

ACCESSION SHEET

Maine Folklife Center

Accession Number: 4007

Accession Date: 2016.06.14	T#	C#	P	D	CD
Collection MF 192			M	A	#
Number:			#	T	
	P	S	V	D	D mfc_na4007_audio001
Collection Climate Change	#	#	#	V	A
Name: Institute 40th				#	#
Anniversary Oral					
Interviewer Adam Lee Cilli	Narrator: Daniel Sandweiss				
/Depositor:					

Address
& University of Maine
phone: Orono, ME 04469

Address
& **phone:** University of Maine
Orono, ME 04469

Description: 4007 Daniel Sandweiss, interviewed by Adam Lee Cilli, September 27, 2013, in his office in Stodder Hall at the University of Maine, Orono. Sandweiss talks about the beginnings of his career in archaeology; conducting research in South America; working with Thor Heyerdahl; his beginnings at UMaine and the Climate Change Institute; his work's contribution to the CCI; changes in the CCI over the years; and his role as Dean of the Graduate School.

Text: 11 pp. transcript
Recording: **mfc_na4007_audio001** 68 minutes

Related Collections
& **Accessions**
Restrictions

Formats Included Document: Original= .docx, Master= .odt, Access= .pdf; Sound: Original= .mp3, Master= .wav, Access= .mp3

Notes

Accessioned by MO'Brien

Date last updated 6.14.2016 by MO'Brien **Use Tracker** **To transcriber**

Previous name(s) **Completed**

Narrator: Daniel Sandweiss

Interviewer: Adam Lee Cilli

Transcriber: Adam Lee Cilli

Date of interview: September 27, 2013

ABSTRACT: This interview took place in Daniel Sandweiss's office in Stodder Hall at the University of Maine in Orono. In the first half of the interview, Sandweiss discussed how he became interested in archeology and described his earliest experiences researching in South America. Later, he reflected on how his work contributes to the mission of the Climate Change Institute. Towards the end of the interview, he shared his views on how the Institute has changed since he first came in 1992, and he also discussed his role as Dean of the Graduate School.

Note: This is the transcriber's best effort to convert audio to text, the audio is the primary material.

Cilli: Today is September 27, 2013. This is Adam Cilli, PhD Candidate in the Department of History, and I'm here to interview Dan Sanweiss (in his office) about his experiences in the Climate Change Institute. Just to get us started, I'm wondering if you can tell me a little bit about how you became interested in archeology.

Sandweiss: I was not planning to be an archeologist when I started college. I thought I was probably going to be an English major. But we were required to take one course per semester that was outside of our general area, so if you were in Arts and Humanities, you had to take something in either social sciences or natural sciences. I wasn't interested in natural sciences, so I took a course in the Aegean Bronze Age--an archeology course in the Classics Department. And I said, "Ah, that could be fun." So I took the course and it was absolutely fascinating. So the next semester, for my requirement course, I took an anthro course on world archeology for the old world (Africa and Europe). And there were about 60 people in the class; I'd say 55 of them were bored to tears, and 5 of us were on the edge of our seats. I was one of them. I said, "Hey, maybe this is what I'm supposed to do." So the next semester I took three archeology courses, including a digging class that met on Saturdays all day, in the fall. And then I was hooked.

Cilli: This was your sophomore year?

Sandweiss: Yeah. By the end of the fall semester sophomore year I was a declared archeology major and totally hooked. The ability to go out and dig things up and learn things from them was fascinating. The idea of doing it in other parts of the world was also fascinating.

Cilli: So you participated in several digs while an undergraduate?

Sandweiss: I did. We had the digging class. We dug a historic site outside of New Haven in the fall of 1976, when I was a sophomore, and the next summer (summer of 77) I went with one of the grad students as his field assistant. We flew to Mexico and bused our way down, looking at various sites along the way, to Guatemala City, got our permit, went down and did a month of

field work on the Pacific Coast of southern Guatemala near the El Salvador border. We weren't digging; we were looking for sites and identifying them and collecting things from the surface. So that was my real first out of the country prehistoric archeology experience. And then the next year, after my junior year I spent the summer in Peru, cause I'd read a book in a class I was taking that expressed a theory on ancient civilizations on the coast, were built on the basis of marine resources, rather than agriculture. And that was interesting to me. So I got in touch with the author and then went down, he helped me out, and I did a project interviewing fishermen to find out how they collected shellfish. So I was interested in that particular aspect of marine resources and what I could get from that.

Cilli: It sounds like you actually got involved in ethnographic research.

Sandweiss: I did. Early on there was good advice from the archeologist who had written the book that inspired me. He said, "If you're gonna dig up these things and study them and get information from them archeological, you better find out what local people know about them now. That's a great source of information." I travelled up and down the coast with a Peruvian colleague interviewing fishermen about the different species and what they knew about their habits and where they collected them, all those kinds of things. It was really fun and it has been useful ever since. So I came back and I applied to graduate school, and I got in and got fellowships and so on. So I started grad school in the summer of 1979 and almost immediately went to Peru from a year. I had one of the Fulbright fellowships that sort of let you do what you want. And then I spent the year on various projects. It's been every year pretty much since.

Cilli: And you went straight from your masters to your PhD working in Peru?

Sandweiss: Actually, at Cornell, where I got my PhD, they didn't want master's students. You applied directly to the PhD program. You didn't do a master's thesis. You just took your comps, and if you passed your comps at a high enough level you were both granted a master's and admitted to candidacy for the PhD. So I didn't do a master's thesis.

Cilli: So, for your dissertation, you concentrated on the interviews you had conducted?

Sandweiss: No, by that point I had become involved in multiple excavation projects, and the one I designed for my dissertation was to take an early historic record, what we call an ethnohistoric record, about fishermen at the time of the Inca empire and their economic organization and how it differed from what was happening in other parts of the empire. In the highlands they had a very different system, or were supposed to. And I decided to test that through excavation. So that's what I did for dissertation work. But when I got to Cornell, because I was interested in the earth science aspect as well, and how understanding landform development and geological processes impinged upon archeological sites and what people are able to do. And I was also interested in climate and foodways. I actually had a geologist on my committee. So we had majors and minors. So my major was anthropology, and my minors were archeology and geomorphology. So I actually had a pretty interdisciplinary education to begin with, even as a grad student.

Cilli: So, how did you come to the University of Maine?

Sandweiss: I was very lucky. When I was almost done with the dissertation I was in Peru on another project with a couple of colleagues who were faculty elsewhere. I was still a grad

student. We'd gotten some NSF money to examine shells in order to track ancient El Niño events. And so I had funding from this grant to go down and collect shells from various archeological sites that had been excavated previously, and consequently I got to stay in good hotels, instead of what I usually did as a grad student (which was at the very bottom end; the dollar a night place with the reed roof and the shared bathroom, not toilet paper). This I was staying at really nice hotels. Which in those days wasn't that much, maybe 30 or 40 dollars a night. And I was staying in a city called Chiclayo, which is in northern Peru. And I was with another grad student who agreed to help me for a while, because I preferred not to travel alone. And we were going to check out of the hotel, and we were waiting in line, and the clerk said to this older gentleman standing next to me, "Dr. Heyerdahl, you have a telegram." So I turned to him and said, "Excuse me, but are you Thor Heyerdahl of Kon-Tiki fame?" And he said yes. I said, "Oh, I'm Dan Sandweiss. I'm a grad student at Cornell, and I'm working on a fishing site at southern Peru and I work on El Niño." And he said, "That's great, we need to meet. Meet me at the bar at 4 o'clock." And we talked for four hours. And I'd read *Kon-Tiki* as a kid for a summer reading class in seventh grade. So, it was great. At the end of the conversation, he said, "Do you know of a site called Túcume?" I said yeah and that it's a great site. He said, "Well, I've decided to start a project there. Would you be interested in working on it?" I said, "Yeah. If you could start in six months when I finish my dissertation, that'd be great." He said, "Do you think Cornell would be interested in sponsoring the investigation." And I said no. Even our faculty had to find funding for the research. So I was very disappointed. I thought, "Oh, the whole thing was he heard Cornell and he thought he could get money. It was all a buildup to see if he could get some money." He said, "Alright, here's my address. I'll give you my address. See what you can do to get down to the site next February and I'll see what I could do to get you down there." Then I figured that was it, that I would never hear anything again. And I knew I couldn't get funding to get down there. So, that was July. In October I was in my office at the university, working on my dissertation, when I got a call from this secretary who said, "Fred Olson of Timex would like to talk to you." I said, "What does he want to talk to me about," but she wouldn't tell me. Then Fred Olson came on the line and he told me, "Thor Heyerdahl called me up and he wants to know what you need to come work at Túcume for the next two to three years. FedEx your proposal to me in two days, cause I'm going to Europe in five days." And then we chatted some more, and then he put me back to the secretary. So, I asked the secretary, "What does Fred Olson do at Timex." And she said, "What does he do?! He owns it! The Olsons are one of the richest families in Norway, and they're old friends of the Heyerdahls." Fred's dad had helped Tore early on. Fred himself had grown up during World War II with Heyerdahl's first wife and two sons, cause they had been refugees in North America during the war while he went off and fought with the free Norwegian troops. And so he felt that he had inherited a responsibility to help Tore with whatever he wanted. So I talked to my adviser and asked should I do this? They said, "Yeah. You should." I said, "Well, what should I ask for, 500 dollars and airfare?" And my adviser said, "No, if you didn't do this you'd be looking for a job as an assistant professor. So find out what the best places are paying and ask for that on a nine month contract. And whatever it is, is gonna look like small change to Timex." So I asked for 33,000 dollars a year. This was in 1989, actually end of 88. And nine-month contract and ten personal days.... And what they did was they actually gave me 35,000 and they said you cover your airfares. So, that's what I did for my first three years after the doctorate. And in the third year, one of my mentors, who was a professor at the University of Pittsburgh, but also the head of anthropology at the Carnegie Museum (also in Pittsburgh), offered me a postdoc, so I

could come to the states. 'Cause I knew that I had to come back at some point to look for a job, so I told Tore that I'm going to go back, but that I'd help him find somebody else. And in January of 1992 I went to Pittsburgh and I started the postdoc. It paid a lot less but it was a great place to be. And my mail had been going to Ithaca, but eventually I had it forwarded to me in Pittsburgh. So when I started looking through all this mail, I saw a job posting at the University of Maine. They were looking for somebody in anthropology in what was then the Institute for Quaternary Studies, who worked in the New World (preferably South America), who worked on climate change, and in those days that was a pretty rare combination. So I went to Jim Richardson, my supervisor and mentor there, and I said, "Look, I saw this posting, but what do you think." And he said, "That's your job. You'd be crazy not to apply for it." So I did, and I got on the list for interviews for the National Archeology meetings. I think they invited nine people. Dave Sanger was there. Fortunately the meeting was right there in Pittsburgh. So Dave took me out to lunch and we talked for two hours. And I was one of two people they invited to campus for an interview a month or so later.... So [eventually] they hired me, and that's how I got here.

Cilli: So you were hired with the expectation that you would join the Quaternary Institute.

Sandweiss: I was hired under the EPSCoR grant that the Institute had. So I was a new line. They hired two archeologists, who were split that year. The first search they got Kris Sobilek. And then they got this big EPSCoR grant that allowed them to hire a bunch of faculty members; and I was one of those. So it was a new position created, funded by the grant for three years, and then the university was to keep the line. That was the deal. Kirk Maasch was hired under that same grant.

Cilli: So, how do you think your research contributes to our understanding of climate change?

Sandweiss: In a variety of ways. One is that the work I do process actual climate records. And they're important because where I work, coastal Peru, is a core region for El Niño, but it doesn't have many of the common high resolution climate proxies, or they're not fully applicable to that area, even though it is a very climatically important area. Ice cores are in the Andes adjacent to the coast, but they partly reflect what's happening in the Atlantic, so they're not a complete record of what's happening in coastal Peru.... So in the absence of many direct records, natural records of climate, we've been able to take natural objects, shells and fish principally, and look at them in terms of their habitat preferences, the chemistry that make up the bones and the shells, and use that to get a look at an actual record of marine climate along the coast in this core area of El Niño. We were ahead of the curve in recognizing changes in the frequency of El Niño events during the Holocene. Now everybody knows that. But we really were the first people to identify this. And we did it from the basis of marine remains at archeological sites. So that would be the main contribution. And then examining how the changes that we see impacted the lives of people in coastal Peru. So there's a human-environment connection as well.

Cilli: So, how far back do the fish bones go?

Sandweiss: Until recently the oldest sites we have in Peru were 13,000 years old. There's one site now that has a few dates and a small amount of remains that's about 14,000 years old. And there may be more, but we haven't found them yet.

Cilli: So, in terms of climate, fairly recent record, but nevertheless an important record.

Sandweiss: It's the period in which humans have been in the New World....So it's the most critical period in human history, when everything has accelerated tremendously. And that's all happened within climatic contexts, and we have a piece of that story, but for what happened to humans in Peru, but what also the Peruvian situation says about climate generally.

Cilli: Pretty much everyone I've spoken to in the Institute has stressed its interdisciplinary character. Has it been difficult for you to engage in interdisciplinary work with other scholars because you're working in Peru?

Sandweiss: Absolutely not. One of the reasons why I would never really consider going someplace else is been the incredible ease of being interdisciplinary here and getting people to join me in my research. The first person from the faculty here who went down with me to Peru was in 1995. Professor Faulkner, who is now passed away, was a historic archeologist, came with me to Peru. We were looking at some historic sites and talked about doing some El Niño archeology. And then in 1996 Kirk Maasch came with me and we looked at beach ridges and the effects of El Niño on beach ridge formation. Then in 97 Dan Belnap came down; we brought down two students we were advising, and following up on the beach ridge study. In 1998 it was Hal Borns, founder of the Institute, and we were looking at obsidian sources and the effect of glacial movements in making sources available or not available.

Cilli: Can you go into a little more detail about the work you and Hal did together?

Sandweiss: Yeah, it was one trip. I had been working on the coast at this site, and one of the things we found in it was obsidian, which is volcanic glass, and it has a particularly useful property for archeologists, and that it every flow on it has a different chemical signature....[But the obsidian was not used there.] So, one of the things I had to resolve was, was this area covered with glaciers? So I turned to Hal. And although he was already in his 70s, he came down and we were living at 3600 meters and going up to 4600 to work, and we looked at the terrain around the obsidian sources and collected some samples for what was then a new dating technique.

Cilli: Fascinating. So I take it you and Hal never published a paper on that.

Sandweiss: No, we didn't 'cause we weren't confident enough there was enough data. It was hard for me to work in the highlands, there's just not enough oxygen up there. Hal, however, was fine. He was fine until we went back to the lowlands and he ate something bad and got sick. But despite all his health issues he did incredibly well up there. Hal's just a machine; it's incredible.

Cilli: Shifting topics, I'm wondering if you can tell me a little bit about how you came to be Dean of the Graduate School?

Sandweiss: Oh, another accident. Everything happens by serendipity. Early in my time at the university I was elected by the Institute to be the representative to the graduate board. So I did that from my second year here until I became the dean. So I joined the executive committee, which is the central advising body for the dean, and I found it was really interesting. And we had one particular crisis come up, and I guess I took something of a leadership role in crafting a

response to an attack on its [the university's] existence, basically. So that was about a year before the position came open, and then at that time there was an interim dean appointed for three years without a search, and that's the maximum anyone can go here in a position without having a formal search. But then they opened a formal search, and I applied and I got the position. They selected me, so more than eight years later still doing it, 'cause I like doing this job. It lets me keep my hand in as a faculty member and a researcher, but also do interesting things on the campus side and interacting with students from across campus, which I really like.

Cilli: Can you talk briefly about how you see your roles and responsibilities as the Dean?

Sandweiss: My job as the dean as I see it, is to make certain that graduate studies at the university of Maine are characterized by a high degree of professionalism and by high quality, both on the part of the faculty and students. That the experience of students is as successful as we can make it be, that problems get resolved in a timely way, that we craft policies that will make the experiences better and the outcomes better for our students.

Cilli: What kinds of policies?

Sandweiss: Policies, for instance, on the kinds of programs that we can put together to the needs of students and the state, [such as] policies on credits and how credits are counted and what you can transfer and how you can transfer them.

Cilli: What measures do you think the graduate school is able to take to make sure that its graduate students are productive?

Sandweiss: The first is to help departments make sure they are being rigorous in their selection of graduate students. So we set base criteria; no department should accept a student with lower than a 3.0 GPA, for instance. We don't set a limit on GRE scores. So that's one of the things we can do. We provide whatever funding we can, as you know, to support students who are doing important work. We work out problems between students and their advisers to help them find new advisers and make that work. We sponsor workshops on how to write your thesis. So anything we can think of that would help the students, we try to do that. One of the things we've been emphasizing recently is getting involved in mentoring undergraduate students, which is good for the undergraduate students, it's good experience for the grad students, and it also helps to make the case for the importance of graduate students on this campus, since now the budget is principally driven by undergraduate tuition. We have to make the case that we play a role in the quality of the undergraduate experience. It justifies the presence of graduate students. And we're really the only real research university in the entire state.

Cilli: For the budget, you remarked that the large portion of the budget comes from student tuition and not the government?

Sandweiss: When I came here twenty years ago we were 70 percent state-funded; now we're 30 percent state funded. And we're around 40 percent tuition funded. So, yes, it's now the single biggest contributor.... So, if we could get more undergraduate students we could get more money. If we do the right things we can get more undergraduate students. But with graduate students, they don't bring in revenue; they come with costs associated. But I think that's what makes this a university worth being at, both as a faculty member and as a student. But it's a case you constantly have to make, particularly in tough times.

Cilli: I'm slightly surprised; I realize that we're in a recession, but I was under the impression that through the efforts of George Jacobson, Steven Norton, and others...

Sandweiss: The "Faculty of Five," which also included Dave Smith.

Cilli: I was under the impression that the Maine state legislature has been very supportive of the university.

Sandweiss: That was really important in the late 90s and early 2000s, and it did get us the MEIF funding, which is critically important, but the last couple years there have been either cuts from the state or flat funding as costs have gone up. The state's cutting everything, 'cause the state doesn't have much money. But if the funding is slack, than you gotta find the money somewhere else.

Cilli: So what has been the primary strategy for getting more students here?

Sandweiss: They hired a vice president for enrollment management who's driven up the number of incoming freshmen. Through advertising and selective aid packages and so on, and in particular through bringing in more out of state students, cause they have to pay more. So, if you can get ten of those it's like getting 30 Mainers.... Budgets are never fun around here. I think that in my time here, which is 21 years now, there's only been one year when there's been a real increase in the purchasing power of the dollars we have, where they were actually able to add things instead of cut things. We've been so good at cutting without making the hurt obvious that everyone thinks we can just keep doing it. You cut for all those years there isn't much left, and every cut now makes much more of an impact, cause you're getting into critical areas.

Cilli: So, the strategy for bringing in more students to raise revenue, does that cause problems? 'Cause then you need to hire more faculty and support.

Sandweiss: It does. This year there are probably more new faculty than any previous year. And they're really good people, too. The ones that I've got a chance to meet are surprisingly good. It is a buyer's market in academia. But in any of the traditional academic disciplines, there are hundreds of qualified applicants. So, as a seller it's not so good. As a buyer, it would be criminal not to higher the very best, cause we can get them. We can get absolutely top-notch people.... And the Institute *really* gets its pick, because people really want to be in the Institute. I even remember, back when I was applying for the job here nearly 22 years ago, and I asked my advisers if they knew about the Institute and what they thought, and the geologist on my committee, who was a very famous geologist, said, "oh, they're probably one of the best institutes focusing on these issues in the country. Maybe the Quaternary center at the University of Washington can give them a run for their money, but Maine is better because they include the archeologists and the anthropologists, and that makes them a more complete center." And that was many years ago, when we were much smaller. Already it had, thanks to Hal and both Georges and Dave Sanger and others, it already had a great reputation. The Institute is a magnet; it attracts great people.

Cilli: It's a remarkable story about building a world-class institution at a relatively small university with very limited resources.

Sandweiss: And the Institute didn't really get a lot of funding from the university, other than the faculty lines that were taken half way out of units and reassigned to the Institute. But because it was such a good group of faculty they raised the Bingham Trust money and so on. There was this fellow, Bonnicksen, he had this center for First Americans, and he had a ton of money from outside. So, a lot of what's made the Institute work is having this trust fund, which generates a fair amount of money (it's over a million dollars now). And so the money from that is what gives the Institute the flexibility to do the kinds of things it likes to do. That, and I think Paul Mayewski was given a big chunk of the MEIF money to get him to come here, and so I know he's used some of that over the years to help the Institute.

Cilli: Since we've meandered back to the Institute, one of the things I'm curious about is the university-wide impact has had, outside the realm of climate science itself. It seems to me that, of course the efforts of Hal (getting the first NSF grant here at the University) but then the work of George Jacobson and the Committee of Five in getting all kinds of money for the university.

Sandweiss: I was here for the Faculty Five and the creation of the MEIF. It was transformational. It showed the university that we could be world-class outside of agriculture and forestry. That we could do straight academic stuff and be recognized internationally. I think that's been inspiring to many people. And of course getting the MEIF money. The committee of five was comprised mostly of people from the Institute: George Jacobson, Steven Norton, and David Smith (not deceased). Dave Smith was a historian and a founding member of the Institute. Among the many things he did was climate history—fascinating stuff. The impact of getting MEIF, we would probably be another USM [University of Southern Maine] now, at that level, if we hadn't got that money in the late 90s. It's been critical to the growth of the university.... So that would be the single biggest impact, those two things: one is to inspire people about the power of what we could do with interdisciplinary research, and the other was the MEIF, which re-jumpstarted research on campus and set us up to be a much bigger player than we used to be.

Cilli: Do you think the Quaternary Institute has been pretty important to making this a research university?

Sandweiss: It's played a leading role in bringing research into the objectives of the campus.... And because it was interdisciplinary it spread that mission throughout campus. It's been one of the most successful units in getting external funding, and it still has an unbelievably high success rate for getting grants. It's many, many times the national average, even though we're a middling university on the periphery. Paul is one of the absolute top scholars on campus, and he was recruited away from a senior position in New Hampshire, because he wanted to be with the group of people in the Institute and the culture of the Institute. And he's been transformational for the Institute.

Cilli: I imagine that took some doing, to get him to leave a full position at UNH.

Sandweiss: Yeah, it took a lot of negotiating on both sides to get the package that Paul needed, and George Jacobson took the lead in that. But it's been really good for us that he's been here. He's a world-wide top scientist and brings a lot of students and colleagues and money and fame and connections, and really good ideas for promoting the Institute. So, it's been very good.

Cilli: It seems to me that, as you said, Paul and his team have changed the character of the Institute. I'm wondering if you can comment about that, past and present and future.

Sandweiss: Well, it's much broader than it used to be. The original, they had a couple of biologists, a couple of archeologists, and a couple of earth scientists, and those were the three legs of the Institute, traditionally. We don't have a historian, now, but I'm hoping that your new hire, Christina Adcock, will join. Her work is relevant, and I believe she would fit really well. But we've got not just archeologists, but social anthropologists now, we've got a much broader set of people from earth science, we've got lots of people from biology, we've got a lot of engineers (never had engineers before). Just this whole slew of different kind of people. We have external people who are involved. It's become much more diverse. It's become much bigger, and that changes the social interactions to some degree. But there is still emphasis on getting together. We had an even two weeks ago, where all the faculty who came were supposed to stand up and give a 90-second talk about their research, so the new students would know who everyone was and what they did. We have the Borns Symposium in the spring every year. So, community building has been a part of it. It's harder with this many people, but it still happens....

Cilli: Would you say that one of the ways the Institute has changed is that there are more scholars examining issues closer to the present?

Sandweiss: Absolutely. The Institute has moved from a purely paleo-perspective, to now a much greater concern for policy. People like Jim Roscoe in anthropology deals with contemporary responses to climate change. The adaptation to abrupt climate change, IGERT, is not about the past, it's about the future and how we prepare for climate change.... Many of us still work principally in the past. I do and others do. But we also now have many people a contemporary and a model-into-the-future perspective. And I think that makes us more relevant. We can now take the long span information that we've got and use it to test ideas about how climate works, where it's going... but people in the Institute are at least now looking to the future. That's good.

Cilli: When Paul Mayewski came, you said that he really changed the character of the Institute. Aside from his research, what has he done for the Institute?

Sandweiss: He has pushed us to be broader—certainly pushing the forward-thinking policy aspects, engaging with the state (Maine's Climate Future, for instance), bringing people here who have forward thinking and contemporary impacts of climate and so forth. Although much of his work has been, until now, on paleo records, he thinks very much towards the future. And he's been trying to bring the Institute into that arena, I think quite successfully.

Cilli: Maine's Climate Future. That was an effort at public outreach?

Sandweiss: Absolutely. We also have Molly Schaffler; she's a public education expert. She is a graduate of the Institute, and her job is outreach to the public, to K-12, for the Institute.

Cilli: One final question. What do you think has been the Institute's most important contribution to our understanding of climate change?

Sandweiss: That's a hard question. I think there are lots of contributions. Early on it was improving understanding of past climates. Now I think it's shifting into the realm of where are

we going with climate and what are we going to do about it. If this IGERT program really works well, the people who come through that program will become leaders in dealing with the climate crises of the future, and that will be a very significant contribution that we make. So it changes. The important thing is that the Climate Change Institute has remained at the forefront of the field as it changes. So it continuously makes contributions, both as a group, and in terms of the individual work. And it remains a model of interdisciplinary interaction working pretty well. And it doesn't always work. Many scientists don't know how to work with people from other disciplines and do productive work. I was on an NSF panel last year which solicited proposals, and most of them came from very distinguished scholars who'd gotten lots of NSF money in their disciplines. And you could see in their proposals that they had no idea how to work with scholars in other disciplines. It was not like our proposals, where the researchers on the proposal are clearly in lock step with each other.

Cilli: Are there formal expectations that you will do interdisciplinary research when you come to the Institute, or is it more informal?

Sandweiss: In some ways it's more informal. It's the ethos of it. We talk together, we go on trips, we go to meetings, and you begin to realize, "hey, there's overlap in what we do." What the Institute does, from the perspective of a tenure track faculty member, with half your salary in the Institute, what that gets you is liberation to do interdisciplinary research if you want to. Because you're jointly reviewed. You're not reviewed by a discipline. You're reviewed by a combination of Institute people and discipline people. And that means that whatever you do, if it's good work and it comes out in a decent journal. It's going to count positively towards your tenure. If you were in single discipline, say you're in anthropology and you're publishing in archeology journals, you might be in trouble. There are places that might not tenure you. In fact I know a guy a Penn State who lost his job because of that. It would never happen to you as a joint appointment, because Institute people are on your tenure committee and anything you do within its broad area of research counts. And so it frees you up to do interdisciplinary work.... Right now, the group that I work with includes Alice Kelley, Joe Kelley, and Dan Belnap. For many years Kirk Maasch and I worked together, and we hope to get back to that. It's very productive. But you have to have a structural support that allows you to do that safely, and the Institute provides that.

Cilli: Has that ever created an issue, where a scholar was doing something outside of what his department traditionally does, and got in trouble for it?

Sandweiss: I've never heard of that happening. There's an understanding that that's a good way to go. Maybe that's because people have seen what the Institute has done and they see that it's a good model....

Cilli: Well, that's all the questions I had, but before we conclude the interview I do want to give you a chance to add something that I didn't think to ask you about.

Sandweiss: You covered it pretty well. The big thing about the Institute is how it succeeds in inspiring interdisciplinarity. You touched on that very directly with your questions. I think that's the big story about the Institute, was that it brought people together to work productively, beginning at a time when that was just a thought in some people's minds. But it was not what it later became. But now it's the buzz word throughout academia. That wasn't true 40 years when

the Institute started. It was ahead of the curve in that respect. And it's led the way in showing people how to do it. And there are places where it doesn't work. And there are places on this campus where it doesn't work. I know sometimes people are joint appointed and the discipline in fact does exactly what you're saying and doesn't accept that their work, that is not in the core area of your discipline, is not worth tenuring or promoting, and it's nasty business. But that's never been the case with the Institute. The departments that participate with the Institute buy into the mission. They see the advantages of it. And also it's interesting that the constituent departments tend to be among the strongest on campus. And the departments that have made a fuss about this sort of thing are among the weaker departments.

Cilli: As much as you can say, could you give me a "for example"?

Sandweiss: For example, the person is in a side area, related to another discipline, and (I have to be careful how I say this) the peer committee insists that people who are from the core discipline... they don't quite say that "we don't believe that what this person does is within our discipline," although that's exactly what they believe. Instead, they'll say, "well, you have to have 20 peer-reviewed publications to be a full professor." And their document for guiding tenure decisions absolutely doesn't say that. And they take their review letters, and out of five glowing review letters, [they] take the one statement that is slightly negative and [make it] the only thing they quite out of all the letters. Just bias. Just their bias, because they don't like the person. Well, that's probably enough. That's a real case that has happened recently. And it's unfortunate. But the Institute doesn't do that. It's not that the Institute doesn't have its internal squabbles. It does. But as an organization it works extremely well. It's a good organizational culture.

Cilli: Well, thank you once again for sharing all of your thoughts.

Sandweiss: It's been a pleasure.