed a lot of funds to SHASS [MIT's School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences]. Also, that in addition to his accomplishments as an engineer he had deep roots in the study of history.

In any case, I have learned a great deal serving on the Corporation. I'm about to go emeritus. I've chaired the Political Science Visiting Committee, it seemed like, forever; I'm still on it. But I also chaired the Committee to the Dean for Undergraduate Education.

One of my initiatives when I became dean at Michigan was to improve, invigorate the undergraduate experience at Michigan. That was part of what UROP was, but it also involved creating a first-year seminar experience. There were a lot of changes made in our undergraduate experience. That was one of my major initiatives. I learned a lot about undergraduate education that was broader in a lot of ways than what I had experienced at MIT.

I chaired that MIT visiting committee for a while, just as the Office for Undergraduate Education was becoming established, and I've been on a variety of other visiting committees as well. I've been chairing Linguistics and Philosophy most recently, and I'm just ending that. I've also been on the Chemistry and CJAC.

MIT's very unusual in the way it goes about these things, not only because the visiting committee structure is unique but because there are all these non-academics on each committee. Every good university does evaluations of their departments or their schools, and they might have some industry presence. If it's a chemistry department, they might have people from industry help with the review along with academics.

But [at MIT] here are these very smart people who are highly successful in business, but they may have no background in academics, and they're going in to evaluate an academic department. Of course, MIT does have academics on visiting committees as well, but it's a challenging thing to manage one because sometimes people from the private sector have ideas that just don't really make sense in an academic environment. The cultures are different. It's been interesting to operate in that environment and to deal with members of the board who love MIT very much and really want MIT to flourish and do all that it can do, not just on behalf of its students but on behalf of society and research and the whole schmear.

It's been an interesting time, and I have learned a lot. Sometimes I felt I was working more for MIT than for Michigan. [LAUGHS] They had me on so many different things at times, especially when I was on the Executive Committee. Oh my god! But that's all going to change pretty soon, and that's OK. They have to bring in younger people. They need to renew the board on a regular basis, and they're doing that. I've gotten quite close with a number of people on the Corporation and at MIT, and it's been a good experience.

Over the course of these years, the Corporation has helped MIT become more diverse. And developing the UROP program led to another fundamental change.

UROP and programs like it at Michigan and around the country are changing the relationships between students and professors: both get to learn about each other as people, and a deeper kind of learning often takes place. And UROPs definitely help students mature as young adults.

KLING: Switching gears back to your own academic work, I'm very curious about the student voter initiatives you've organized at Michigan. Could you please talk about that, especially given the upcoming election, allegations of voter suppression and all of that?

GOLDENBERG: At Michigan, when I stepped down as dean, I started a program called Michigan in Washington (MIW), which is a great program. Students go to Washington, D.C. for the semester. It's a very demanding academic and internship experience. I did that for 13 years or so and I decided it was time to do something else. I had gotten involved with the Obama administration barely, around issues of inspiring more underrepresented minority kids to go to college, and I had planned to do some work on that. I had a sabbatical coming, and the colleague chosen to succeed me as director of MIW said she would take it on if I would stay on an extra semester and let her basically follow me around so that she could learn how to do this. I said OK, because I cared a lot about the program. It has a required research course.

KLING: This is the Washington program?

GOLDENBERG: Yes, the Michigan in Washington program has a required research course. Students do individual projects. I agreed to teach that course in the fall of 2016. I was in Washington, teaching these students—17 students doing 17 projects—and the [presidential] election occurred. There were more Hillary supporters than there were Trump supporters among the students because the Michigan undergraduate student body tends to be a bit more liberal than not.

I was worried about the Trump supporters the whole first part of the semester and whether they were being harassed [LAUGHS], and then the election happened. I had a whole series of Friday meetings scheduled with my students, one-on-one, to talk about their research progress. This was the Friday after the Tuesday elections. They started coming into my office, one after another, and they would burst into tears, or they would say things like, "I can't do my project—it's meaningless." Or, "I'm never going to vote again. This is just the end of the world!" One of them had been throwing up for 24 hours! [LAUGHS] It was really a mess. I listened to this, and at the same time, the students back in Ann Arbor were protesting on our campus. I thought, "Oh my gosh, this is a mess." At that time, it turned out that Tufts University had started something

called the National Study of Learning Voting and Engagement (NSLVE), which, started in 2014. It reported campus by campus, student registration and turnout numbers. That was the beginning of the data. And I learned what our data were, and I said, "This is absurd." We had 14% of our eligible students vote in the last midterm, and they're protesting on campus? There's something very wrong here. They care a lot, and they didn't show up. So what is this, right?

I talked to a couple members of Congress, and they just didn't think young people got it. It was clear that the students cared a lot, but it wasn't clear that we had done – as a political scientist, I sort of took this personally—that we had done a good job in explaining how important voting is. That if you really care about issues, voting matters.

So I dumped my plans for a sabbatical. I came back to Ann Arbor and I started working. I formed a group called Turn Up Turnout, and I corralled some of my Michigan in Washington students and others to join that group. I talked to our president about starting a Big Ten Voting Challenge, which would, we thought, stimulate more activity on the part of the students. He was willing to do that, and the thing just took off.

I applied for a couple of grants to work with research universities around the country. I got on MIT's case because MIT had had only 11% turnout. They weren't participating in Turbo Vote, they weren't doing anything. But there were a lot of schools like that.

I started visiting with different schools and developed a set of things that schools could do to get more active and to help their students get registered and cast their ballots. There was a lot of blame going on. "Students don't care." "They're not interested." "They don't get it." And I knew that wasn't true.

But I also learned, as I got into it, that it's hard for students to get registered to vote. It's harder than it should be. And it's hard to vote. It's not easy if they want to vote absentee or whatever. So instead of getting into this blame game, there's a very active national movement now to promote student voting. What is interesting is that as I visited places like Georgia Tech and talked to Carnegie Mellon, Caltech and others-- There's this image that especially the students at those schools could care less about politics and elections. They don't have time for this. And that's just not true.

MIT demonstrated that. They got going, and they tripled their turnout between 2014 and 2018. Yes, it's still lower than it should be, but it's higher than it was, and that's a big deal. I'm still very engaged in this work, not just on our campus,

but across our state of Michigan, and around the country as well. I just think it's important.

In the fall, I'll teach two courses. One of them is on student voting, and one of them is a joint course with our film program where students will develop public service announcements, videos, basically, to promote student voting. We did this once before. It was very successful. The students did a great job. We have a distribution team. They got lots of hits. They were up on YouTube. It's a whole kind of new endeavor, and I'm going to do that. Then, at the end of December [after the 2020 election], I'm going to retire. [LAUGHS] That's the plan.

KLINE: Well, it'll definitely be an exciting time to be taking those courses this fall. Who knows what that's going to look like?

GOLDENBERG: I don't know whether we're even going to be back on campus in the fall, so we're now developing lots of online capability.

KLINE: I would think if we're not back on campus, those kinds of efforts would be even more important.

GOLDENBERG: They are going to be very, very important, yes. So that's my passion right now.

KLINE: That's really exciting to hear about.

Winding this up, I'm wondering whether there's anything else you want to say about Margaret MacVicar—and if there's anything else I haven't touched upon in my questions.

GOLDENBERG: I think we've covered a lot of territory.

I would say that I think Margaret was an extraordinarily talented person, and she died way too young. She would have been president of a prestigious university, and she would have been a great one. She was courageous. She really believed in education and, as you know, was the first undergraduate dean at MIT and really made a mark on the quality of the experience just generally.

She was a dear friend and had enormous impact on me. I think you can tell. As I got involved in administrative things, we talked all the time—and she had good advice for me. I tried to do the same for her, although she was ahead of me a little bit.

I feel very fortunate to have known her. She certainly made my experience at MIT very special. Although she was two years ahead of me, we were roommates at one point, and I don't know what would have happened if she hadn't tutored me (and others) in physics.

When it comes to myself, I'd say that I've become interested not just in voting, but my last book, after I stepped down as dean, was all about higher education [*Off-Track Profs: Nontenured Teachers in Higher Education*, co-authored with John Cross (MIT Press 2009)]. I'm very interested in how we make our universities better, what it takes to do that, and the student voting just fits right into that. That's just one activity of many that universities were ignoring but aren't ignoring anymore and need to pay attention to.

It's been an interesting journey and one that I don't really expect to end just because I retire. But I'm ready. I'm ready for a change. [LAUGHS]

So, Maddy, good luck with all of this.

KLINE: Thank you so much. It's been so interesting to talk to you. I feel lucky to have gotten a chance to do that.

GOLDENBERG: Well, I'm really glad to have done this. Thank you.