

James Cleary, Track 4

Tape 2, Side B

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 incensing, I'm telling you it's incensing to the students.

JB: I hear it all the time.

JC: You hear it.

JB: Constantly.

(00:05:01)

JC: 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, just a moment.

JC: Sure.

JC: 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.

(00:09:59)

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. 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.

(00:15:07)

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.

(00:20:11)

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 facility, 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.

(00:28:40)

JB: 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 materialism. 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 2B]