

Oral History Transcript  
James Cleary, CSUN President, 1969-1992  
Interviewed by CSUN Professor, John Broesamle  
Interview conducted 1990

JC = James Cleary  
JB = John Broesamle

JB: [00:00:05] There, we're on tape. You're on your graduate work and your masters were taken at Marquette and your PHD Wisconsin?

JC: Yes.

JB: And then you became assistant chancellor at Wisconsin, and then vice chancellor for academic affairs. What were your responsibilities in those two positions at Wisconsin?

JC: [00:00:30] Well the, let me lead into the appointment at each of those levels. I had the great fortune to have been nominated by Fred Harrington who was then president of the University of Wisconsin system. To a program that served really as the prototype to the president of American Council on Education program of luring classroom professors into administrative positions, and it was sponsored by the Philips Foundation of New York City. A modest program to the extent there were only twelve national awards each year and you had to be nominated by your home institution and I was quite fortunate to receive Fred Harrington's nomination and I was also very fortunate in having UCLA respond affirmatively to a request to allow me to do my administrative fellowship, as they were called, the Philips fellowships at UCLA. And so I had kind of a preview of a California setting before coming out here in 1969 by way of spending the academic year of 1963-64 at UCLA working as kind of a special assistant to then Chancellor Franklin Murphy. But in fact, I worked far more closely with Chuck Young the current Chancellor, who at that time had just been appointed vice chancellor for administrative affairs at UCLA. And spent the first semester of that academic year basically getting to know or understand UCLA but also the entire University of California system as well as what was then called the California State College system. And drafting a revision of the academic master plan for UCLA which ultimately went through the faculty governance channels and ultimately was approved by the board of regents at the end of that academic year; and then spent the second semester visiting a number of institutions in all three segments, UC, CSU or then CSC, and the private sector and in that latter category I visited, had in depth visits at Stanford and Occidental and USC, particularly those three. And it was during that Spring semester that Bob Clodius who happens to be now President of the land grant association a [inaudible] in Washington then, but serving as Vice President for academic affairs of the entire system came out and talked to me and said that, for the first time, the University of Wisconsin system was going to look at the concept of, and implement the concept of, a chancellorship of the Madison campus that would be separate from central administration. Harrington had served in both capacities, Chancellor and President of the system. And I was informed that Bob Fleming who was then director of the labor relations institute at the University of Illinois had been appointed chancellor and that Fred and Bob Clodius and a person by the name of Ed Young who was Dean of the College Letters and Science but had moved on to become President of the University of Maine, returned later to become President of the University of Wisconsin system, had recommended me for the position of Assistant Vice Chancellor - Academic Affairs, the assistant simply meant that there was still some uncertainty as to the what would

ultimately become the structure of, the administrative structure of the University of Wisconsin Chancellor Office, Madison campus. And I served in that capacity only one semester and then was promoted to Academic Affairs Vice Chancellor and it was interesting that Bob Atwell was recruited from the Bureau of the Budget in Washington to become Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs and Bob Fleming had brought up from the University of Illinois, Barbra Newell to serve as his special assistant and the four of us really organized the first Chancellor's office for the Madison campus. It's also interesting to see that Bob had gone on after three or four years there, I think he left in '68, to the presidency of the University of Michigan. Bob Atwell, or Barbra Newell went with him but ultimately became president of Wellesley University, and became in fact the first woman in the United States to head up a major higher educational system, Florida State University system. Atwell stayed on after I left, but the year I had left he came out to become president of Pitzer College out here in Claremont and is now president of the American Council on Education. Fleming left Michigan after 12 or 13 years of very distinguished service, went to, in his retirement or semi-retirement to head up the Public Broadcast System and then resigned from that and returned to Michigan, and I believe he is still teaching law on a part-time basis. He is a Michigan FERPer as he would be called in our system. So in answer of the question, there really was not much difference between what I did for one semester as the system Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and what I did as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. It followed the usual pattern that I was responsible for faculty affairs to assure that the RPT process operated in compliance with the faculty constitution, met with the deans regularly, was responsible for the academic part of the budget, recruited administrators. I did have an unusual appointment over the responsibility in that of all ROTC programs reported to me and also for whatever reason, ended up as the CEO for the entire intercollegiate athletics program at Wisconsin. And in my term of three and a half years in that position, Wisconsin reached the questionable stage of having the longest losing season in the history of the intercollegiate athletics in the country. I think the football team went 3 and a half years with a something like 28, or 3 and 28 season, or record. In addition to that, of course, this was in the middle '60s a lot of my time was taken up in working with the, very carefully with the Dean of Students who at the time was Joe Coffman who later, interestingly, went on to become the President of Rhode Island State College. Left that institution and returned to Wisconsin and ultimately became Executive Vice President of the entire system, so it was rather interesting that that cad ray had organized the first Chancellor's Office of Wisconsin, moved out in different directions and exciting times. But a good deal of that time was spent in dealing with the student unrests and after Fleming, Bob Fleming left Michigan, a very distinguished and very liberal professor of sociology became chancellor, Bill Sewell was his name. And it was during my term that I had that very tragic but yet very educational experience of being called upon by the Chancellor to preside at what I believe, in probably higher education with the longest faculty meeting in the context, or in the aftermath of the Dow riot of October 17, 1968. I just returned from the University of Wisconsin where I received recently the Distinguished Alumnus of the Year award. And in my speech my response opened by way of saying the last time I stood on the stage of the Wisconsin Union Theater was the time of presiding over that faculty meeting. And as the parliamentarian oversaw that it was interesting to see that in a meeting that lasted, started in one day at one in the afternoon and ran until about one in the morning, and then a meeting, we recessed. I met with the Executive Community of the faculty from about one thirty until seven a.m.; the faculty reconvened at eight a.m. and carried on the second day until I believe about four or five in the afternoon. But in that total period of time we had disposed from a parliamentary perspective of three hundred and forty-four motions from all classes main, subsidiary, privileged, and incidental. The other interesting aspect was that the theater capacity is about 1,400, every seat was taken and we had an additional 500 hundred faculty at the Wisconsin Center, about a block away tied in by a way of a two way remote television setup. And parliamentary it was quite an experience to be sure that the ratio was fair in turns of recognizing two speakers from the theater over and against one from the Wisconsin

Center to keep that balance in the debate and various resolutions. Had it, it's served a very good purpose and I, as I have pointed out in those remarks to weeks ago. It was probably a university in its most tragic moment, but also in its greatest moment, in that through those deliberations, which resulted in a lot of ventilation of hard pent-up feelings because in that Dow riot the police and ultimately the National Guard had been called in, approximately six hundred students ended up in the University Hospital and about as many police and security officers at the day end of the break out of the riot early in the morning, about mid-morning. That the university really pulled together, the faculty did, irrespective of the strong feeling on either side of the issue of the universities involvement in Dow, contracts and difference of opinion in regard to the use or call of for outside police forces, which call was mandated by faculty policy under the circumstances that we were confronted with.

JB: [00:14:48] The faculty called in?

JC: [00:14:50] No, but Bill Sewell called them in. But the reason why I ended up as presiding officer, he called upon me to preside so that he could sit behind me and look at the faculty to quote him, squarely in the eyes in discussing and debating the feasibility or the wisdom of that decision. When he was simply, in his words, trying to follow faculty policy, it was a very, very tense moment in the history of the institution. But out of that came an institution that realized that it was pointless to allow disruption of the educational process to occur at any cost and resulted really in the reunification of the entire faculty and the student body as well. But it was a very scary time because the faculty who had attended that meeting had to, students formed a gauntlet had to walk into that theater down through a gauntlet of students on either side, jeering some cheering. It was a not pleasant situation to say the least. In many respects it seemed to become the basics for my involvement in that situation for interest of the institution when search and screen community came out, unbeknownst to me, to ask me if I had interest in coming to this institution. A community that incidentally spent three days on campus checking me out, so to speak, in a number of different quarters before they came in to see me at eleven o'clock on Friday or Thursday afternoon.

JB: [00:16:54] Again, what were the days of the dow affair?

JC: October 18, 1968. October 17, 1968.

JB: '68. Alright. You're appointed of...

JC: Oh wait, now you got me confused here. I think it was October 18, 1967. That's when it occurred.

JB: [00:17:23] You were appointed president of San Fernando Valley State College in June 1969. You had time at UCLA, you looked at the CSC system as well as the UC system, what impelled you to come to Valley State at that point, what drew you here?

JC: [00:17:44] Well several things in that year I spent at UCLA, given the fact San Fernando Valley State College, as what it was called in that time, was geographically close to UCLA was one of the first institutions that I visited after I have concluded my work at UCLA. And I found the institution, though I had not any inkling that I would eventually or fate would eventually bring me here. That the people I had met out here, Ralph Prater as a matter of fact, I spent several hours with interviewing as your interviewing me about the start of the institution and so on. And many others that the institution seemed to have the same kind of intellectual and professional environment that I knew existed at Wisconsin. So I found this institution by virtue of the makeup of the faculty, and in many respects, even the students, very comparable to the

faculty, and general education environment to the inverse of Wisconsin; and then secondly, I knew as many people across the country knew, that this institution was a troubled institution having had a very serious and tragic moment in terms of the November 4, 1968 arrangement or incident. And the second compelling reason was that I thought perhaps I might for my past experience in having served in the capacity of the mediator between the students and the administration and the university and the faculty, to provide some assistance to the institution.

JB: [00:19:47] What were your first priorities when you arrived?

JC: The first priority was to reestablish a sane, peaceful, educational environment, in working towards that objective, to try to bring the faculty together as a united community, the students as well, and really to get on with the business of the institution and the mission of the institution. The second priority, and it kind of relates to the first, was that I learned that many, many people believed that our library now called the Oviatt library, was lost in the legislative process in Sacramento as a punitive measure taken by some legislators in response to the November 4 incident and succeeding incidents of protests and demonstrations. And so it became important to address what appeared to be, a very poor rapport between the institution and the immediate community, to restore that to normalcy as well as restoring the credibility of the institution within the system of CSC and the legislature; and that task did not take too long, within six months the library was back on track in Sacramento and funded so we were able to open the Oviatt in '73, so it was I think it was about two years in construction. So it was probably a year, at least a year, in restoring those relationships.

JB: [00:22:30] It had been encoring another way.

JC: Oh yes, but that's, yes it was scheduled for funding, and the institution had lost its funding in the spring of '69, in the budget deliberations in Sacramento, in the spring of '69.

JB: So your goals, initially, was to bring the students together, the faculty together, the campus community together.

JC: Yes.

JB: And restore the credibility of the institution.

JC: Yes.

JB: [00:23:00] And Sacramento also.

JC: And in the community, right, yes.

JB: Daunting priorities indeed.

JC: Pardon?

JB: Daunting priorities indeed. So Much is subsumed within that.

JC: Well it, I don't know what your next question is. Is it on the same [inaudible]?

JB: No, I wanted to stay with this just a bit longer. Did you develop an overall strategy for coping with student demonstrations?

JC: [00:23:30] Yes. Having come from the academic discipline of communication, speech communication, and other forms of communication, the obvious key was talking. And getting people to talk rather than to fight and argue. The first task was really of one establishing a presidential office that would become known for its openness and to encourage discussion of all the issues that led to the November 4 incident. And be willing to meet with students, to meet with faculty, to hear both sides and try to explain the importance of re-tracking the institution that, in this kind of situation, the institution experienced no one was really a winner, and everyone a loser to the extent that the students simply were not receiving a traditional normal scholarly experience, or educational experience. The faculty had been detracted to the point that I suspect during that period, and you probably know better than I, since you came about that time, you were here before that time, you went through the incident. Detracted from their professional objectives and scholarly tasks of researching and writing and carrying on with teaching under normal civil circumstances. And I must say that I don't really attribute anything to myself or very little. I attribute more to the commitment of the faculty in carrying on with the business of education. And attribute to a wariness that had apparently developed with personal friendships that were broken up among the faculty, among students, etc. People were simply tired of that kind of setting and so, as soon as people knew that it was going to be open and that dialog there would not be anything to fear in terms of retribution or any special autocratic activities, people were anxious to get back together and get with on with the institution and with commitment of the desire to do that, I think, was a major factor in the institutions getting back on course. But I, as I started to say, I was amazed that from my perception began to occur within six months and within 12 months, I felt that the institution was fully back on course and the only thing left that made it difficult was that there were some felonious charges still pending against some of our students. And those charges went through litigation and during that first year there are many people who had been involved in various situations that had to make depositions and those depositions brought back memories and very severe feelings on one side or the other. But once those trials were over, the mending was almost a complete process.

JB: [00:28:30] Did you open your office to the aggrieved or to those who felt they were aggrieved, students and faculty would come in and talk? Did you know?

JC: Yes I came in to the office at I think was eight a.m. Monday morning June 15, was my first day in office. And several things surprised me, number one, the office of the president was in a windowless closet because the president's office had been burnt out. My first meeting within 25 or 30 minutes was a group of black students, the representatives of the BSU. With whom I had spent about two and a half hours listening, not talking, but listening to their concerns but more importantly their expectations. And as soon as they left, without notice, a group of about six or seven faculty came in to indicate what they perceived to be the position of the entire faculty. And then right after that group another group came in presenting what they perceived to be the faculty position from their perspective and of course the two came from conflicting camps at the same time. But that probably was the most educational moment in terms of becoming acquainted with the institution that I have ever had; and then in a relatively short time, in a matter of one day. But I remember Dean Scofflan was one of the first, I think he was the spokesperson of a group, the first group of faculty that came in right after the leadership of BSU left.

JB: [00:30:39] In General, what did you feel were tolerable and intolerable forms of protest, on the campus? Was there any clear definition of that or merely the legal definition?

JC: Well in my mind I personally believed then, believe now that all forms of protest are legitimate. I'd hate to ever give the impression that protests need to be looked at by virtue... [End of tape 1.]

JB: And again we were talking.

JC: Yes I.

JB: About forms of...

JC: Yes, I never cared to look at the concept protest immediately cast it into a legal or illegal dichotomy. I think putting aside the concept of protest; the question had to do with what's tolerable and what's intolerable. And I think what's intolerable is of course violence, physical violence and destruction. Again problems are not solved by burning down buildings. But messages are made very clear through the form of protest and demonstrations and I applauded the students in the protest and demonstrations and in which I was personally involved and that was almost every day for the first 2 or 3 or 4 months of the fall semester of '69. And I had not so much to do about, interestingly enough, about the about the racial issues that were so fundamental to the 1968 episode. Believe it or not, apparently from many conversations I spent most of my time meeting with student groups, student individuals, students who came out to the house. And I think that, that the intense feelings on the racial issues diminished to the point or level of people wanting and expecting solutions to that problem and had some reason to feel there was a way to address those issues. The protests, believe it or not, had to do more with obviously the social issues of the day, national social issues of the day, the Vietnam situation, but also many of them having to do with the disposition of faculty promotion, retention, and tenure decisions that were made favorably or unfavorably. Protest over obviously popular instructors who were not promoted or did not receive tenure. The students at that time were very much interested in the faculty personnel process and the outcome. And you must remember at that time they really had as they now have, any opportunity for student input, formally and procedurally. We have now student evaluations, we didn't have those before. And, but there were demonstrations over many of them were over personnel actions taken by faculty committees or ultimately by myself, because I, given the thoroughness of their own internal faculty RPT process, never overturned any of those decisions. Although I may have had questions but I have to respect the role of the faculty in determining personal policy and actions.

JB: [00:35:53] Apart from RPT were there any areas where you felt students had a case where they were right as student demonstrators? And where did they go wrong?

JC: Where did...

JB: They were arguing about social issues of the time, as you point out, race and the war, did you find yourself in agreement with them at all?

JC: Oh yes I was fully sensitive and sympathetic with their issues as I am today on some of the current burning issues. I think if there's any disagreement, or where I personally perceived that where they may have gone wrong was to attack the problem in a way that simply would not be productive. As I have said earlier, you don't effect change by burning down buildings or stopping the educational process or disruption an educational institution. 80% of the community, LA community, could care less whether we shut down a day or two classes, the only people who suffer are the students and faculty and many administrators who then have to put aside all their administrative work and let it pile up until they get back to it. The interesting phenomenon of the student revolutions of the '60s and early '70s; I think the

students generally came out of that experience, coming to that realization you don't get change, you don't effect change by closing down administration building or disrupting teaching. You get, you affect change by getting involved in the process itself, and I think one of best examples is the instances of the real student leader of that Dow riot at the University of Wisconsin, ultimately, only about 4 years later became the mayor of the city and stayed the mayor of the city for 15 or 18 years, and he was a very distinguished mayor and things changed.

JB: [00:37:53] Who was he?

JC: I'm sorry I can't...

JB: It might be Tom Hayden up in California.

JC: Well yes, well the same thing happened up in Berkeley. I think one of the student leaders became mayor of Berkeley, if I'm not mistaken. That wasn't Tom Hayden.

JB: No.

JC: But Hayden in turn also got into the process and now he's a very distinguished assemblyman.

JB: It could be called the Tom Hayden syndrome.

JC: [00:38:52] That's right, and that was a good lesson to learn. And as we now return since I've firmly believe that it's all cyclical and the pendulum moved extremely to one extreme in the 60's and 70's and then through the middle and late and early 80's moved to the other extreme of indifference, no activism, which cost, I think, educational institutions the price of being or ceasing to be intellectually lively places in which to learn. And now it's starting to swing back, but as it swings back so far there hasn't been the violence that one normally associated with the activities student activism of the '60s and '70s. And while those protests or demonstrations are beginning to become more and more frequent, at the same time there is civility, good humor and willingness to get involved in the process. So you see the leaders now becoming more involved in student government, student government becoming more articulate, important in the decision making process or policy setting process of an institution. So if we do move further to, as I am sure we will do and see it all about us, to the point of activism that will be very comparable to what we experienced in the '60s and '70s, it appears that it will be done in a more effective way in terms of getting or achieving, affecting change. And the media are assisting a good deal. The media are paying more and more attention to every kind of demonstration on Wilshire Boulevard. And any demonstration over the quality of food or the dress code in high school, as a matter of fact high schools are now becoming as popular for the journalist and the news reporters as places of action and newsworthy events as institutions of higher learning. And those students in high school will be soon our students and another, it's happening now and I suspect the student attitudinal profile will be far different from 4 years from now than what it is now, if not sooner, 3 year, 3, 4, 5 years.

JB: [00:41:57] I think you're right. I'd like to make a rather a long leap, to a very different sort of question, it's one that I put to Ralph Prator, and I would like to ask you the same question. How would you describe your own style of presidential governance? Are their ways in which you would characterize it? What your approach is, your philosophy presidential governance?

JC: Yes I, I think that, I can do that rather readily because it is a question I always raise it, if we were in a reversed situation and I was interviewing you for a administrative position, vice-presidency or deanship or whatever. The question I always ask is how would you describe your administrative style? Which gets at the same basic answer as your question does. There are certain characteristics, I think first of all, and you put it in the context of the presidency or the chief executive officer of a educational institution. The first thing that I've believe one has to highly value, is the fact that you are there really as a servant of the people supposedly or to preside over, you're to be a facilitator. You are to assist students in the best way you can to meet their individual educational goals and aspirations. The president or a chancellor is there to facilitate the function of a university professor, teaching and research and community service but primarily the prior of the first two. And to protect at the same time the academic integrity of the institution, particularly during times when change is inevitable in adapting to special and obvious societal needs. Changing, in our instance, changing demographic conditions of the state, the people we serve and to be the best possible spokesperson of both the faculty and the students and I have to include the administrators because they do from groundskeepers, to technicians of all sorts, to secretaries. To be the best possible spokesperson in the forums where the resources of the institution are at stake and that means the best possible spokesperson before the Chancellor's Office in the instance of our system and before the Board of Trustees and before the legislature and various offices of the executive branch and the Department of Finance and so on. In terms of style, I have always believed and something basically that Bob Fleming taught me and I consider it a great benefit that I derived from working with Bob Fleming who is chancellor at the time, that people will accept a decision normally if they feel they have been a part in the shaping or making of that decision. And to achieve that kind of feeling among people, faculty, students there has to be a very important element of consultation or willingness to consult as often as possible on every issue. And I know from my in-depth evaluations made by the Chancellor's Office over the years, which have been, and I say this very modestly, I hope that they have been very very kind and very very favorable, but one source of criticism is of myself has been that I consult too much. And if one has to err on the side of consultation I suspect it's far better to err on the side of over consulting than under consulting. And the price you pay is that it takes a little longer, sometimes too long. But, I don't mind that it requires at the same time then patients in dealing with given problem and quite willing to be patient and wait it out. And sometimes if the institution is known to be a place where there is a good deal of openness, sometimes those problems get resolved without any involvement of the president or vice-president or the dean. And that probably is the best way to get at a solution, because you can be almost absolutely assured that whatever the outcome, everyone irrespective of which side the given issue one may be, will tend to accept it because they know it's evolved out of the pure discussion, pure dialog rather than being imposed by the administration fiat which is the worst possible thing to do. So openness, frankness, forthrightness, patience, willingness to be available, those are all, in my book, important characteristics of a good presidency.

JB: [00:49:33] Shared Governance?

JC: Yes, no to be sure.

JB: As a Principle?

JC: Yes.

JB: Let me ask you about the faculty role ensure of your governess because they do play a large role in this. Looking back as far as 1969, would you say that the faculty role in governing the campus has grown or diminished or remained about the same?

JC: Could you be clearer on, what do you mean by role?

JB: Well...

JC: I know what I mean by role.

JB: We have a senate now and we had a senate then. And we have faculty opinion that is reflected in the senate and reflected outside the senate. And faculty come in and share views with you and they do that now and they did that then. You have ways of tapping faculty opinion and attitude. Through your conversation and through talking with your own executive group and with those in turn who have contacts in the general faculty. I guess to phrase the question a little differently, has faculty influenced on the ways, on the direction the campus takes and on what the campus does remained as it was then? Has it actually increased, has it diminished as you see it? Maybe that's not a meaningful question.

JC: Well I. Pardon?

JB: Maybe that's not a meaningful question.

JC: [00:51:07] No, I think I understand the drift of it. I think that, well first of all let's set out some basic principles. One, of one I firmly believe that the faculty should have a prime, primary voice on all issues having to do with educational policy and personnel policy in regard to faculty peers, having to do with retention, promotion, tenure. And this is why over now 21 years, I take great pride in the fact that in regard to personnel matters, I have not overturned a single action, personnel action, by a personnel faculty committee. Where I have had some question, I made it a point of meeting with that personnel committee, and I have to say that honestly in 21 years I may have done that once or twice. But nonetheless, irrespective of the outcome with the request for reconsideration, after the request was made the decision was to stay with the original one, that's what I accepted. The only time that I did not give a clear reading was on one faculty personnel action, in which at the department level, school level, and the all university level, those three bodies voted differently, two in one direction, one in the other direction. And in each and every instance the difference was only one in the vote, in the actual vote. And I simply took arithmetically all those votes and gave them equal weight and went with the decision of what I could determine to be the majority of all those who did vote, all three levels. In regard to educational policy, prior to this year, I also take great pride in the fact that I remember, rejected the recommendation of the faculty senate, I think only one occasion I sent an issue back for reconsideration, quite frankly, about 10 or 11 years ago, and I can't even recall what the issue was but it was re-debated and the faculty senate changed its position. And this year I broke that record in one semester by having to reject two recommendations, one coming out of the educational resource committee that called for formulaic approach to the allocation of support positions, and the other in regard to ROTC. On both issues however, I was in support of, sympathetic with the motives of the recommendations that came forward and in support of what was being ultimately sought. In regard to the ERC recommendation I returned to that committee, the ERC, and indicated a full willingness to pursue that, the basic problem about which we all exist, and to encourage that we sit down together to examine various alternatives. I felt I could not accept the recommendation after having had 20 years plus experience of fighting for opposing formulaic budget approaches. It destroys the flexibility of an institution. It makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible to deal with mandates imposed by the state government or by the Board of Trustees in regard to the use of positions that can be used for different purposes within certain guidelines. But you see the basic problem here is inadequate support for faculty at the departmental

level. And I have talked enough and have talked enough with a number of faculty saying, who said that giving a department an additional support position does not guarantee that the faculty will benefit from it. I mean you give it to a school and it may stay in the school and the departments don't. Or you give it to a department chair and the department has to use the position to respond to the numerous requests, bureaucratic requests for responses to questionnaires and reports and so on, that the support is not available for the faculty in order to prepare for exams, or prepare for research grants and the whole bit. And so I suggested to ERC and I said, I hope you understand that, and I hoped they understand, even now or with the new members coming on, that I agree with the problem and there may be some alternatives we can follow to address really what are the roots of the problem, inadequate individual faculty support for teaching and research. One alternative for example might be to establish a university wide or school wide pool of secretarial service, to which pool faculty member could go to have a grant proposal prepared or a manuscript prepared for submission to editorial board one sort or another. So I, even having taken that action of rejection doesn't mean the issue in my mind is finished and I want the dialog to continue and to continue until we get a satisfactory resolution And I hope ERC invites me back and they get to the point where they want to revisit that particular issue. And they seemed at the time of my meeting, four weeks ago, that they will extend that invitation. I don't want to impose myself but they know then I'm anxious to address the problem. In regard to ROTC thing I was kind of caught in a unfortunate, no-win situation in terms of the university community, or at least the vast majority of the university community. Because I have received a legal opinion from the Chancellor's Office that simple said, that you are running a very serious legal risk and a risk that the trustees ought to address rather than an individual campus. That was the basic context of the message of saying here are the problems, one two three four five. And I found myself, I guess a rather lonely position and frustrating position of supporting the effort to change or to really abolish the discriminatory policy of the Department of Defense, homosexuals serving in military ranks. And I, in one session before the last senate meeting spent time working with a rewrite the resolution that would in effect put us all together on a university-wide bases altogether on the issue of opposing the discriminatory policy of the military and in fact going further and setting out a course of action that would call upon the students, the faculty, myself, the chancellor, and the Board to Trustees to pursue a given course of action to secure that end. And as I recall we worked nearly two hours on that and at the last senate meeting it never came up, and I don't know what happened to it. And I'm pleased so see the original position was reaffirmed and the senate simply chose to go the governance route and message that position to the state wide... [End of tape 2.]

JB: [01:03:09] We're back on tape. Would you please continue?

JC: So they, our senate chose the governance, faculty governess route system side and messaged its position to the statewide senate and I presumed the statewide senate, which is also taken the position a little different, but not too different from the one taken by our own faculty and that issue will come before, properly before, the chancellor and the chancellor will make appropriate consultations with the presidents, the leadership of the California State Students Association and, probably continue the consultation with exec committee of the state wide senate and then the issue will become before the board. And if it becomes before the board, I can assure you that I will take a position of supporting any effort taken by the system or by the trustees to affect change in that policy. Now the interesting thing is that, I would rather address what I perceive to be the most important of policy or issue and that is the issue discrimination against homosexuals, rather the issue of ROTC. Because ROTC does perform a service to society, we did not have a formally hosted program and the faculty apparently back in the early '60s; it was not just something that was done in 1984 someone pointed out on the senate floor, or '76 we had, I understand, an ROTC not program, but we had students in 1962-63 who matriculated in ROTC programs, I believe it was at USC, as a matter of fact rather than UCLA as it now is, back in 62-63. But ROTC does

provide an important service to American society in providing to the leadership ranks of the military, people who come out of a liberal education with great sensitivity for critical thinking and sound judgement along those lines, and with an appreciation of pluralistic society and prevents America or the United States from depending purely upon professional military establishments for their leadership. Many of the greatest military leaders we have had come out of the reserve force, and were well liberally educated individuals.

JB: So the issue is not ROTC, the issue is the treatment of homosexuals.

JC: That's right.

JB: In our ROTC.

JC: Precisely.

JB: I'm becoming mindful of our time.

JC: Yup.

JB: And your schedule, but I wonder if we could just explore briefly one last aspect of the matter.

JC: Incidentally, let, I probably didn't go full circle, you started out by way of asking me what the role of the faculty diminished or increased. I would say it's the same yet it may have diminished somewhat but not by virtue of these two actions of rejections on those two issues, one of which is still open, and I hope to get resolved. The other also resolved but with a different way. I think what's happening for my prospection over a long period of time, is that for whatever reason, and it would make an interesting subject to study, there seems to be a more universal evolvement of the faculty in the '70s little bit in the '80s than there is now. And I think the last several faculty presidents will attest to this, it's getting more and more difficult to get faculty to serve on faculty committees. And it's getting more and more difficult, as I understand it, to get faculty to run for office or to be willing to become, that is to say, a senator, or to take the chair of a standing committee. And I think something needs to be done to address that, and it may be a matter of an overload of the faculty, it may be, in other words, too busy to get involved because it does take a lot of time involvement also in educational processes involved that you need to sit on a educational resource committee you gotta learn something about the complex nature of the budgeting system and on the campus. And faculty, some faculty, or many faculty obviously feel it's not that important. It's more important to meet the promotional criteria and the promotional criteria say nothing specifically about service in the senate or service on the committee, also there is a criterion that does say service to the university. But that can be met in a number of different ways other than running for an office or a position in the Senate. So I guess what I'm saying is that, at least from my perception, a smaller and smaller group is getting, the group that is willing to get involved in faculty governess, seems to be getting smaller and smaller and smaller. And I think that's a serious situation in terms of the effective functioning of faculty governance.

JB: [01:09:46] Are there any places in faculty governance [inaudible] faculty themselves do not directly belong? For example there are not faculty members on say, is there any place that faculty step aside and those vested with administrative powers take over?

JC: Take over what?

JB: Authority within the university.

JC: Authority on issues of educational policy?

JB: Only with responsibility, we've talked in terms of educational policy, we've talked in terms of personnel. But there are aspects of power within the university which you've reserved for yourself are their not?

JC: Well, I hesitate to use the word power, it...

JB: The wording, I'm sorry.

JC: That's fine.

JB: Responsibility perhaps?

JC: [01:10:33] That's more accurate because with that responsibility also comes accountability. And that is the key here. That the decisions in terms of expending of resources and full accountability of the use budgetary resources, rest with those that have appointments in positions where the responsibilities are articulated in a matter of law. I have to sign off personally, in writing, that this university, every year, that this university has used every penny of the \$120,000,000 a year budget. Every penny has been used and conformance of the intent of the legislature and governor when that budget was made into a budget act. Now I delegate that responsibility to the three Vice Presidents in the three basic areas. It is important to have the faculty input, the faculty should be part of the decision making process, but the ultimate decision has to rest with the person or persons that have the legal reasonability and accountability, for those decisions. Now it's interesting that you mentioned SEG because the subject just recently come up, not discussed in the Exec Committee off the, someone, some member last year of the exec committee asked that this be was on the agenda and there was some discussion, we, I guess it was that it was at the very last Executive Committee and we didn't have time to really to get at it, except that I did have the opportunity to, because I attend all the exec committee meetings, to talk about really more involvement of the faculty by virtue of say the faculty President or designee in SEG. Now SEG, maybe it's the wrong acronym or the wrong name or appalachian because it's basically nothing more than three vice presidents and myself and two of my special assistants or Director of Governmental affairs and administrative affairs and legal. 95% of the time we spend in SEG would be, and I say this from a faculty perspective, having been a teaching professor and a research professor, the worst waste of time one could, I mean you have no idea as to the nonsensical things we have to deal with. An effort by some developer to convert some faculty in the immediate area into a disco open until four in the morning. We'll spend three hours or two hours discussing that. The key decisions are made in terms of the faculty and interest, and should be made are in those, basically those two areas of policy and personnel. But also the should have a voice in the budget process. And I think we have come a long way on that, and there is a lot of faculty, we have more budget advisory committees on this campus than on any campus I know in the system. We have the most decentralized budget process than any campus in the system, and we have been criticized for that. We are the most decentralized, and I get comments from, you know, the Vice Chancellor for Business, Dale Hannon and others. Or there'll be new people coming from one campus in the system to this campus saying my God, President so and so always kept aside hundreds of thousands of dollars and just arbitrarily moved that money around you know. The only money I have control over is what's allocated to me basically by the process, is here in the President's Office and it's the tiniest budget on campus, less than

most of our departmental budgets, far less. But getting at, I think the substance of the question you raised and this is the comment I made after the close of the meeting. And I hope to talk to the new president, Al Baca, about this that I'm perfectly happy in sharing the agenda or happy to invite in anyone who wants to speak to a particular topic that is known to be on the agenda or should be on, and is not on the agenda so there would suggest. And I hope we can get at that concern that seems to be inferred in the question you raised, about closer communications and I would support that. And I hope that you know, we continue this discussion in the Exec Committee this year. I would like for example, for years I had a schedule of meetings, not meetings, the president of AS and the Vice President of AS, and I have lunch together twice a month sometimes three times a month, just review informally the concerns or what's on the horizon, things that we, you know, would have to work together on. I would like to see the same sort of thing in regard to the relationship between the President's office and the president and the institution, president of the faculty. And there's no reason why that can't be achieved, there used to be times in the past faculty presidents, anybody can walk through that door at any time. And I don't know but for whatever reason there's less interest in doing so or whatever. But I'm be very happy, you know, to pursue more and more communication and involvement. But in regard to the budget, as they say, we have more budget advisory committees then I think any campus in the system.

JB: [01:17:38] You mentioned earlier formulaic constraints.

JC: Yup.

JB: And we all know what they are coming down from the top. Sometimes I think of Northridge as the kind of chained giant. Here we are with about as many students at Berkeley, but were within a system that has any number of formulaic and other constraints that it puts on us and a legislature which further puts constraints on us. Are we a chained giant, that is to say realistically what could we become? What could this campus, given the realities become over time? And I wonder if there is a model that you have in mind for our campus, is there some university that you thought of held sort of the back of your mind as one to model this one after over the long hall.

JC: Well I have a model, but is not extant at any institution. And your question is a very good one and it gives me an idea of an opportunity to say something that I think many people have overlooked or simply not been aware of in terms of potential. There's no way that this institution or any institution within this system will ever get away from formulaic budgets. The legislature is sorry that, by way of giving constitutional status to the University of California, it's sorry it's done that because the University of California can say thanks a lot but no thanks. And take the money and do whatever they want with it, there's very little accountability before the legislature. And I know over the years that it's a common theme up every time I visit in Sacramento and talk to the legislators there hyper critical about the way in which the University of California responds to legislative budgets or budgets acts and speak of the arrogance of the system. And in the same breath will say, "by god this will never happen in the CSU or in the CSC", meaning that they won't give up that control, so were stuck with that formulaic budget. All we can do is fight for greater flexibility, and I think essentially we got more, even though we got a lame budget, we've got more fiscal flexibility today than we have ever had. The problem is that our flexibility is such a tiny bit of a vast spectrum. 85 to 87 cents of every budget dollar that comes to this institution is determined how it's to be spent. Goes into salaries and benefits and basically so this gives us only about 15 or 13 cents on the dollar to fiddle with internally to meet those needs here and there and so on. So we don't have that flexibility, so we need to protect whatever we do have. It has always been, and I know the program or the project is now about 9 or 10 years old from inception to now, and I'm speaking about the University Park project. My basic drive all along has been two-fold. Number one, that through that

University Park project, which carries a lifetime of 55 years with two ten year options. But the first 15 years will result in facilities that the state would never build for us. And I'm thinking of the theater, performing arts and visual arts center, multipurpose stadium, conference center, we would not under current, and they'll stay in place for many many more decades if not centuries. Cannot be justified by any of the state capital outweigh criteria. My intent in terms of this University Park project is to see that these facilities are provided, but in addition to that, and not many people realize this, that after those facilities are achieved, the university will participate at a level of 20 percent of all of the revenue coming in from the facilities that are leased out to non-university entities, but entities that must have some kind of interface academically, or programmatically interfacing capacity. This means that if the full build out of the totally envisioned University Park occurs, that annual revenue of 20 percent flow will give this university an endowment compounded over the years, properly or safely, or reasonably invested an endowment that could range 200 to 500 million dollars, 70 years out, starting as soon as our last building that we need to build in that University Park plan. Because the revenue, all the immediate front revenue coming in will be used to build those facilities. But once there constructed, then we can start building our own endowment. I have asked the Exec Committee, of this past year, to assist me because before I leave office, by virtue of retirement or whatever, I would like to set in concrete and irreversible policy that says that that endowment is to be used for educational development and faculty research and creativity. And an exclusive that no one else can get to it for any other purpose, and then let my successor and your successor 25, 35, 40 years out from now determine how best to use it but within those constraints. And the numbers on it will show that, in terms of that revenue, that's revenue that would come to us from the office structures that are being constructed, the hotel, the restaurant, the conference center, somewhat from the housing will go into that, and the numbers and projections have indicated it be something in the neighborhood of 200 to 300 million dollars. And that's three times our current budget. And that means if you have an endowment of 250 million dollars, that means [inaudible] if properly invested with touching the capital, it can provide a yield of about 10% or 25 million dollars a year or 25% of our entire current budget or nearly that, 20% of our budget, to be used exclusively for faculty research and educational development. And the reason why I conceived of this model and it's not entirely original, other institutions have done it in bits and pieces here and there, but nothing on this magnitude, is that the University of Wisconsin, the only reason there is an institution that world famous, top quality faculty, many departments that are ranked by graduate school deans as the best or in the top ten in the country, History being one of the departments or disciplines. Extremely limited resources from the state, the state has less than the population of the county of Los Angeles, basically farming industry as its basic industry and breweries. It was only by virtue, many years ago, of a biologist in the College Agriculture who discovered vitamin C and turned over that patent to the University of Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, which is now called WARF. With the understanding that income from that would be used exclusively to provide for faculty research and educational development. That grew over a period of years to a point where the University of Wisconsin, that association owns all of the Wisconsin dells, the primary resort and tourist area for the state of Wisconsin. It was followed not only by that professor's act but all other professors that received research support, but was willing particularly in the scientific areas, faculty that were willing to give to the university ownership of the patent. And this enables from that fund alone, the Madison campus alone, to provide for research leads in various different forms and annually about where I left in 1969, it was no less than 25 million dollars. For about 2,000 faculty members for research and I suspect that's at least doubled or tripled by now, and that's the thing that makes the University of Wisconsin great because it has the reputation that being at the bottom of big pay latter in terms of faculty salaries, but that was the thing that attracted quality faculty, many of whom receive Nobel Laureates and the like. And I see in the University Park project a similar opportunity. And if you're going to get that margin of distinction that you're suggesting here, despite having to deal with formulaic budget, which will never

change, this is our answer. And we'll be as well-endowed as most land grant institutions are in the country, as a state university having to deal with a formulaic budget, and that's the value of the project.

JB: [01:30:40] So a lot going on. Mindful of our time, I want to ask a broad perspective question. Which I suspect you many want to take a bit of time to answer. And if not we can go onto others.

JC: Sure.

JB: Let's play with this.

JC: How many others do we have?

JB: Oh, not many.

JC: Okay.

JB: I was going to ask about Division 1.

JC: Oh Yes.

JB: [01:31:07] But let's bypass that for a moment. You've been president now for 21 years, from the vantage point of 1990, what do you regard as the most important accomplishment you've achieved so far? And have yet to make in this role? I think you just answered a large part of the second question. And then finally to make it a tripartite question, any regrets?

JC: I can't, I really don't have any regrets expect one that given the context in which we have to work, and I mean, nearly full dependency on the resources of the state and the generosity or lack of generosity of the Governor and the legislature. We didn't, what we achieved as a institution did not come earlier. I wish the University Park project had been in place, you know 5 years ago, fully. We've run into, you know, political and community relations problems but they're being resolved and I hope they'll be finally resolved, believe it or not, in the next two months, sometime this summer. And hopefully the first revenue producing, real revenue producing facilities will be under construction early sometime in the Fall semester up on Devonshire. I think that the greatest satisfaction I've had in this position is to be present and in a position of some influence and being part of the development of the institution into a mature institution from one that was fairly new, almost an infant. And by institutional maturity I mean obviously not only the physical growth of the campus, which was a source of a lot of frustration until now. We now have one of the largest capital outlay programs of any campus in the entire United States. I mean visitors that come from the Midwest or East or South, Southeast, come here. They can't believe we have or will have over the next 10 to 12 years a half billion dollars' worth of capital facilities constructed on this campus. And that would include state support, non-state supported facilities, and of those non-state supported facilities two-thirds of them will come out of the University Park project, the other third coming out of the students, but there union expansion, new union, and housing. I mean more than the physical maturation of the campus, the academic maturation to the point that it's a respected institution, it is nationally known and fast becoming internationally known... [End of Tape 3.]

JC: I think I was about to say AND internationally known. And it's amusing at the same time kind of painful to realize that the institution is more well-known and respected outside of the state of California as it is right here on the campus, and I think that with the turnover of faculty, 500 – 700 due faculty coming in

and it is critical that those faculty come in with a sense of pride, institutional pride, and pride in the institution, something that is not as obvious or present as many of us would like it to be. And for good reason, in particularly faculty coming in at a time when it was just an open field. But it strikes me, and impresses me, to find so many people, so many of my presidential colleagues for example and chancellors is that participating in various national forums, ACE, American association of eight colleges and universities, that they know probably more about the institution than some of our own faculty here, in terms of its strengths and its reputation and activities and development on a number of different fronts. And the students are starting to sense this ever since we had about 3 or 4 years ago, a conflict between some student organizations, basically our ethnic student organizations and the AS government of the time over, believe it or not, a budget issue of 5 or 10 thousand dollars. I decided to bring the leadership of students at that time, immediately after commencement, to a kind of day long retreat in which we have 20 or 30 of the most effective leaders of the key student organizations in our student makeup, together to address that and it solved our problem, that budgetary problem but it went beyond that and it has now become kind of traditional annual thing that I host a day long retreat with the student leadership, from our student organizations, the Greek organizations, BSU, MEChA, Student Union, AS, and so on. And it's been obvious in the past three retreats that the students are developing that pride, have developed that institutional pride, and they're very sensitive to the fact that it's not present among all members of the faculty. And it is that, that becomes the reason for their wanting to get more involved in our faculty retreat, at least to have the opportunity to have a panel or participate in a panel. And to be involved in the orientation of new faculty coming on the campus and most institutions don't have a new faculty orientation thing, I know we have made great strides in that area. But the students are at least the student leadership at these retreats seem to feel that new faculty coming in better understand immediately that the students take great pride in this institution and they want to make sure that those faculty join them in their excitement about the institution. And it's amazing how many professors have been quoted back by the students to me in terms of being derided that if you were any good you wouldn't be here, you would be over at UCLA and that sort of thing. And that comes back to me more and more and it's insensing, I'm telling you it's insensing to the students.

JB: I hear it all the time.

JC: You hear it.

JB: Constantly.

JC: [01:30:34] And so I think we now have the opportunity to move, that's the next step in the development of the institution to that point. I can't provide any detail at this time but let me just say that it is possible, maybe even probable, that our largest single donor gift, and I'm talking about a very large amount of money. Which could well turn out to be the largest donation to any campus in the system may come from an alumnus of this institution, who is in a position to make that contribution easily and is interested at least at this time in doing so because of love for the institution and gratitude for what has done for that person. And if that occurs that will be another factor that will contribute to the advancement of the institution to that next step or next level of universal, university community wide pride in the institution. It's there and very obvious among the students and I think for the most part among the faculty as well. But there is still a large component I think of the faculty and it's still not in that mode and we just said, you hear it all the time.

JB: Just constantly.

JC: Yea. So I think in answering this question it's a great satisfaction seeing an institution, you know, move through a difficult, first of all difficult stage in which there was great divisiveness getting its act back together again and getting back on track and really mushrooming into a highly respected, nationally respected, and internationally respected institution. And all because of the dedication, commitment, hard-work of the faculty and commitment of the students that come out of this institution.

JB: You're going to go off tape. Just a moment.

JC: Sure. [End of Tape 4.]

JC: [01:42:25] Prior to the University Park, I really hope that there will be a better understanding among the faculty of the nature of that project and its purpose, long range purpose, and immediate purpose. Because we have such, and I think we're going to reach that point, most, if not everyone, will understand the importance of that project in the intellectual or academic or educational probably is a better term, development of the institution. We have a very large faculty oversight committee and it has many many sub-committees. So the faculty will be, and many are right now, deeply involved in the planning of some of these facilities, likely the stadium as a multipurpose facility and the performing and visual arts center, a committee working on that. There is also a committee and a whole task force as a matter of fact has been setup expressly to assure that the tenants that come in to the revenue producing facilities will come in with certain understandings and requirements that will promote the interfacing, academic or instructional interfacing of the programs of the tenants and various parts of the university. For example, the expectation is that whatever comes in, and as a good example would an accounting firm establishing its corporate headquarters here, in one of these leased facilities. Could afford many internship opportunities for our students, at the same time would be able to provide a locus of research activity for our faculty, or would provide our faculty an opportunity to extend public service or community service or professional service to these organizations that would come in. I know, despite the fact there've been so many speeches given on this, so much literature disseminated that explain the basic nature but yet there are many people out there thinking, well there going to lease, were going to have you know a penny store up there or whatever. And that's, nothing that could be further from the truth. And I'm not at liberty to say what's some of the potential tenants are at this point, because we have to get over the final legal hurdle or diplomatic hurdle of the city of Los Angeles, and get those buildings, the first two off structures constructed up there, but I can tell you that they are potential tenants that will have every reason, and that's a matter of fact one of the draws in attracting tenants to be located on the university campus and take advantage of the fact that we have a student population of 30,000 here and very distinguished departments in business, in entertainment, you know in engineering, and the whole bit. And the other aspect of that of course is after the lease runs out, I forget to say that in addition to the endowment, all those facilities becomes ours, so will have a research park up there, perhaps some, 70 years out at max.

[01:46:50] On the Division 1, I find it rather interesting that even the issue of division 1 raises the issue as to the place of an athletic program involving a large number of student athletes, that raises the question as to whether there's legitimate, academically legitimate place for a program of that sort in an academy or an institution of higher learning. If there is serious concerns about that issue, they should have been raised way back when we established the program, long before I came, and certainly discussed more than two years ago when the issue of movement into the Division 1 came up. The fundamental questions of value, educational value, have just been raised recently. It is clear from the statement of the mission of the institution that the program has a very legitimate place in the university, from our own mission statement. We are here to, one of the components of that mission statement talks about providing every opportunity to a student to cultivate and develop his or her skills, as well as other things. To, there's

another component or statement in the mission statement that we are here to enable those students to reach their full potential in society. About three or four components of that stated mission statement, in the catalog, that fit hand in glove with a justification of the athletic program. Now the movement of Division 1 is really not so much a difference as we were operating in Division 2. We have the enviable reputation in not only the NCAA but having been a charter member and member for three years of the president's commission of the NCAA, the enviable reputation of having one the strongest, educationally sound, athletics programs in the country. We have breadth, we have balance in terms of men and women, we have achievement and recognized achievement, and we have not had any scandals, athletic scandals, and that's due primary to the commitment and the vigilance of not only the members, but the coaches and their staffs, but also the faculty that have been involved on a voluntary basis. And there are many that have given freely of their time and counseling student athletes and so on. It's interesting that when I first came here, it was, well as a matter of fact, I served on the search and screen committee, but Dawn Shills became president of sports, and I was on that search and screen committee, and after he was in office at Cal State Fullerton, this is about '74 – '75, Shills pressured me and said, we're moving to Division 1, why in the world don't you move with us? And I said, no I'm perfectly happy with Division 2 status at this time. It's costly and we think people will get the wrong notion that were more concerned about athletics than anything else. We could have made the movement at that time and I'm beginning to think that with hindsight that maybe I made mistake in not raising the issue earlier. But I don't think so, I really thing that at that time we were still coming out of the trauma of the '60s and so on. But Cal State Fullerton with full faculty review made that decision to move in and it's interesting that our movement into Division 1 is for all sports except football, and that's a major point because the cost of football alone would cover the cost all of other sports. But recently, I just told someone the other day, I received a lengthy report, a copy of a report, prepared by the faculty committee down at Fullerton that was called upon to address the issue as to whether they ought to remain in Division 1 in football or whether football ought to move to Division 2 and keep all other sports in Division 1, which is the direction of the tract were on. And I was assuming and hoping that they would recommend cutting programing to Division 2 so they could become eligible for membership into our Western Football Conference at Division 2 level, and strengthen that conference. Because the cost is far less, staying at Division 2 in football and then it would be in Division 1. And I mean considerable, big money. The faculty in that report determined that the overall benefit of movement by Fullerton to Division 1 in 19 whenever it occurred '73 or '74, had a great beneficial impact on the entire university. And instead of concluding, given even though financial strapped, instead of concluding that we ought to move to division, football to Division 2 they came out with a strong statement of support, to maintain football in Division 1. Which, I still think is wrong and would be wrong for our institution, until the resources are there to permit that. I think it's tied in with the notion of institutional pride and the thrust, despite the belief of many people, I have pressed this, the real thrust for this, came not from this office or my office or from myself, but from the students themselves. Who are beginning to get tired and upset, disappointed that the scores of our events received such little, small size print, if it appeared at all in the sports page. That the name of the institution was not getting around, and that people didn't know we existed here. And that's where the primary thrust came, and the initial thrust of course came from the department itself, the Department of, then, Physical Education, but now Kinesiology and Physical Education. The initial thrust came from that department. It was a hard decision, but when you look at it economically, despite some of the numbers and information and oversight, faculty oversight committee that is recently reported out of committee. Economically, it would cost us just about the same amount of dollars to stay in Division 2 than to take us to move to Division 1. Not so much in the first year or two, but as soon as we get into a conference centered here in California, the cost will actually, you know, on a projection, probably be less than Division 2, because the Division 2 institutions are disappearing. There are only 12, I think, 11 or 12 west of the Mississippi and in the Division 2 conference in which we sit, there are member institutions contemplating making the same move to Division 1. Sac

State is going to be taking that step next year, has already filed its declaration, or is about to. Cal Poly SLO is studying, and they have some kind of all campus committee the feasibility of doing exactly what we're doing. And I must say that where we see were permitted to move a program into Division 1, we did do that years ago in regards to men's volleyball. I don't know whether you, prime ticket I guess, that's the channel the television channel that played a match with Pepperdine that was covered, it was interesting to see that in, what they called the background or color coverage of the game itself, the second reporter or announcer talks about the institution and its programs, the size of the institution, what it's known for, etc., becomes a very important vehicle, a communication vehicle, or instrument, in getting the institution known, and the better known the institution is, the better our chances, to obtain extramural funding for programs and projects other than athletics. Notre Dame, academically is where it is today because of its football team. Everyone knows, I mean it's a common feeling that USC wouldn't be where it is if it didn't have its program. Now those are private institutions but it came primarily out of this feeling of institutional pride that seems to be spreading among the students. And after all, we talk about support, the students in fact, in terms of the five year plan, financial plan worked out, are putting up the most money, out of their own budgets, AS budget, out of IRA, which is student fee money, and out of foundation which Board of Trustees, 6 faculty, 6 students, 2 administrators, 3 community people voted 14 to 1 and one abstention being myself, as the President of the foundation to provide a substantial level support until such time as the program can be self-supporting. The foundation money, 95 to 97% of that is student money, you know, revenue coming in from student purchases. The IRA student fee money and AS revenue is student fee money. So there putting up the largest amount. And so the question, you know, that I was faced with, what do you do in terms of fostering this notion of growing institution pride among the students and their willing to make that kind of commitment, you just shut them off because, those moneys wouldn't be available for any other purpose. And I feel very firmly that a satisfied, that a full consultation, I mean this thing has been consulted to death for two and a half years, I'm satisfied that that principle was observed and I'm satisfied that if we can stay with the fiscal plan, which has a built in annual review to make adjustments every year, that this can be achieved without, to quote the minutes of the senate, having any, what was the term, the adjective,... *detrimental* impact on the instructional program. And it was a commitment I had made two years ago. And I personally and firmly believe that's been observed. But it has got to be monitored, and this oversight committee has come forward with a good recommendation, and it's got to be monitored, and nothing would suit me more than to have a faculty based oversight committee, and based, faculty based I mean, a majority or more faculty to follow that but informed faculty group with interest to spend time to understand, learn the nature of intercollegiate athletics and understand the budget and follow it, carefully, with continuity. And I'm hoping, I asked Al Baca yesterday at the Exec Committee while the Senate did not get to that report, which kind of upset, some of, some of the members of the committee there standing there waiting to make their report. And there are some things they disagree with in that report, but by in large they think it was a very constructive and comprehensive report and the basic recommendations, for example, of this kind of monitoring committee I would fully support. And I've asked the Exec Committee to put it on the agenda for the next meeting of the Exec Committee this summer, which is, I think, June 25. But I think the thing is behind us, we got a baby in terms of moving a program into a new area. New level of competition and sophistication. It's got to be watched carefully and, you know, nothing is forever, if we don't have the right experience with it, we are committed through for two or three years, I forget which, at which time we can leave at any time and go back to what we are, or eliminate the program entirely, which I think would be a mistake because I do think there is a place for student athletics in a university.

JB: [02:03:18] Return, if I may, to that last question, which is really a question that invites you to ask me questions I may have missed. There is always that risk, I find, that you come in with a array of questions and a couple of hours in which to ask them. But you may have missed the one you should have asked.

JC: Go ahead.

JB: Don't want to run that risk, so I want to ask you if we've done that.

JC: I don't think so, John. All of your questions have been very good and so wide open it gave me an opportunity to say many things that didn't really relate to the bottom line answer to the question. I suppose I'd like to say in probably a response to one of your earlier questions in regards to how I personally feel about being here and this seat for 21 years. I can only say that it's been the greatest privilege and honor of my life and I'm so glad and happy that the two occasions in which I might have had reason to have to leave, or opportunity to leave, did not materialize. One of which, many years ago, probably it was around about 5 or 6 years after I came here, I was a finalist for the presidency for Ohio State University and the other was shortly thereafter, it must have been longer, well about 5 years after I came here. And then the other opportunity was, when I was a finalist for the chancellorship. [End of tape 5.]

JC: [02:05:48] That, I was obviously not the choice of governing board in either case. I'm happy in retrospect, that those opportunities did not develop into a reason for having to leave the institution because, I've been basically, thoroughly, basically *and* thoroughly happy in this position and happy to have had this opportunity to watch it as it develops over, you know, two decades plus. I suppose the only, since basically I came out of the classroom, but still feel very still apart of the classroom environment. That, the only thing I really miss is really teaching. But that's one of those personal decisions one has to make in one's life, and I tried to go back to teaching here, as a matter of fact. Introduced a course in parliamentary procedure here, and thought it was possible to select some evening during the week on which I could confidently feel nothing would happen and that there would be no reason to have to miss a class, but as a backup I got Don Cameron to co-teach the course. And I chose Thursday night because those early days, Monday nights were still filled with problems of one sort or another, student sit-ins and so on. Tuesday and Wednesday are the days, traditional days, of the trustee's meetings and meetings of the presidents, then the Council of Presidents, now the Exec Council. So I picked Thursday, Friday we wouldn't get any students interested in coming to a parliamentary procedure class normally on a Friday night. So we settled on Thursday, and even then, in the course of the semester I had to miss at least three classes because of emergencies of one sort or another. But maybe someday I can get back to teaching. I like to feel as though it's a matter, the experience really, is a matter of leaving the environment of a classroom, but the concept of a classroom has just changed into meeting with the Alumni Board or Advisory Board or meeting with the AS senate from time to time. But in answer to your question I think you've really covered the waterfront beautifully, very well.

JB: Should we go off then?

JC: Sure.

-----End of Transcript-----