

**INTERVIEW WITH
GLEN URBAN
Sloan Oral History Series
MAY 9, 2012**

B: Bob McKersie
G: George Roth
U: Glen Urban

G: All right. It is May 9, and this is George Roth and Bob McKersie interviewing Glen Urban.

B: Good. I guess a place to start, Glen, is telling us a little bit about what prompted you to come to MIT back in the 1960s. What was it about the Sloan School/MIT that pulled you this way?

U: Well, it's an interesting story. I had a bachelors and master's degree from the University of Wisconsin in Business and Engineering. And the career choice was to go into a deferred job, stay in school, or go to Vietnam. So it seemed like the best choice was to stay in school. So I started a Ph.D. program at Northwestern and end of the first year you take generals, and second year you start down the program. I fell into a thesis. So about January of the second year I had my thesis pretty well in hand. And Phil said, "Why don't you interview?" I said, "Okay." Talked to a group of schools, and MIT was, as usual, late in the market, hadn't filled a position by February, or something. So I came out and talked to the folks out here. It looked like the kind of stuff I was doing, things with computers and marketing and computers, that MIT was on the edge of the frontier there; and MIT was high-tech computers, seemed like a natural fit. So it was not a big search and screening; it was an opportunity. I thought maybe I should stay in the Ph.D. program another year. But because the opportunity was so good, I said, "Well, let's do it." By the time I got here, I was just 26.

G: That was 1966?

U: 1966, yes.

G: I remember this from the 150th interview, and in some ways it continued to offer you a deferment.

U: Well, at the time I came here, you would be deferred if you were in an academic position. Then if you were in an academic position at an institution that does critical defense work, and so forth. By the time I got up to the random part I just didn't get drawn. There was a point where I could have – my number was pretty high. And then, eventually, I just got too old, and my number was off.

G: You're not the only person who's mentioned Vietnam as a reason for staying or being here.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

2

U: I don't think the choice of MIT versus somebody else was affected at all by that. It was just what was exciting, what was going on, and stuff that we started at Northwestern. I remember back at the University of Wisconsin, the first computer when I was a senior was a 1620 IBM, which is like 1/1000th of the amount of digital capacity that I have in my watch now. We did our first programming in binary code. Northwestern had a Control Data machine, a bit machine. You carried around boxes of punch cards. You punched them and validated them. They eventually ended up under my furniture, holding up my couch. But MIT was really the place to be for computers at that point.

B: So you finished your dissertation here? You hadn't quite completed it at Northwestern....

U: That spring, I wrote it up, probably in March. I really thought I would probably stay on another year and finish the thesis. I remember my wife and I said, "Well, let's see if we can get a draft." We sat at this table with – remember the mimeograph technology where we had purple ink on the back of papers and razor blades you scraped off? [Laughs] So we did this 200 pages of mimeo, handed off, put our skis on the car, drove around to the thesis committee, dropped off the thesis, and went out skiing for a week. Came back and I thought, "They're going to have a lot I have to do, and we'll hold off the MIT thing for a year." I got back and met the committee.

They said, "You're not going to submit a thesis like this, are you?"

And I said, "What do you mean?"

They said, "Well, these figures are all in the wrong formats. You've got to change the formats of the figures." That was about the only thing. So basically, with minor revisions—and MIT came through with the offer—I said, "Okay. Thesis is done. I guess I'll go to MIT."

B: One of the things we're interested in is how groups come together. So who was here in the small group that you joined? Where were you physically housed?

U: The people here were really exciting. Arnie Amstutz was here. Don't know if you remember him. Arnie was faculty track and doing micro analytic simulation with a guy at Stanford, Henry Claycamp. They wrote books on micro analytic simulation, customer flow through decision processes with a thousand simulated customers—way ahead of their time. Arnie was also a Juilliard concert pianist graduate. A really interesting guy.

John Little was here. Dave Montgomery was here. Dave had just come a year before.

So those three guys were big center of gravity for just what I wanted to do. Who else was here? You want where, you said? Geographically?

B: What building were you –

U: In the library building, the Herman Building.

B: E53, right. The Herman Building.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

3

U: On third floor, far corner. The Management Science Group was on that floor. So you had Dave Ness, and Chris Sprague in the Computer Science part. Stu Madnick, Information Systems, Jack Rockart, I think was here at that time. Zenon was there. The year I came a lot of young people came. Michael came. Stu came. Jeremy Shapiro. I think there were – Sloan might have hired eight or ten young people.

G: I think you mentioned ten in your MIT 150 interview, who came that year.

U: It was an exciting time. You certainly had a good group, Jay Galbraith was in Operations. Warren Seering, maybe. I'm not sure. Maybe he was a little later. So it was a really exciting time, young people coming in, new directions, a lot happening. Everybody looking at impact. Warren [Bennis] was here. Ed Schein. And what was my third name – I can't remember – with Warren and Ed? The other ... Don Marquis.

B: Ed and Tom Allen worked closely with Marquis, didn't they?

U: Yeah. You think of Warren, Dennis, Ed Schein, and Don Marquis – that is a real core set of people, along with Jay Forrester, people here a long time before I got here. I think Bill Pounds was in Operations when I interviewed that spring. He was a young professor who subsequently, at a very young age, became dean, of course. By the time I got here in the fall, I think Howard had moved on.

B: Yes. He became Dean when Howard became President of MIT.
Now, the cluster of Ph.D. students has always been a really defining characteristic of your group and Marketing. What was the situation with Ph.D. students when you were here in the late 1960s? And maybe, you can move forward, because at some point, you folks developed a wonderful synergy with Ph.D. students and faculty.

U: I'm trying to think of the earliest people. Shortly after I got here, John Hauser, who was in Operations Research, came over to Marketing, and John and I worked together. I was kind of his pseudo advisor. John Little was his official advisor. But John Hauser and I co-authored the paper that was his thesis plus our extensions of it, which turned out to be a major paper for both of us. Other people at that time, like Len Lodish, who would have been late '60s, then went on to Wharton. I'm trying to think whether he was ... We were admitting people interdepartmentally through the OR Center, as well as the Sloan School at that point. I think our primary flow was through the OR Center, initially.

G: Did you work through the OR Center as well?

U: I've always been a member, but I wouldn't say I – probably my primary center of gravity is Sloan rather than the OR Center.

G: Maybe you could help us understand how that was constituted and connected to Sloan, or if Sloan people ...

U: Yeah. John Little's really the person to do that because he was the first OR Ph.D.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

4

of MIT. I think it came out of WWII when operations research was used for decoding messages, search algorithms for submarines, radar detection.

John was working with some core people in Engineering who got interested in interdisciplinary algorithms, computation, and intelligence around operations. Then math programming became a big part of that.

I'm trying to think whether before I came, whether John was director of the OR Center. I know he was director for a while. So there were a lot of interactions with the OR Center, and a lot of people who were there. John was making his transition from his work in hydraulics and dams and flows, to marketing, which I think a number of people got attracted here through John's shift toward advertising and budgeting control.

G: One of the questions we're want to go forward on this is the development of centers, because I think they played a big role in the School. I'm always curious: this OR Center was probably one of the first centers in ...

U: It was an Institute center, which had Engineering and Sloan people, primarily. Jerry Shapiro was over there. Probably Gordon Kaufman, Statistics?

Gordon certainly goes back a lot. But I would follow up with John. I think he can give you a better picture on that.

By the time I was on board, the OR Center was a well-defined entity. People were admitted to the OR Center, with their Ph.D. program. I know John Hauser was admitted there first, and then did his thesis. My recollection is Len, too, but I would have to check.

At that time the Marketing group was taking through two portals, the OR Center and Market group Sloan Ph.D. program.

B: Right. Tracking the Marketing group, you mentioning the input from OR, maybe it's important to have a few comments, Glen, about how your Marketing group has developed over time, because I know you've brought in psychology. You've developed a really multi-disciplinary approach to Marketing. Is there some way to characterize that journey?

U: I think we were starting with the quantitative side. We had Dave Montgomery, and me, and Arnie, and John. We had some senior lecturers that did the Sloan Fellows Senior Executive teaching. I'm trying to think when was the first time we brought in a behaviorist. But the field in which we operated clearly started to segment into the quantitative people, the classic management people, and behavioralists. So we said, "Well, do we want to be a group? Or do we want to be specialized in this? Or do we want to widen?"

It was Rick Bagozzi, I think, who was one of our earliest behavioral hires. He was here for several years and left. We made two or three attempts to try to hire a behavioralist, young ones and senior ones. But they didn't stay. Eric Johnson was here for a while, an important behavioralist. Eventually Dick Thaler was visiting. We kept trying to pull those people in because we wanted to be across all disciplines.

At the same time, a classic management part, like the Phil Cutler part of Marketing declined a little bit. So it was quantitative and behavioral. Then economics came in as

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

5

another dimension of people looking at marketing problems. We wanted to have all three of those. So Drazen Prelec was a real coup in pulling the behavioral area to somebody who was really here. So it was a 25-year effort to become multi-disciplinary. Then we hired Birger Wernerfeldt as the first economist. So it was very quantitative as the last ten years unfolded. We basically filled out with Duncan in Economics as well, and then began hiring young people.

I think we achieved what we wanted to. We had hoped that would result in a lot of cross-disciplinary work, and I think we've had some of that. But, the field of Marketing really has become almost separate segments, separate journals, separate promotion letter writing. For me, that's an alarming trend because I'd hoped not just us but everybody in the field would be much more interdisciplinary.

B: So there are sub-fields within different journals.

U: Yes. The behavioralists publishing JCR and Management Science was doing do marketing science.

B: Does that also describe how Ph.D. students align themselves within the group?

U: Yes. Unfortunately. I had hoped that wouldn't be the case, but hiring and PhD students tend to be counted as you are a behavioralist or you're not, or you're an economist or you're not. And it's not just here, it's the whole field of marketing.

Anyway, we had a vision. We succeeded in some dimensions, and actually probably were much more interdisciplinary than a lot of schools. I'm doing a project right now with Renee Gosline, who's a young sociologist. I've got one going on with Catherine Tucker, who's an economist. So there is in our group—because it's small and we're all geographically in the same place—quite a bit of interaction, particularly around some of these new media things, new changes that are coming into this that drive you to put the technology with the response.

B: Okay. I think we can shift. George, you were intrigued by Glen, when he was dean. And you were wondering when Glen became dean was, and what he wanted to do.

G: What the status of that strategy was, and where it's gone, and where he sees it now.

U: When Eli started this hiring, it really was a disciplinary focus that Sloan was going to bring some theory to bear. So in the early days, there was the MIT model with disciplines and theory, and there was the Harvard model, which was teaching cases. So somebody at Harvard got promoted by good teaching and good case writing, and somebody here got promoted by good disciplinary research. Then over time schools aligned around those two models. Most moved to the theory side; some – Darden and Harvard – staying on the case side.

About the time—maybe a little before I was dean—people started to say, “Well, maybe there's a middle ground.” I think Stanford moved into that middle ground with faculty who could contribute to the basic discipline but were also good teachers and had relevance as

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

6

well. I think when we did our strategic planning, it was Abe and Bill and Lester, who all did retreats. I don't think we've done nearly as many retreats as we used to in those days. Remember, we went to the War College down here, or we'd go to Cape Cod, too.

I took people to Cape Cod on one of mine, on three-day sessions. So it was very participatory. I think people wanted the schools to be great and build off of its current capabilities, but recognize what's happening. I remember coming out of those things thinking, "We need to grow. We need to have better public relations. We need to turn out students who can succeed in the management world, not just specialists." I remember there was a time – in fact, I think I even handled the task force – should we have two masters' degrees, one that is specialized, and one that is general management? We'll make the general management one a one-year, and the specialized two years.

We put in the accelerated general program. That was one of the few programs that was dropped after it was implemented. The view was, "OK, let's try to take our one program and see if we can do both." So we need teachers who can do relevance, who need theory and discipline.

So I think teaching ratings became more important. When I came, we didn't even have teaching ratings. Then there was a point where teaching ratings came in, but it was so controversial that there were teaching ratings, but no name.

B: (Laughs) That's right.

U: Do you remember that? And then there was a big set-to when the names were associated with the teaching ratings. And then they were reviewed in the Personnel Committee.

I think the model became, there are two ways to succeed: maximize research subject to a teaching constraint, or maximize teaching subject to a research constraint. Most people were still on the research one. When I was dean, I think it was that period of "let's grow, let's be more relevant, let's be more known, let's make sure we're turning out students who have good skills." We had the basic disciplines in the organization side with Organization Studies, Leadership, etc., to do a lot of that.

It's interesting to me that even after all the changes we've made – which I think are really substantive – the perception from employers hasn't changed that much. They still tend to see Sloan as more specialists. Not as much as it was, but it long affects you, and is part of its shadow, because it's MIT. Wasn't it about our era that we renamed the school?

I remember I got my wrists slapped by the provost because they said, "You didn't get permission to call it MIT Sloan School and create a logo." And I said, "I'm sorry," but we kept it. The idea was that we would gain from the reputation for excellence and visibility, and we'll overcome any shadow effects with program changes. I think it was good marketing for the school to be MIT/Sloan, and we gained a lot from that. We contrast it to Carnegie, because when we came in 1966, Carnegie was one of the top schools. It was Harvard, MIT, Carnegie, Chicago, maybe. And Carnegie slipped off the edge of the table because they never adapted. They split their school up into two parts, the public school and a private school.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

7

B: The name now, for GISA school, somebody endowed it. Heinz is the public.

U: At that time Carnegie was viewed as the same breath as MIT.

B: ... had Herb Simon and Lee Bock and it was really a powerhouse.

U: Much of the dean's job, through the last 20 years, for all the deans has been to not get lost out of the lead pack, because the lead pack is tearing along. And we've got to be moving really fast just to keep up. They say "run with the big dogs." And run with them or you eat dust. So we had to grow, we had to get star faculty, we had to expand our programs to pay for all that. We had to be relevant in new ways, research centers, international.

And that wasn't the whole stream of deans. Probably Lester started the ball rolling. I did some things. Dick did. Dave's doing a great job. I think our model for deans has been, say in contrast to Northwestern, we have one person for what? How long was Jacobs there? 20 some years?

B: A long time. John Jacobs, right.

U: We were more of a relay team, best handoffs. But I think the integrity of the strategy was pretty good along most all of those deans. Expand the school, become global, add new programs, add new budget, keep really strong researchers who are leaders in their field but require teaching and maybe a little more tolerance for a mix of faculty with different skills. You contrast it to Harvard now, who moved away from the case-only model by hiring people from here, among other things. They said, "OK, people who brought a research focus in." And then they found incompatibility with tenure, new roles, and old rules. So I understand they're really two tracks. You have the tenure track which are researchers, and you've got these professors that practice and they're more case teachers, from what I understand. So you could actually go to Harvard now and not teach the basic marketing course. You could be doing the advanced course for Ph.D. and still get tenure, which would be unheard of in the old days. You probably still have to write a case or two, symbolic almost, but people on the research track are evaluated by the same criteria as Sloan. Like Elie Ofek, who just got tenure there a year or so ago. His letter of writing would probably have been the same at Sloan as it was at Harvard.

So the winning model is building Stanford better, it's doing both research and teaching relevance and global things. Maybe Stanford has actually slipped a bit, do you think? They were, for this mid-period, kind of the... When you put it all together, I think they're definitely still out there, but I don't see them as so much a leadership school as they were.

B: I can't calibrate that. But in terms of the evolution of Sloan, would you add to what you just said the fact that we shifted from being a management school to a business school? One of the things you mentioned...

U: From a business to a management. When we came, it was a School of Industrial Management.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

8

B: Well, we did public-sector programs and health programs, which we don't do any more. Another transition has been to the MBA without the thesis, etc. So now we are much more of a generic business school than we were when we started.

U: Yes. I remember back in maybe the 1970s when I was head of the public-sector program. I think 25% of the students wrote theses in public sector at one point. Then we got to the '80s and '90s where it was much more career and money, which had a negative effect in some ways because the students wanted to get jobs. And we finally realized that. We didn't even have much hiring staff in the early days. We didn't have an alumni organization. There were three women, right? Gertrude Burns, Miriam Sherburne, and Esther Merrill. They were the total staff of the School. Now we have how many hundred? It's great. Development of the alumni, job placement. I don't know how many new programs we have now. Every dean for a long time talked about cutting back the number of programs, but every dean ended up adding. Kind of like Coca Cola, like 25 flavors. Sloan education was just our big pressure. And I think we responded to those pressures due to some good deans getting around some constraints.

G: One of the things you mentioned in your 150th interview, which relates to what you were just saying, is that there used to be dean's dinners.

U: You mean the deans of the other business schools?

G: The Living Deans' dinner, it was the previous deans that met with you?

B: Lester and Abe and...

U: Yeah, and we did those. There was also this other group of seven deans. The private schools had—I think it was quarterly or every six months—this all-day meeting twice a year, full-day meetings when the deans would talk. It was through Harvard Business School.

G: Still goes on.

U: Yeah, still goes on but that was an interesting change because that was the time when it was all confidential, and deans could sit down and talk about what they were doing and what their problems are. There might have been a little bit of gamesmanship, but it was a lot of open compass. I think it still goes on today. When I came in as dean, we had a dinner with all the living deans at my house. Howard Johnson was probably 72 then.

G: What do you remember about Howard and what his priorities were and what was really motivating him in his role as dean? I think that's something we can't get anywhere else.

U: Yeah, well, that's a little bit before my time. By the time I got here, he was president.

G: Right. But his speaking about his priorities for the Sloan School.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

9

U: For the school. I don't recall any specific thing from Howard. I think the general consensus from all the deans was along the track we said. You've got to have excellence of faculty, we've got to be responsive to the market. We're innovators, we've got to stay on the innovative track. And we probably have to increase our scale because we're small relative to others, but we shouldn't aspire to be a Wharton. We have to be a little bigger to have the impact and visibility. So I sense there's quite a bit of coherence across the deans.

B: One area though where there's been a difference of opinion over the years has been how do we define ourselves vis-à-vis MIT. And you alluded to that earlier in terms of MIT/Sloan. So you had a vision, but other deans had other ideas.

U: Yeah, Abe was a little more centric here, and maybe Bill Pounds. Have to talk to Bill on that issue. Bill was more judicial as a dean; Abe was more directed. By the time we got Lester, the view was, "What are the strengths for the school?" And one of the big strengths was that you're part of MIT. You have all these other centers and all this power, etc.

The Leaders for Manufacturing Program ... I'm trying to think, were you deputy dean at that time also? So you and I were the deputy deans. One of big jobs was to sell the Leaders for Manufacturing program. What was the dean's name in engineering at that point?

B: Wilson.

U: I don't remember his first name. So that was really close working. We were making calls on companies and partnership things. And that was one of the major organizational integration success stories for Sloan, which really kicked off Sloan as, "We're part of the same thing."

B: Yeah, the LFM is a major story for how Sloan is connected and probably today viewed within MIT.

U: And also MIT's strategy involving partners, designing innovative curriculum jointly with companies. So that was a major program and a big success of that. After that, it wasn't hard to talk about MIT/Sloan because we had gotten major ties on that. We've always had historical ties with Economics. Now we've got ties with Brain and Cognitive Science, all the OR people, Energy came in about that time. Energy Initiatives have always been there for the last 35 years, right? John Deutsch's big push on the Energy Lab. So I think MIT has a big strength in Media Lab. I think every dean since Lester has been really strongly pushing that.

B: It was Dick Schmalensee who worked out the current financial arrangement between Sloan and MIT. I know that was a struggle for Lester, to work out something that we felt was fair.

U: I think every dean had those deal parameters on the top of his agenda. What usually happened was everything was a special case. So central administration would squeeze down the core things, and then whenever we'd add a program, we'd negotiate separately and get something or not, or how much we'd get. I think we were pretty successful generally in getting incremental revenue to the School for new programs.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

10

Then Dick said, "Look, we've got to get rid of all this." Every special case was like a layer cake. Talking about everything was special. He tried to get to a more universal formula when we were talking about undergraduates and out-of-course students and so forth. I don't know what the state of that is now, but I would guess there's probably more new special cases added onto Dick's.

B: As we develop new programs. Right.

U: Sloan deans have been pretty effective in negotiating those things. We certainly grew more than most schools at MIT.

B: You've mentioned a number of things that could be big accomplishments, big story lines for the School. As you think about Sloan over the years, what should we be most proud of? This is the question that the dean's asking for the celebration.

U: I think we should really be proud of our core MBA. We have to adapt to these new needs, moving away from theses, more general management, like giving people the flexibility if they want to, to go into the core of production or operations or whatever. I think our basic MBA is well recognized and our salaries are good. I think we created a lot of nice niche programs that met needs, like Leaders for Manufacturing, the new Executive MBAs, the finance program, global cooperation. We should feel really good about those. I think we've made a lot of progress on entrepreneurship over the years. Ed was a working alone for a long time.

Then when I was deputy dean for research, we formed the Management Technology Center. I can't remember who was trying to get money from Ken Morrison and he said, "Why don't I come and help?" So Ken came and helped to build the entrepreneurship program. We started hiring faculty and that ended up in the controversial end for Ken, but carried on. But we've certainly been doing a lot more.

We were doing a lot ad hoc, now we're doing a lot organized. So scale, core programs. I think our faculty has continued to be really innovative and doing new things and combining rigor and relevance.

B: Any particular areas that come to mind when you think about research?

U: Finance has got to be one of the real breakthrough areas, with Nobel Prizes and all, right? But at the same time, the Leaders for Manufacturing, the Operations Management area, and Marketing have done a good job. Organizational Studies carried on that strong tradition. You must have talked to Eli, right. The original composition of the school was more than half the behavioral and organizations, wasn't it?

G: Right, yes.

B: And some of that was already here. Interestingly, it was within the Economics Department. People like Doug McGregor and even Warren Bennis, they were all here, and then they got carried over to Sloan.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

11

George has a particular interest in that because that's his area. But there's quite a story.

U: You talk to students about Theory X and Theory Y, of course some of them don't know what that means. If it's Theory Y, they certainly don't know that Doug McGregor invented it.

I think the work on leadership and labor relations group over the years has done great things. It's hard to find a place that hasn't excelled as the school has moved forward. What replaces Statistics? MIT never got its act together, and we don't have a statistics department at MIT, which is kind of strange, given the math as a core part of the school. So our statisticians here, Gordon et al., have had to live alone. There are a lot of people who use statistics, but the statisticians don't have the OR Center for Math Programming. So they have trouble.

IT is interesting. We're always ranked top, this is MIT. But we actually have some of the lowest faculty size in IT of the major business schools. And they're good people like Eric von Hippel, but not many of our students take their classes and there aren't that many faculty. It's a novelty. Why? I guess it's because the rest of MIT is so great...

G: What about major grants? The NASA grant had a big impact. I don't know if that was going on when you were here, when you first came.

U: I think that was Don Marquis. Even before that. Who was the guy who had the Fellows in Africa Program and a lot of public health grants? Who was heading the Fellows in Africa? It was before the India program.

B: You mentioned in the 150th something about Calcutta.

U: Calcutta was part of the India program, but even before that we had fellows in... Carroll Wilson?

G: That's a name I've heard.

U: Might check that out. Carroll Wilson was here before me, and he was connected to the UN and development. We got into a very big grant program for Africa called the Fellows in Africa. I think it was like Sloan Fellows, but it was Sloan Fellows in Africa and people came from... it was when the colonial era was ending, the new Africa. It's a forgotten piece of history, you don't hear it talked about very much. But it would be interesting to track down.

India came after that. India was Ford Foundation. I don't know if Fellows in Africa was Ford Foundation or not.

Then you have NASA grants. I think overall part of Lester's strategy was to increase sponsored research. Abe had only one deputy dean, Al. Lester, when he came in, had Arnoldo Hax and added me as a dean for research. I think that's the sequence.

B: Right.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

12

U: And then you came in from me or Arnaldo?

B: From you. Steve Graves took over from Arnaldo.

U: So there was more emphasis on sponsored research and we started more centers.

G: I was going to ask. I think that led to centers.

U: Yeah, So CISR came on about around that time.

G: CISR had been there for a while I think. I came in 1987 and CISR had been around for a while already.

U: Probably Groove. Was definitely the management technology was the center.

B: One of the things you really worked was some of these new centers that would connect with a series of sponsors. Stu Myers had one in financial services and it was ICRMOT. There were a couple of those. They haven't survived in the same way that some of the other centers have.

U: You always had a center in labor relations.

B: We had sponsors for some of our research work. We always had something that was like the Institute here. When I came, Charlie Meyers before me had a group of companies that put money in. Then when we went into our first major research project, we had a group of sponsors. But right now we don't have anything within however it's called, and I don't think ICRMOT and POPI and then financial services. But that's all right. Some of these things get clustered and you get a group of sponsor companies and you get a group of faculty connected. And then you move on to others.

U: One of the lessons I took away from all those centers, which actually is reflected in the Digital Business Center, Center for Digital Business, is that collecting money for a research agenda and RFP and getting faculty to do them doesn't lead to long-term customer satisfaction by the companies. So the Center for Digital Business, we actually changed that model and said, "No faculty can have a research grant unless it's pre-agreed with the company about what the focus is and what the deliverables are, so that it's beneficial to the company and to the faculty member." And that principle is very different than, "Give us \$100,000 and we'll do all these RFPs and then we'll have a conference and report." Now the companies feel they really get something as well as the overall benefit. So CDB actually went through the recessions and things pretty well because people were getting benefit.

B: Let's stay with that. I'm really interested. I think it's a very important model. As you bring faculty together with the interests of the sponsors, do you start with the sponsors first, saying, "Here are some of our interests." And then you see whether there are any faculty and see whether you have a match?

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

13

U: It's a matching process. Usually David Verrill will do a lot of the upfront screening. He'll talk to a company and say, "We have capabilities in these areas. What are your problems?" If it looks like any match, he'll say, "Let's get together at MIT for a day so we can understand your needs. You can understand our capabilities." So you would have around a table with executives and faculty and say, "Does something match here? Does it make sense?" And if it does, then you write a scope-of-work document, and deliverables, and a research contract, in addition to the membership.

The Center for Digital Business, its \$300,000/year for three years. \$100,000 of that goes to the overall Center for administration and conferences and blue sky research. And then \$200,000 goes to a dedicated project. That dedicated project has to be something that everyone works off of. So that's been a pretty effective model.

I think at the same time, the dean has been very successful in getting research funds for summer support. When we were working there, faculty were expected to get their own summer support. Now, pretty much the dean gives everybody summer support of a ninth or two-ninths. That's taken away some of the push on the faculty to have to get these matches.

G: So it's money looking for people to do projects? Sponsors looking for...?

U: No, it's just that the matching doesn't go anywhere. Either the faculty doesn't need the support, or they're in a different area. So it's not quite as much of an incentive for the faculty to be interested.

G: There's not as much of the supply.

U: Demand comes and goes with supply.

B: Bill Pounds would be concerned about this because he thinks that like Engineering School, our faculty should have part of their salary covered by grants and contracts because that forces them to be working on problems that have a marketplace value rather than just being comfortable working on whatever they want to work on. So I don't know what your...

U: I think that's an important point. I think not just Sloan but everywhere, as research follows, people are increasingly tracking down academically interesting paths, it may not have as much relevance.

Last week there was a conference at Harvard called "Theory, Practice, and Marketing." It was by a core of senior faculty in marketing across the profession who are worried about that kind of trend. Somebody is doing Gain Three (?) models that aren't relevant. They're doing behavioral experiments that go into the cute category and get published in the *NY Times*. Actually JCR, the major publication for the behavioralists, now has a policy that you cannot describe any journal implications in your paper. We're social psychologists, we're not marketing. So there is a concern for that.

I think one of these things is sponsored research. The other is probably since our time, the amount of consulting faculty do has gone down. It might increase in the executive education, but it decreased in consulting days. So if you look at the outside activity reports over time, I'll bet you'll see less direct consulting with companies, except as Exec Ed.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

14

So Bill's point is probably a legitimate one. Are we sure we're going to stay true to *Mens et Manus*? Or are we going to get pulled off? I think that's a challenge for deans and promotions and classroom. Students I think are a big pressure on keeping people relevant, which is probably stronger than it was before. But the other ones are probably a little bit less. You can probably get tenure with less relevance today, as long as it's interesting academically.

B: You get those letters in from other academics.

G: I wonder to what extent Bill's view is conditioned by the time when he grew up and what was important then, and how fields have changed to be more disciplinary-based. There are good reasons for that, because there are many more people doing research. Some of the big ideas have been out there, so you're elaborating on them. So changing in those conditions he might not be as sensitive to that.

B: I think he's concerned that there are a lot of problems out there that maybe aren't being addressed. He uses the model of the Engineering School where they have to address relevant problems, otherwise you're not going to get the funds. He would also be concerned that we dropped the thesis. You can't get a master's degree in engineering without doing a thesis. So that's got to have some connection to some problem. We lost some of what keeps us connected to the applied side.

G: Yeah, it's a different system. Having worked in the Engineering School with the partnerships, you see that the faculty need there is they need a team of students they work with and that they fund. The students come in, most of them expecting not to pay tuition, but to find research assistantships for their masters degrees. And therefore you've got to have... The system works together.

B: You've done a lot of that with your work. You brought students in and you formed corporations.

U: Yeah, the last 10 or 15 years have been very related to computer science. Every year in the last 15 years, I've had three IT students working with me. Most of the last ten years are master's program. They are some of the smartest people who come to MIT because they think computer science is the toughest place to get in. By the time they get to be seniors or juniors, they start to say, "There's more to it than just programming machines. What's the impact if I use it?"

I've had people who have been very rewarding. One is in a Ph.D. program at Harvard right now. Others have gone out and started companies. That was a benefit of research funding, plus having MIT support to do it. So you can break through. A paper John Hauser and I wrote recently was a web morphing paper. It was the third most-cited paper in marketing science in the last five years. I look at the citations and 80% of them are from computer science, artificial intelligence, which reflects that John's a great algorithm guy. We were actually doing things in marketing that came out of CSAIL. Had some co-authors with that and students were doing it.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

15

G: Do you see young faculty coming on, or middle-level faculty following in those footsteps? Or is what you did something that happened for a period, and your successors are going to find other paths?

U: You'd like to hope your legacy continues, but I'm afraid legacies probably don't continue very long. I'm working with young faculty now doing things, so that's a good thing. But I will say one of the senior faculty members in my group said in a disturbing conversation, "The kind of work you do, Glen, is obsolete. We don't do that kind of thing anymore. We use theory. We test theory."

B: We don't do practical things, huh?

U: Yeah. You don't condemn your theoretical work by practical tradeoffs. You don't worry about the impact, or you probably are worrying about how your theory applies to practice, probably prevents you from doing good theory.

G: Yeah, there are some challenges.

U: Yeah, I think the school will have to keep the strategy to do both to those. Either you get different people that do each of them, or just keep trying to get the person who does both of them.

B: One line from Herb Simon was that a school has always got this tension between the disciplines and the applied. He used the image of oil and water. There's always a tendency for it to separate. The job of administrator is keep it agitated, find ways to keep things shaking all the time.

That gets to the question about this building. We've got a committee now, a space committee, that's trying to wrestle with the question about, is this building working for us.

G: It was very interesting, because in your interview, you were so excited at 150 about having everybody together and seeing colleagues that you hadn't seen. That was July 2010, so it was anticipating moving in here, or you were just about to move in here. Now two years later, maybe you want to reflect on some of those comments, given where Bob was going. I was going to stop you from going there.

U: It's a good building. It's pretty interesting. Facilities generally fit for Sloan and you could probably do a physical history of the school which had some really good ...

B: ... we should have that track in the story.

G: In the history we feel that where people's offices had been, particularly back in the 1960s and 1970s, had a big impact on their career.

U: You had the Herman Building, which is the "young Turk" guys. The Sloan building was the economics and organization people who were established.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

16

B: And you guys were in E56. That was an interesting... Well, it was the building that was torn down.

U: That gap over there, which is always funny because it was... I think when I was deputy dean, I moved the marketing group there. And it was supposed to be for two years, right? Then we were going to get everybody back together again. It was in the Dibner building, which was the animal lab for ADL. It's a good place for marketing! (laughing) That was the time we were growing, we needed more classrooms. Lester started the Tang Building and got the initial 50% of money from Hank. And when I became dean, it was my job to get the other 50%. We opened up Tang, and that was a bit step forward. More classrooms, a lot of the scale of the students, left us in the office space still kind of in a mess because they had faculty even in E-40 then. Manufacturing faculty went there and everybody was spread out.

When I was at the end of the dean, it was three of our alumni and I were having dinner with finance guys. I don't remember their names. Somebody said, "Why don't we give you \$200,000 and you can have a competition to design a new Sloan School?" So we did. And the parameters at that time were, we're not going to be able to raise more than \$100 million because I think Tang was \$30 or something. So that left us not being able to build a full grid school. And when the design competition was over, i.e., 51, we have a bridge over the parking lot and extending. And the original Parks3 architects, design consortium and the architect eventually chosen for this building was an entrant.

At the end of that, we turned that over and Dick took that on. And Dick's vision was, "Internet's booming. This is the time we're going to get a lot of money. Let's build a completely integrated school. So why don't we tear down this stuff and we'll build a whole new school. Everybody in one place, classrooms all in one place, UCLA kind of vibe." And then the crash of 2000 occurred and it was clear we weren't going to have the money to build that super big building, so things got pared back and we said, "OK, let's keep a bridge to E52 and over this way and E40 and so forth. And we'll keep Tang." So the building became, "OK let's get the faculty together. We want an Executive Education Center because we have to have that. A lot more open space for students and student life and so forth." So I think that was the cause. You can ask Dick where the compromises came out. I think what began as a building really has achieved a lot of those objectives at tremendous student space on the first floor. Everybody is there for lunch.

B: It's a great community center.

U: Great community, big effect there. Faculty are all together in the same building, which is good. I don't think the integration of the faculty with the geography has worked as well as people would have hoped. Tom Allen down the stairways, but the stairways that got built didn't turn out that way. There's not a lot of up/down traffic on the stairways. Tom always said you have to have line of sight, and they didn't build the line of sight, and it's even hard to find the stairways. So the integration across floors didn't happen. And because the elevators are in the center, everybody comes back to the center and they only bump into each other at the center.

Of course, it turned out to be very contentious organizationally who gets what offices, which I think abstracted a price from the school in terms of faculty interaction. It also

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

17

was heavy control from the architects about how the building would look and be used, and no degrees of freedom by groups or anything. If you walk into a Google office, it's all kinds of individuality everywhere and creativity. You walk into this building and it looks beautiful, but looks so sterile. Big open spaces and nobody around and doors closed on the side. So I think it hasn't functioned as well on that. I know there are some initiatives underway right now to move on that. But I remember the Marketing group we wanted to put an HDTV in there so we could play games in the evening, computer games, and things. I think John Hauser went through 10,000 hoops to get the ability to put something on the wall and couldn't use it before 6 pm. So hopefully we'll get more creative and more interactive space.

G: I wonder if your experience might not be different because you were in a separate building with the Marketing department and you were seeing colleagues you hadn't seen in ten years. Whereas in BPS, people were on top of each other and used to that kind of colleague-ship and all of a sudden they felt different. So with your experiences and my projection—I haven't been in the BPS space, I've been over at the other part of MIT for the last couple years—this place feels cavernous and doesn't feel like community, but you may actually be experiencing more community.

U: Well, definitely with Economics, because if you walk by my office, I see Ernie and Tom.

G: Eric was telling me how being next to Simon Johnson's office has been really good for him because his agent just represented his next book, and it made a huge difference. So different experiences based on your history and where you work. It would be interesting to see how the committee—if they gather different kinds of data and what the problems are—if there are different kinds of problems.

U: Well, you probably had pretty ideal space where you were, so this has actually separated you.

G: And the BPS people. We're all on one floor. We were crowded together.

B: Seeing each other a lot!

U: Bumping into each other. Like our Ph.D. fellows are down at that end, so that was a big loss for our group too, compared to where we were in E-40. It's beautiful views and space. Should be able to make it work.

B: Glen, anything you would say we should pursue with this project?

U: I don't know. I think the 150th interview really went over a lot of stuff. And you have it as well, so I don't think we missed anything.

The only thing we turned up here is the Fellows in Africa. That would be interesting to follow up with Ker Wilson and that generation. Don Marquis maybe more. The NASA project, I don't know how well-documented that is.

Int. w/G. Urban
5/9/12

18

B: We have some of that with Ed Roberts.

G: I will pick up your, "When I stop learning, I will leave." Is that what the title was?

U: *Journal of Marketing.*

G: I haven't had a chance to get that yet, but I will look at that and put it with your materials here. Thank you very much.

U: John Little says, "You cannot tell that story again!"

B: Thanks, Glen!

U: It's always good to reminisce.