

## James Cleary, Track 2

Tape 1, Side B

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: 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?

(00:04:53)

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: 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: 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.

(00:10:47)

JB: 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.

(00:18:23)

JB: 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: 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 for 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

(00:25:05)

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 1B]