

James Cleary, Track 3

Tape 2, Side A

JB: 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 evolvment 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.

(00:06:52)

JB: 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: 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.

(00:10:41)

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: You mentioned earlier formulaic constraints.

JC: Yup.

(00:14:48)

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.

(00:20:20)

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 pen 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.

(00:27:44)

JB: 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: 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 except 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 2A]