

UC Santa Cruz

Institutional History of UCSC

Title

Karl S. Pister: UCSC Chancellorship, 1991-1996

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7pn93507>

Authors

Pister, Karl
Jarrell, Randall
Regional History Project, UCSC Library

Publication Date

2000

Supplemental Material

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7pn93507#supplemental>

Introduction

The Regional History Project conducted eight interviews with UCSC Chancellor Karl S. Pister just prior to his retirement on June 30, 1996, as part of its University History series. Pister was originally named as the campus's sixth chancellor for an interim two-year appointment by UC President David P. Gardner in August, 1991, after the resignation of UCSC Chancellor Robert B. Stevens. In March, 1992, the UC Regents approved President Gardner's recommendation for Pister's regular appointment as chancellor.

Prior to his appointment, Pister had spent his entire academic life at UC Berkeley—thirty years as a faculty member and fifteen years as an academic administrator—and as a seasoned veteran of the UC system and its bureaucracy, he knew the workings of the Academic Senate, the key figures in the University administration, and the institution's policies and culture, all of which stood him in good stead at UC Santa Cruz.

Born in Stockton, California, Pister received his B.S. (1945) and M.S. degrees (1948) in civil engineering at UC Berkeley. In 1952 he received his Ph.D. from the University of Illinois in theoretical and applied mechanics.

He began his career at UC as a lecturer in 1947, and in 1952 joined the faculty of the College of Engineering where he had a distinguished career as a professor of engineering. He served as dean of the college from 1980 until 1990.

He is a member of the National Academy of Engineering, and in 1993 was appointed chair of the section on engineering of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Mechanics, of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and in 1995 was elected a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Pister begins his narration by describing the circumstances which led to his interim appointment at Santa Cruz, and the difficult situation he found upon his arrival. As he explained, "the campus was in such disarray that [President Gardner said he] couldn't go out and recruit for a permanent chancellor." Before accepting the offer, Pister consulted with former UCSC Chancellors Robert L. Sinsheimer and Angus Taylor, and with former UC President Clark Kerr, all of whom encouraged him to take the job and considered him the ideal candidate who could stabilize the campus.

When he arrived at UCSC he encountered a number of institutional conflicts. He found this campus to be very different from its sister institutions

and worked to reconcile its unique college system and emphasis on undergraduate education with the University's research mission. He faced controversy over campus building projects—the founding of Colleges Nine and Ten and a music/performing arts complex—and became aware of how sensitive an issue campus development had become. Pister's approach to building in a campus area known as Elf Land and the proposed extension of Meyer Drive and its impact on the Great Meadow led him to develop a long overdue update of the campus's long range development plan and the protection of the meadow.

Severe, unprecedented budget cuts at UC from 1991 on, brought on by California's recession, had a huge impact at Santa Cruz. Pister's approach to reduced funding was a rational retrenchment process which included the entire campus in budget deliberations, which maintained morale and imparted a sense of equity and fairness among faculty and staff during this difficult period.

Another significant topic Pister addresses is the difficult state of town/gown relations when he arrived. The major issue he faced was the controversy over the rate of the campus's growth (capped at 15,000 students by his predecessor) and its implications for the surrounding community's housing, traffic, and water resources. Pister's achievements in toning down the rhetoric and establishing cordial relations with the city and county of Santa Cruz have promoted a new spirit of cooperation.

Pister discusses his devotion to and advocacy for improved K-12 education in the region and the role of UCSC in the Monterey Bay Educational Consortium, which has fostered collaboration among UCSC and public schools. Another area he worked to develop is his outreach to the regions' thirteen community colleges and the Leadership Opportunity Awards program he instituted for assisting community college students transferring to UCSC.

Pister discusses UCSC's role in the Fort Ord base conversion project; the new state university at Ford Ord, CSU Monterey Bay, and UCSC, have become partners in the Monterey Bay Education, Science, and Technology Center, along with local governments and agencies.

The narrative also includes Pister's detailed commentary on UCSC admissions strategies subsequent to the outlawing of affirmative action in admissions at UC by the UC Regents, and the role he played in joining with other UC chancellors in a unanimous public statement opposing this decision. Pister said of the regents' decision, "In all my years at UC this is the worst day of my life, "because he believes it is the mission of the University to reach out to all the

people of the state; that affirmative action “is not just for the people that it helps but for the society as a whole.”

These tape-recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim, edited for continuity and clarity, organized into chapters and the transcript returned to Pister for his editing. He carefully went over the manuscript line-by-line and provided many written amendments and clarifications which have been incorporated into the manuscript. My thanks to him for his great care in assuring the accuracy of his narration.

Copies of this volume are on deposit in the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley; and in Special Collections, McHenry Library, University of California, Santa Cruz. The Regional History Project is supported administratively by Christine Bunting, head of Collection Planning, and University Librarian Allan J. Dyson.

Randall Jarrell

December 12, 2000

McHenry Library

University of California, Santa Cruz

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------|
| Introduction | viii |
| Becoming Interim Chancellor of UC Santa Cruz | 1 |
| A People-Centered Research University | 8 |
| Arrival at UC Santa Cruz | 13 |
| R. Michael Tanner | 15 |
| Billie L. Greene | 18 |
| Non-Academic Staff: The Glue of the Campus | 20 |
| Key Appointments | 21 |
| Campus Advisory Council | 23 |
| Student Activism | 24 |
| Campus Advisory Board | 28 |
| Meyer Drive Extension and the Music Facility | 32 |
| Campus Physical Planning Advisory Committee | 36 |
| Colleges Nine and Ten | 38 |
| An Era of Retrenchment: UC Budget Cuts | 41 |
| The College System | 50 |
| Affirmative Action | 57 |
| Mathematics, Engineering, Science, Achievement [MESA] Program | 58 |
| New Admissions Strategies | 69 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| | 2 |
| Council of Chancellors | 80 |
| Relations with Other UC Campuses | 84 |
| Graduate Education at UC Santa Cruz | 87 |
| Enrollment Problems | 88 |
| University Development | 91 |
| Leadership Opportunity Awards Program | 100 |
| Endowed Chairs | 102 |
| Academic Planning | 105 |
| Monterey Bay Regional Studies Program | 109 |
| Fort Ord Base-Conversion and the Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology Center | 111 |
| Monterey Bay Educational Consortium | 115 |
| University Extension | 117 |
| Town-Gown Relations | 120 |
| Relations with Elected Officials | 122 |
| UCSC Foundation | 124 |
| Rita Olsen Pister | 125 |
| Life at University House | 127 |
| The University Staff | 130 |
| Index | 134 |

Becoming Interim Chancellor of UC Santa Cruz

Jarrell: Please tell me, to start, about the circumstances surrounding your appointment here as interim or acting chancellor by President [David P.] Gardner.

Pister: I'm happy to do that. In June 1990, I had completed ten years as dean of the College of Engineering at [UC] Berkeley. During the summer of 1990 I started a sabbatical leave at Berkeley. That sabbatical leave was subsequently interrupted by a couple of things that are pertinent to your question. The first, I think was in June or July of 1990, when Vice President Bill [William R.] Frazer called and asked if I would be chair of a task force to study the faculty reward system for the University of California. I accepted that appointment and as a result of that I spent a good deal of my sabbatical leave preparing what ultimately was a report of the task force on the faculty reward system, but was shortened to the so-called Pister Report. This was published and distributed to the [academic] senate and engendered a year of discussion about the faculty reward system. So that was the first thing that shifted me from my plan to return to teaching and research at Berkeley after being dean for a decade.

The second thing that happened then brings us to a discussion of my becoming interim chancellor in December, 1990. But let me back up now. There are three things that happened. In the fall of 1990, as I was working on this task force, President Gardner asked me to consider taking over the responsibility of planning the tenth campus. At that time, of course, in 1990, there was no indication of where it would be located, except that it would be in the Central Valley. The committee hadn't identified a site yet. But he said we ought to get started on an academic planning mission for the tenth campus. I accepted and said that would be something I would be interested in. Two things happened then. Robert [B.] Stevens resigned in December, 1990, as chancellor at [UC] Santa Cruz. Then the tenth campus planning began to slow down because of impending budget problems.

So I remember in December 1990, and then in the winter 1991, having a number of conversations with UC President David P. Gardner about accepting an interim appointment here, and David at the time said to me, the Santa Cruz campus is in a chaotic state; the faculty are divided; the chancellor is in real trouble. He said there was no way that he could go out and recruit for a chancellor at the time. He needed

somebody to go down and do damage control and try to quiet down the campus. Because I'd had long experience in the University of California, he thought I could probably have the best chance of doing that.

I had to bring my wife along who had no great desire to leave our home in the East Bay in Lafayette. She had no plans to be even an interim chancellor's spouse. So I remember a number of conversations with David in his office in Kaiser Center during which he tried very hard to convince my wife. I was more interested in the idea than my wife, to take on this interim assignment at Santa Cruz. Ultimately we made that decision, and I can't remember the exact date now, I think it was in March of 1991 that I agreed to have him recommend me to the regents. He did that and I was confirmed. I think it must have been at the March meeting of the regents which was [held] on the [UC] Irvine campus. I remember my first contact with the [UCSC] campus was in the person of Jim Burns who was the public information officer at that time, and set up for me telephone interviews with the *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, and the *San Jose Mercury News*.

Jarrell: When President Gardner asked you to come down here on an interim basis, what was the understanding in terms of a time frame?

Pister: Oh, he said to me, "I'd like you to go down for at least a year and up to two years, to give me time to find a permanent chancellor for Santa Cruz." The recommendation of the regents was to appoint me as acting chancellor but he permitted me to use interim as a little more appropriate term. It sounded better in my view.

Jarrell: So the president was very forthright and made no bones about the fact that he considered UC Santa Cruz to be in disarray?

Pister: Yes. I think he had made some public statements saying that the Santa Cruz campus was virtually ungovernable. I remember him being quoted somewhere as having said that. I never saw that statement.

Jarrell: Yes, I read that.

Pister: It was a fact, yes. I guess in retrospect, I was sort of a fool to think that I could come to UCSC when the president of the university said the campus was virtually ungovernable.

Jarrell: Why would you walk into a hornets' nest like that?

Pister: The campus was in such disarray that he couldn't go out and recruit for a permanent chancellor. I suppose it shows a misplaced naiveté that I thought I was so damned good that I could do it. It was an ego thing maybe. Seriously though, I really was looking for something to do. I almost signed the last line of Verip I.¹ I went through the whole process; I had all the printouts done. I attended orientation meetings. I had the form and I was one signature away from taking Verip I. Then out of the blue David started talking to me about the tenth campus job, which then turned into, with Robert's resignation, the UC Santa Cruz job.

Jarrell: I received an e-mail from a staff member at Berkeley which she sent to her sister who works here. They were delighted you were coming to Santa Cruz. But apparently you had been the Berkeley chancellor's choice for vice chancellor for development at Berkeley?

Pister: Oh.

Jarrell: That was a rumor.

Pister: Thanks for reminding me. That's an interesting part of that whole period too. That crazy thing. I was on the short list for the vice chancellor for what became university relations, the vice chancellor for development, but the title was changed to University relations. I was interviewed by the search committee and indeed Chancellor [Chang-Lin] Tien offered me the position. I remember talking to Chancellor Tien in his office on the seventh floor of University Hall at Berkeley. I still have that recollection of him trying to convince me that I should stay at Berkeley and be his vice chancellor for University relations. By coincidence the person who chaired that search committee is now the chairman of the academic council, Arnie [Arnold L.] Leiman, who is a professor of psychology at Berkeley, someone I've been working closely with this last two years, since he's on the academic council. I thought seriously about that position but David was talking to me about either the tenth campus or the Santa Cruz job. I told Chang-Lin, and he talked to the president about that. He was well aware that I had another opportunity. During that sabbatical year my wife and I took a brief vacation. We took a

¹ UC offered three early retirement opportunities to faculty and staff in 1990 as a way of obtaining salary savings. As senior faculty retired, the University could then recruit for junior faculty just starting their careers at lower salaries.

cruise in December of 1990, and on this cruise I got a call on the ship's radio. It was Chancellor Tien calling me saying "I don't want you to give up." He didn't want to give up on me and was still hoping that I would take that job. But I didn't and I certainly don't regret the choice. I am delighted that I decided to come here. So that was correct. I was offered the job at Berkeley.

Jarrell: This is just an e-mail that somebody passed along to me.

Pister: I bet it was Marion Taylor. Alice Taylor to her sister Marion Taylor.

Jarrell: You're right. Alice wrote to Marion, "Anyhow you are getting a gem. And I hope you deserve him!" Marion was my supervisor for many years.

Pister: You may be aware that Alice came to me when I was dean, from biology down at the Life Sciences building at Berkeley which was being remodeled. She came up and worked with me and my executive officer in the budget area and did a splendid job. I really became very fond of Alice. What a great person. And of Marion when I got down here.

Jarrell: So it's a very small world. So, I'm interested why you would come down here to this so-called ungovernable campus? What appealed to you? What moved you?

Pister: Okay. That's an important question. I've thought a lot about that. First of all, I'll have to say it was a challenge that I simply couldn't pass up. After spending part of my sabbatical back in my office on the Berkeley campus, I realized I really didn't want to get back into the research rat race; to start getting grants again; to gather a stable of graduate students. I was no longer motivated by the quest for knowledge in a narrow area. That shows I was getting old of course. But it was no longer a challenge to work on . . .

Jarrell: I don't know if it shows you're getting old. Maybe it was a changed perspective?

Pister: Yes, it certainly was a change of perspective. I no longer had the motivation to look at small research problems anymore. So partly it was a challenge that offered a new opportunity for me. I had really enjoyed the ten years as an academic administrator, as dean. Along the way I talked to a lot of people about this. I talked to my own chancellor, Mike [Ira Michael] Heyman. I said, "Mike you know me well. I

worked with you for ten years as your dean. Do you think I could do the job at Santa Cruz?" He said, "Absolutely no question about that."

Then I should say that the first person whom I called was Angus E. Taylor. I said, "Angus, tell me, what do you think about my going to Santa Cruz?" "That's a great idea. You ought to do it. No question about your success in doing that." I called [former UCSC Chancellor] Robert L. Sinsheimer. "Bob, what do you think?" He said, "Why in the hell would you want to do that?" Or words to that effect. "Do you know what you're getting into?" He was much more reserved.

I had a wonderful two-hour lunch session with Clark Kerr, to ask Clark, and he encouraged me to come. He gave me a lot of good historical background about UC Santa Cruz. Little did I know that Clark, Angus and David Gardner had had lunch at Berkeley to discuss the Santa Cruz situation and that they decided that I was the one who should be recommended.

Jarrell: I see. That's very interesting. That Clark Kerr still had his hand in . . .

Pister: David had turned to both Clark and Angus, because of their interest in UC Santa Cruz. I'm very honored that that triumvirate recommended me. They thought that I could be a person who could have a chance of restoring some stability to Santa Cruz. I don't remember that I talked to anybody else. I think that was it. Apart from continuing conversations with David.

The thing that really attracted me here, apart from just . . . you know the personal, was problem-solving. Academics, and particularly engineers, I have to say, are problem-solvers. I've spent all my life solving problems. In a sense the job at UCSC was a huge new problem: how to take my forty years of experience at Berkeley in the UC system and come down here and try to help this campus realize its potential.

Jarrell: I think that occurred to many of us. That you are a veteran with deep knowledge of the system. Bob Sinsheimer he went to Massachusetts Institute of Technology [MIT] and he always referred to himself as a problem-solver, that that was his basic approach, but he came from the California Institute of Technology, a small, elite institution and didn't know the very thick UC bureaucratic system.

Pister: Yes . . . I agree.

Jarrell: And you had grown up and spent your entire adult life, since what, 1952, at Berkeley.

Pister: Yes. I'd had two years on the faculty at Berkeley before I went off for my Ph.D.

Jarrell: Before you went off to Illinois.

Pister: I was one of the vanished breed of people called instructors. I was actually an instructor at Berkeley in 1948-1949. I was a lecturer for a year in 1947-48 and then an instructor for a year. In those days instructors of less than two years standing were not voting members of the senate. I was privileged to go to senate meetings, but couldn't vote. So I had two years before my Ph.D., and then came back in 1952 . . .

Jarrell: And then you'd gotten your bachelors and your masters at Berkeley.

Pister: I did, yes. I was fortunate to be in the navy V-12 program during World War II, and I was able to finish my bachelors degree living at the International House, which was called Callaghan Hall during the war. I've had a fond spot in my heart for the navy for many years, because it helped me get my education and get experience in active duty at the end of the war. So . . . where were we?

Jarrell: I asked you why you accepted the chancellorship . . .

Pister: It was a challenge, a problem to solve. This fits in very much with my work at UCB on the task force on faculty rewards. I'm not sure what was the source of this growing feeling, but it began sometime clearly in the late 1980s and certainly it became very clear in 1990-1991 that I had a growing disaffection with the way in which the academic community insisted on dividing knowledge into boxes called departments. The tremendous autonomy and power of academic departments was often at the expense of the institution. To put it more plainly, Berkeley had some eighty departments, and it almost at times gave me the feeling that there was not a University of California, Berkeley; there were eighty separate Universities of California at Berkeley, and each department was *the* University of California at Berkeley. Even in my College of Engineering which had seven departments, I had very little success in getting the faculty to act as a faculty of the College of Engineering, and not, "I'm a professor of this or a professor of that and don't bother me with the institutional concept of college." I saw a tremendous erosion of academic citizenship. Stepping back, I spent two years in the academic senate of the University systemwide as vice chair and chair of the

academic council. I wrote an essay in 1979, I guess it was, my first statement in the faculty publication called *Notice*, about the importance of dual citizenship, that you needed to be a citizen of your department; that you needed to be a citizen of your campus as well. Growing out of that experience as dean I saw the importance of getting out of this very narrow disciplinary focus, to try to restore a stronger sense of collegiality on the campus.

That leads back now to why I thought Santa Cruz would be a good place to go. Santa Cruz was founded on the basis of the college system, and I knew something of Dean [E.] McHenry's vision. Clark Kerr filled me in a great deal more on this matter. I saw an opportunity to join a campus where there was, I thought, already a better sense of collegiality. That is, the disciplinary focus was not so overwhelmingly dominant as it was at places like Berkeley or Stanford or MIT,. So the college system itself, and the undergraduate strength of a place like UC Santa Cruz, the absence of so many graduate students as at Berkeley or UCLA—all of those were things that I said, well here, this is a new ground. Here's an opportunity to try to encourage that sort of thing. My task force report, the so-called Pister Report, encouraged a restoration of balance between teaching and research, or among teaching, research, and service. It fit in very much with the mindset I had developed at the end of the 1980s.

Jarrell: That's very interesting, because those precise issues, the hegemony of disciplinary departments was certainly something that Dean McHenry, in particular, wanted to change; when he opened this campus . . . they couldn't even call them departments; they had to call them boards of studies, which is kind of an eccentric designation for somebody from the outside. But he'd been at UCLA and he'd experienced the dominance also. Your interest in citizenship, in which the primary allegiance is to the whole entity, not just to your discipline and your narrow view, and the importance of undergraduate teaching, are UCSC's historical issues. I think it's precisely these sorts of reasons that caused Bob Sinsheimer, coming from the outside, to designate this as what he termed the anomalous campus. Is this campus *sui generis*? Or is it supposed to be like the other campuses. And I'm very interested in how you're seeing those goals of yours realized. But when you came those were your primary interests. That was your overview.

Pister: Absolutely. I hadn't anticipated the complexity, the difficulty in sustaining a campus as part of the University of California system that has such a marked difference from its sister campuses. The faculty are recruited and appointed and promoted using

the same personnel manual, as well as sharing a common culture which shapes these processes.

A People-Centered Research University

They are reviewed by colleagues, both inside UC and outside UC, by colleagues that typically understand UC through its majority campuses. This, by the way was said to me by faculty once I got here. How can you espouse this restoration of balance and move away from this very clear and dominant model of a research university? How can you espouse that, when the faculty here are judged by their colleagues on other campuses, and they can't possibly call themselves different from their colleagues? So there was an underlying tension here that I had overlooked, I guess, in my zeal for the collegiate system. What I tried to do, however, and from the beginning I talked about this balance, was to restore the balance. I first articulated this, I believe, in my remarks at my investiture, where I appealed to the campus to set up a model of a people-centered research university. I prefaced that statement, I remember very well, with the statement, the nation doesn't need another research university. I was heartened to hear from the back, over to the right side behind me, in a stage whisper and a clap from Clark Kerr, "I agree with that." Later on when I sent him a copy of my remarks he wrote back one of his beautiful little one-line notes in green ink, the letters are about an eighth of an inch or a sixteenth of inch high . . .

Jarrell: Tiny little handwriting, I know.

Pister: Tiny little handwriting saying . . . in my speech I talked about four dreams. He said, "I concur heartily with your four dreams." Among them was the idea of a people-centered research university. So the point, as I was trying to make it, is that there needed to be more time spent in the development of human potential, and less time spent on the acquisition of knowledge. Now the two were not obviously mutually exclusive.

There's a kind of academic materialism that's measured by the quantity of work someone publishes, as opposed to a somewhat more spiritual content of a faculty member's proper work, as the personnel manual calls it, which involves much more intangible things like working with people in one's office, talking about the subject,

talking about research, or talking about teaching. Talking about life in general and not just concentrating on this mad pursuit to find some new piece of knowledge.

Jarrell: And publish it.

Pister: Yes. No matter how important it may be or may not. I found myself and many of my colleagues engaged in the pursuit of triviality. Moving out of that kind of an environment was very appealing to me. But yet interestingly enough, once I got here, and after I'd talked about this for awhile, I began to get a backlash. The backlash started with the biologists. Essentially I was summoned, that's an overstatement, to meet with the biology board.

Jarrell: Invited?

Pister: Invited to meet with the biology board. Earlier I'd been approached by one of the very senior members of the biology board who told me that I really ought to stop talking about teaching and talk more about research.

Jarrell: I wondered if you were perceived by some factions as somewhat of a heretic?

Pister: Well certainly I was perceived as a heretic by some members of the biology board, and more broadly, I think, by some members of the division of natural sciences. It was less clear that other people in the natural sciences division were as upset with me as the biologists were. So I attended a department meeting, and tried to explain to them that I wasn't against research, I didn't want them to give up their research, but that I thought there was room to achieve a better balance between time spent on research and teaching. And later on, as you know, I started to really talk about service, particularly service to the K-12 community and we can return to that later on. Because I think that's one of the major things that I've accomplished on the campus. Outreach to K-12.

Jarrell: And that was directed at faculty as a way of widening, enlarging the idea of teaching, but also bridge-building. We have a responsibility not just for higher education, but for education.

Pister: Education more broadly. That's it exactly.

Jarrell: What was the drift of the critique—Chancellor, you really need to stop trashing research. And you said no, you weren't trashing research. You were just having a larger vision of what this place is about?

Pister: That's right. The other thing, I guess that is a perennial problem in any research university, or in any university that has a tradition of shared governance, there's always a perception on the part of the faculty that it's the administration that's holding them back from doing this or that. Since I spent thirty years as a faculty member before the last fifteen years as an academic administrator, I well understand the faculty perspective. For two-thirds of my academic life I served in the role of a faculty member critical of the administration. I did my share of dean- and chancellor-bashing as a faculty member. In fact I once wrote a letter to the editor of the *Daily Californian* along with a group of faculty members who severely criticized Chancellor Roger [W.] Heyns for his mishandling of the Free Speech Movement and as a consequence of that we said we're joining the AFT and we're going to fight you, basically. I still remember that.

Jarrell: So you were a red-hot too?

Pister: I was a red-hot. I grew a beard and I pounded the table as a faculty member at Berkeley. So all of that is to say I understand the faculty perspective. But turning that around as an academic administrator, I learned that the faculty often conveniently say the administration is what's holding them back. The point I'm trying to make here is, if faculty really want to rebalance teaching and research, they have it in their power to do that. It isn't the administration that's responsible for the imbalance, it's the faculty itself. Because the faculty members initiate the letters of recommendation, or the personnel cases. They are the ones that set the tone, the committee on academic personnel recommends to the executive vice chancellor or the chancellor or the dean what actions ought to be taken, and they have it in their power to change.

Jarrell: You mean to redefine criteria, to add criteria for tenure review?

Pister: Well to rebalance, Randall. The criteria are fine. It's the culture, the practice, that needs to be changed. It's within the power of the faculty to make that change. Except that, and this goes back to, again the anomaly of that . . . I think you used the word . . .

Jarrell: Yes, Bob Sinsheimer called this the "anomalous campus."

Pister: Yes, the anomalous campus idea. We are not only embedded in the UC system, as a sister campus, but UC is embedded in this group of major research universities in the United States who have their own culture. That culture, and I've written and spoken about this frequently since I've been here, that culture was set following World War II. It was the decision of the federal mission agencies to take over the support of graduate research, particularly in the sciences and engineering.

Jarrell: Right. And the whole evolution of "big science."

Pister: The whole evolution of science was influenced through Bush's mission² and ideal of science, the endless frontier statement that led to the establishment of the National Science Foundation. This put tremendous emphasis on disciplinary loyalty and the importance of research and that made a major shift in the daily life of faculty members on every campus that aspired to be or had become a research university. I saw that in my own life as a faculty member. I've often mentioned this to faculty who are complaining about the system. I've said, the system grew. It wasn't handed down on a tablet. As a young faculty member at Berkeley, I typically taught three lecture courses per semester. I had at most one graduate student at a time. I got tenure at Berkeley never having written a grant proposal. I had no sponsored research when I got tenure. So you see.

Jarrell: The basis on which one got tenure gradually changed over those years?

Pister: I say that because that's the way it was in the early 1950s, or even the late 1950s. I guess one of the things that radically changed this, in addition to the Bush Report and the emergence of the National Science Foundation, was entirely beyond our control. It was the launching of Sputnik. That totally changed again the nature of our universities, the Space Race, the Cold War, created a national unity of purpose that substituted for the national purpose to win World War II, and now we had to win the Space Race and the Cold War. And that totally dominated what . . .

Jarrell: It suffused the university.

² Vannevar Bush, the first dean of engineering at MIT in 1932, was one of the primary architects of what has come to be known as the military-industrial complex. During World War II, he became the first chairman of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, organizing research by American scientists and engineers. The system of funding and research through the military provided the economic support for the Manhattan Project. These wartime activities were further institutionalized during the Cold War and resulted in the shift from industry to government funding of large-scale scientific research, or "big science," in American universities.

Pister: Absolutely. Now, ironically we are at a stage in history where those things have disappeared and we don't seem to be able to find a national purpose that can be translated into a new job for our universities. Economic competitiveness or the global economy are much more amorphous. There's not an enemy to fight. So all those things oddly enough, maybe not so oddly, have a profound effect on what many faculty members view according to the personnel manual as their proper work as faculty members. That's kind of getting off the. But it's background . . . it's all wrapped up in what Santa Cruz is and what attracted me to come here. Even though I grew up through this period of the Cold War and the dominance of science and technology in our society, it came at a price and I was kind of rebelling, I guess in a certain way. It became an excess.

Jarrell: I appreciate the larger context in which you are viewing this, in terms of World War II, the Cold War, the Space Race, the Bush Report . . .

Pister: Most recently I've written an essay on this called, "American Research Universities"³: I've raised a lot of these issues. It's contained in a proceedings of a conference at UCLA two years ago. By the way that conference was really a milestone for me, because I had an invited paper at the conference. There were also two or three panels of faculty members at the conference as well and my youngest son, Kristofer S.J. Pister, was a member of one of the panels. He's an assistant professor at UCLA in electrical engineering. He appeared in the same program with me; we're in the same journal and the thing that pleased me most was to sit in the audience and listen to his presentation and then to have people come up to me afterwards and say, "Is that your son?" In fact David [S.] Saxon, our former president said, "I think your son did a better job than you did."

Jarrell: Well, how nice. To move back to UCSC again. I'm getting a sense of what your larger context is for this campus. Then if we could get a little more nitty gritty, a little more concrete. You'd been told that this place was sort of in disarray, that maybe its mission or its purpose was sort of ambiguous, that it was . . . I don't know, rudderless? Before you got here it sounds like you got wonderful counsel from a wide array of people. Then once you were here what did you realize as you spent your first few months and looked around and talked to people?

³Karl S. Pister. "American Universities at a Crossroads," published in the proceedings of a symposium held at UCLA on June 22-23, 1994, "Reinventing the Research University."

Arrival at UC Santa Cruz

Pister: That's very important. One of the first persons whom I talked to was Ruth Crook. Ruth was executive assistant to vice chancellor Wendell [C.] Brase. And for some reason I started a conversation with Ruth Crook. I guess I had talked with Wendell off and on after he learned that I was coming here. Ruth seemed to be very knowledgeable. She had been on the campus a very long time. She was very helpful. Wendell was at that time an important figure, because we had to have work done on University House., Since Robert [Stevens] had had a young child, it was a bit shop-worn. Wendell was the person who took responsibility for that, by virtue of his position, and Ruth was his assistant.

Now I also had a number of conversations with Stephanie Hauk, who had been a special assistant to Robert [Stevens], and who had several roles, several responsibilities, on the campus. They were early people that I talked to before I got here. Then I started to talk with Judi [Hance] because she obviously was going to be setting up appointments for me and I had to get acquainted with her. I remember her saying, well this must be a reasonable person, he answers his own phone. (laughter) She didn't know that I, as an ex-dean at Berkeley, as a professor, had no perks whatsoever. Obviously I was answering my own phone. I had no problem there.

Then I came to campus. I don't remember the exact date when I told David I would come. But prior to that, I think it was in February of 1991, I came down to the campus incognito with vice president Bill [William B.] Baker. Bill knew the campus very well and he drove me down and we drove all over the campus, sneaking around, and he said, well if someone asks, sees me, we'll invent something. (laughter)

Jarrell: In your trenchcoat. (laughter)

Pister: Yes. We did many drive-throughs all through the different paths. I remember getting out of the car. There were no students. It must have been spring break. I remember walking up and seeing Merrill College. By the way, I'd only been here once before in my life. There was an all-University faculty conference here, about 1973. I remember staying in a dorm, I think it was Crown when David Saxon was not even president, he was vice chancellor at UCLA at the time and Charlie [Charles J.] Hitch was UC president. I remember hearing David give a paper at that conference. Anyway, that was my only other contact with Santa Cruz. So I went around the campus with Bill

Baker and had a chance to see, physically, what the campus looked like. And by the way, this is a chance to record my first impressions of the campus, which . . . even are sustained today. Where is the *campus*? That was my first question to Bill. There's no campanile. There's no tower. There's no there there. (laughter)

Jarrell: No big edifices.

Pister: Exactly. That was my first orientation towards something that I've become accustomed to now, that the campus is everywhere at Santa Cruz. There is no center of the campus, really. Okay, so I had these early at-a-distance interactions with the campus. When I actually got here . . . I came first, by the way, officially as a guest at the academic senate meeting, which was the May, 1991 senate meeting. I was introduced by Robert [Stevens] and I made about a five-minute speech to the senate at that time. That was my formal introduction to the campus. I started getting email from people in late May or June of 1991 and interestingly enough, it was concerning the Meyer Drive extension.

Jarrell: People were lobbying you even before you were here.

Pister: Yes. The problems with the Great Meadow, and I think even the music facility came to my attention at that time. I remember getting an e-mail from the Friends of the Great Meadow. One of the people I remember sending me e-mail was [Professor of Physics] Michael Nauenberg, whom I knew from previous senate work. We'd been on the same committee together back in the 1970s. So I knew Mike. He was lobbying me right away about the Great Meadow and Meyer Drive. And [Professor of Physics] Peter [L.] Scott was another one. I think he was one of the friends of the Great Meadow who ride bicycles, or something like that. That was prominent in my memory.

I must talk about the people who were most influential in helping me understand the campus when I got here. Julia Armstrong, certainly, my next door neighbor here. Julia was invaluable and has remained invaluable in helping me understand the culture of the campus, the academic culture especially, to help me understand, to know something about faculty members. When this or that issue came up she was able to tell me, well so-and-so comes from this perspective or that perspective. She's been a wonderful person to work with.

Jarrell: Kind of like a coach who has the *dramatis personae*.

Pister: Absolutely. She's been wonderful. She didn't hesitate to tell me the truth about things. I never had the sense that she was telling what she thought I wanted to hear, but she would tell me this is the way it is. You know . . . *c'est la vie*. That's Santa Cruz.

R. Michael Tanner

The second person whom I've been blessed to have as a colleague is [R.] Michael Tanner. Michael likewise having been here for twenty-some years knows the culture. He came out of Cowell College and he understands the history of the colleges here very well. He was committed to the collegiate system. He lived at Cowell as a preceptor with his family for a period of time. So he really knew that. He saw the evolution of the colleges and has been very helpful there. More than that though, he's been a tremendous tower of strength for me to handle the tough problems. I'd be remiss if I didn't say that an executive vice chancellor on any campus has an unenviable role of having to be seen as the bad guy, whereas often the chancellor is seen as the good guy. Michael has had more than his share of being tabbed as the bad guy. In fact the honest truth is that I share in all of the major decisions that Michael makes. I'm not as visible in those discussions but he doesn't commit resources or make decisions that I don't know about. His integrity, honesty, and intelligence have been of tremendous value to me.

I can't remember the year, but at one point I changed the responsibility and title of the academic vice chancellor to executive vice chancellor.

Jarrell: I was going to ask about that, because that position . . . the AVC had been the number two person on this campus. That title no longer exists here. It's now . . . Michael Tanner is the executive vice chancellor.

Pister: I changed his title for the simple reason that I wanted to construct what we call here in the chancellor's office, the box, the chancellor box. Michael Tanner and I basically are the occupants of the box. Even though the executive vice chancellor essentially has the daily responsibility of, shall I say, running the campus.

Jarrell: The operating officer?

Pister: The operating officer of the campus. He and I confer on a daily basis and no significant decision is made on the campus that I am not consulted on. I thought it was important to give Michael Tanner a larger role on the campus, to give the office a larger

responsibility, because I saw very quickly that the responsibility of the chancellor often took me away from the campus, or even if I were here my concerns had to be focused outside the campus. If I had been overly concerned with the daily operation of the campus I could not have accomplished the things that I needed to accomplish outside the campus. That was a major organizational change.

I recognized in Michael Tanner a very, very competent, intelligent, effective academic administrator. The job of being academic vice chancellor, which I changed to executive vice chancellor, that's the hardest job on the campus, no question about that. So I created the executive vice chancellor position for him. I basically worked out with Michael an agreement that he was responsible for the day-to-day operation of the campus. We met on a regular, weekly basis together with all of the senior people, all of the vice chancellors, and my assistant chancellor for human resources and our budget officer. But he also met singly with them to get into the details about the budget and any critical issues. I say that because that's where the daily operational issues were discussed, in his one-on-one meetings with them. When we met together with people it was more a sense of the state of their division, the state of their responsibilities, policy issues, but not detail issues, typically. I want to take this opportunity to put on the record, something I think it is very important for me to say, and that is that all through these five years Michael Tanner has quietly behind the scenes made hundreds of decisions, done hundreds of things in my behalf, that he either gets criticized for, when it was my responsibility, or if credit is given I get the credit.

Jarrell: And if it's criticism, he gets the criticism.

Pister: And if it's credit I get it. That's a kind of a bitter, unfair thing in administration that often happens. There's not proper recognition of the parties that deserve the credit; there's misplaced recognition or acknowledgment for someone else. I don't mean that somehow I shouldn't get any credit. But Michael, or the executive vice chancellor, should get more recognition. And it's not just this campus, it's every campus that I know.

Jarrell: Yes, I think it's the dynamics of an administration.

Pister: Yes, exactly.

Jarrell: I think the perception of the executive vice chancellor, or a president's chief of staff is as kind of a hatchet man, who takes the heat, gets the flak.

Pister: Absolutely. All the major decisions of policy or implementing policy that required any substantial commitment or resources, whatever, Michael and I discussed all of those. I'm fully responsible for those decisions. The *City on a Hill Press* typically didn't attack me, they would attack Michael Tanner. I want the record to be sure to show my appreciation and the campus's appreciation, and understand its debt to the five years that Michael gave on this campus while I was chancellor.

Jarrell: I don't know an AVC or a EVC, executive vice chancellor, who has ever gotten his due, or her due, such as Ronnie [Isebill V.] Gruhn.

Pister: Yes. I think Ronnie had a very difficult time from what I understand. At Berkeley the vice chancellors there routinely were seen as bad actors. When I was a dean the vice chancellor was my enemy, basically, and the chancellor was my friend. That's basically the way it is here.

Jarrell: But the politics of it mean the roles are split; the chancellor gets all the positive stuff; the AVC, EVC is the lightning rod.

Pister: Exactly.

My assistant here, Judi [Hance], has been another incredibly important person. She's been here from the beginning of the campus; she knows everyone and can give me an insight on things that is incredibly valuable, that I couldn't get elsewhere. Furthermore, she has incredibly good judgment about people and their issues. You probably can imagine the range of people and their needs, or should I say demands, that come to the chancellor's office in a given week. Telephone calls, letters, personal appearances—every one being at that moment an urgent matter that only the chancellor should handle. Judi is endowed with patience and sensitivity seldom found in people. Her good nature and caring attitude, her ability to say no in a graceful way, were indispensable assets to any success that I achieved as chancellor. She came early and left late, never complaining and always cheerful. On top of all this she did a masterful job in maintaining my calendar, getting me to places on time and with the background material that I needed. The campus and the chancellor were fortunate indeed to have such an effective person in such a key position.

Billie L. Greene

Last I'd have to say that, the thing that really saved me, in addition to these folks, I was fortunate to be able to bring my executive assistant, Billie Greene, from Berkeley. Billie is a good friend of Alice [Taylor], and she was willing to come with me. She arrived in September of 1991, a month after I did. The first thing that she had to do, the very first day, was to go up and dismiss the housekeeper at University House. A very hard thing because we changed the nature of the job, and the incumbent housekeeper had not really been doing a satisfactory job, in my view, and so we had to terminate her. At the beginning I didn't know anyone here. Billie and I essentially were an island. We gradually gained confidence in the people we were working with, and enlarged that island. But in the beginning there was no one really whom I felt comfortable in trusting 100 percent, because I didn't know these people.

Billie's role during my years at Santa Cruz is so important that I must add some background here.⁴ She and I began working together in 1980, when I was appointed Dean of the College of Engineering at UC Berkeley. At the beginning she was my executive secretary. However, I soon saw that she had the potential to contribute a great deal more to my administration. So, with some reluctance on her part at first, I appointed her assistant to the dean. In time she managed all of the flow of information and people in and out of the office, attended meetings of my senior administrative officers in the college, and, perhaps most important of all, became my trusted advisor on problems with issues and people (the two are usually inseparable!). Having worked together so successfully for ten years, it was obvious to me that I needed to have her accompany me to Santa Cruz. Fortunately for me and for UCSC, she agreed to do so.

As I mentioned, she and I were on an island by ourselves at the beginning. Both of us were in unfamiliar roles in a new community, with new kinds of problems we had not encountered at Berkeley. As she and I became better known on the campus, as our style of operation became visible, I believe it became clear to the campus that Billie spoke for the chancellor. Indeed, I did have complete faith in her judgment and integrity. Yet, Billie had great sensitivity and understanding of the delicate nuance required to speak for the chancellor but not act in place of the chancellor. Although I know of many instances in which she had to face extremely difficult and often openly hostile persons bent on confrontation, I know there are countless other instances that

⁴ Chancellor Pister provided these written comments on Billie Greene.

were shielded from me. Her judgment of what to bring to me and what not to bring to my attention saved countless hours for more productive use of my time, not to mention my nervous system. She was usually an important part of any new initiatives on the campus. Let me only mention here that the Leadership Opportunity Program owes a great deal of success to the energy and careful attention that she gave to the program, particularly during its design and early implementation.

Finally, over the period of fifteen years during which we met on a daily basis, she performed a task more often than she would have liked, I am sure, that is invaluable to any chief executive. She told me the truth as she saw it, no matter how much she knew I might not like to hear it.

Jarrell: You didn't have any close acquaintances here.

Pister: I did know Michael [H.] Cowan. In fact Michael Cowan was division chairman here when I was chairman of the academic council. I like Michael very much and I trusted Michael. But Michael at that time was a faculty member. He wasn't involved in anything administratively. I also knew John Dizikes. John and I served on the University committee on educational policy in 1972-73. So I knew John. I knew John through Angus Taylor, also, because Angus was vice president when John and I were on UCEP together. I knew Angus respected John. But again, these were faculty colleagues, and even though I knew them, they weren't people who were immediately helpful to me to understand my job. It would have put them in an awkward spot if I had depended too much on them. So I really came into a place that I knew nothing about. Wendell Brase, the vice chancellor at the time, was very helpful in furnishing me with information and played a very important role for a short time, because as you know in September of 1991 he went to UC Irvine. So he was a very short-time person here for me.

Jarrell: So you had this little network. You had Julia, you had Michael Tanner. You had Billie Greene that you brought from Berkeley. And you had Judi.

Pister: That's the network I first started with. But in that first summer, starting in August and going into the fall I made it a point of doing something that certainly paid off in the long run. To the extent that I was able, I got out and I walked the turf of the campus; I went to the colleges; I met the people in the colleges; I went to the academic divisions, met the people. I went to the library.

Non-Academic Staff: The Glue of the Campus

The thing that I made it a special point to do was to meet the non-academic staff of this place. I spent time down in Campus Fac[ilities] and talked to the custodians. I talked to the shop people. I got out and really learned. Because . . . and I said this at the first academic senate meeting that I attended here. I said, the students come and go quickly. The faculty come and go and they don't pay much attention to what's going on on the campus unless something doesn't work. Then they complain about it. But the staff are absolutely the glue, the coherence of a campus, that keep it going. I made that statement and I sincerely believed it. As a dean I learned that. So I wanted to make that point and I emphasized that by going out and meeting staff . . . and you know, Randall, I still have people saying how pleased they were that I did that.

Jarrell: It means a great deal.

Pister: Of course. I've often said to people, I could never sit all day long and work at a typewriter, or I could never sit all day long and sort mail. I admire and appreciate the work that everyone does, no one of us can do it alone. You have to have a team. I was trying to emphasize that I respect your position in that team. Like I remember seeing Manny [Manuel R.] Mendoza, who is now our head custodian. I ran across him down at the Barn, and I said, gee you know, I've only been here a short time, but your buildings are cleaner than the buildings at Berkeley. As a result I've always gotten a Christmas card from the custodians. It really touches me. You can see right now.

Jarrell: Yes. And this feeling of community you value—when it's absent, the University's employees often feel this to be an alienating and demoralizing place.

Pister: It hurts me when that kind of thing happens, because it's not the kind of place I want to be part of, but it's often by accident these things happen, that some individual or group of individuals is hurt in a way that hurts me. Sometimes I can help and sometimes I am unable to help. You know it's interesting in reflecting why I did that, I think it goes back to my experience when I was a young officer in the Navy. I was a young ensign. I was in construction, a seabee battalion in World War II on the island of Okinawa. We got a new commanding officer. I was essentially in charge of the maintenance of our camp of about a thousand men. I remember the new commanding officer came on board and said, I want to take a tour of the camp and I want you to come with me so I can learn about the camp. So I went with him. He walked, just as I

did, over this campus. He asked me a zillion questions. I didn't know the answer to most of the questions he asked. I said to myself that I better not let that happen again. I better learn what I am supposed to be responsible for. So it was a lesson I remembered from almost fifty years ago. When I came down here I didn't want to repeat that. So I not only walked but I gained an appreciation for the environment, for the beauty of this place in walking around it, which I have felt very strongly about ever since I got here.

Key Appointments

Jarrell: I have a list of the different appointments you made. You made these appointments but then in a talk you gave before the academic senate on November 6, 1991, you talked about the campus organizational structure. I see by November you had already drawn some conclusions about the way this place was organized in terms of lines of communication and responsibility. But also you mentioned in this early talk that you were forming a human relations group, an advisory council to the chancellor, and a campus advisory board, three entities that were new.

Pister: Well as I look back, there were several things that I did fairly early. The first thing that I remember doing was to recognize the urgency of getting a budget officer that was responsible to the office of the chancellor. In the previous administrations the budget had been under the direction of the vice chancellor for business and administrative services. I found that to be kind of a strange situation, that an officer who had line responsibility, who reported to the chancellor had his own staff and his own division to operate, had the corollary function of being the budget officer, essentially. So I moved the budget function out from the vice chancellor for business and created the position of associate chancellor for budget and planning.

I was fortunate in persuading the former budget officer for UC Berkeley, Errol W. Mauchlan, who was a longtime friend of mine at Berkeley to come to UCSC. I might say a friend (laughter) but also a person that I often disagreed with, because as dean of engineering I felt that Errol never gave me enough resources. But I respected him and he had great experience. Errol had just taken VERIP and we recalled him as a 49 percent appointment. He commuted back and forth from Berkeley and stayed with this for two years to really redesign the budget operation at Santa Cruz. In setting up that office of budget we moved over Assistant Vice Chancellor Dick [Richard W.] Jensen, who at that

time was reporting to Michael Tanner, who was academic vice chancellor. I want to note here, the academic vice chancellor, who really had the responsibility for the academic programs on the campus, was not comfortable having another vice chancellor as a budget director, so he set his own budget function under academic vice chancellor. There was this shadow unit under Dick Jensen over here in the chancellor's office and there was another budget office under the vice chancellor for business. It was a ludicrous situation in my view. So we moved Dick under Errol and created a budget function that I think was very largely responsible for setting the tone and the process that enabled us to go through the very critical years of budget reduction in a much less damaging way than if we had not made that change.

Jarrell: Can you be a little more precise about what your critique was? It was organizationally very ambiguous, but what was the main drawback for you?

Pister: Well the main drawback was I felt that the budget function was under a vice chancellor who reported to me rather than under a staff officer. The vice chancellor is a line position and I think the budget officer for the campus ought to be a staff position that reports to the chancellor. That's the way we reconstructed it.

Then the other thing . . . I felt that again, what used to be called personnel, staff personnel particularly, that function also was under the vice chancellor of business and administrative services. I felt that personnel, later renamed human resources, was such an important function on the campus that it ought to be brought closer to the chancellor's office. I felt that Julia Armstrong had very good experience working with people. She was already assistant vice chancellor for academic personnel, or academic affairs, but academic personnel was one of her major responsibilities. So I asked Julia if she would be willing to take on the line responsibility for human resources.

Jarrell: For staff, not just for academic?

Pister: Yes, for staff as well. She did accept, and we put affirmative action under her, as well as labor relations. I think it was a very wise move. Because it showed the importance of having a senior member of the campus responsible for staff personnel problems, or more broadly, human resource problems.

Let's see, what else did we do. The other thing, organizationally, that looking back, I think, was the right thing to do . . . I did not fill the office of vice chancellor for advancement, or vice chancellor for external relations, which was a position that was on

the books but was unfilled. When I came here there was an acting assistant chancellor for external affairs or advancement. That was Stephanie Hauk. I moved Stephanie into another position of basically being a special assistant to the chancellor, for the relatively short time that she was here before she went to another position. I felt that my experience in fundraising and more broadly in the development area at Berkeley, was such that I could take the role since the campus's advancement program was not that highly developed yet. So I should take that responsibility. I moved Dan[iel] G. Aldrich from assistant vice chancellor for advancement to assistant chancellor for advancement and gave him the day-to-day responsibility for development and alumni affairs, and I basically served as the senior advancement officer for the campus, although he in the external world had that responsibility. He attended the systemwide meetings and things like that. Let's see . . . what else, organizationally.

Jarrell: I assumed that when you got here that things were kind of disorganized?

Campus Advisory Council

Pister: I think there needed to be a renewal and I was trying to do that. The other things you mentioned that are very important . . . again, based on my previous experience as an administrator in a large college . . . one of them was not a new creation but I simply continued the chancellor's cabinet . . . the senior officers that I meet with individually on a regular basis meet once a week to discuss critical issues on the campus informally with no agenda. Then I've created another group called the campus advisory council, CAC, and that group consists of my cabinet members, but it is augmented by the deans, the representative of the council of provosts, the associate vice chancellors in the chancellor's office, the chairman of the academic senate division here, and the chairman of the committee on planning and budget. That group meets on a monthly basis and I try to schedule that meeting before the monthly meeting of the council of chancellors with the president. Then I have a chance to go over the council of chancellors agenda, which is an important agenda typically and get input from my colleagues on the campus here. It's largely an information exchange. Again, there's no agenda. We do go over the council of chancellors agenda. But it's a chance for us to take stock of what's going on on the campus. Everyone has an equal right and opportunity to talk and I've found it to be very helpful. I haven't done a good job of asking

members of the council how they feel about it, whether they think it's a waste of time or not, but I think it's good.

The other thing that I did, Randall, was that I've tried each year to make a visit to each of the colleges. I haven't always been successful but I try to spend an evening, typically, there for dinner and then be open, usually with the college senate to have a Q and A after that.

Jarrell: Right, to hang out with them.

Pister: To hang out. That's been a very good experience. Although there have been a couple of exceptions that I can talk about, too.

One that still sticks in my memory was a meeting over in Oakes College with Gini [Maria Eugenia] Matute-Bianchi. It was a dinner ostensibly to talk about campus affairs. It was, I have to say, infiltrated by a very hostile group who weren't invited to dinner but they came anyway. It was largely over a few students who perceived my lack of interest and support for affirmative action and they trashed me for being insensitive to people of color. That one still sticks in my memory because I received a lot of very severe criticism from a few people.

Student Activism

Jarrell: Every chancellor who's ever been at this campus has had to deal with at least one demonstration. It seems to me that the chancellor's hands are rather tied. If there's a demonstration and students are committing civil disobedience and you arrest the students, then it clogs up the whole municipal court system and costs thousands of dollars. If you pursue it and want the students to be prosecuted then the entire system is completely jammed. I think a lot of students know that probably nothing is going to happen, or maybe it will happen to three or four or five or them. What's your philosophy about student civil disobedience? Do you have a general approach to it or is it an ad hoc situation?

Pister: There's inevitably an ad hoc element to civil disobedience and our response. I could give some examples of that. But I had a very clear strategy, which I think has been different from previous chancellors here, which was to remain virtually invisible in these instances; to keep myself essentially not only away from it, but above the

entire issue, until or unless it really became essential that I took some responsibility for stating a position or publicly taking an action.

Jarrell: So it's very calculated on your part.

Pister: Absolutely.

Jarrell: Your invisibility.

Pister: Yes. The chances of that being successful depend obviously on the quality of staff work that's done on your behalf. With Vice Chancellor Hernandez's arrival here two years ago the quality of student affairs staff work really improved enormously. In the first years here I have to say candidly the quality of staff work in student affairs was not good. As a result student activists essentially bypassed the vice chancellor for student affairs and came directly to this office. That meant that either they got in to Michael Tanner directly or they were intercepted by my executive assistant Billie Greene. For at least a year I remember, during 1992-93, she was basically a student affairs officer. She was dealing with . . . remember the group called Concerned Students?

Jarrell: Yes.

Pister: That was a kind of an omnibus group of people that were just mad at me and mad at the campus, mad about the budget, mad about affirmative action, rape prevention education . . . you name it. It was an omnibus bill of particulars—this is why they were after the chancellor. Billie had to deal with those issues because student affairs was not dealing with them. Perhaps that was a fault of my leadership in not insisting that it be done, but my vice chancellor at that time was really I think not in good shape. We tried very hard always to work with the organizers of the protest so that we could define some sort of understanding as to what they were going to do and what we asked them not to do and to deal with them in a non-confrontational way. If they overstepped that they would be arrested. But in some instances part of the students objective was to get arrested. When that's the case, if students want to be arrested for civil disobedience, then I think it's my responsibility to arrest them. Okay? And we did.

Jarrell: To take them at their word, so to speak.

Pister: Exactly. I feel that if civil disobedience is to mean anything, a person who engages in it has to accept the consequences. If you say, I'm going to be disobedient and get arrested and then ask for a leniency or mercy then you're hypocritical. So we tried very hard at the very beginning to let the students know that and the last time it happened was January at the demonstration, and there were twelve students arrested. The police are getting more wise to the whole thing too . . . they no longer charge them with an offense that requires a jury or that they can ask for a trial. So you cite them on some kind of a . . . I can't remember what the ordinance is but they either can pay the bail and the thing is dropped or, if they go to a judge it's just a hearing before a judge, there's no jury trial possible. Just like if you get a speeding ticket you don't have to pay it, you can go see a judge.

Jarrell: I think your tenure has been relatively serene in terms of student demonstrations.

Pister: The most complicated period, was the fall of 1992 when budget cuts were rampant, when affirmative action wasn't going well and we had this group of really angry students here, a small group. That led I remember to the occupation of the library foyer. Twelve students were arrested and the police came in with riot gear. That was a real messy situation. I was away in Washington, D.C., at that time, so I was isolated, not by choice this time, necessarily. The students broke into the chancellor's reception area and the police chief asked them to leave but they refused, so they were arrested. That led to the famous bullet-proof glass caper, where the following summer acting on the advice of the chief of police and my business people, [Chief of Police] Jan Tepper was worried to death that kids were going to get pushed through the glass. So we put shatter-proof glass out there.

Jarrell: Oh, she thought that the *students* would get injured.

Pister: Yes, that was the whole purpose of it.

Jarrell: Not the chancellor!

Pister: The whole purpose was to put in shatter-proof glass so that if somebody got pushed against it, it would not break and cut somebody in half. That was the whole motivation for it, but unfortunately, the characterization of the glass was otherwise. So the students picked this up and made a big deal out of that . . . you know, that . . . my door is closed virtually all the time . . . there's no way, whether that's bullet proof glass

or not, you've got to have a sniper scope that will see through the door, to shoot the chancellor through that glass. So it's got nothing to do with me. By the way, this glass here, I learned much to my surprise several years ago, is also bullet proof. And that was put in explicitly because it is bullet proof. Because when Bob Sinsheimer was here people took shots through that window.

Jarrell: I never knew that.

Pister: No. I didn't either. Well that glass is flexible so I am protected on this side.

We have a demonstration crisis team that meets when there's an indication that we're going to have some kind of crisis. They plan the strategy of how we are going to deal with the incident. The famous one that caused the closure of the campus . . . we worked with the leaders of that movement . . . they were inexperienced, first time ever, there was no indication that there was going to be any serious problem. They didn't want to block the place. They only wanted to have a show of strength down there.

Jarrell: Down at the campus entrance?

Pister: Yes. But then, as you know, some outsiders came in . . . much more experienced people, and they provoked the crowd and the police and got the place shut down. Then they disappeared and our kids got arrested.

Jarrell: So that's the extreme form of student activism. Maybe we could go to the other end of the spectrum. Every chancellor has his or her own way of relating to dealing with students. Some chancellor have office hours. I remember Bob Sinsheimer said he had office hours and hardly anybody ever showed up. How do you make certain that you have one-on-one connections with students? You showed me this lovely album today which included many personal letters from students. Obviously you're not a figurehead chancellor. That part seems to gratify you so much.

Pister: Sure. Well that's because it's about people and that's what life is about. It's about people and not things. So the first year I had office hours and they didn't work; students signed up and then didn't show up. The students who did show up typically had some kind of an issue that needed resolution that I could not resolve. So I had to say, look if that's your issue, go here and somebody could deal with your issue there. In other words, I think it was a leftover from some previous days when seemingly

everything was done in the chancellor's office. So I tried to dispel that. After the first year I stopped that.

Campus Advisory Board

One of the most important things I did was to create the campus advisory board. I started out with just myself and my executive assistant, the chairman of the division, the chairman of the committee on educational policy and [the committee on] planning and budget. Then I invited the leadership of student organizations on the campus. The college senate representatives, the chair of the Student Union Assembly [SUA], the chair of the Graduate Student Association. And we've invited the chairs of the all the major student organizations. Now, the attendance at these is very . . .

Jarrell: It fluctuates?

Pister: It depends on the state of the campus in a sense. But I think it was a real shock to students to have an opportunity to sit for an hour and a quarter. Again, the agenda is determined by the people who show up. To that meeting were invited all leaders of the major student organizations, and the representative of each of the eight college senates. Cowell, Stevenson . . . the whole bunch. So all student leaders could come to that meeting. Then I had my senior administrators, the vice chancellors, and I invited the chairman of the academic senate and the chair of educational policy, and . . . even originally I had academic personnel, but we dropped them.

So anyway, there was really what I'd call an opportunity for students to come to those meetings, no agenda. We went around the table and introduced ourselves each time and then asked students what they wanted to put on the agenda. Then we'd go around. It was just a Q and A session. We frequently took out of those meetings action items that we and the students worked out. In the early years advance [class] enrollment was a big issue. The students said you're going to ruin our life; we can't shop for courses. The world's going to fall apart and all that. We got through that and that meeting, I think, was very helpful, I think, in educating the students about what that system was going to do for them. It was not an evil. It was going to make life better for them actually, give more access to classes . . . parking inevitably, housing . . . things like that came up.

Jarrell: So all those different student concerns got aired; it was like a gripe session too . . . people could say whatever was on their minds?

Pister: Absolutely. It was a town hall kind of thing where people could come and vent and they frequently did.

We just have a free-for-all question and answer meeting about what's going on on the campus, what's going on in the University. People often make suggestions, they make criticisms, they ask why such and such was done or they say could you follow up on such and such? It's been a real opportunity to get grassroots input about how students feel about issues. Often we've had meetings where only a couple of students show up. So frequently the administration and faculty outnumber the students there. But at least it's a safety valve and students can come and talk to me and my senior staff about things that are on their mind. I've found it to be a very profitable use of my time.

The SUA chair when I first got here was Brant Smith, whom I the first August I was here. When Brant Smith was elected to the SUA I'm told, one of his platform planks was that he got rid of my predecessor. (laughter) People warned me about Brant Smith. Well the fact is I got along famously with Brant and he's one of my best supporters now. I'm really pleased because it certainly didn't start out that way. Brant insisted that I have office hours for students and the first year I was here I did have office hours for students. But as I said, I just felt it was not productive. I got some criticism from students for not having office hours. But by substituting this monthly meeting of an hour and a quarter I thought I really served the campus better in the use of my time than having office hours that never really amounted to much.

Jarrell: Some of your predecessors have leveled the same criticism and they didn't come up with an advisory board like this. It wasn't very productive, you know, the office hours with the chancellor where ostensibly the students could just kind of sign up and come in and chit-chat. But this seems to be more an opportunity that's institutionalized in a way, so that the campus's student community has an avenue for communication.

Pister: Then a couple of years ago the student affairs people started a student-administration retreat. We spent a better part of a day, usually a Saturday, with students, administration, sitting down, getting to know each other and then dealing with a set of issues. Out of that, for example, came the undergraduate internship

program. I'll take credit for the original idea of getting it started. The implementation and the structure of that program were a consequence of this retreat. To his credit, Eli Ilano, who was the Student Union Assembly chair, worked with Jim [James C.] Quann, who was acting vice chancellor at the time, to put together the structure of that undergraduate internship program which has been very successful. Each year I meet with the group of interns and we have an evening together. They gave me a reception earlier this month. It gives students a chance to learn about how the campus is administered, its complexities, the competing needs of different constituencies, and then it gives them financial support and business skills that they otherwise wouldn't have. It's a wonderful program. We have thirty or thirty-five students each year now. I pay half the bill and the unit that has the student pays the other half. So that is another example of getting closer to students.

Another thing I did was on a more or less regular basis I went to each college during the year and had dinner with them and then spent usually an hour to two hours afterwards with the senate to talk about issues. I remember well going to Porter during the Elf Land crisis and a guy came in and read this long manifesto. (laughter) Things got so tense that when I left . . . I can't remember his name now, a preceptor with a walkie-talkie walked me all the way back to University House because I had come on foot. He was afraid for my safety.

Jarrell: It was that heated?

Pister: There were people that were very outraged.

Jarrell: It sounds like it's really tough sitting in your seat.

Pister: (laughter) As Truman said, "If you can't stand the heat in the kitchen, you should get out of the kitchen."

Jarrell: Yes, I know. But, it's sort of *de rigueur*, for some students to be oppositional to any chancellor, as an authority figure, as a symbol.

Pister: Yes, I think there's a lot of truth to that. I think it's important for a chancellor to recognize that. That whether the students are even aware of what's going on, for a certain number of students it's an opportunity, a first opportunity to get away from home and parental authority, and to essentially react to another authority figure in a way that they feel is exercising their emancipation from the home. So you have to be

prepared for that. It's not nearly as personal as it may seem at times but it's hard to separate that, to accept the fact that they're not really after you personally. They are after the authority that you are perceived to exercise in your office. If you can separate those things it makes your life a lot easier.

Jarrell: It's actually very complicated. In actual fact a chancellor doesn't have unlimited authority. I mean there are very limited things that a chancellor can do, but students often perceive that the chancellor has this enormous amount of power that he or she can wield completely arbitrarily.

Pister: You know I'm glad you brought that up because I was just thinking about that. In fact I was just talking to my executive assistant. We were kind of reminiscing before you came in. I think perhaps the most difficult thing to do when you are in a position where you do have a certain power that you can exercise, is to exercise that power in the least injurious, most constructive way. The temptation to use power is always there. It's a tremendously difficult line to walk, not to misuse your power by jumping over people's heads when you should go through a chain of command, or just not being sensitive to what the consequences of a particular decision might be, to the people that are affected. I think you learn that from experience. Some people learn it faster and better than others. It's always there. I'm reminded of the expression that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. That's always there.

I think many students grossly overestimate the power and authority that a chancellor has. That complicates life. They say, Chancellor why don't you do this or that or the other thing, or why can't you just . . . The fact is if you did what you were asked to do you would last about a week or two and you'd be gone. Because you can't do those kinds of things and retain your credibility and integrity. Because of our shared governance system . . . it's not only shared governance with the faculty, but at the institution particularly . . . everyone here feels that he or she has some right and some responsibility to tell the chancellor how the campus should be governed. It's a place where participatory democracy has been perfected.

Jarrell: (laughter) Has it run amok?

Pister: (laughter) I don't think it's run amok, but at times I'm tempted to think that. At times, for example when a student has told me in my office, I think we should vote on every one of your decisions. There should be a campus referendum. Do you realize the

unworkability of this proposal? That's preposterous! But there are people here that really think that yes, everyone has the right to input on that decision.

Jarrell: I think in that same context, that universities, not just the UC system, are particularly vulnerable institutions in our society.

Pister: Oh, tremendously vulnerable.

Jarrell: The complicated, complex issues with affirmative action or Proposition 187 . . . all of these things that are exploding in our state . . . this is the line of least resistance, the institution of the university. Students, I think, exaggerate how easy it is to do certain things, and underestimate the complexity of these larger problems.

Pister: Absolutely.

Jarrell: I think that universities are kind of fragile, actually.

Pister: Absolutely. I agree. Your analysis is exactly the same as mine. Our universities are very fragile. It's interesting, though, since you raised this, that Clark Kerr in something he wrote in the eighties called attention to the fact that, of the institutions of our society that have survived for . . . since . . . 1500, I think, was the data point, our universities are among them. There are very few institutions that have survived the last five hundred years, universities being one. My personal sense of this is that among all institutions of society, our universities, and our churches and synagogues are really the stabilizing influences that have provided continuity to our civilization. I think they are among . . . for better or for worse at times, but certainly they are the glue that holds us together.

Meyer Drive Extension and the Music Facility

There are some other organizational things that I'd like to talk about. Even before I came to the campus, formally in August, I attended the May, 1991 senate meeting here. One of the major decisions, the debates and ultimately the decision of that meeting was for the faculty to vote on the extension of Meyer Drive through the Great Meadow. I listened to the debate. I was struck, I remember, by one of the faculty getting up and reciting a sonnet that he had written in memory of the Great Meadow. The vote, as I remember, was narrowly in favor of extending the road through the Great Meadow.

But there was a resolution passed at the same time offered by professors Ruby and Pepper. The Ruby-Pepper resolution or amendment, I can't remember what it was called exactly, said that this vote extending Meyer Drive through the Great Meadow ought to be conditional upon a satisfactory transportation and circulation plan being developed for the campus. I listened to all that debate and little did I realize how important it was that I had listened to that debate and the importance of it in my administration later on. However, when I arrived here in August, I arrived just after a meeting of the regents in July in which the plans for the new music facility had been rejected by the board.

Jarrell: Right. That was the first design.

Pister: The first design. It was characterized as a massive block of concrete and a travesty to Santa Cruz's sensitivities and so on. I can't remember all the characterizations because they were all unfavorable. So here I arrived in August with the problem of what we were going to do about the music facility. As a result of the vote of the regents it went back to the architect for redesign; it went back to our architects here and the executive architect for the project, Antoine Predock. In addition to looking at the redesign, there were still very strong questionings about why that facility was located in the Great Meadow. So I had to deal with that issue.

During August and the first half of September I had to really get up to speed on the history of the siting of the music facility, the history of its design, because it was going back to the board of regents in September. If the facility, if the design were rejected once again, there was a very high probability that the campus would lose the funds entirely. This is typical of projects like this that come up on the five-year cycle. If you don't hold your place, you lose it.

Well, during that period our campus architects worked feverishly with the architect to get a new design, to do some relocation, to move it back away from the edge of the meadow, lower it down. I remember attending a meeting of the campus physical planning committee. I can't remember the exact title. It was chaired by the chancellor's assistant, Stephanie Hauk. I never could figure out why that was the case, but she chaired that meeting. I remember the strident opposition of the people whom I heard. I can still picture that room. It was in the Cowell conference room, which I've since learned a lot about, since I have a lot of meetings there with people. Anyway, I was sitting away from the table watching this meeting go on, because at that time the

chancellor had nothing to do with this. It was an advisory council or committee. I remember Jim [James E.] Pepper getting up and speaking against the design, and Mike [Michael] Rotkin was in the back of the room. I didn't know these folks at the time but I know them now. Mike got up and said, "This is outrageous. This thing was done with no student input." And Peter Scott, was there, the great opponent of anything except bicycles in the Great Meadow. All these people were dumping on the design.

I heard all those comments. I looked at the new design. In the meantime we took the new design up to a meeting of the regents special committee on buildings and they were favorably impressed by the design and the relocation. I carefully read the environmental impact report on the siting of the building. I looked at all the alternatives that had been considered including one over past the student center and determined that in fact the siting of the building was the best among the five alternatives in my view. I really did my homework. So I took that music facility to the regents in September. There were a couple of very strident opponents who spoke at the meeting. Professor Bob [Robert F.] Adams was one, I remember.

Jarrell: And this was at the regents meeting.

Pister: At the regents meeting in September of 1991. I'll bring in another character in this discussion at this point. Regent designate Paul [J.] Hall, who is an alumnus of UC Santa Cruz, was just starting his term as regent designate. Paul was very upset with the siting of the building. I met Paul in the lobby of the Clift Hotel in San Francisco the morning of the regents meeting in September. I'd never met him before. We sat down and had breakfast together. I explained my position on the music facility, that I had reviewed it all, the EIR; I'd reviewed the new design, and I felt it was the right thing to do, to go ahead. So Paul said, "Fine." He understood my position. I presented the case to the regents, the building and grounds committee. Paul supported it and the thing was approved.

I drew a lesson out of that whole thing. I'd learned about all the previous problems of College Eight . . . you name it. With anything that was built on the campus there was a problem. At that point I said, "Look. There's not going to be any more building like this, any more discussion about siting until we've brought the campus master plan up to date." I made a commitment then that led ultimately to the creation of three new entities . . . that's getting back to organization again, that I think have been absolutely critical to helping to stabilize the campus. It was clear that buildings or anything to do

with altering the environment, were such sensitive issues for so many people on this campus, that we had to be very, very careful that we had a clear plan that the maximum number of people would be comfortable with for any future development of the campus. So I made that a public statement, it might have been at the November, 1991 senate meeting.

Jarrell: Yes, it was. The Long Range Development Plan.

Pister: Yes, and that we were going to develop an update of the campus master plan, which was created in 1963, really, and had never, in my view, been carefully and systematically updated to modify it for a 15,000 student campus instead of a 27,500 student campus.

Jarrell: That was a problem. Have you come across *The Natural History of the UC Santa Cruz Campus*⁵?

Pister: Yes.

Jarrell: Well I wrote the chapter on land-use history of the campus. But it was very interesting because you're quite right that there has been an unusual sensitivity in this campus community. Environmentalism started here very strongly in the late 60s, early 70s. I think that there had not been a large context with a lot of input from a lot of voices. So that each building, each new project was like a battle.

Pister: Yes, right. It was a battle because each thing was done in an ad hoc way. People were sick and tired of these kinds of ad hoc additions to the campus without a sense that it was part of a larger plan. Well, I became sensitized to that instantly because of what I saw on the Meyer Drive extension and the music facility. I said, we can't continue that way. The campus will never settle down. So I did two things. I brought in a consultant in the person of Richard Bender, a Berkeley colleague, who was dean of environmental design at Berkeley. He's an architect, and a person who's had substantial experience in campus planning. He had a major role in developing a master plan for UC San Diego. He worked for UC Davis in a similar capacity. So he was very experienced in campus planning and in addition to that had an international reputation as an architect

⁵Warrick, Sherridan F., ed. *The Natural History of the UC Santa Cruz Campus* (Santa Cruz: Environmental Field Program, University of California, Santa Cruz, 1982).

and planner. I engaged Richard as a consultant, and, as an aside, that caused a problem in and of itself.

Jarrell: What was that?

Pister: I had a whistleblower who claimed that he was an old buddy of mine and I gave him a sweetheart contract. All of this was checked with legal counsel before I did it . . . but we had whistleblower investigations that I had to deal with because of an alleged conflict of interest.

Jarrell: I don't even remember coming across that in my research.

Pister: Well it was all done pretty much internally. I don't think it ever . . . But there was one whistleblower who was absolutely convinced that I was up to a lot of dirty tricks and he's long gone from the campus, but it was a real problem for me for a long time. A lot of capricious whistleblower allegations were dumped on me.

Campus Physical Planning Advisory Committee

Anyway, so Bender came in to do a study of the master plan. At the same time I created an organizational structure for planning that I think has served the campus very well. I created what I called CPPAC, the campus physical planning advisory committee. That committee was constituted by having faculty representatives, one from each of the divisions. There are student representatives, staff representatives; a representative from the city of Santa Cruz, from the planning commission of the city of Santa Cruz, an alumni representative. I chaired the committee myself, to show that I am really concerned about physical planning and I don't want to foist that, fob that off on somebody else. From the beginning I said to the committee and I think we published this, that I was chairing this committee but there were going to be no votes on this committee. I want to hear all of the input that I can from these different constituencies so that I know what people are concerned about, what they think about things. But ultimately you have to understand that the regents have delegated to me the responsibility for making planning decisions. It's not going to be by a vote but I'm going to listen.

It was a risk, but I thought I had to take it. Then as input to that campus physical planning advisory committee I created two other groups. A Long Range Development

Plan implementation advisory committee whose purpose was to look at the Long Range Development Plan for the campus and ultimately also to look at the guidelines that were developed by the Bender study, and when new projects came along to advise the CPPAC, to advise me and my committee as to whether or not a proposal satisfied the guidelines, to bring up any issue that . . . to place the project in the Long Range Development Plan and the guidelines. So they are advisory to the CPPAC. That's also a broadly represented committee. In addition, we created the design review board, which is an outside group of professional architects, and landscape architects. A three-person board, and that board also reviews design issues and inputs to CPPAC.

So we have the campus physical planning advisory committee which is informed by these two groups. One an outside, independent group of design professionals. Then the internal people. Well that whole process I think has worked very, very well and has served the campus well. The Bender study ultimately led to a report, you probably have seen a copy of it, it has a green cover, *Guidelines for Campus Planning*.⁶ It took essentially two years to produce that report, but the process of generating that report in my view is the thing that made the report important. Because Professor Bender engaged a colleague from Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill to help on this. They made an extensive review of the original campus plan and tried to extract from the minds of the original planners what were the guiding principles to be respected here. They then had extensive public forums on the campus, inviting people to come in and talk about the campus. From that they put together a report, which when it was finally brought to the academic senate division here, didn't elicit a single comment. It was approved unanimously by the senate. I still remember that meeting. Dean McHenry got up and gave a great speech in support of the report. Pavel Machotka was the chair at that time, and asked for comments. There wasn't a single comment.

Jarrell: I think it's interesting that you are highlighting that the process was as important as the content, product—the report.

Pister: Absolutely.

Jarrell: Because I think that through previous administrations here there have been these pitched battles over each one of these building projects and the University I think was perceived in terms of town-gown relations as flexing its very real muscle. It's

⁶Richard Bender, *Implementation Program for the Long Range Development Plan*, University of California, Santa Cruz. 1993.

autonomous; it doesn't have to listen to the concerns of the community downtown. But it's not good public relations. Some of your predecessors have said—this is not a state park. (laughter)

Pister: (laughter) I remember that.

Jarrell: (laughter) You can go up the coast, go to Henry Cowell State Park.

Pister: The campus is not a state park, it's a campus with a lot of trees. I think that was the quote. Yes, I understood that that would catch it. But anyway, that really worked. But looking back, even though this got started, and ultimately, I guess two years ago was finally approved, I think it's worked. We've since looked at the siting of the environmental studies building within this process. We totally relocated the Meyer Drive extension. By the way it didn't take me more than a couple of days to realize the stupidity and in a sense the error, in trying to put Meyer Drive through the Great Meadow. I don't know . . . that might have been a cost effective way to move people across campus but it would have done tremendous harm to that beautiful meadow. I started to walk through the Great Meadow every morning and that's really what did it for me. I took six o'clock walks down and back up again. I said there is no way that I'm going to be the one that wrecks this meadow.

I used to then joke with people when we had affairs at University House and say, "Well I'm not going to put a road through but out there on the mound I'm going to put a ten-story tower." It evoked a certain amount of surprise. (laughter) Of course I had no intention of doing that but it got people's attention. Anyway, while this was going on, I don't mean to say that life was easy. I want to look back at December, 1991. This was essentially the last of the projects that I inherited. That was the problem of creating the sites for Colleges Nine and Ten.

Jarrell: The last of the big three.

Colleges Nine and Ten

Pister: Yes. I remember well the pain of that December of 1991. My staff said well, we have to get ready to do the logging so we can do the site preparation for Colleges Nine and Ten. Again as I look back at the history of this, the siting of Nine and Ten went on for I don't know how long a period here, it was kicked around by the campus. Yes, we

have to have two new colleges, here's the place to put them. It was all done according to process. But typically, even if there has been a process, and there was in this case, if people disagree with the process, they reopen the process. So what happened there was that we were invading what became known as Elf Land. And I'm not terribly clear about . . . you may have a better sense of how real Elf Land was. But it certainly it was reinvented in a way that made it sound like that I was invading St. Peter's Square, or something like that, to destroy this place. Well, as an aside it turns out there were fewer trees removed for Colleges Nine and Ten than in the construction of Kresge. That's not a way to win the war. But it was a realization that we weren't really raping that part of the campus. There was a mystique and a history that I think was embellished by people who were opposed to any expansion of the campus. This happened so often that I invented a characterization of those who believed that existing buildings simply appeared with no prior site preparations. I called this belief in the principle of "Immaculate Construction."

Some people call this the drawbridge phenomenon or mentality, that is, we're here, let's pull the bridge up. Nobody else can come. So that painful December, 1991, when we started the logging, I still remember it well. We ultimately had some unfortunate intruders who got in the way of the logging. I think there were thirty-eight or forty-four people arrested. I remember an attorney was arrested for walking through the police line and she got very, very upset. I think ultimately she was not prosecuted. But among other things, a Berkeley campus police officer pushed a television cameraman and knocked him down and his camera was damaged and I had to pay the cost of fixing up the camera. The *Santa Cruz Sentinel* wrote a nasty editorial accusing me of not knowing the law and supporting the abridgment of the rights of journalists to be on the property. I remember turning this office into a press conference. I was sitting behind a table with my chief of the campus police, Jan Tepper. The room was full of reporters and bright lights and television cameras. It was the first time I had ever been through this. As a dean I never had this kind of a problem. But it was a very uncomfortable affair.

Looking back, I don't know how we could have handled it differently at that stage of the history of the campus. It hurt because there were a lot of very critical people. The fact is that we were simply doing what had been on the books for some years, but I learned that people had very strong feelings about the environment here and they were expressing them. They didn't like the way we did things. Now that the colleges

are in place I have gone up there many times and I haven't seen or heard the term Elf Land for several years. People seem to be quite comfortable. They like the looks of Colleges Nine and Ten. That's the end of that. I remember one morning after the logging, opening my front door and there was a bag of garbage on my doorstep.

Jarrell: At University House?

Pister: Yes, at University House. And a note on the door saying these were friends of Elf Land or something, saying, "Here, we picked this stuff up that your loggers left." Their lunches and stuff like that. Dumping it on my doorstep.

Oh, there's another incident about Elf Land that I don't want to forget. I mean, it was not amusing at the time. My wife and I were in our apartment in University House on Saturday morning and the doorbell rang and my wife went down and I was behind her and there was a person shouting there, and I said, "Don't open the door." There was a guy walking outside the front door with a long club, a big four-foot club of some kind. He was screaming, demanding to see me. I hit the panic alarm . . .

Jarrell: Do you have something in the house to instantly call the police?

Pister: Yes, we have a silent alarm that summons the police. Anyway, I hit the panic alarm and I said no I am not going to talk to you. Later on I learned the identity of this person. It was someone who had come in and talked to me at one time, I realized. It was a person called Peat Moss. Peat Moss had been one of the guys that had put his arms around a tree and had gotten arrested and he was coming up brandishing this stick to complain about it. Peat Moss, I remembered came in to talk to me during my office hours when I still had them and said, "This campus is all screwed up. The students and faculty and staff ought to grow their own food, make their own places to live on the campus, and raise hemp." That was basically Peat Moss's . . .

Jarrell: This is taking everything (laughter) out to the very, very edge.

Pister: Yes. Peat Moss fortunately disappeared from my life. I don't know where he is now. That was one of the last Elf Land incidents. So I learned a lot.

Just to conclude this planning thing with the music facility we had one unfortunate incident. There was a march of twenty kids or so beating drums that went out there just when the construction started. But that was it. Then two students really did a silly thing.

They went over and tried to cut down a power pole and they were going to pour gasoline on a tractor or something. They were apprehended and fortunately they were caught before they did any more serious damage. To the best of my knowledge there hasn't been a single incident since. I think what that does is demonstrate that if you give people an opportunity to express their views and if you have a clear process that's visible to people, and you stick to it, that most everyone then will accept the outcome.

An Era of Retrenchment: UC Budget Cuts

Jarrell: I'd like to discuss the fiscal backdrop, starting when you arrived. I'd like your point of view on the whole fiscal situation for the University of California and for our small campus. Working in the library, for instance, the University Librarian told us that we're going to be experiencing cuts for the next three or four years. Now that's just one unit on this campus. But the trend generally has been downward and there are a lot of ramifications. How do you approach it? How do you deal with it in terms of retaining the vitality and the viability of this campus and its programs? I think I called it rational retrenchment. Maybe that's not your word for it. But your approach to this?

Pister: Do you want to go back now to 1991?

Jarrell: Sure.

Pister: Well, let me begin by saying that it was a very new experience for me because I grew up and lived in a University of California which over the period of my experience had always been either, if not growing, at least sustaining itself, and not having budget cuts. The only recollections I have of serious cuts were during the time when Governor [Ronald W.] Reagan cut faculty, or failed to give faculty salary increases for a couple of years, and staff, I might add. I remember one year Governor Jerry [Edmund G.] Brown, Jr. gave essentially uniform dollar increases, I think, to everybody, and didn't use the percentage which was typical of most salary adjustments. But except for minor retrenchments that took place along the way, the University was relatively healthy. Well in 1991 when I came to the campus the University was faced with a budget crisis of what Clark Kerr called unprecedented magnitude. He felt that the crisis of the 1990s even exceeded the crisis that the University sustained during the Great Depression.

The campus in one way was in an enviable position by virtue of the fact that most of its units had, for reasons that are not entirely clear, squirreled away what are called carry-over funds, that is funds that are not spent in one year were carried ahead, so that there was essentially a cushion of resources in 1991 that had been built up over a period of time for most units, not all the units. The problem was in many ways two-fold, and hasn't gone away, because of this carryover. The first was to come up with a process for downsizing the campus by cutting back across units, to reduce the annual operating costs of the units. Secondly, we had to try to do this in a way that made people realize that if they used these carryover funds this was only a temporary solution. I think we succeeded better in the first instance, that is, people understood the magnitude of the crisis and were sensitized to the need to make cuts, but I'm afraid in some units the cuts were taken by absorbing these one-time funds that had been carried forward, and that permanent cuts had not been made to the depth or to the extent that they should have been made early on in the 1990s. So your statement that you understand that cuts are going to continue to be made . . . that's essentially a consequence of not taking permanent cuts early enough and using one-time money . . .

Jarrell: It's a kind of false cushion?

Pister: Yes it's exactly that, a false cushion. I don't mean to second-guess any officer that did that because there might have been very good reasons for not taking the permanent cuts early on, and trying to distribute the permanent cuts over a longer period of time.

But at any rate, what we tried to do here was to engage a broad constituency of the campus—faculty, students, staff, and administrative officers—in group discussions that we constituted—called the budget council. I think I mentioned earlier that this budget council was new to this campus. It was new to me. I had never enjoyed the same understanding of the budget in any instance at Berkeley as a dean that we made available to the campus community here. We basically put the entire campus budget out into the public. Copies were made available in the library. We gave copies to other budget council members. So that people could see that here's historically what people had in their operating budgets. Then we tried very hard to let each of the budget officers on the campus, that is the principal unit heads, the librarian, the deans, the vice chancellors and so on, explain to the budget council group . . . well here's how we've been spending our money. Here are the purposes for which we've made these

expenditures and this is the size of our budget, the staff that we have, the faculty, staff, and so on, and operating expenses.

Then we did kind of a cross-cutting operation in which we took the budgets of each of the operating units and extracted from these budgets functional categories so that people could see the relative amounts of the budget that were spent for different purposes, across all the units. I think that was a very important step to take, because that enabled us to look carefully at what you might call a first cut at prioritization with respect to sustaining certain functions as opposed to other functions.

By the way, one of those categories, functional categories, was called administration. Here I must interject. I remember at a certain point in this process we had an academic senate meeting, and the senate's response to this was, well let's just take all the cuts in administration. One of the senior staff members after hearing this jumped up and said, "Hey, I don't think much of that idea. After all, who is the administration? It's the staff and a few academic administrators, but it's largely staff you're talking about. Why do you want to take all the cuts on the staff, basically." It saved Michael Tanner or myself from having to make that statement. Because it was made very accurately and eloquently by the person who said the administration is here to support the academic mission of the campus, to be sure but, you shouldn't decide, you know categorically, just take the whole budget cut on the support staff.

But in fact we did break out those categories. Ultimately, then, decisions were made. The budget council discussed these matters. But the decisions to allocate percentage reductions, or dollar reductions, were made basically by looking at the relative importance of different categories. The administration did take the highest percentage cut. I think that's clear. Then, having made those determinations and functional categories, we then went back and allocated to the academic divisions and to the vice chancellors and to the support units the percentages in their particular budget categories. I must say, that was done with a minimum of acrimony and anger and bad feelings, at least at the level of the council. I can't in any way say that it didn't cause pain and anguish and anger and frustration and affect the morale . . .

Jarrell: Down the chain.

Pister: Down the chain, I know that happened. It was inevitable and all I can say is that we did everything we could to explain that to the campus. We put out a publication

called FYI. I don't know if you remember . . . Errol [W.] Mauchlan was responsible for writing the early editions of that. We tried to explain to people how we were doing it, why we were doing it, and what the consequences were. I certainly appreciate the impact on morale of individuals when this happened. It hurt all of us, including the senior administrators of the campus. So that's where we came from. Now, I think we did a very good job on this campus in that we anticipated several years ahead the level of cuts that we'd have to make. We took those cuts over a several-year period. As I said, in many of the units at least, the cuts were made to reduce the permanent budget of the unit. If there are still cuts going on it's largely because they were sheltered temporarily by this carry-forward money. What the future holds is a whole different story.

Jarrell: There was an article in the *New York Times*⁷ about a week and a half ago by the columnist Anthony Lewis. He was talking about the so-called golden age of California higher education, when we had the most distinguished public university in the world, maybe it still is, okay. I grew up in this system. You've been in the UC system for almost fifty years. You came of age here; your whole life has been spent in this marvelous, remarkable system. Anthony Lewis was talking about the prison budget in California, and the budget for higher education. It's a very, very grim picture. I mean you can cut and you can cut. You know the UC system so well, but you say that the permanent operating budgets of different units on this campus were downsized, were cut. Did anybody take a really bad hit? Have we come to the point yet where we're going to start consolidating? Where the University, for instance, would start to say well, how many library schools do we need? How many teacher training programs do we need? How many Xs and Ys do we need? We have nine campuses. A proposed tenth campus. I don't know where that's going right now, but the idea of the duplication on different campuses. I've read that people are talking about those sorts of things. Has anything been done along those lines?

Pister: Yes well, Randall, you've posed a whole set of issues here. We need to step back. A number of the things you talked about are clearly systemwide issues and then there's the larger issue of the funding for education in the state of California.

⁷Anthony Lewis. "Sunlight and Shadow, California Spends Far More on its Prisons than on Education," *New York Times* (March 25, 1996).

Jarrell: Yes, that's the long range. Let's start and kind of tidy up the UCSC campus. So you started this very rational, open process of saying, no this isn't a done deal; this isn't done in secret. We're going to let everybody see what's going on.

Pister: Now we're at a point where the state revenue stream, however modestly, that's still a bit speculative, has turned around.

Jarrell: Right, from the recession.

Pister: I think all the economists in the state now agree that we're out of the bottom of the recession and we're in the recovery period. The optimists say that our recovery is going to be much faster than the rest of the nation and I have no basis to judge that. But at least in the near term the revenue picture looks very good. On the other hand, the University of California is beginning to be funded in a more reasonable way. But we've been cut back so badly that, limiting ourselves just to this campus, we have a great deal of catching up to do. The whole area of faculty and staff salaries needs a great deal of attention. We're not competitive any longer with those institutions with whom we compete for the best faculty and staff.

That's one area. The second is that deferred maintenance of our plant is woefully behind schedule. We have a plant even in a young institution like Santa Cruz that's badly in need of more maintenance. Our capital program for taking care of our space needs is in reasonably good shape. That's one of the good things. There are clearly some exceptions that we need of buildings, but I think we're in reasonably good shape there. Now the issues about the next steps for this campus, the growth of this campus are very, very important. We're addressing those issues in a couple of ways. First, there is the campus academic planning council that was created a year and a half ago. The charge to that group, which is a faculty administrative committee, is to look at the medium-term projection for the academic growth of the campus. By growth I mean not only what programs are going to be added, because we are going to be in a growth mode, but what internal reallocation of resources might be called for. What programs ought to be expanded? What programs ought to be downsized, or possibly eliminated? It's very difficult to talk about that in a university, including the University of California, because of all the vested interests on the one hand, but also because there's really only with great difficulty a consensus reached as to what a university campus should be. There's very little consensus about that. What programs should be represented on a campus? But CAPC is looking at this and hopefully will give the campus some

guidelines as to areas that ought to be strengthened and areas that ought to be held flat or even downsized or eliminated. That can't be done really without our answering those questions in connection with our role in the nine-campus system. So I'll have to come to that next.

The second thing I want to say about the campus is that there are some clear prospects for growth of the campus now. With the budget turnaround we are looking very seriously now at the resurrection of the engineering plan, which was part of the 2005 academic plan. The campus has almost reached the point of agreement between the faculty and administration as to the desirability of adding two new programs, electrical engineering and applied mathematics. The president's office is very supportive of our adding these programs. So I'm hopeful that before I leave we'll get some clear signs that will add these two new professional programs, which I think will be good for balance on this campus.

Jarrell: Absolutely. I think one of the great tragedies for Chancellor McHenry was the fact that we didn't get to have an engineering school. It skewed, truly altered the development he envisioned. I know that Bob Sinsheimer also thought it was a terrible blow. So you think that there's going to be some kind of a decision before you leave?

Pister: Yes, well I'm hopeful. At least all the preliminary work has been done. The campus reviews have taken place and this fat binder here represents the current plan for adding new programs. I've received at least informal assurance from the president's office that the funding for the programs will be forthcoming. That I want to make clear. It's not at the expense of any program on the campus; it will be in addition to. It will bring us up until the program can justify itself. You see, when you add a new program you bring in faculty and students and you need the resources to pay for those faculty, to get the students to come. Until you build up a suitable enrollment that would justify the faculty, somebody's got to pay the bill. Once you have the enrollment, and particularly under the new scheme for funding growth on the campus, which is so many dollars per new student, which is a departure from the past, we need to be bankrolled, so to speak, to get the programs started. But I've received assurance that that will be forthcoming, so I'm very pleased about that.⁸

⁸ The Baskin School of Engineering was established in July, 1997.

Now the larger question of institutional planning, that is the nine-campus academic planning activity. That's a very difficult issue. I spent two or three years as a member of the University-wide academic planning council. I found that experience extremely frustrating, because we talked about many, many issues, but there was very little attention paid to how we might more effectively deliver courses and curriculum by looking at the University as a system rather than as nine autonomous campuses. I think that's a tremendous challenge for our administration, our faculty, to come up with a process for utilizing the resources of the campuses more effectively. I have no great insights . . .

There are some chancellors who believe very firmly that we're basically nine autonomous universities that are only linked together by the common budget, but once you get your money you can forget about the other eight campuses. It's a tremendous challenge. There are pockets where there is some collaboration. Maybe educational technology will affect the way we look at ourselves, and the University, I don't know.

Jarrell: And of course even the charge to look at it as a system, rather than as nine autonomous identities, is difficult because I think each campus prides itself, and rightly, on its identity, its uniqueness.

Pister: Sure. But I think that's well established, and we can celebrate that. The trick is to take that differentiation of function of our campuses and turn it into a more positive characteristic for making the University work in a more coherent fashion. For example, I think it should be clear that we're not going to add medical schools to any of the campuses. We're not going to add law schools, at least in the near term because of the number of law schools that we already have, the number of lawyers in our society.

Jarrell: In fact I think they're going to be closing medical schools. That Dartmouth report indicated there's an expensive surplus.

Pister: Yes, exactly. There's a serious issue there. I think here's an important time to talk about that tenth UC campus. How is that tenth campus going to come on stream, how will it be funded, and what will it look like? That poses a tremendous challenge to the University and to the state. Inevitably the state, in my view, needs a tenth campus. The growth in population, in enrollment, will justify an additional campus. The students who will go to that campus are already born. The capacity in our existing system will be

exceeded in the next century, no question about that. But how to fund it is another issue.

That really takes us to the issue of the state's investment in education. You mentioned that I've spent virtually my entire adult life in the University, which is the case. I was able to get my education and find my career in the University because generations of people before me built that University. They made it possible for me. For a number of years as a taxpayer in California I continued to perpetuate that for my children. But clearly there's a discontinuity occurring. It's going to be hitting us very, very quickly. We are already in the throes of that discontinuity; we are now paying the price and suffering the consequences of massive underinvestments in education in this state. At all levels, not just the University.

Jarrell: Right. K-12.

Pister: The statistics are extraordinary and I can't help but say that I think it reflects very badly on the political leadership of our state that we can as a state be complacent about the fact that we have the worst class-size ratio of any state in the United States. We're 45th in K-12 textbook expenditures per pupil; we're 40th in total per pupil expenditures for K-12. We're in that position in the United States at a time when every industrialized society or every society that's moving toward industrialization like China, values education as the tool to bring them into the 21st century. Here we are, in this ridiculous position of saying Californians can't afford to invest in education, but by the way because we're failing so many young people we're going to build more and more prisons to take care of all the failures because we haven't educated people to earn a living. I am very depressed by the incredible failure of public policy to address the root causes. The companion of underinvestment in education in my view is the rising levels of poverty among our citizens, particularly the percentage of children living in poverty in this state.

Jarrell: A quarter of all children, or a little above that.

Pister: It's between twenty-five and thirty percent. The University has a great opportunity to help restore the economic viability of California, but it can't do it if we don't invest in K-12 education to the level that we must, if we're going to be an industrialized state. That's maybe enough on the broad issue, unless I've left something out.

Jarrell: No, that's fine. I also wanted to know, is the figure that was agreed upon during Chancellor Stevens' tenure, of the maximum growth for UCSC of 15,000 students, is that still in place?

Pister: 15,000, that's right.

Jarrell: And that's been retained.

Pister: Well, yes that's embedded in the Long Range Development Plan that the regents approved, and the environmental impact report that's connected to that plan, which was approved in 1988. In order to change that target, one would have to go back and redo the environmental impact report, with the concomitant politics and community involvement that that would entail. Now, I'm not going to be so foolish as to say that's impossible to do. Because, since we raised this, I see some signs that there is some softening of the hard feelings about the University in the last four or five years. Having gone through a depression, the University in many ways was one of the positive things . . . as bad as you and I might have felt, and our colleagues might have felt, about what was happening to this campus, and the fact that we took pay cuts and all that, we still remained the largest employer in Santa Cruz County at a time when many people were out on the streets. We kept going and kept a substantial number of people employed. I think there's more of an awareness of the importance of a strong economic base in the city and county of Santa Cruz. I just hope that our supervisors and city council will continue to see the importance of the University. I don't mean in any way abrogating the very important and commendable commitment to preserving the things that are good about this county, but to understand that an absolutely no-growth, no-change mentality will not serve this region at all over the next century. There will inevitably have to be some accommodations made to continue to allow people to move into this area, to build a stronger economic base for the region. We'll clearly be a big part of it.

Jarrell: In the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* editorial that they printed a day or two after your retirement was announced, they really lauded and gave great credit to you personally for mending the rupture, the bad feeling and misunderstanding, miscommunication between town and gown. They saluted you for being able to listen to other people's points of view, for not being the unilateral dictator up on the hill—"I'm the University. We're autonomous." Of not rubbing it in people's faces. Because it is true that the

University does not have to abide by local ordinances. But it doesn't help when you remind them of that. I certainly notice a much better feeling flowing back and forth.

Pister: Well, I'm pleased with that. I think it's a very straightforward issue. I think it's very important to be honest and open with people, to be consistent, and not to be blown away by situational or political forces; to make your principles and your positions clear to people, and then to stick to them. You know it's apparent, I think, to remember the importance of being consistent in making decisions about the way your family operates. Virtually all of us like to live in an ordered society; we like to know what's okay and what's not okay; what provides stability and what creates instability. I don't think the human spirit likes to live in a chaotic world. I try very hard to reduce the chaos by putting some order in the process. That's something that I've tried to do on the campus to start with, to create processes that people understand that this is the way we do business, and to stick with it.

The College System

Jarrell: I'd like to move on now to your view of the colleges. That has been a thorn in the side of every chancellor, I dare say; of how the colleges are integrated into the overall academic planning and the social and cultural and intellectual life of the students. I know that you have been very active in thinking through and maybe redefining this latest incarnation of the colleges. Because originally they had the same kind of status and power as the boards of studies. During Chancellor Sinsheimer's reorganization things changed radically, both in terms of how the faculty moved back and forth and were clustered differently, and also in terms of academic appointments. I would like to know how you view the colleges now, and what initiatives you've taken to give them a clearer identity?

Pister: Well I should state again that when I left Berkeley one of the things that really attracted me was the idea of residential colleges that had an academic role on the campus. I mentioned earlier in our conversation, after spending some forty years at Berkeley, I became tired of the realization that Berkeley was really a set of independent universities. Each department, or virtually each department or school or college certainly, was an entity unto itself. We called ourselves Berkeley. But if you were a physicist it's Berkeley physics you worried about. As an engineer I was concerned about engineering at Berkeley. I got my budget from the chancellor's office. There was

little to celebrate as an academic institution beyond your own department or beyond your own school or college. I earlier remarked that in my lifetime at Berkeley, I saw not only the erosion of institutional loyalty, but I would say almost the utter abandonment of institutional loyalty on the part of the faculty.

Jarrell: So it was just completely fragmented?

Pister: Just to document that, and not just to make an assertion: in my early years at Berkeley, there was a substantial involvement in the Berkeley Division with the approval of curricula in the schools and colleges. That is, the faculty of the Berkeley campus through their participation as members of the Berkeley Division approved the degree requirements for each of the schools and colleges. That disappeared, basically. It was a utterly pro forma. I mean it still happened over forty years, but it was just a rubber stamp. But it didn't stop there. The faculties of schools and colleges in turn, in my view, more or less abandoned their responsibility to approve the curricula of the separate departments within the schools and colleges. It was more or less a rubber stamp. If department x decided it wanted to change its degree requirements it brought that to the faculty meeting which was poorly attended to start with, and that group of faculty who showed up would largely be the faculty of the department that wanted to make the change so they all voted to make the change. So it was basically an abdication of academic citizenship. Essentially the institutional loyalty was replaced by departmental loyalty or even in the extreme, disciplinary loyalty within a department. Department meetings were not necessarily well attended in large departments, which is to say that basically the idea of not only a liberal education for letters and science, should that be, but even in a professional school like engineering at Berkeley, the characterization of a professional education was left pretty much to a narrow group of people to define. I got tired of that. I saw that the lack of citizenship was leading to the production of graduates who in my view were not well educated. It wasn't just that engineers and scientists couldn't communicate with the rest of the world, they couldn't even communicate with each other, let alone the rest of the world. A nuclear engineer couldn't talk to a civil engineer, or you name the pair. So alas.

But the Santa Cruz opportunity came along and I read about the colleges. I knew something about them. I thought this was a wonderful opportunity, to go to a place that understands collegiality in a different way than the typical research university that I'd grown up in.

I got here only to find that the college system was not in good shape. Indeed it had been pretty much dismantled, as you mentioned, by an earlier chancellor. I became chancellor at the end, when the power and authority had been taken away from the college provosts and I think in 1990 or 1991, there was a substantial budget reduction as well. The last resources of the provosts' control in the academic area was removed. The old bursar position was replaced by the college administrative officer. So the collegiate model was also altered, not only its funding, but how it was administered. However I still clung to the idea that a provost should be the chief academic officer of a college. I remember an early moment on the campus speaking to a provost and mentioning, well why don't you do this? You're the chief academic officer of this college. The provost looked at me with a strange expression and said, "What do you mean by that?" I think what he was reflecting was the fact that even though the title existed and was kind of carried on from the earlier days when the provost really did have substantial authority and was a chief academic officer . . .

The title remained but the reality was quite different. The authority of the provost was not only diminished by virtue of the loss of a resource base, but I think perhaps more important, the loyalty of the faculty to the college had been severely or seriously changed or eroded. That was manifest in the later period a year or two after I'd been here. The chairman of the Division and I wrote letters to each faculty member essentially demanding that they affiliate with a college because faculty no longer saw any reason to be a fellow of a college or to be affiliated with a college. Indeed I heard more than one faculty member say well I'm a member of such and such a college but I've never been there since I've been on the campus. So the idea that I was coming to a place where the colleges offered an alternative to Berkeley, was quickly challenged, shall I say. That didn't mean that I gave up on the idea and if I were to go back and read the talk that I gave at my investiture, I remember very distinctly making a public statement of commitment to the colleges and that was very seriously done with all good intention.⁹

⁹Chancellor Pister added the following written remarks: My investiture in October, 1992, coincided with the onset of California's depression and the UC budget crunch, along with threats of a graduate student strike over recognition for collective bargaining. That the confluence of these forces would produce trouble at the ceremony should have been a foregone conclusion. Following the entry processional there appeared a procession of students, with raised clenched fists and placards, with shouts of slogans supporting their several causes. This went on for some time and continued as the program unfolded. In planning the program I had requested the inclusion of both an invocation and a benediction. Since the event was held on land originally inhabited by the Ohlone tribe, I believed that it would be appropriate for an Ohlone to deliver the invocation. That was done in the person of Patrick

I worked with the provosts through the council of provosts and the associate vice chancellor for undergraduate affairs, who worked with the provosts. I worked almost continuously with the divisional chairs, at least two of the divisional chairs, to try to find ways to reattach, or to rekindle the spirit of faculty to work in the colleges. There were several attempts made to put together proposals to strengthen the colleges. One of the earliest ones was a proposal that we put together to establish in each college what you might call the equivalent of an endowed chair that would enable a faculty member to take that position, take the income from the endowment, to develop courses that would be suitable for presentation through a college, that is, courses that were interdisciplinary in nature that would attract students from any one of the four academic divisions. We had no success in getting that proposal funded. So we abandoned that.

We subsequently worked with the provosts and with the support of the Hewlett Foundation to put together a different kind of proposal and I'm pleased to say it ultimately was funded this year to develop in each of the colleges courses that would be aimed at examining in a comparative way the different cultures of our society. That program got underway in January, and I'm hopeful it will be a step, albeit a modest step, to getting a better focus on bringing together faculty from different areas of the campus, different disciplinary backgrounds to focus their collective wisdom in important scholarly areas. Time will tell whether this experiment is going to work and whether it will be sustained. The faculty the year that I came here also voted, although very narrowly, in favor of having each faculty member teach a one-to three-unit course every three years.

Jarrell: In the colleges?

Pister: In a college or in a division. That was a modification. I have not seen a careful analysis of the success of that program. That's something I should look into. I think Professor [Leo F.] Laporte is examining that issue right now to see how successful that's

Orozco, an Ohlone spirit man. He arose and spoke something like this: "I sense the presence of evil spirits in this place. I will use a chant taught to me by my grandmother to drive them away." He then chanted, accompanied by a drum beat, for about twenty minutes. That he was successful was virtually inevitable, for how could the protestors prevail against a Native American in Santa Cruz? Then President of the University of California, Jack Peltason, never forgot this incident. He told the story over and over again, attributing the intervention to my brilliant planning. Of course, it was certainly not on my mind when I conceived of inviting an Ohlone to the investiture, but I didn't refuse taking credit. Subsequently, I worked with Patrick in support of his attempts to gain recognition for the Ohlones as a registered tribe with the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington, D.C.

been. I have some anecdotal evidence that in a number of instances it seems to have been very well done. I don't know what percentage of the faculty have really been involved. So the long and the short of it is the role of the colleges is still undefined. There's an elusive goal that many would like to see attained. In the final analysis, I think the only way that will sustain any role for the colleges will be to make some academic resources available to the provosts again, without giving the provosts control over faculty appointment or promotion.

Jarrell: Which they used to have, yes.

Pister: I think provosts should have some discretionary resources that would enable them to work with faculty in the divisions by taking resources and buying out the partial time of a faculty member from a division or from a board of studies, and encouraging that faculty member or group of faculty members to work together in the college setting. This is exactly what you do on a traditional campus when you set up an interdisciplinary center. When I was a dean, I had a certain amount of resources that I put in an interdisciplinary center in engineering to bring people from departments to work together in the center. But if you pull a person out of a teaching role in a board at some percent, let's say one course, then you've got to put some money back in the board to hire a substitute. There's just no way you're ever going to break that because of the way we do accounting for our teaching load here.

Jarrell: In diagnosing why the colleges have had such a difficult history—is it in some measure due to the expensiveness, the costliness, of running these colleges which are duplicative?

Pister: It's possible that it's had some effect but I think that's not the major reason. The major issue here is the following: our faculty are basically evaluated just like faculty on every other UC campus, and on every other major research campus in the United States. In fact the appointment and promotion committees of our faculty often contain members from other UC campuses. So if you're a biologist at Santa Cruz you are expected to perform like a biologist at Irvine, Berkeley or UCLA—where they don't have residential colleges, okay? So that's pretty clear, isn't it? If a person wants to be a successful professor, a recognized scholar, in a particular field they look at the outside world and the outside world looks at them as if they belong in the outside world.

Jarrell: Exactly. In college-building, for instance—faculty don't get brownie points for college-building when they're up for review?

Pister: That is the problem. If we were strictly a stand-alone liberal arts college that even had some graduate programs, and not just strictly undergraduate, then I think we could be much more bold in the way we used our faculty and we'd be much better off. But we're not that. The only way we could be like that would be to essentially ask for exceptions to personnel policies.

Jarrell: Right. Secede from the UC system.

Pister: And secede, like Kresge did (laughter) from UC the year that I got here or the year before I got here, and say we're not going to be part of UC. There's even a pressure, in my view, that's equally compelling and that is the disciplinary pressure across the United States. This is a consequence of post World War II federal governmental policy basically, that you're probably well aware of. The mission agencies in many, many fields, basically became involved in and took over the support of graduate education in the United States, which didn't exist before World War II in a major way. So what happened, if you're in a particular department, particularly the sciences and professional education (less in the humanities . . . although certainly true in social sciences, and not at all true in the arts), was that if you were in a department, you became much more strongly connected to the department and less to anything else. If you wanted to do good work in your department, you had to convince granting agencies outside your university that you were going to do work. That required the approbation of peers who were also in the same discipline. So that the whole idea of institutional loyalty was badly affected by federal funding policy. This was an issue that we grappled with in the task force which I chaired on the faculty reward system. We tried to call attention to the historical evolution that shifted institutional loyalty to department loyalty, or even to subdiscipline loyalty. It's affected Santa Cruz as it has every other campus in the United States. Except liberal arts undergraduate education.

Jarrell: Which is not dependent upon federal funding for resources?

Pister: That's right. Their dependence is very different because they are not engaged in the education of graduate students. So that's been a major issue. I don't know how to turn that around. I know that Chancellor McHenry is still painfully concerned about this. He's talked to me recently. I think he's launching an independent study of the

colleges, from what I gather, to try to keep his dream alive. I respect his dream but it's a dream that's very, very difficult to actualize in today's world.

Jarrell: Right, to integrate the colleges into academic life . . .

Pister: . . . of the campus.

Jarrell: I see how important the colleges are to so many students, especially undergraduates. Their devotion is to Merrill or to Oakes. I would imagine in the future, well for fundraising purposes in years to come that many alumni want their gifts, donations to enhance one of the colleges, let's say.

Pister: Exactly. In the second year I was here I changed the whole focus of the annual fund, which had been used here historically to try to raise money for the chancellor's unrestricted use. Based on my experience as a dean where I fought that tooth-and-nail, I said that makes no sense. What we're going to do is to change the focus and encourage people to make a contribution to the particular activity that they value most. The colleges became one focus. Each of the academic divisions, the library, became a focus. Each one of the main activity heads was given an opportunity to attract that part of the alumni group loyal to it. That's diminished the amount of money coming to the chancellor, but it's certainly given people the opportunity to support the colleges. You're absolutely right that the colleges are a main attraction. How that will change in the next few decades . . . that's an open question. I still think that it's always going to be a rich experience living in one of our residential colleges. The Hewlett grant that we have is based on using the residential college to reinforce comparative cultural coursework.

I want to say something about the colleges and the role or the importance that the faculty currently attach to the colleges. That's reflected in the core courses. I think the core courses are a marvelous idea; they ought to give the students an orientation to this campus and to a particular segment of knowledge. Whatever the college faculty decides is the right focus.

In the ideal world that core course ought to be the most valued course from the standpoint of the faculty. Because it launches the student at Santa Cruz. Regrettably the data show that relatively few tenure track faculty, regular faculty, are engaged in core course instruction. The core courses are largely staffed by competent people that are temporary . . .

Jarrell: Right, they're not your senior faculty.

Pister: They are not the senior faculty. That does regrettably show that the faculty doesn't attach much importance to the core courses. The provosts do, the alumni do; the faculty don't. Because, I guess, I would have to say, the reward system says that that's not important. That's something again that I tried very hard to change in my capacity as chairman of that task force that looked at the reward system, but the disciplinary pressure is so strong that it says don't waste your time on a thing like this. There are exceptions and here I am probably sounding too much like a Berkeley faculty member . . .

The chemistry department at Berkeley is a paragon of virtue in this regard. Since I can remember, and it goes back half a century, the best senior faculty in chemistry at Berkeley teach the freshman chemistry course—Nobel prize winners like Glenn Seaborg. The greats at Berkeley have staffed the freshman chemistry course. They know that they don't have to worry about the fact that they are teaching a freshman chemistry course. But it's something we ought to think seriously about here, if we really believe in the core courses.

Jarrell: I think that there's a renewed kind of an outcry, almost about the University, not just this campus, but you know, devoting more attention and seriousness to undergraduate teaching.

Pister: Amen. I agree that the students shouldn't be the ones to suffer from this tension between teaching and research. This is consonant with an idea that I've tried over and over again to speak about. That is to place attention on the idea that it's just as important for faculty to think about the people they produce as the knowledge that they produce. If we could just kind of slow down on our mad quest to find new knowledge or to reexamine the organization of knowledge, and spend that time working directly with the development of the human potential . . . with kindling that, I think we'd all be better off.

Affirmative Action

Jarrell: Chancellor, I would like to address a very complicated issue, which hopefully we can break down into smaller pieces—the issue of affirmative action. Maybe part one

could be your approach to affirmative action prior to coming here, and how you implemented affirmative action on this campus, including your very broad outreach efforts. During your tenure you've been a very strong supporter of affirmative action.

Pister: Well I think it might be useful to go back some years to start this discussion, Randall. I'm going to go back to 1978-79, which after all was still some years after the Civil Rights Movement, simply to establish the fact that people can change. At that time I was vice chairman and then later chairman, of the academic council. I remember the academic vice president from UC Davis, Donald [C.] Swain . . . and sitting in meetings where Don was talking about the need for reaching out to groups . . . I don't know if the term underrepresented students was used at that time, but I would say groups of students who were not present in the University of California in very large numbers then. My faculty-oriented response was, well we have our standards, you know, and we can't just admit anybody just because they happen to be in this or that group. I was very unsympathetic to the idea of putting resources or trying to address issues of underpreparedness for any groups of students that didn't meet our A-F [course] requirements and our admission requirements at that time. That was say, 1979-1980. Well shortly thereafter I became dean of engineering at Berkeley. I guess at that time I had a reawakening of something that I should have remembered, which would have taken me back to an earlier point in 1970, when I discussed the early years of the very successful MESA program.

This is a kind of parenthetical remark again, but it establishes the context I think you wish to establish. The cofounder of that program, Bill [Wilbur] Somerton, was a neighbor of mine; he was a professor of petroleum engineering at Berkeley. We commuted to Berkeley every day. He talked about the need for a program that would bring minority students into petroleum engineering. On the strength of that, together with an Oakland high school teacher, Mary Perry Smith, the MESA program was born in 1970. Well I had that experience. I was very supportive. I visited Oakland Tech high school and met Mary Perry Smith and worked a bit with Bill in those early years. But I seem to have forgotten that at the end of the decade, and was less sympathetic to the need to reach out to help disadvantaged students.

Mathematics, Engineering, Science, Achievement [MESA] Program

MESA is an acronym for Mathematics Engineering, Science Achievement Program.

Jarrell: That's what we would call now an outreach program.

Pister: Yes, it's an outreach program. It was specifically designed to encourage high school students from Hispanic, African American, and American Indian groups to stay in the A-F track, to pursue mathematics and science that would qualify them to go on to a four-year institution. Incidentally, that program has now been broadened to go down to the middle school, and even to the primary grade levels. It's a program that's pervasive in California. It's supported by both industry as well as the state government. In one form or another programs like MESA are now in eighteen states in the United States, so it was a wonderful model to open up a track for young people that had previously not existed. By coincidence, last night I attended a 25th anniversary celebration dinner in San Francisco honoring six companies in the San Francisco area that have been instrumental in supporting MESA. We heard three students who are in the program now. It was a wonderful evening. But getting back now, when I became dean of engineering at Berkeley, I inherited a MESA center, by the way, and I also inherited the problem of under-representation of not only ethnic groups of students in engineering, but women as well.

So I had the good fortune of having a couple of very key staff people and a supportive chancellor. I really at that point found myself, to use Paul's words, on the road to Damascus. I saw a real problem in engineering that we simply weren't addressing. So I invested substantial amounts of my discretionary resources, and built not only the MESA pre-college program, but what we called originally a minority engineering student program, which later became MEP, the Minority Engineering Program, which is part of MESA now—a statewide program that was designed to recruit and support and graduate minority students and women in the college of engineering. I was very successful in doing that at Berkeley. I saw the tremendous need to encourage young people, many of whom had no expectation they could do engineering, no understanding of what would be required if even they wanted to. So we really put a lot of effort into that and as I said we were ultimately very successful. I doubled the number of women in the college of engineering while I was dean and increased not only the number of students from ethnic groups that were underrepresented that came into engineering, but dramatically increased their graduation rate over the decade. I'm proud to say that I received a national award for my efforts in that area from the American Society for Engineering Education.

So I brought that experience when I came to Santa Cruz. Not only the experience, but the commitment to make accessible to all Californians the benefits of a college education. I was committed to do that. When I got here I found that the campus certainly lacked no commitment to that same set of goals, but that in fact there were some problems . . . there were internal discords in my view.

The responsibility for diversifying the campus for students was too diffuse. It wasn't in my view well articulated in the administrative structure we had. There were whole sets of problems. The other thing that really frustrated me apart from that, was at Berkeley as dean, I could work with my staff in a hands-on way. The coordinators of my programs at Berkeley were a wonderful set of young people, all minority people. I could walk into their offices, talk to them and put my arms around them, so to speak. But alas I learned that as chancellor one can't do that because . . .

Jarrell: You can't just amble . . .

Pister: Because you jump over too many people below you and it creates all sorts of problems for the people below. My executive assistant constantly had to remind me, remember, take yourself back to Berkeley. How would you, when you were dean, have liked the chancellor to walk into your staff office and to (laughter) talk to one of your staff people about the way that this program or that program might be going. So that was a real frustration. It meant that I had to approach this whole area in a different way. I had to learn that, because it wasn't intuitive to me. What do I mean by that? Well I learned that it was probably more important for me and less destructive of the life of the campus for me to try to set a tone, to be a leader and not be a doer, if that makes proper sense. The first recollection, was the press that talked about my coming here and mentioned my commitment to affirmative action at Berkeley, and the success I had at Berkeley. It was very important that the campus knew that. But I remember very well my investiture when I was formally made chancellor of this campus, in October, 1992. We chose the theme Unity with Diversity for that investiture. At a press conference associated with that ceremony, I made the statement, because we were entering into the budget cut era, that I would not cut budgets of programs that were explicitly directed toward affirmative action.

Jarrell: I remember that.

Pister: I have kept that commitment. The funds that have come from this office have not been cut back. There have been some internal readjustments of funds in different programs but certainly the budgets of the units have not been cut. With one exception, that Valerie [M.] Simmons brought to my attention, there was apparently a reduction in one position in her affirmative action office. You know she helps develop the policy and the statements of what we have to prepare for the federal government, keeps the statistics, the records. So that wasn't essentially a student program. But it was a program of affirmative action.

But no student program was cut. Even though at different times during my tenure here, when disaffected students chose to, they said well the chancellor's cutting affirmative action. But anyone who bothers to look at the budget record would see that that's not true.

Jarrell: You said that you were dissatisfied when you got here with the way affirmative action was being implemented. We have the student part of it, admissions policy to encourage underrepresented minorities and women. Then we have faculty recruitment . . .

Pister: And staff recruitment. We need to visit all those things. Let me talk about the student issue first. When you come into a new situation you basically have to get acquainted and comfortable with the people who have been here whom you are working with. More than that, not only the people but the environment and the unexpressed but clearly present understandings that exist on the campus. That's the big task. Because I think what is not written down, but understood to be the modus operandi of the campus is much more important (laughter) than what's explicit.

What I learned . . . and I have to be very candid about this, was that the admissions folks in their outreach, their recruitment, were not really working well with the SAA/EOP [Student Affirmative Action and Educational Opportunity Programs] folks who were also recruiting and trying to support students of underrepresented groups once they got here. There was a kind of a turf war between the admissions office and the SAA/EOP office which was in student affairs. That really did not get properly resolved until Vice Chancellor [Francisco J.] Hernandez came onto the campus about a year and a half ago. There was an interim solution where I had an associate vice chancellor, Cliff [Clifton A.] Poodry, to whom I gave that responsibility. Cliff was certainly very committed and well intentioned but lacked the administrative skill to

bring together these two groups that simply had not worked well together. When Francisco came he had great experience in this area and . . . not only did he successfully bring these groups together, and restructure that whole area, but he brought on an associate vice chancellor, J. Michael Thompson, who was skilled and committed to this area. So about a year and a half ago, in my view, things really turned around in that area.

Jarrell: So that these two entities were not competing. They were both working together and . . .

Pister: That's right. An interesting side comment here—when people are not happy, or they feel like they're not part of the team, if they are suspicious of the administration, things happen. Disaffected persons used the students against the administration. That was happening. The SAA/EOP students were often the agents used by people who had their own agendas to deal with the administration. I had that problem for most of my time here until Francisco came as I said, and I think really turned that whole area around. It was not unlike an experience that I went through at Berkeley. When I first started working with minority students at Berkeley, I remember my first encounters were very tense. The air was . . . my office was charged and it was a case of students not having the trust that the dean was really on their side and wanted to work with them. It took me five years at Berkeley working with students to gain their trust. By the time I left Berkeley after ten years not only had I gained their trust, but they gave me awards for what I did.

The same exact thing happened here. I just had an affirmation of that, Randall. Over most of the time I've been here, the SAA/EOP students as a group were . . . they were not disrespectful. They were not dumping on me. But they were suspicious. They didn't trust a white chancellor, to put it very bluntly. That in my view has changed at the end of my tenure here. I had an interview with two students who were writing for the magazine that the SAA/EOP students put out. The students conveyed to me gratitude and respect for the work I've done. I think that is a reaffirmation of what happened to me at Berkeley. I hadn't been smart enough to see that it would take five years to do the same thing here.

Jarrell: Yes, and I see there is the political polarization that you're describing. The human relationships that develop give the inner substance to these policies.

Pister: Absolutely.

Jarrell: So they know you're for real. They know you're not just mouthing some rhetoric.

Pister: Absolutely. That's it. Putting myself in their position, I understand. It's a perfectly human thing and I'm certain I would feel the same way were I in their shoes if the roles were reversed. At any rate, I think the student affirmative action structure and the relationship among the different groups is vastly improved at this point.

Staff affirmative action is a totally different area. That's basically the responsibility of the academic human resources people and the individual units. The boards, the divisions, all of the units on the campus. I felt that the leadership that Julia Armstrong, Willeen McQuitta and Valerie Simmons and various groups like in the library, the diversity . . . I can't remember the exact title . . .

Jarrell: Task force?

Pister: The diversity task force. I think there have been some wonderful spontaneous expressions of commitment in groups like that that have done a splendid job. I don't mean in any sense that the job has been done perfectly or that it's completed. But I think that there's a real commitment across this campus to try to diversify the staff work force, to diversify in the broadest sense. Ethnicity, gender, age, social position and so on. There's a real awareness that diversity is a very complex, multidimensional issue. I'm pleased to see that. We always can improve. Certainly there are areas where we're not doing well. We don't have good gender diversification as you move up in the hierarchy in our institution. That's a matter of concern that we have to continue to work with; to train people to give them professional development opportunities and so on. Faculty diversity includes a different set of issues.

Jarrell: And very tough.

Pister: A tough one. There is constant pressure to diversify the faculty. Let me start out by observing that this campus among the nine UC campuses has the highest percentage of women on its faculty, and again has the highest percentage of faculty of color of any of the nine campuses. That doesn't mean that . . .

Jarrell: That it's satisfied?

Pister: That things are over. But I just mention comparatively we're not doing badly in diversification of our faculty. In my experience the problem that has to be solved in diversifying the faculty is at least two-fold, it's probably manifold. First of all, in many fields the pool of candidates is very small. So you've got people pulling in three thousand directions. There are some three thousand post-secondary institutions in the United States. That's number one. That brings you back to the pipeline. We need to educate more young people to start with, so the pool is larger. The second problem, in my view, is that there is a very strong, lingering, male-dominated academic environment in our institution. No matter what people say, the language, the culture, of the academy is white male dominant. And I don't need to tell you . . . We're trying to break out of that. I have seen over and over again in faculty recruitments, when a person who's different from the dominant culture is discussed there is a . . . it's not explicit, there's an implicit assumption that difference means "less than." That's what we're dealing with, I think. There's an enormous problem of acceptance, that a person can be different and yet be of the same quality. And God help us on that. It's going to take generations.¹⁰

Jarrell: It's going to take generations. This is not something that can be done in five or ten years.

¹⁰ Chancellor Pister added the following written remarks: Angela Davis and I both arrived at UC Santa Cruz during the same academic year. Little did I know what this held in store for me. Although her name and her public life could not have escaped my attention, I had not met her until arriving at UCSC. On the several occasions where we were both present, I found her to be an engaging, articulate faculty member. She was extremely popular with students and an acknowledged contributor to the stature of the History of Consciousness board of studies. It was therefore not a complete surprise to me when, on the occasion of my call for nominations for the presidential chair, her application was judged by the relevant committees of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate to be the most worthy. I submitted my recommendation for her appointment to the president, who actually made the appointment. That was the beginning, but scarcely the end, of the matter when it became public. From the beginning, neither the president nor I had the slightest reservation as to the action taken. I had carefully followed University policy in seeking nominations and being guided by the senate as to the person to be selected. Further, both the president and I were very much aware of the regents' standing order which strictly forbade any political matter to be considered in a personnel action. However, such facts were not to constrain voices among elected officials in Sacramento. One senator issued a press release demanding my removal from office, with support from a politically conservative group in Virginia, who would come after me. I also spent an hour in the office of another senator, who in spite of my representations as to the facts of the case, could not accept its outcome. Eventually the matter disappeared from public view, but not before one amusing anecdote, recounted to me by President Peltason. One day his office received a call from a person demanding to know why Angela Davis was made president of the University. Jack told me that his first reaction was to tell the person that she had not been made president, but that a campus had been named after her. As this story reflects, one of Jack Peltason's great strengths was his sense of humor, which helped us on many occasions when the going was tough.

Pister: Yes. To be very personal about this, in my own experience, if I look back thirty or forty years, I lived in a virtually white world. That has been forty years or so of my experience at UC. That has changed dramatically. I can look back and remember when that white world started to take on some colored hues and the process of learning to accept that and to be comfortable with that. I'm just one person in millions. We all have to go through that. Some people are never able to accept that. To go into a room where there are different kinds of people present and not see that. In my view that's what we're trying to do; we're trying to remove that differentiating quality, or the qualities of difference that are really accidental and have nothing to do with people. So those are my recollections about the state of the campus and how I came to the campus and what I've tried to do.

In the faculty area I've tried very hard to encourage the deans through several programs. I've introduced the chancellor's professorship and lectureship program to encourage deans and boards to seek out promising candidates from underrepresented groups and bring them to the campus as visitors or as potential appointees. We've visited each of the deans of the divisions and their search committees, to encourage them to diversify the pools of applicants as much as possible. But we have a long way to go.

Jarrell: In addressing recruitment, in the past couple of years I've read several articles about student recruitment, that our figures for the last couple of years have been dropping. I think in *City on the Hill Press* they had some statistics from the admissions office that said . . . see we've done so well in the faculty part of things in terms of comparing ourselves to the other campuses. But in terms of student recruitment of underrepresented groups, that Santa Cruz . . . I think it said we had the poorest or the lowest numbers of any of the nine campuses.

Pister: I don't think that information is accurate.

Jarrell: You don't think so? I have this article in my file . . .

Pister: Randall, the best place to look at the data on this campus would be in the diversity issue of *Currents* that we put out.

Jarrell: Yes, I saw that.

Pister: Or to talk to Randy Nelson, who does the statistics on this. I don't have the exact figures in my head, but let me give you my sense. Certainly in the last two years at least, the percentage of students of color on this campus has continued to grow. It's not correct that we are going down. The actual numbers of non-white students have been going up, and the percentages have been going up. At the undergraduate and the graduate level, for that matter. The percentage of students of color on this campus is, I think, between thirty-four and thirty-seven percent.

Jarrell: If we take all the groups and put them together?

Pister: Yes. If you look at the detail there are some interesting observations. Like every campus, the percentage of Chicano/Latino, and African American students or American Indian students, the percentages of those groups are less than the percentages in high school graduating classes in California. But we are improving. Particularly we are improving in the Chicano/Latino group of students. That's I think the result of a couple of things—the outreach programs we have. The sheer numbers are increasing; that population is increasing more rapidly than the rest of the groups. So there are more people in the pool and we're going to get more. Even though their eligibility rates are low, the low eligibility rate times a larger number gives you more students. So that's what's happening there. The one group that's an interesting anomaly here is Asian-American students; there's always been a hue and cry that we don't have Asian-American students on this campus. The fact is that's the one group of students of color that are here in the same percentage as that group in the California population.

The fact is Asian-American students are greatly over-represented on most of our campuses. My analysis of why they are underrepresented here compared to other campuses is that we don't have the professional programs that tend to attract those students. At Berkeley for example, something between forty and fifty percent of my undergraduate engineering students were Asian-American. We have only one engineering program right now. We're moving to add another engineering program and I hope that will help. Asian-American students likewise are typically attracted to other professional fields like business, optometry, the law and so on. So whereas I understand the desire to diversify and bring that group here you can't bring people to programs that they don't want.

Jarrell: Exactly. I heard [UC Berkeley] Chancellor Tien on C-SPAN give a very remarkable lecture at Brown University last month where he was a guest lecturer. He

said, and this was way after the regental outlawing of affirmative action, that at UC Berkeley if we have to completely dismantle affirmative action it's conceivable that the vast majority of students at Berkeley would be Asian-American students. He said, wouldn't that be awful. (laughter)

Pister: No, I understand that. That's exactly what will happen. Berkeley would be virtually an Asian-American and Caucasian school. If you look strictly at the SAT scores and the GPA's . . .

Jarrell: And you don't look at anything else . . .

Pister: And look at nothing else, that's what will happen.

Jarrell: That's what you wind up with.

Pister: I agree with him that that would be a very unfortunate thing to happen at Berkeley.

Jarrell: I thought we could go into this latter part of your tenure when the regents decided on July 21 of last year that they were going to dismantle affirmative action in terms of both students and faculty and staff, across the board.¹¹

Pister: And in contracting and business practices, yes.

Jarrell: I would like you to spell out how that position affected you, what you think about it, what the implications are.

Pister: Well, when I saw that coming I worked very hard with my colleague chancellors, and urged them to not be silent on this issue. For this record I think it's okay for me to say that I wrote the first draft of the position statement that the chancellors and the president adopted, because I felt compelled to have the chancellors and later the president decided to join us, to make a public statement. I felt we couldn't be silent on this issue. So I wrote the first draft. It was subsequently modified. We passed the draft around and the other chancellors had a chance to take a shot at it. That ultimately was the document that was published. At one point the [UC] president said he didn't want it to look like the chancellors were on one side and he was on the other.

¹¹ Amidst great controversy, in July, 1995, the Regents of the University of California voted 14-10 on a resolution proposed by Regent Ward Connerly, to ban the use of gender and ethnicity in student admissions, substituting instead economic and social need. The policy took effect in January, 1997.

So he said he wanted to join us in this statement. Ultimately he and the vice presidents, excluding the vice president for legal affairs, the general counsel, not by virtue of his own personal view, but he's vice president of the University for legal affairs and also the general counsel to the regents, all signed the statement. He felt that he couldn't as general counsel be on the record, although Jim [James E.] Holst certainly supports affirmative action. So we joined together in that public statement, which has been widely referenced in the press. I was very pleased that we were able to show that kind of unanimous support. Well, of course the rest is history. I still have memories of sitting through that infamous regents meeting. I still see the actors on the stage. I have to say that it was a staged play; I have no personal doubt whatever that the whole thing was staged for the governor's campaign. That doesn't mean that there are not some regents whose ideologies are against affirmative action.

Jarrell: Right. On its own merits or demerits.

Pister: I'll say that there are . . . just a few of them . . . I'm not sure that there were fourteen regents who felt that way, who voted for these resolutions. But certainly a substantial number are simply opposed to the idea for various reasons. I've had some very frank discussions with a couple of regents that I really respect. That said, I simply feel that this kind of a law or this kind of a policy is not the right one.

On the other hand I think there was such an obvious political motive to this. After the meeting I remember talking to an *Los Angeles Times* reporter and I think I was quoted as saying, "In all my years at UC this is the worst day of my life." I felt so low about the University and felt so disappointed. I thought of all the years that I'd been working for the University to open it up to students, to help the state reach out to the people of the state . . . all the reasons why I believe in affirmative action, the social good that is produced as a result, the fact that affirmative action is not just for the people that it helps, but for the society as a whole. It's so bloody damn obvious to me you're not just helping some small group of people; you're making your society better by doing this. For all these reasons I felt very low after that meeting. I expressed myself that way. I've since written a couple of pieces on this decision. One of the pieces I wrote for the *UC Santa Cruz Review* went to the regents. It caused one regent to be very angry with me. He wrote to the president and said that he thought I was insubordinate to write such an article.

Jarrell: Which regent?

Pister: That was Regent Ward Connerly. He insisted some action be taken and the president really ignored the letter as far as I know . . . he may have responded but he said nothing to me about it. But I subsequently talked to Mr. Connerly about his letter because I felt that I owed that to him. I explained to him that if one looked carefully at what I wrote, I said simply that I continue to feel that the regents' decision was the wrong decision, but that we had to be guided by it. As a longtime naval reserve officer I understood the idea of insubordination and I simply said to him "I was not insubordinate, sir. I don't have to agree with your position but I have to do what you ask me to do." Well that sort of leaves us in one hell of a mess, to put it bluntly.

New Admissions Strategies

We're working hard now with new admissions strategies. I would say that the University vis à vis student admissions now is not in an impossible position but it just makes our job a great deal more difficult. I say that for the following reason. When I started the Leadership Opportunity Awards Program here, which was the outreach program for bringing outstanding, yet disadvantaged students, from the community colleges to the campus, there was nothing in our brochure or in our policies that said anything about underrepresentation, gender, ethnicity, anything like that. We simply said let's go out and look for a group of students from these community colleges who have done well academically, who show potential, but had done this at the same time in the face of serious impediments in their lives, whether socioeconomic, familial, whatever . . . We uncovered a pool of students who were incredibly rich; and that group of students has been diverse in all the dimensions we talk about. We have one 55 year old Hispanic woman who is a graduate in that program. We have young black students; we have students from all different cultures and languages.

I cite this because there is no explicit policy that gave any specific direction with respect to diversity but by putting a lot of energy into the selection process we were able to get a group of students each year that was outstanding in its qualities and its diversity. What I'm saying is that, yes, if you have the human resources to invest in the admissions process you can diversify the student body in a satisfactory way. Institutions like Stanford, Harvard, or Princeton do that because they invest huge sums of money and time in selecting their classes. You look at a range of factors, and the regents have allowed us to do that. You can't use any one single factor as the sole

determining admissions criterion. But you can look at a range of things. In fact we're being forced to do that.

Now there are two other very important points here that I don't want to lose. One is that at the moment at UC Santa Cruz everything the regents did is really irrelevant functionally because we are still able to admit any and every qualified undergraduate student who applies. If they all took our admission offers we'd be in trouble but a sufficiently small percentage takes our offers so that's not an issue. So at the moment we're not turning any qualified person away. On the other hand I can't overlook the symbolic impact of the regents' action on our admission pool. I am convinced that the symbolic act they took, the symbolism of the act they created will influence the number of applications that we get this year.

The other thing I have to say is that by concentrating our outreach efforts, by doing a better job of working with our high schools and K-12 schools that send students to Santa Cruz, or to the University, we can increase the eligibility pool to offset the problem of the regents' action. We are doing that vigorously.

Jarrell: Yes. Related to that issue is I believe that Regent Connerly, months after the July decision also suggested strongly that outreach efforts vis à vis minorities, underrepresented groups, should also be dismantled.

Pister: Right. At one point he and the governor, who joined him on this, were pressing us to drop our outreach programs, that were what our general counsel called "race-attentive."

Jarrell: Yes. It seemed that these outreach programs would become the new instrumentalities for assuring qualified people could be recruited into the University without affirmative action, by just making special efforts.

Pister: Sure. Fortunately they backed off on that position. This is purely speculative, but many feel, and I guess I would join that group, that they backed off on that with the expectation that the Civil Rights Initiative¹² will be passed in November and that will abolish our race-attentive outreach programs. Time will tell whether that happens or not, but . . . interestingly enough, I believe it is relevant that I spent two days in

¹² Proposition 209, the California Civil Rights Initiative, made it illegal for the state of California to grant preferential treatment to anyone on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin, and was passed by the voters in November, 1996.—Editor.

Washington, D.C., with the president and my fellow chancellors this week. The president a number of times asked our elected representatives—senators and congresspeople that we visited—what their sense was of affirmative action on the political agenda for the fall election. There was almost unanimous agreement that in Washington this was not an issue; that affirmative action was not on the political agenda. Immigration possibly. But not affirmative action. It certainly still is in California.

Jarrell: In terms of the California Civil Rights Initiative, which will be on the November, 1996 ballot . . . and then the Hopwood v. Texas decision.¹³ The appeals court basically in that case said the University of Texas had to dismantle affirmative action; the only reason justifying the use of affirmative action is if there is explicit past discrimination. You were saying earlier that the University has to comply with federal guidelines, and it seems as if it's being undermined on different fronts.

Pister: Yes, that's right. The courts are another major force here, of course. I have not read the Hopwood decision, but I've talked with people who have and haven't talked to any of our general counsel people yet. But the Hopwood decision in Texas in the eyes of people I've talked to has some problems in the sense that apparently at the University of Texas law school their affirmative action process was really defective; they were pushing affirmative action beyond what Bakke allowed.¹⁴ They were doing things that the Bakke decision said you may not do and if that's brought out properly and somehow that case decision is not just willy-nilly applied across the land . . .

Jarrell: It only applies in the fifth district.

Pister: Yes. So we'll have to wait and see but certainly your observation, Randall, that the court decisions can be a major force, that's a very important one, well beyond what the regents' action has done. We have to follow that very carefully. There was of course

¹³ The series of court decisions known as Hopwood v. Texas began in 1995 when the Texas Supreme Court ruled that the University of Texas Law School's affirmative action plan was unconstitutional, including the use of race as a factor considered in the admissions process. The decision was affirmed in 1996 by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit which told the university that it could not use admissions standards for minority students different from those applied to white students. Although this decision applies only to the Fifth District, its influence nationally has caused schools across the country to reassess their affirmative action policies.

¹⁴ Pister is referring to the Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, June 28, 1978. The UC Davis Medical School acted illegally by saying a white applicant, Allan Bakke, could not compete for a set number of slots reserved for ethnic minority applicants. The court, however, did not deny the concept of affirmative action, saying that admission policies could consider race as one of many criteria.

another very important case also in Texas that had to do with a construction contract. I can't remember the name of the case, but it was the one that led to the definition of strict scrutiny. The very important legal term that came out of that case applies to our understanding of what you can and what you can't do in affirmative action.

Jarrell: It was for minority contractors.¹⁵

Pister: Yes, it severely limits the application of affirmative action in that particular area.

Jarrell: I don't know of any precedent like this in terms of the schism among some of the regents, all of the chancellors, and the president of the University, who really found themselves on completely opposite sides of this issue. In fact that action was so politicized, it seemed to suborn the whole notion of how the University arrives at consensus about an issue of such great importance as this. I wonder, what do you think is going to be the long-term implication of this kind of a schism?

Pister: Well, I think I'm going to have to respond, Randall, by going back and kind of thinking through what happened again. Because I'm not sure that I've really come to a definitive position on what the long-term consequences will be. So I think it's helpful to go back and retrace the events.

In my view there were several different important forces at work here that were not necessarily all publicly acknowledged or accepted, but I think were clearly at work. One hypothesis would be that it started when some of the regents had asked for information about admissions practices and policies in the University and the president's office had put together a series of presentations. In the minds of some regents, the presentations were not balanced. Particularly, I think, Regent [Ward] Connerly didn't really say what he meant by balanced, but he felt the University's presentations were not sufficiently responsive to what was actually happening in admissions. The environment in which the subsequent discussions took place was colored by that, because the whole question of appropriate admissions policy was clouded by the fact that it got off to a bad start. I think he never forgot that and never

¹⁵ In *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, June 12, 1995, the U.S. Supreme Court introduced the concept of "strict scrutiny," and held that any action involving racial classification, including set-asides, by either the states or the federal government would be judged by a standard of strict scrutiny. This decision did not ban as unconstitutional all affirmative action programs, but meant that the government would have to demonstrate a pattern of prior discrimination in order to justify remedial, narrowly-designed affirmative action plans.

let the rest of his colleagues forget that. So that, you know, there's an old adage that what starts badly ends badly. I think that's really what happened.

Jarrell: Did you mean that Regent Connerly believed that President Peltason was not sufficiently responsive or detailed, that he was sort of stonewalling?

Pister: Well I think that I've read that Connerly felt that way. I've never talked to him personally about it, but certainly I think subsequently it became clear that he felt the president's office was not open enough, or not thorough enough in describing admissions policies and practices. So that was one issue.

Second, there was a significant mistake made early on, in that the president's office took the lead in making the presentations about admissions, the practices and so on, and the academic senate, to whom the regents had delegated the question of setting the conditions for admission, really didn't get deeply enough involved. The faculty representatives were sitting there of course, but there wasn't any kind of grassroots senate review of the affirmative action question; there was no thorough study leading to a policy paper, or anything like that. I think that was unfortunate.

So two things were wrong. The third thing that was wrong, in my view, was that the whole issue was seized upon by the governor and politicized. Whether that's the way the regents always work or not, the fact is that happened and that was very unfortunate; it has had serious consequences for what happened.

The fourth thing, and this hasn't been too widely discussed or acknowledged even, but I think it's true (and I've heard this from people whom I feel have a clear picture of the dynamics of this sort of thing) was the position of a number of regents that the president and the vice presidents, excluding general counsel, and the chancellors united this way to present a position which was contrary to the regents creating a turf battle that the regents felt very uncomfortable with. To put it one way, who is running this place anyway? Some regents at least thought it was an assertion by the chancellors and the president that they ran the University. These regents would say, you're wrong, we run the University. I heard that in statements by some regents who were quoted in the newspapers that the constitution makes it clear that the regents run the University and who are these people that are saying this? That was very unfortunate, because speaking as a chancellor who was instrumental in writing an early draft of the statement myself, that was the furthest thing from our intent; we felt that it was very

important for the regents and for the public to understand how deeply we felt about this issue. It had nothing to do with who was in control.

It was simply an honest expression of how we felt about the issue. That was certainly what motivated me and I think I could speak for my colleagues as well. So all these things made a very complicated set of affairs. Now, some have said it's a crisis of shared governance. I don't think it was a crisis of shared governance at all. Because the fact is that even the question of the delegation of authority to the academic senate by the regents that says the regents delegate to the academic senate the authority to set the conditions for admission, this is often quoted but, there is another clause, "subject to the approval of the board." In an opinion piece written by a group of Berkeley faculty, they conveniently omitted that clause, "subject to approval of the board." And you can't do that.

Now what you can question is the quality of dialogue, the quality of the exercise of shared governance in that period. I think that certainly, as I've already indicated. I feel there was a great deal to be desired there. Faculty didn't speak through the senate as they should have early enough and . . .

Jarrell: So they kind of abdicated?

Pister: Well, it isn't clear whether it was an abdication or whether maybe we were too naive, we didn't see where this whole thing was going.

Jarrell: Yes, I wanted to ask you if you or your fellow chancellors or faculty members whom you were talking with had a premonition that this innocent request would balloon, would grow like this. Or if it just seemed sort of an innocuous request, "we'd like to know what your admissions practices are . . ."

Pister: Well you know we didn't go back all the way back to the beginning; the thing that really triggered this was the Scott family in San Diego, who complained about the rejection of their son for admission to medical school at UC San Diego. That really was the opening shot in this whole campaign.

Jarrell: I didn't know that.

Pister: Yes, and so the whole thing started with a general request for review of admissions policy in the UC medical schools, specifically at UC San Diego and then

more broadly at the five medical schools. That was the first step and it ballooned into the whole issue of examining admissions, and the role of affirmative action at the graduate and undergraduate level. I think in the beginning some of us worried that this might happen but I guess we kind of harbored the hope that it wouldn't. We miscalculated the way in which this would become a political issue for the presidential race and ultimately the ballot in the fall. We were probably naive in not grasping that, but we didn't. I don't mean to speak for my colleagues, maybe some did, but I don't think that most of us saw this going as far as it has gone. I don't think that it's done irreparable harm to the concept of shared governance. I don't think that many people in the University—regents, faculty, you name it, have a very clear understanding of shared governance, because . . .

Jarrell: It sounds very amorphous.

Pister: It is. Because it's not really codified; it's largely a set of traditions that have developed unevenly among the nine campuses. The older campuses have a much more stable and more widely understood and accepted set of practices that define shared governance. The newer campuses are still kind of searching for that.

I believe that's been one of the real wedge issues at Santa Cruz over the years—to develop for this campus in its short history a workable and comfortable sense of what shared governance is. It's expressed right now at UCSC in some very unfortunate and destructive accusations and responses concerning administrative practices in the discipline of faculty, the charges that were leveled against Executive Vice Chancellor Tanner. It's an indication that the understanding and acceptance of shared governance is not general. There's no generally accepted position. Shared governance is going to survive however it's defined on a particular campus. But it's been trampled on by virtue of the lack of constructive dialogue among the parties—the administration, the faculty, and the regents in this case.

Jarrell: So if you were going to do damage assessment of the fallout of this last year's worth of rhetoric and the regents' SP1 . . . do you think this does irreparable damage?

Pister: No, I don't think so. I think the impact of this on the University will be determined by what the regents do in the next few years, how they perceive themselves, the kinds of issues that they concentrate on, the kind of leadership that they show as the trustees of the University. In other words, if they show some real

leadership and real commitment to the University in ways that the faculty appreciate, then I think this will die out. If they continue fighting among themselves, continue to take on the role almost of inquisitors, rather than protectors of the University, then I think the damage will not be trivial, and could easily get worse. Will the regents be able to pull their own act together, to put it in colloquial English. I'm not sure. I've watched the regents carefully during the last five years and I am concerned about what I would have to call a lack of leadership, and a lack of understanding that they have to work as a team. They don't have to agree but they have to work as a team.

Jarrell: In behalf of the whole institution.

Pister: Yes. I don't see that happening often enough. So we'll see.

Jarrell: In terms of the specific issue here, of the dismantling of affirmative action by SP1, do you have any insight into what might be substitute mechanisms for promoting diversity in the University?

Pister: Absolutely. I just read a wonderful essay that Neil Rudenstine wrote¹⁶; he is the president of Harvard University. It's in the most recent issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and is an article in defense of diversity. He had a very interesting approach: he traced the history of Harvard's commitment to diversity. I think his historical treatment is something critics of diversity should look at. He pointed out that Harvard was originally a young gentlemen's school preparing people for civic life or the ministry. It drew from a very narrow pool of applicants. As early as the last century, from the Civil War on, the leadership at Harvard, the president and the trustees recognized that it was in Harvard's best interest to reach out and diversify the student body. While there wasn't steady and uniform progress in this area with respect to ethnicity and gender, at least there was the recognition that there ought to be geographic, cultural, and social diversity.

So diversity was a concern 130 years ago. I thought he made a very interesting observation. He made the arguments that we're well familiar with, that it's important for people to learn, to understand and to be at least tolerant, if not accepting, of differences in viewpoint on issues, differences in behavior and so on, the common attributes of diversity. That was an eye-opening article. The other article that I would

¹⁶ Neil L. Rudenstine, "Why a Diverse Student Body is so Important," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, (April 19, 1996).

call attention to is the essay that President Gerhard Casper of Stanford University wrote.

Jarrell: Yes, I read that one.

Pister: Rudenstine's and Casper's pieces, I think, are the best that I've read in this area.

What can the university do? We can continue to emphasize our outreach programs, to create larger pools of applicants in California. The fact that the population base of California itself is diversifying means that if we do a better job of reaching out into the K-12 system to get young people, to get students for a university-level education, that in itself is going to help diversify our student body. The problem is that that kind of outreach really needs to be targeted. There's no point in going into white suburbs to do this, or into predominately upper middle-class Asian communities, if such communities exist today. I don't know that they do. Certainly there are geographic areas in California that are crying out for intervention to help raise the quality of preparation of students. I can't believe the University doesn't have an obligation to do something about the eligibility rates in those areas. I'm told our general counsel now has invented a new term called "rate attentive outreach". Not race attentive, but rate attentive. Because race attentive was an earlier term that he used. He said we can do race attentive outreach, to reach out to racial groups whose eligibility rates are low. But some of the regents got nervous about that, I'm told, so he's now changed it to rate attentive, which means that we look at high schools, or areas where the eligibility rates for UC are low. We're going to be attentive to those low rates.

Now if those schools which have low rates of eligibility for UC happen to be largely minority students, I think that's a secondary consideration; the primary consideration is we're trying to reach students who are not coming to UC in numbers that we'd like to have them come.

Jarrell: Yes, you could have a rural high school in one of the northern counties in California where college education is not the norm.

Pister: Yes. So I think that gives us some ground to work on. I hope we continue to be able to do that. But that's long term and a very costly project; it takes a lot of effort to make these things go and I don't know how fast we can change things, if we only do that.

Jarrell: This whole complex area has been one of the most significant to have occurred during your tenure here.

Pister: Oh I agree. Yes, it's been a milestone, a watershed event. You know after that July regents' meeting I expressed to one reporter that it was the worst day of my life in UC. I have devoted almost twenty years of my life working in this area because I believe in it. To have this action thrown in my face . . . it is kind of a shock. It sets me back and makes me wonder what's going on.

Jarrell: Since you've been here you've dealt with three UC presidents: David [P.] Gardner, Jack [W.] Peltason and Richard [C.] Atkinson. That's three UC presidents in a short period of time. Do you think that that is just coincidental or do you think that it might be symptomatic of some kind of difficulty that the institution is going through in terms of finding a head who will stick around and grapple with these very complicated issues?

Pister: First, let me say that I don't believe there's any connection between the complexity of the institution and these changes and the complexity of social change that's going on and the political winds that are blowing.

After all David Gardner made it very clear . . . he lost his wife. That was clearly a blow to him and he kind of lost the zeal for the job which he'd shared with Libby for the years of his presidency. The conditions under which he left office were most regrettable, both for him and for the University, obviously. Without in any way taking a side one way or the other on that, the fact is that it was ugly. There was considerable disagreement internally, I'm told, among the regents as to who his successor should be. That ambiguity left the next president in a weakened position because he was clearly a compromise candidate. No matter how well Jack [Peltason] did in that term, at least my understanding of the dynamics of that search process, was that he was a compromise candidate. He came in at a tremendously difficult time, having to deal with what we agree was an ugly situation with his predecessor leaving. On top of that he had to preside over the worst set of budget cuts in the University's history. I think he did that very gracefully, if you can say an execution is done gracefully. He certainly had to preside over a partial execution of the University of California, in my view. When he announced retirement it brought another search on in a very short time and regrettably that search was also very complicated.

Jarrell: Headlines in the newspapers.

Pister: It was conducted in the newspapers and even when the successful candidate was finally announced, there were newspaper headlines about that and the whole thing was just not good. All of that in my view created a situation and an aura around the office of the president that was not at all helpful. The president has to be seen ideally as a leader who is beyond this kind of stuff; who is not mixed up with this kind of mudslinging. Yet our presidents have been right in the middle of it. I think that's created a lot of problems for the University.

Jarrell: It seems in the last few years that virtually every day in the *San Francisco Chronicle* or the *Los Angeles Times* there is some article that's either terribly negative or quite negative about the University or one of its campuses. I don't ever recall such a period.

Pister: Yes. Well it's become a news item that the newspaper people feel sells newspapers. That's why it's there.

Jarrell: It's a lightning rod, the University.

Pister: It's a lightning rod, exactly. I don't know what might replace it one day but it certainly is not giving a balanced picture of the University. I want to be careful. I don't mean by that that somehow the University should be protected from examination or accountability, but the kinds of articles that are written go well beyond that. They're not interested in just making the University accountable. They are interested in basically whipping the University in such a way that it's a sensationalized account of what happened and . . .

Jarrell: You think it gives a very misleading impression of the institution as a whole?

Pister: Sure. I had an opportunity a couple of weeks ago to have a dinner up in Sacramento with three regents and a group of alumni and staff members from the legislature. I had three faculty members and four graduate students come to that meeting. Each of the faculty members and graduates talked about what they did on the campus, about their research and their teaching. It was such a wonderful and refreshing opportunity for the people there to hear something positive about the University and what was going on. You and I know because we live here day in and day out where that kind of work goes on.

We are all doing our jobs. You're doing your job. I'm doing my job. The students are being educated; the faculty is teaching and doing research and service; the staff is making this place go. That never gets in the paper. There are a lot of people here doing their jobs well and they never get any credit for it ever. That's grossly unfair and presents an exaggerated picture.

Council of Chancellors

Jarrell: I'd like to move on into your relations with your fellow chancellors and the council of chancellors and how that has influenced your leadership of this institution.

Pister: When I first joined the council of chancellors in 1991 I knew nothing about the council of chancellors except that it was a group that met with the president. From my previous experience as a dean and a faculty member, never having been in that circle, I perceived the council of chancellors as an extremely powerful body of elders who really ran the University. Under David Saxon, when I was chairman of the academic senate, I do remember attending briefly one meeting of the council of chancellors at UCLA. I can't remember the purpose now, but as a faculty member I was invited to sit in on this meeting to address some issue that came up. So I came into this thing totally cold.

As the junior chancellor under President Gardner during my first meetings I sat quietly and somewhat respectfully with my eight fellow chancellors and David Gardner. David Gardner really ran the council of chancellors meetings. They were very orderly and he kept his arms around the nine chancellors very, very firmly. Things moved along and his agenda was carried along. Gardner had a remarkable ability to listen to people discuss an issue and then just extract the essence of the discussion and condense it into a few sentences. He was a master at that. His style was really interesting. During the first year I got better acquainted with my fellow chancellors.

By the way, I note here, there's been a tremendous turnover in the composition of the chancellors. At that time Rosemary [S.J.] Schraer was chancellor at UC Riverside; Dick [Atkinson] was chancellor at UC San Diego; Barbara [S.] Uehling at UC Santa Barbara; Of course, Chuck [Charles E.] Young at UCLA; Julius [R.] Krevans at UC San Francisco; [Chang-Lin] Tien at UC Berkeley; [Theodore L.] Hullar at UC Davis and Jack Peltason was at UC Irvine. Of course I was the new person. So it was a very different cast of characters.

Well, as you know, there have been dramatic changes. The first change was that David left. I guess Rosemary died first. And Ray[mond L.] Orbach went out there. Then Jack [Peltason] became president so Laurel [L.] Wilkening came from Washington to be chancellor at UC Irvine. Barbara left and was replaced by Henry [T.] Yang. All of a sudden in a period of less than four years, I went from being ninth in seniority to third. Chancellor Young and Chancellor Tien, Young by many years, and Tien is only senior to me by one year, as chancellor. All of a sudden I was not the junior chancellor any more. Thinking about the change as David left and Jack came in, there's always a period of time when you change jobs from being chancellor to being president, or being a dean to being chancellor, or being a faculty member to being dean—when you're really going through a metamorphosis; you don't know whether you are the butterfly or the cocoon. You kind of go back and forth. I felt that certainly and I saw that very much in Jack. When he started out he was president but he was still acting like a chancellor . . . he shed that gradually. He realized he had to take on a new role. Jack was just exactly the opposite of David. His meetings were utterly unstructured; people talked all the time. They were quite chaotic, to be descriptive. The meetings were often dominated by Chancellor Young, who as the senior person . . . In the middle of a discussion Chancellor Young had the habit of standing up and walking around the table or even sometimes walking out the door and coming back again. He was a real character in that and so Chuck's presence was always felt very prominently. But under Jack it reached a new level of perfection. So that was a real change.

But here I'd like to note something that is really misunderstood by a lot of folks. The chancellors are really largely advisory to the president; the decisions that are taken are his decisions. There's absolutely free discussion of issues and allowance for different points of view. But there are never any votes taken. There have been some quotations in some papers that there have been votes where chancellors voted eight to one this way, but in the five years I've been chancellor, we've never taken a vote.

We're advisory and the president listens and that's that. I think one of the most important things the council of chancellors provides us is an opportunity to engage in group therapy. I'm saying this seriously, not flippantly. When you are in a position of responsibility such as this there's really no one you can talk to at that level except someone's who's going through the same thing.

Jarrell: You need a peer.

Pister: You need a peer. Exactly. We can get together and talk and joke with one another and release a lot of the frustration, a lot of the . . . I can't think of all the words, but the anguish that's kind of built up and sometimes even the hurt that you've experienced because of things. I've found these meetings enormously rewarding.

Jarrell: They're cathartic?

Pister: They're tremendously cathartic, yes.

Jarrell: I'd never even thought of that part of it.

Pister: Typically what happens is you sit down with your colleagues and you say, you can't believe what happened to me this week. So you tell your story. You find out well that's nothing: you should have heard what happened to me. The most bizarre things come out and that's a very helpful and a very human kind of experience—to put your arms around each other figuratively and say look, we get through these things.

Jarrell: Nobody can really understand what it's like if they haven't been in your shoes, and you've all been in these shoes.

Pister: Sure. The closest experience that I've had to that before is going through the early stages of parenting, when our kids were born and growing up. My wife and I were in groups of young parents like ourselves and we went through the same thing. I didn't realize that at the time, but looking back it's the same kind of cathartic and learning experience. You not only release these things and feel better but you learn a lot by sharing experiences with people in comparable circumstances. So that's been a wonderful experience. Typically during the regents meeting week we have a dinner with the president, not a formal meeting, on the Wednesday night before the meetings. The president brings up whatever he wants and we talk and relax and have dinner together and the socialization is a tremendous bonding experience for us so that we have a sense of purpose and mission and sharing of responsibility in trying to lead our campuses and the University of California.

When Dick [Atkinson] became president he brought a new style. In my view, Dick is somewhere between Jack and David Gardner; he is much more structured; he keeps a firm hand on the discussion at our meetings. He wants to hear everyone's views but he keeps the agenda moving along swiftly and he has an incredible mind. He's extremely quick to get an idea or see an issue. You don't have to do the typical professorial thing

of saying it and then saying it again in a different way with Dick. You say it once and he says shut up, I understand your point, basically. I've found him a great person to work with, although I expected that because I worked with him for almost twenty years.

It's been a very interesting experience to work with these three different individuals. I also had the chance to compare them with President Saxon and President Hitch. I worked with Saxon when I was a dean and when I was the faculty representative to the regents when I was vice chair and chair of the senate. David was the president so I met with him monthly. Then he came to our academic council meetings so I got to know him. Earlier with President Hitch, when I was a member of the academic council in a different capacity. So I've had a chance to work with five different presidents, two of them as a faculty member and not as an academic administrator. They've all been different and all been very good leaders of the University for their time. They all brought different strengths and abilities and they served in very different circumstances.

At some point during his presidency Jack Peltason decided to hold a Council of Chancellors meeting using video-conferencing facilities which were emerging on some campuses, but were not yet available in the Office of the President.¹⁷ Accordingly, a number of us in the Bay Area went to the Harbor Bay facility in Alameda, while chancellors in Southern California participated from facilities available to them; I don't recall who actually took part that day. Our meetings were always characterized by very frank expressions of opinion, sometimes exaggerated by the heat of discussion. Such was the case that day when we discussed the refusal of the Democratic leadership in the State Senate to support the appointment of Lester Lee to the Board of Regents, for reasons that some of us attributed to political infighting with Governor Wilson rather than the merits of the individual. I was particularly vocal in the discussion, suggesting for example that the Bay Area group known as Chinese for Affirmative Action should go after Senator Lockyer.

Another sensitive matter that was discussed by the President was the terms and conditions for the terminal sabbatical leave for Chancellor Barbara Uehling, who had decided to leave the University. Unknown to us our entire meeting was taped and the tape given to a reporter for the *San Francisco Examiner*. The *Examiner* subsequently published an article quoting parts of the discussion and making attributions as to who

¹⁷ The Chancellor added the following written comments to supplement his narrative.

said what. Obviously someone who knew the voices of the chancellors was part of the team who wrote the story. The consequences of the story were predictable and unpleasant. The President received a letter from Senator [Bill] Lockyer requesting my removal as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the California Council on Science and Technology, a request which the President did not honor. Senator [Henry J.] Mello was very upset with me, accusing me of attacking his party, the Democratic Party, which had supported the University and the campus. No explanation on my part came close to satisfying him and as a consequence he restrained his staff from working with mine on problems of mutual interest for a number of months. Fortunately, time healed the wound and before I retired from the Chancellorship he and I had re-established our friendship and a working relationship.

Remarks made in a private meeting should remain private. I fault the editors of the *Examiner* for allowing publication of parts of the tape. What would happen if the political party caucus meetings in Sacramento were made public? People who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

Relations with Other UC Campuses

Jarrell: Yes, also among the other chancellors whom I've interviewed over the years, one abiding concern is of the nine campuses that Santa Cruz was kind of the stepsister, had a bit less status sometimes. It was the smallest, youngest, most inconsequential campus to some of the other chancellors; Berkeley and UCLA were the main show. I wonder what's been your experience in the sense of heading this campus, and how seriously the smaller campuses are taken. There is not equality among nine campuses; I know that's true.

Pister: You've touched on something. I'm glad you raised this because it's a continuing concern of mine and a continuing issue in the University. Only a fool would say that there are nine equal campuses; and no matter what the issue is let me say that Berkeley and UCLA have a dominant role on every issue. The chancellors from Berkeley and UCLA, when they speak, they speak for the University. In saying that, I'm simply repeating what you may have read in Bob Sinsheimer's autobiography. I don't know if you . . .

Jarrell: I have read it. *Strands of a Life*.¹⁸

Pister: I know when Bob wrote about what he called the club of nine, the nine chancellors of whom we've been speaking, different people but the same officers, Bob in describing the Berkeley chancellor said that he sat at the table and didn't say much, but when he spoke everybody listened because after all, wasn't Berkeley *the* University of California.

In a sense that's kind of played out in a lot of the dynamics of the University. I'm probably putting myself out on a limb when I say this but Berkeley and UCLA certainly deserve to be first among the campuses in a sense that they are the oldest, most mature, and have the most comprehensive set of programs. Invariably when those kinds of issues came up about who was the greatest among us, UC San Diego wanted to be at the table, and Dick as chancellor down there did a tremendous job in bringing San Diego up over the years he's been there, building on some excellent earlier work. But San Diego in terms of its academic reputation has moved up substantially, as has UCLA previously.

It's interesting. I think that the middle-sized campuses like UC Davis and Santa Barbara . . . Well Davis has a kind of special role because of its agricultural heritage. In other words people kind of don't worry about Davis. They are out doing their things; they grow great grapes for us and make wine and do all those things that have to be done to keep our agricultural economy going. That leaves Santa Barbara, Irvine, Riverside, and Santa Cruz. The four. In many issues those four campuses are kind of out by themselves.

Jarrell: There's an alignment, then.

Pister: There's an alignment.

Jarrell: I never knew that, really.

Pister: Particularly Riverside and Santa Cruz, which are the two smallest. We are not the smallest any more. Riverside is smaller than we are. The two of us and often Santa

¹⁸ Robert Sinsheimer, *The Strands of a Life: the Science of DNA and the Art of Education*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994). Also see Randall Jarrell, editor, Robert L. Sinsheimer: *The University of California, Santa Cruz During a Critical Decade, 1977-1987*. (University of California Santa Cruz, University Library, Regional History Project, 1996).

Barbara, we have the least enrollment impact. In other words, Riverside, Santa Cruz, and Santa Barbara are the least selective in admissions; we accept a larger percentage of applicants than any of the other campuses. So we share that in common. We're trying to build our reputations, build the quality of our student bodies. Although Santa Barbara is substantially larger than we are, we share a kind of a legacy of being the last ones to be created and therefore in need of more attention and more maturation in the UC system. That's one dimension.

The second thing I guess is that Santa Cruz unfortunately, I think, shares some very unflattering perceptions on the part of many in the University and many outside the University. As you are I'm sure aware, Santa Cruz originally was the most selective campus at one time.

Jarrell: Yes, the most sought after.

Pister: It outdid Berkeley and UCLA and everyone else. Then it went through that dark night, when I think through no fault of the campus the whole area here was kind of branded as a place where parents didn't want to send their kids for many reasons you probably know better than I. So UCSC went through that dark night which was turned around . . . but like many things, even though an institution has changed, just like a person changes from one experience in life and one characterization to another, the perception or the image doesn't change. There's a lag. I think Santa Cruz still is suffering from that, from the perception of many people away from Santa Cruz, both in and out of the University.

Jarrell: I'm surprised. I don't get exposed to that kind of opinion as much of course as you. I know that Bob Sinsheimer used the word flakey, that we were perceived as this kind of flakey place and with all of the other variables that were mostly all negative. It's like when you know somebody who's behaving badly and then you see them twenty years later and they are just like totally appropriate and well-mannered and courteous. But your memory is of that earlier perception.

Pister: Absolutely.

Jarrell: You're saying that we still have a touch of that.

Pister: There's no question about that. That's one of the reasons why we've created a task force to look at our image to the outside world. This isn't the first time that's

happened. Professor [Dane] Archer sent me a report he put out sometime in the early 70s addressing the same question. There's a continuing sense on the part of some people that the fact that we have a narrative evaluation system, which overlooks the fact that grades are optional in many areas if you want to get a grade, that this immediately says to some people, oh they don't give grades. They can't be a serious place with any quality. We're trying to deal with that issue. But among the campuses we still are not seen by many as a serious place.

Graduate Education at UC Santa Cruz

Jarrell: This campus started as an undergraduate campus and gradually has been adding graduate study; as you know, a little less than ten percent of our student body is at the graduate level, whereas the other campuses are substantially larger. Berkeley is almost thirty percent, twenty-five, thirty percent, something like that. That creates again in the minds of some people an essentially second-class status, that we don't have serious scholarship here because we don't have significant graduate work going on, in terms of percentage of the whole student body. Actually right from the beginning, we've had way more graduate activity than anyone had ever dreamed, especially in the natural sciences.

Pister: I think in the years ahead there will be a gradual move to add more graduate study here. I don't see how we can remain as part of the UC system without doing that. But I think, and again I tried to address this in my investiture speech, that this campus has a great opportunity to do that without giving up its commitment to undergraduate education. Because in the natural sciences although now there're dominant graduate programs, there's still a demonstrable commitment to undergraduate teaching. What I'm hoping is that the campus in its evolution will keep that in proper balance. The faculty will be encouraged and rewarded to continue to work with serious undergraduates, to keep their teaching at the level that it has been, and not give that up in adding graduate students. It's not impossible. It's just that in other sister campuses and across the country the whole thing has gotten out of control and out of balance to the point where too often the case is that in a research university a great deal of the instruction is done by temporary faculty or by . . .

Jarrell: TA's or . . .

Pister: Yes. I think there's a real opportunity for us to carve out our niche and I hope my successor will see that and I think she will be encouraged by the faculty to maintain that commitment to undergraduate teaching. Because the faculty here that I've talked to, even the new ones, come here specifically because they know from colleagues that this is a place that values undergraduate teaching. So let's hope we stay that way. But going back again, it clearly marks us as different from the other UC campuses, the fact that we have a different balance. San Diego was started basically from a graduate program. And added undergraduates.

Jarrell: That's right.

Pister: Of course it has a medical school. So it's evolved very differently from this campus. Santa Barbara evolved in a more traditional way.

Jarrell: From a teacher's college and . . .

Pister: Yes. Incidentally, my parents went to Santa Barbara Normal School and received their California teaching credentials when Santa Barbara Normal School used to be up on the hill by the mission before it moved down as it did to Goleta after the war.

Enrollment Problems

Jarrell: Chancellor, I made a mistake in a past interview. I was questioning you about declining enrollment figures and mistakenly said "minority," which you corrected me on. What I really wanted to ask you about, that I'd read in the *City on a Hill Press* was that this campus for the last two years, had had generally declining enrollment figures. It wasn't by a great deal but the article said we were the only UC campus with declining figures. The reason I bring it up is that when Bob Sinsheimer became chancellor the most serious problem he faced, he discovered to his chagrin, was the fact that the enrollment figures here for admitting new students had declined and that he couldn't justify budget increases because of a very small dip in those figures. He wasn't concerned at first, but his administrators explained how this decline affected the campus's budget. That's why I brought it up. Do declining enrollment figures still have that kind of impact? I think we're just talking about a couple of hundred students . . .

Pister: Let's go back over this to be sure the record is clear as to my own perception about what's been going on here. First of all I need to distinguish among different categories of data. Last year for the first time the number of applications dropped only a couple of percent. Likewise, in fall 1995 the actual number of students enrolled on the campus dropped a couple of hundred. So the first thing we noticed was the drop of enrolled students. The second thing we noticed was the drop in the number of applications for the fall 1996 class—a two percent drop. That created some anxiety. The two events reinforce each other. But what I have to be careful to say is that, number one, the drop in enrollment for fall 1995 was not so much . . . it was not the fact that we didn't admit a sufficiently large new class. There were plenty of people admitted. What happened was that retention of the fall 1994 students dropped dramatically for reasons that we are still trying to understand. There were plenty of new students coming in.

Jarrell: In the pipeline?

Pister: But there was a hole in the pipe and we were losing students at a greater than historical rate. So that created one kind of crisis. Our enrollment people are still investigating that.

Jarrell: In the article I am referring to, they really didn't know; they could speculate but they said we don't know why.

Pister: There are many reasons. The reasons students withdraw are well known, we don't just know the percentages. You have to do surveys of people and that takes time. That may be complete but hasn't been brought to my attention yet.

Jarrell: I wanted to clarify that. Because it had nothing to do with minorities at all.

Pister: Now back to the application pool, though, for fall 1996. There was a two percent drop in total applications. However there was a disproportionate drop among underrepresented students. The drop for underrepresented students for fall 1996 was about ten percent, if I remember correctly. So that is now going to be reflected in the numbers of students who intend to register for fall 1996. The data are still incomplete but the preliminary data that we have, Randall, show that the total number of students who have indicated by paying their hundred dollars or whatever it is, the total number of students has increased in the last year by several hundred. So we're in good shape there.

We don't know until June 1 about advanced standing transfer students. But signs are positive so far. Once again we don't know how many students we're going to lose out the back door by virtue of a drop in retention. All of this is very, very important in the new University budgeting scheme, because beginning in next year, the campus will be budgeted on a per new student basis. That is, the base budget for 1996-97 will be retained for every campus.

Jarrell: As is?

Pister: As is. It will be adjusted for inflation and those elements that are inflation adjustable. But any new money coming to the campus will depend specifically on how many new students the campus adds. It will be at the rate of something like \$6800 per student, plus some amount for adding new space and maintaining space. So it's a very critical issue for the campus to be well positioned on a modest growth mode over the next decade. That's basically the long and the short of it.

But let me say in the five years that I've been here, this year was the first year where I've really seen that the whole campus, that all the constituencies understand the dynamics of this problem. The academic part of the house, the faculty, the divisions, the boards of studies, along with student affairs and the enrollment people, the staff—there's a real sense of working together that was reflected on our open house day on April 20. For the first time open house was not seen as just something the admissions people do, or the colleges do, but as something the whole campus does. We've got to work together. There was a dramatic increase in the number of top students that we acquired this year.

Jarrell: Because of that sort of effort?

Pister: Because of that sort of effort. We had a scholars day, and invited the top six hundred applicants, out of whom we got 123. So I think we did very, very well. Including more than a dozen regents scholars. I think the campus is really engaged in the issue now, and by the way, the old timers of course would say this is déjà vu.

Jarrell: All over again. (laughter)

Pister: Exactly. Because this happened when Bob Sinsheimer was first chancellor and he brought in Richard Moll to turn around admissions.

In this last year we brought in [J.] Michael Thompson from Irvine, who is a very accomplished enrollment manager. I think even in his first year he's made a dramatic difference and we'll continue to see that reflected, just as Dick [Moll] did fifteen years ago. We have a task force designed to look at all the issues that affect Santa Cruz's image—retention, recruitment, academic programs . . . It's a very broad-based group, and we have a series of subcommittees working on the different areas. The steering committee just met yesterday and things are really moving along. We're looking at how we present ourselves to our different publics. How do we characterize Santa Cruz? What are the programs that are attractive? What are the problems with the grading system? I don't know if you are aware that our educational policy committee has made a proposal to retain the NES [Narrative Evaluation System] but to permit letter grades for courses . . . It's an attempt to preserve NES but to add an option that will attract students who are, by our surveys, shown to be turned off by the fact that there are no grades here. So it seems to me the logical thing to do is, if there are some people who come here because they like NES, let's give them that opportunity; if there are some people who want letter grades, let them come too, and we'll give them grades. That seems to me to be a very pragmatic way to deal with that issue.

Jarrell: I think so too, but I know that it arouses all kinds of controversy.

Pister: Well the major attack on that proposal I think will be, some people will view it as a first step to get rid of NES.

Jarrell: Right, yes.

Pister: Well, we got over that one.

University Development

Jarrell: I'd like to focus on the University Development Office. What has been your role in fundraising, establishing endowments . . . any special development priorities that you have brought to the table, and how closely you work with Dan Aldrich and his operation.

Pister: When I came to Santa Cruz, I'd just finished a capital campaign at Berkeley in which we raised tens of millions of dollars. I can't remember exactly how much. Engineering raised about 120 million, I think, in that five-year campaign. Altogether,

while I was at Berkeley as dean of engineering, I raised almost 150 million dollars in all kinds of gifts from industry . . . individuals, endowed chairs, you name it. I thought with that experience it would be a cinch to go to Santa Cruz. I know how to do fundraising and we'll be able to really move UC Santa Cruz along. Well, I received two rude shocks when I got here. The first was the realization that the age and tradition of a campus are enormously important when it comes to raising outside money. Berkeley was a century older than Santa Cruz so it had a century more alumni. Furthermore it had more than a dozen professional programs in addition to its academic programs. Professional programs are traditionally more fruitful sources of outside support than academic programs. Engineering, business, law . . . and so on. Those were the big players at Berkeley, and they were missing here.

That was my first awakening that this was a very different kind of situation. Parenthetically, I would add, in my first months here, I learned that not only did Santa Cruz not have this tradition, and not have the kinds of programs that attracted outside support, but perhaps more important, there was a sense here, among some of the faculty at least, that it was just not the right thing to do and that the state of California should fund this campus. I was cautioned by some that I'd better not pursue this too vigorously. Going out for private support, especially corporate support, the "evil capitalistic America syndrome," because they didn't want the University to be captive to General Motors or Exxon, or you name it. That was present in the minds of some faculty.

I wasn't terribly surprised because even at a place like engineering at Berkeley I had a substantial challenge to get the faculty to understand that it was more important for me as dean at that time to spend time trying to get outside funds than to fight with the chancellor over state funds. I learned that lesson as dean and I passed that on to my department chairmen and ultimately the faculty understood that. So coming here it was not that much of a surprise that the faculty felt that the state pays our bills, and why waste time going out to get private money. There was a culture that had to be changed.

The second major shock I ran into was that while the advancement office here had very committed and energetic, innovative people, the office was in utter disarray. There was no vice chancellor for advancement. There was an acting assistant chancellor for advancement. There was an assistant vice chancellor for advancement, Dan Aldrich. But not only was it in disarray in terms of its organizational structure, but it had not had

what I would call very clear guidance from the campus as to what it should be doing. It was kind of left on its own. You go out and raise money but . . .

Jarrell: And to pursue its own initiative kind of helter-skelter?

Pister: Right. I had the strange feeling that the advancement people basically determined the priorities, where they put their effort, and it was almost accidental the way their activities intersected with the academic program requirements of the campus. We hired a management consulting group to look at advancement, and do a study. The outcome of that study was both useful and created difficulties for me. The study was done all right, but the implementation was done in a very insensitive way. By that I mean that the way the findings were presented to the group was very insensitive because it personalized the problems too much rather than dealing with structural issues.

Jarrell: So it felt like a personal attack?

Pister: That was a temporary setback for me because a lot of ill-will was generated by that study. Looking back I would have been well advised not to have done that and simply to have made the changes myself. I don't think I learned anything from the study that I didn't already know, but I guess as a new chancellor I felt I better be careful and have outside evidence that changes needed to be made. What I did, basically, was to designate myself as the vice chancellor for advancement; I removed that position from advancement, took the money in salary savings . . . and basically took on that responsibility given the experience that I'd had already. I made Dan Aldrich assistant chancellor for advancement and he reported directly to me on a weekly basis. That organizational change was accompanied by substantial cutbacks in the budget of the advancement operation. They took a very large cutback along with administrative units across the campus.

The other thing I moved on right away that was vital to the ultimate restructuring and operation of advancement was to create what I called the academic advisory board for development. The purpose of that board was to advise the chancellor on priorities for campus fundraising. The group could propose fundraising projects perceived to be campus-wide projects; to bring those to the board and let the board discuss them, so I could hear the discussion, and they could advise me as to the importance of these projects from a campus-wide perspective. I could then set priorities for the

advancement unit. That board consisted of me, the executive vice chancellor, the academic deans, the vice chancellor for business, the vice chancellor for student affairs, and the University librarian. Later on we added the president of the Santa Cruz Foundation as well. First, the board was to make an assessment of what things were out there, what projects had already been started, sometimes they just kind of evolved spontaneously. I'll talk about that because it's been a real complication. Then the board set up a new set of campus priorities connecting fundraising with the campus's academic mission. Then we developed policies on how fundraising would be carried out, how to conduct annual campaigns, defining the focus of campaigns, and so on. We set up protocols so that people would all move in the same direction. That advisory board has worked well. We just met yesterday; it will be my last meeting with them and I think we've created a much better understanding of fundraising on the campus. It's more systematic.

Jarrell: How often have you met?

Pister: We meet once a quarter. Another thing I did early on was to change the purpose of the annual fund solicitation. Every campus each year, this campus likewise, sends out mailings or telephones alumni and friends asking for gifts. Previously it had been the practice of this campus to use that campaign to try to get unrestricted money for the chancellor. I thought that was a very poor objective. My previous experience informed me on this. So I said no, what I want to do is turn the annual fund solicitation to what we call the gift activities center heads—the academic deans, the vice chancellors, and the librarian. So that we could allow potential donors to go down the list and decide.

Jarrell: And have a wish list.

Pister: Yes, a wish list.

Jarrell: People have to love something, or get excited about something.

Pister: So, to say we want money for the chancellor to give to somebody is not a great scheme.

Jarrell: It's not a turn-on.

Pister: No, exactly. I did that and I'm pleased to say that each year we've increased the level of annual giving. It gives the deans and the activities center heads like the librarian a sense of ownership, that you know, I have a constituency out there who knows me and whom I can work with to improve support for the library. That was a major change and I think it's worked well. The problem I had to deal with, and in fact we're still dealing with, was that there were some projects started early on that didn't have a really clear basis in what I call the academic mission of the campus. I had to decide to deal with those projects because people had given money to them already. They were awkward. For example, there was a project to build a structure at the Arboretum. Well, the Arboretum people were very sincere; the Arboretum is a wonderful addition to the campus. But it's not really well connected with any academic program. It hasn't been for quite some time, if ever. So that was awkward, to figure out how we were going to get approval to do this, who was going to do the work and so on . . . Well, in the final analysis it worked out well and it didn't hurt anybody, but it was one of those things that simply was inherited.

Another is the Long Marine Laboratory Visitor Center. That had been in the works for a long time so that was brought on stream as one of the campus projects. I introduced one myself that has become a priority for the campus, and that's the Leadership Opportunity Awards program for community college transfer students. I made that a priority, but I brought it to the board; I didn't just say we're going to do this. I gave them an opportunity to comment on it and I am pleased that the board felt that this was an important priority.

Another project that was most difficult for me was one initiated by the previous chancellor in what I would have to term a very awkward way. That was the promise of an endowed chair in psychology to a candidate whom the campus was bent on recruiting. Now this has nothing to do with the merits of the individual or anything like that, but rather it was an outrageous breach of protocol and University policy, I'd have to say, in that a professor who was being recruited was told that an endowed chair would be available if she took the job. At the time that this negotiation took place there was no endowed chair; there wasn't even an authorization for an endowed chair. Nothing had been done except the advancement people in good faith were told by somebody, and I never found out how that was authorized, I couldn't find a paper trail authorizing someone to go out and start to try to raise money. Not to mention the breach of campus protocol or academic personnel protocol that would require any

person who gets an endowed chair to be approved by the committee on academic personnel, or at least the recommendation reviewed and a recommendation made to the chancellor. So I was stuck with a faculty member who was brought here under this outrageous protocol with raising money for an endowed chair. I don't know how many times I got angry about that, and had to deal with that issue. The funding for that chair has never been completed and I had to take campus discretionary funds last year and create the chair, because the faculty member really had been given a promise in writing that such a chair would be available and I had to backtrack and do all this.

This is washing dirty linen, but it's an example of the kind of mess that you can get in if you don't have orderly procedures for doing things and respect them. Fortunately that problem is now under control and we did do it according to the correct process, but it should never have happened in the first place.

Jarrell: I'd like to go back to something you said that's part of the larger evolution of this very activist kind of fundraising and identifying areas of need. I was talking to University librarian Lan [Allan J.] Dyson a month or so ago, and I believe he was going off to a meeting of UC librarians. He said, you know when I started here as UL, this was really not a part of my job. He was discussing this with the other UC librarians and they all recognized how outside fundraising has become a critical dimension of their jobs. For instance in the *San Francisco Chronicle* last week Chancellor Tien at Berkeley said he was trying to raise twenty million dollars to buy things for the library. He thought UC Berkeley was conceivably losing people because they were not able to purchase out of state funds things that are just *de rigueur* for an academic field. I'd like to ask, is it the case that no public institution can any longer take it for granted that they are going to be operating just based on public monies? There is the old criticism that this is a public institution, we don't want to take money from IBM or Exxon as you said, but we are in a transition right now.

Pister: You've really put your finger on a very interesting cultural change in public universities. I certainly was thrown right in the middle of that metamorphosis if you want to call it that. Just to personalize this, in the 1970s at Berkeley, when I was a faculty member, the administration decided to build an engineering center. Ultimately it became the Bechtel Engineering Center and was built entirely with private funds. The project was started in 1975. I have still vivid memories of standing up at the department meeting and saying just what you said. "This is a public university. We should build our

buildings with public funds. And I won't give a nickel to the Bechtel Engineering Center."

Jarrell: You actually said that?

Pister: I did. As a faculty member I was utterly outspoken in my opposition to raising money from the outside for a building on a public university campus. That was 1975. I didn't give a nickel to the Bechtel Engineering Center. When I became dean in 1980, one of the first things I did was to take part in the dedication ceremonies of the Bechtel Engineering Center as a dean designate, I think, at the time. I hadn't assumed the responsibility. But let me tell you, it didn't take me many days on the job to learn that one of the major things that I was going to have to do as a dean of engineering was to go out and raise private money. What had happened is that the public universities and UC as a great example of that, are no longer state-supported, they are state-assisted.

Jarrell: Right, I'd say what, 28 percent comes from the state?

Pister: Overall in the University it's about a quarter now. This campus is higher because we have a higher percentage of state assistance. It's in the 45 percent range, I think right now. But that's because we have fewer graduate programs relatively, than other campuses. As we move ahead and expand we're going to get a smaller and smaller percentage of state money. Relatively. We'll get more money but percentage-wise it will be a smaller percent. The point was I underwent a dramatic change in my own understanding of the importance of private fundraising when I was a dean.

It turned the whole thing around. Even at a campus as mature as Berkeley, in terms of its age, private fundraising didn't really get started until the 1980s. There had been annual campaigns, but prior to Chancellor Heyman, who came in in 1980, chancellors really spent virtually none of their time raising money. The deans at UC Berkeley had very little to do with raising money. But in the 1980s the campus really took off with its first big campaign. Now, what's happened a decade later, in the 1990s, is there is an awareness of the need to concentrate on private fundraising. You mentioned the University librarian. The academic deans here now understand that, the vice chancellors understand that, certainly the chancellor and executive vice chancellor understand that. I have, both internally in the use of my time, and externally, had to put a substantial amount of my time into private fundraising. This campus is positioned, I think, in the next decade, to continue to strengthen its private support base because its alumni base

is growing and getting older. So we're going to continue doing a better job in getting private funds. But one must be very cautious and understand that these things take time.

Private universities, the Ivys, have been at this for centuries. There's a culture build-up; a tradition that creates understanding and awareness and we're gradually moving into that same kind of culture of understanding.

Jarrell: When we were talking about the totality of the University budget you said most UC campuses receive around 25-30 percent on average of state funds. Then in the sciences certainly and the social sciences to some degree, you have federal government funding, which really started to take off after the war.

Pister: That's correct.

Jarrell: I noticed that Stanford President Gerhard Casper in the *San Francisco Chronicle* yesterday was quoted as saying that the problem with getting federal money for research . . . is that it's great, but it also circumscribes the areas in which graduate students can work. They are trying to raise two hundred million dollars so that they can support with full tuition, full-time graduate students to the tune of about \$25-28,000 a year apiece. Then these students can be much more liberated in their choice of research topics, especially in the sciences. So to me, there's something fundamental changing in terms of support even for research.

Pister: Yes. I think President Casper made a very bold and courageous decision to do what he's doing. I don't know how the University of California, or this campus specifically, is going to be able to match that kind of move.

Jarrell: No, I wasn't saying that we are comparable.

Pister: No, I understand that, but we have a lot of pressure on us to do something like that.

Jarrell: You do?

Pister: The fact is, you might be interested, this is one of the things we discussed at the academic advisory board for development yesterday. There's a serious problem here of underfunding graduate student research and for scholarships as well. Both of those have to be priority items for fundraising. They are not always easy things to do,

particularly for underwriting graduate student research. In the sciences corporate America has been quite good in funding graduate student research but with some strings. Clearly if you go to a biotech company they're going to want to fund students who do research in biochemistry and related fields. Or if you go to Silicon Valley people are going to want you to be supporting software and hardware research.

Research support by outside institutions, whether corporate business or foundations is an often misunderstood issue. In the minds of some, anything like this puts restrictions on faculty and students that are burdensome and therefore should not be permitted. My own personal experience over the years I've been at UC is quite the contrary. I have had support from corporations and from foundations. I've had support from federal agencies, including the Department of Defense. To be sure the research areas are constrained if you get money from the Department of Defense as I did, to do work on rocket fuels. Clearly I wasn't doing work on coral reefs in the Pacific ocean. In my view the work of my research group was not in any way so focused that I lost academic freedom as long as I was willing to say I'd work in the general area of applied science, which is what I was doing, that it would be useful for people interested in designing solid rocket motors. That was a statement. Some people said we should never even do that. But I disagreed. Having said that, then my students were free to do what they pleased and I've never felt that as a problem. Not that there haven't been problems. I think some institutions and individuals have accepted research dollars that have been far too restrictive. They've been focused on a very, very narrow problem area. But I guess ultimately the campus or the faculties at those institutions should have to make a judgment—is this something that we tolerate by exception or is this all right. I don't know. That's another issue.

On the other hand, I applaud the idea of giving money that is utterly unrestricted so that students and faculty are free to pursue their wildest dreams. I think we need a great deal of that in our universities because that's really what a university really has to be, open to any idea of the most outrageous . . .

Jarrell: Right. Because otherwise you really have the problem of this kind of pedestrian research with no risks.

Pister: That's the danger. When it's all controlled by outside . . .

Leadership Opportunity Awards Program

Jarrell: Would you tell me what initiatives you've launched that you feel have been important?

Pister: The one I'm very pleased with is the Leadership Opportunity Awards Program. We haven't completed that campaign, but we've raised around \$3.3 million in permanently endowing that program. Each year there's a group of twelve to fourteen students . . . I typically have an opportunity to meet them, interact with them and establish a personal relationship.

Jarrell: How are they chosen?

Pister: They're chosen by a selection committee each year. We give each community college president a chance to nominate students. Then the selection committee reviews the nominations and conducts personal interviews with each of the candidates and then selects one from each institution. That program has worked just marvelously. We've had two classes graduate now, I think, or maybe the second class is graduating this year. Many of them have gone to graduate school. One of our graduates last year, Catalina Berumen is working in migrant worker services in Salinas. Well it makes me feel good that these students who typically would never have gone on to a four-year college have a program like this. Anyway, those are some examples. It's hard, Randall, because it's so easy in a job like this to put yourself in the frame of mind that you've got so much you have to do that you don't have time to go out and do these kinds of things.

Jarrell: You could just be a bureaucrat, couldn't you?

Pister: It's a grave mistake to think that you can lead an institution by spending all your time sitting in the office, handling administrative stuff. The more you get out and the more you're seen . . . and if I did these five years over again I think I would spend even more time outside. If I had a second five years it would be much easier. The problem is I didn't know anybody here; I brought my executive assistant and that was the only person I knew. So I had to start with that very small nucleus and build a support group that I could relate to and trust. That took time. Really, I think only in this last year have we put in place a senior leadership team that I think is fairly stable and competent. Our deans now are all I think quality people who understand their roles as

academic administrators. Our vice chancellors are strong. The new vice chancellor who will come in soon to replace Jim Sullivan, who will be going back to retire again, is very well qualified. There's a good team of people. When you have a good team of people then you can be comfortable that your delegation is going to be responded to and carried out properly. And you can devote more time.

Jarrell: And then you can go out and about.

Pister: You can do more. It's absolutely critical. Because no matter how much I did, if you turned to a random student on the campus, they'd say, who's the chancellor? They have no idea what the chancellor does. A very ad hoc thing was when I'd be driving down to the city and students at the bus stop were hitchhiking, I always picked them up.

Jarrell: Really!

Pister: Yes. I got to know several kids fairly well that way.

Jarrell: They just thought you were some guy?

Pister: No kidding. That's the typical . . . They'd ask me if I worked on campus.

Jarrell: (laughter) And then you'd say, "I'm the chancellor."

Pister: Yes, and more often than not they'd say, "Well what does the chancellor do?"

Jarrell: I think that is delightful.

Pister: One day this young woman was standing down by family student housing, one Saturday in December 1992 or 1993, with her little kid, a little guy, maybe three years old. I picked her up. She sat down, she was obviously not born in the United States. She spoke with an accent. And she was in tears. I talked with her and asked her what the trouble was. It turned out that she had broken up with her significant other, she was trying to finish up her degree so she could go to work. He'd kicked her out of the house or something. It was a complicated home situation. I talked to her on the way down and tried to calm her down and suggested that she talk to somebody or other. And you know, I kept in touch with her by e-mail after that. She got her degree here and went out and as far as I know she's working in San Jose now. So it was a really

incredible experience that she was so grateful to me that just more or less by accident I passed by that day and . . .

Jarrell: And you connected.

Pister: And connected and gave her some hope and she pulled herself back together again. Other students I hauled downtown and said good-bye and that was it.

Jarrell: Well you have a very singular perspective on the role of a chancellor and I think that it's very interesting that you're saying it's taken about five years for you to get to know how to do this job and get your team together . . . you can delegate with complete assurance that whatever's going on it's going to be followed through. But it takes time, doesn't it?

Pister: It does.

Jarrell: To define how you're personally going to shape this role.

Endowed Chairs

The other thing I feel good about is the number of endowed chairs that have been established in the last couple of years; in addition to the chair for psychology, there are three new chairs.

Jarrell: How much does it cost to endow a chair?

Pister: The minimum here is \$250,000 dollars, which is a real bargain, because endowed chairs at many universities, especially privates, are well over a million dollars now. In private universities the endowment is used to pay at least part if not all, of the faculty member's salary. In the University of California that's not permitted in fact. The income from the endowment is used to support the teaching and research of the faculty member.

Jarrell: So you can't pay the salary out of that?

Pister: You can pay the summer salary, but you can't pay the nine-month salary. So that's why it's substantially lower. On many UC campuses now the minimum is much higher. But at Santa Cruz we've stayed at the regents' minimum, which is \$250,000.

That gives the faculty member on the order of ten thousand dollars a year in discretionary income.

Jarrell: Can you tell me, it might be obvious, but for somebody reading your oral history volume eventually—what's the purpose of an endowed chair? What's the motivation for it?

Pister: Well there are two motivations that I see. The first is that an endowed chair is typically reserved for the most distinguished scholars on a campus, so that it's an award, a recognition, of the scholarly contributions of the individual. I don't think I said this anywhere in our discussions, but my experience is that in the faculty culture there's nothing more valued than approbation of peers. That for ninety some percent of all faculty, that's much more important than financial reward.

Jarrell: It's the prestige and the distinction.

Pister: It's the coin of the realm. To receive the recognition of your peers by being nominated to an endowed chair is kind of the *summum [bonum]* of one's career. Parenthetically, I was very pleased and honored to have held an endowed chair for five years at Berkeley, when I was dean of engineering. In fact, by University protocols I'm allowed to call myself that endowed chair emeritus, if I wished to do so. So that's the first thing, it's the recognition. The second thing clearly is that the endowment throws off an annual income, particularly in non-science areas where discretionary resources are highly valued. In the humanities particularly, or the arts, endowed chairs are extremely valuable because they give the faculty member discretionary income to support teaching and research programs. I've found that when one is created, then another one is created, and then another one. They have an ability to kind of reproduce themselves. For example we have four recent endowed chairs at Santa Cruz. I won't be surprised if there aren't a couple more added in the next year. That was my experience at Berkeley. Once it gets started, it multiplies, it catches on and people think, it's a great idea, I'm going to do that.

Jarrell: During your tenure here, have you been fairly involved with our donors?

Pister: In two out of the three chairs established when I was chancellor, I was very clearly involved in talking with the people. In the other case, it all happened almost spontaneously and I didn't even meet the people until we had a dinner in their honor. So it was done in an entirely different way. Normally, endowed chairs are the

consequence of a period of cultivation between either a dean or a faculty member, usually a dean, or the chancellor, with an individual. Santa Cruz is not exactly the wealthiest little community in the world in terms of this kind of giving. It doesn't have a tradition and isn't a capital center in terms of industry.

Jarrell: Have you made forays over to Silicon Valley or other areas in this region?

Pister: It's just been very selective. I've just gone where the development people have felt that there is a likely prospect that should be cultivated. There's been very little of that in the immediate area around Santa Cruz, but I've gone to southern California, to the San Francisco Bay Area. I think the next chancellor will have probably a much fuller plate to do that because the campus is getting older.

Last year we hired a very experienced executive director of development, Nancy [V.] Loshkajian, who came to us from Oberlin College. She has a lot of experience in development and is taking more responsibility for the day-to-day management of development activities, giving Vice Chancellor Aldrich more of an opportunity to go out and arrange the matches that have to be made between deans and chancellors and individuals. Ideally he ought to be on the road all the time doing that kind of work and leaving the executive director to manage day-to-day operations.

Jarrell: Well, we're starting to have baby boomer alumni.

Pister: Yes, I'm interested to see what will happen. Something that deserves mention is the kind of cultural change that has taken place here. When I first came here I was advised by Carolyn Christopherson, our alumni affairs director, that the UC Santa Cruz Alumni Association didn't want to have anything to do with fundraising. That was an "F" word for them. They just said no deal, we're not going to get involved in fundraising.

Jarrell: I can't believe it!

Pister: That was 1991. I am delighted to say that in 1996, not only have they changed that philosophy, they have been marvelous in raising money for alumni scholarships. There is over a \$100,000 in money for alumni scholarships now. They see this as one of their major activities and have a committee analyzing alumni contributions.

Academic Planning

Jarrell: I have a quartet of topics to talk about today, starting with the academic planning process and the 2005 report. I would like you to explain how the planning process associated with the report developed during your tenure and some of the goals that you personally are attached to or thought important to implement during your tenure.

Pister: This puts me at some disadvantage because I've kind of forgotten the 2005 report. I should have done some homework.

Jarrell: Well that's all right. In your November 6, 1991 address to the academic senate you said, "As I've already remarked in the October issue of *Currents*, the top priority of any administration has to be the support of the academic mission. The expression of that mission is in the Santa Cruz division of the Academic Senate and the process associated with the 2005 plan. This process will lead to a document which will be discussed on campus, will be reviewed and commented on," etc. What you really pointed out was there were important issues of how things were going to be balanced between graduate and undergraduate, that's one emphasis I would like to make . . . and then in particular the idea of the engineering school.

Pister: That refreshes my memory. Sure.

Well that process was really going on when I got here. Basically what I had to do was to be sure that that process continued. I recall the chairman of the committee to develop the 2005 plan was then Associate Vice Chancellor Jorge Hankamer. So Jorge and his colleague worked on what we would call an administrative committee of members of the Santa Cruz division, representatives of the senate and administrative people. In consultation with the normal senate committees, the committee on planning and budget, the committee on educational policy, ultimately drafted, or ultimately finished and the division ratified, the plan. As I remember one of the novel features of that process, thinking back on this, was that the plan was put on the Internet and there was an open bulletin board for people to discuss the pros and cons of certain issues, so that not only was the plan developed but there was a very extensive dialogue that took place as a consequence of the way that the plan was put out for everyone to look at, to comment on.

The plan was approved, I can't remember the exact date, I think it was in 1992. But alas the budget ax fell at that time and we were unable to implement it. One of the major features of the plan was campus growth and that we would have a greater emphasis on graduate and professional education in a number of academic areas, most especially engineering. We in fact had already in the pipeline a proposal being reviewed across the UC system and ultimately in the office of the president, transmitted to CPEC, the California Post Secondary Education Commission, a proposal to establish a school of engineering at Santa Cruz. Well that proposal cleared all of the UC review, it went to CPEC. CPEC had some questions about the plan, which they asked us to respond to. We drafted a response but the response was never sent back to CPEC because I made the decision that the budget situation was so desperate that there was no hope at all to start any programs in engineering, at least at that point in our history, because of the budget crunch. So that aspect of the plan, which was a very important one, had to be put on hold, as were all the other plans for any kind of growth.

Jarrell: There were extensive ideas for increased master's degree and Ph.D. programs in graduate studies.

Pister: Yes. Exactly. As I remember, 3000 out of the 5000 student growth was to be in graduate areas. I think that's very important because it places this campus in a position that's more comparable to the distribution of students on other campuses. At the time it would have put us in a better position resource-wise. Because at that point in history the resources came to a campus in a manner that was strongly weighted toward graduate study.

Jarrell: Right. The 2.5 ratio.

Pister: Exactly. The 2.5 and 3.5 for advanced students. Also important is that faculty in many disciplines lacked the opportunity to interact with graduate students. All that was arrested by the most serious budget crisis in the University's history. There's no question about that. The plan still is a good one, in my view. Indeed it has been now reactivated in part by virtue of the proposal which is just about ready to leave the campus, for adding two programs in engineering, not a school of engineering, but two programs in engineering. That plan has been approved . . . It's almost finished its approval process on the campus and is ready to go back to the office of the president for acceptance. I've already had indications from the president that he will support these programs, and indeed give us the necessary forward funding to build the

infrastructure, recruit the faculty, get the equipment, make the space modifications that are needed, ahead of the student enrollment. As the student enrollment builds up you basically earn the right to have those resources. So that at some point out, say five years out, we hopefully will have the number of students that will justify those resources.

Jarrell: Based on establishing an infrastructure, getting your FTE allocations, then it becomes justified with the number of students that apply. Then what's the next step for mounting an actual school? Is that viable?

Pister: Well that would be another step to take and that's going to be up to the next chancellor and the faculty as to when it's appropriate to take that next step. I expect it will be sometime early in the next century. But at least we've made a start. In the meantime we have added a graduate degree program in environmental studies with an M.S. and Ph.D., which is a wonderful addition. I think there will be opportunities to fill out, perhaps at a different pace than we thought was possible early on, in these next years ahead. As you may know, there's been a major change in resource allocation to campuses, beginning this next year.

Jarrell: You mentioned that during our last interview.

Pister: The formula's changed so that it no longer favors graduate students. That makes it easier for a campus but it doesn't recognize that the existing campuses with already strong graduate programs built up their budgets on the basis of a weighted formula and we didn't so . . .

Jarrell: And it's more expensive to educate graduate students.

Pister: Yes, absolutely.

Jarrell: So how does this new formula deal with that fact?

Pister: Well, it doesn't. On the other hand ever since the president first proposed this formula I have consistently brought to his and his budget officer's attention and my colleagues' attention, that this campus really needs to get special recognition, because it developed as an undergraduate campus first and is moving in the direction of a more balanced graduate-undergraduate ratio. As a consequence there ought to be some special attention given to resources for Santa Cruz. I hope that is not forgotten.

Jarrell: What you've described about the change in resource allocation is a big departure.

Pister: A very big departure.

Jarrell: Do you know what prompted that kind of a change in the way the campuses get funding based on their enrollments?

Pister: It's something that was negotiated by the president and by the director of the budget, Larry Herschman, with the state department of finances people and the governor's office. I think it's a more logical way to do it. There're some other features I think are important. The other features have to do with money for the library, and a number of other categories that have not been included in the normal funding for the campuses. It's more inclusive. We'll see how it works. But the point was that the departure from the old to the new methodology is only equitable if at the time when you make the transition there is a recognition and hopefully then a subsequent adjustment to take care of the fact that there were very different histories on different campuses that brought them to the point where the change was made. [UC] San Diego started basically as a set of graduate programs and added undergraduate programs. So they benefited enormously if you look at the growth of the San Diego campus and where they are now. Even taking the medical school away they are in a much more favorable position resource-wise than this campus is, because they were higher-weighted to start with.

Jarrell: The graduate programs. That core they started off with?

Pister: Exactly. So now campuses that have built up their base like UCLA and Berkeley, can say with great righteousness, well we're going to cut back our graduate programs now and bring undergraduates. Because they're cheaper so they can maintain their resource base and accommodate a few more students or even exchange an undergraduate for a graduate.

Jarrell: A last question about academic planning during your tenure. Tell me about some of the developments in the different divisions you've had a hand in, or that you feel especially happy with, in natural sciences or social sciences. Because there have been quite a few changes.

Pister: Sure. Well, in natural sciences, looking at that, of course engineering will be in natural sciences. So that's something we've done. I think some important things that were done and in a way my role in this is very distant but I can lend some encouragement at a distance and try to stir up with the faculty or deans some interest or some challenges from time to time. One thing that comes to mind right away—I certainly had a part in getting the million dollar grant from the Packard Foundation for ocean science and technology. I feel very good about that. I remember well the breakfast with Julie Packard and Robert Stevens where we talked about that gift. I have developed a very warm and friendly relationship with Julie and her husband Robert, and with David Packard himself, having served these last years as a member of the board of directors of the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute.

Jarrell: I didn't realize you were on the board there.

Pister: Yes, I am. That has been one of the most interesting experiences for me. Because, first of all, the institute is a first-class scientific organization, absolutely cutting-edge research and has excellent people. Over these years I've had an opportunity to get to know David Packard, to sit in board meetings that he conducted and to talk and to listen to him, mostly. He was just a man in a million, just a superb human being. Totally unassuming, humble, sharp as a tack, and not afraid to tell people when they were wrong but in a way that wouldn't offend people. Just a wonderful man. Anyway, my association with the Packards helped to bring that million dollar gift. Yet I'd hasten to add that no chancellor can bring money to a campus if the quality of the work being done there is not good.

Jarrell: Right. You have to really have a product.

Pister: Absolutely. The only way I could help to bring a gift like that to the campus was by virtue of the fact that our students and faculty had been working with people at the research institute for a number of years. They had good rapport. They were respected here and that's what made it possible. So that was one program.

Monterey Bay Regional Studies Program

The second program in natural sciences that I'm pleased with is the Monterey Bay Regional Studies program.

Jarrell: In 1994.

Pister: Laurel [R.] Fox helped bring that here. I gave seed money for that program and it resulted in a very nice National Science Foundation funded program. That in my view is important because it cuts across disciplines. I'm a great believer in the need for cross-disciplinary academic endeavors. I really deplore the way in which institutions put knowledge into little boxes called boards or departments and everything depends on the life in that little box. This place does better than many in that regard, that is people crawl out of their boxes and talk to each other. That was one of the things that I didn't like about Berkeley.

Jarrell: Could you describe the program and why you got involved, why you got really interested . . . besides its interdisciplinary quality.

Pister: Well it was part of recognition of the importance of a region, the importance of the Monterey Bay Region. That's something I first became sensitive to when I attended the dedication of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary which was held on a windy day down in Monterey. It was a very impressive ceremony and I learned about the tremendous grassroots effort that it took to get established. I got to know many of the people involved in that, a wide spectrum of people, all the way from fairly conservative scientists to pretty far-out radical environmentalist people.

Jarrell: The green people?

Pister: The greenest people of all. That was a wonderful thing to see. The longer I stayed the more I saw the opportunities to look at the Monterey Bay region as a concept for all kinds of collaborations. Science research was certainly one such area.

Jarrell: I hadn't realized that was the umbrella. I didn't realize that you had participated in that ceremony. It's like having a national park.

Pister: Exactly. There was one ceremony down at Monterey and another at the harbor in Santa Cruz. I took part in both and it was exactly what you say, it was a celebration of a national park. How I would have loved to have been present when Yosemite was dedicated. Because I love that national park.

**Fort Ord Base-Conversion and the
Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology Center (MBEST)**

Jarrell: The concept of regionalism wasn't apparent to me when UCSC became involved in what used to be Fort Ord. Now that it's been demilitarized we have the new California State University at Monterey Bay. Then there are these initiatives in which UCSC is now involved.

Pister: All these things kind of fed each other. First, the sanctuary was established. Very soon after that I learned that Leon [E.] Panetta, who was then our congressman, had asked the University to be a member of a blue ribbon committee looking at the future of Fort Ord. We, the campus, were represented on that committee. It was determined that education would be one of the major focuses of the new Fort Ord. From the beginning UC Santa Cruz was to be a player because education was something that obviously we do. Early on I made a determination if UC Santa Cruz was going to be involved in the base conversion of Fort Ord we could only do it if there were a clear and compelling academic purpose for our presence there. There had to be enough interest there for me to make a public commitment that UC Santa Cruz would be involved. In my thinking about UCSC I believe that the campus ought to have a stronger presence in the entire region and not be seen as so isolated as it has in the past.

I was very lucky to have Dave [David S.] Klinger as dean of natural sciences. Dave for quite a few months took a major responsibility in rallying his colleagues in the sciences to look at projects that could be developed down there, to see how much support there would be if we tried to establish our presence down there. This is a long-term plan and not quite tomorrow. All along I insisted that whatever we did down there had to be connected to the University in ways that supported our mission—which meant teaching, research, and public service. As things materialized then the structure of our involvement there became clearer. We acquired a planning grant from the U.S. Department of Commerce. The campus was very fortunate to have Jim [James B.] Gill step forward to assume the leadership of the Fort Ord project here. I had a credible scholar, researcher, in earth sciences who had had some experience as an academic administrator, already having served as a graduate dean for a year. Jim had boundless energy and enthusiasm for this project and a very sharp mind. He was assisted by Lora [Lee] Martin who essentially was his right hand person for all of this; Lora brought to the table an incredible knowledge and understanding and ability to work in the nation's

capitol. She is a superb federal relations person. At the time she was serving as the development officer in the natural sciences division doing fundraising. But she had worked in the Carter administration in the White House and had tremendous connections. So Jim, with Lora really carrying the bulk of the work in Washington D.C., that team was responsible for hammering out the terms that conveyed the land from the U.S. Army to the U.C. Board of Regents. That was a very long process in which there were hours of very tough negotiation.

Jarrell: Why was it tough?

Pister: Because the army wanted to put too many conditions on the use of the land; they wanted to give us the land but not really; they wanted to control the way that we might use it. This was the first instance after all of the U.S. Army, at least to my knowledge, giving universities, because CSU was involved in this as well, a piece of land. The main thing that we wanted to do was to get this land under terms and conditions that would permit us to develop it and to bring in private enterprise so that it could be used to generate wealth for the region. Because the whole purpose of the base conversion from the beginning was to not only find a civilian purpose for Fort Ord but to try to replace the incredible loss in the local economy by virtue of the base closing. So there was a strong regional economic motivation for what we were doing. For that reason UC was to get land where we could work with private developers to make money, ultimately. In parallel, the CSU system saw this as an opportunity to start a new campus, to bring in undergraduate students. In the beginning I worked with President Handel [J.] Evans at San Jose State University who was the chancellor of the CSU system's representative for Fort Ord. I represented the UC system. We signed a memorandum of understanding early on and we have worked together right along. The terms of conveyance for the two universities were the same.

Jarrell: I didn't know that. I thought we were just a very junior partner in this.

Pister: Oh no, we are equal partners. The rates at which each of us is converting the base are quite different because they had to get up and running to bring in students. We're planning the physical layout of the land that we have, developing a business plan, and looking much more to the future. We want to make that area an industrial research park that will bring in businesses that are connected to the marine environment, the near coastal environment, and are interested in biotechnology or in agriculture, in education and entertainment. The edutainment industry.

Well see, we have a thousand acres there right now. So Fort Ord is a big piece of land. We hope half of it will go into UC's Natural Reserve System.¹⁹ There's habitat that has some endangered species, both flora and fauna, and that's going under. If the regents see fit, that will become part of the Natural Reserve System. Things are moving well in that direction. It looks like this could happen even at the June regents meeting if we're lucky. Then the other half of the thousand acres, about four hundred acres plus will be developed for business and industry and must meet the criteria that we set up related to these general areas that I've just mentioned. Ultimately this will afford opportunities for our faculty and students for research interchange and employment. So that's where we are with Fort Ord. Once we start implementing a business plan we'll have to go through an environmental impact report process and that will have to be approved by the regents.

Jarrell: Is there a task force on our campus responsible for this planning?

Pister: There's a Fort Ord project group led by Associate Vice Chancellor Gill, and Lora Martin is part of that. She's the director of regional economic studies, basically, which means she has an active role in talking to companies and government agencies. We thought originally we'd get NOAA or NASA down there and that still may be a possibility. So she's doing a lot of the marketing work right now. We have brought in our first major research program already, to study groundwater issues in the Fort Ord aquifer.

Jarrell: That's pretty critical for that whole area.

Pister: Absolutely. Water is a critical problem. One of our faculty, Professor [Andrew] Fisher is going to carry that program with money from the Department of Defense for research. Anyway, we have a whole team of people working on the conversion process, doing the planning, doing the environmental studies that have to be done and the economic analysis . . . we have consultants, too. Early on we had a meeting down in Marina when I signed a memorandum of understanding with the city of Marina to work together with them, because our property adjoins Marina. I still have a pen that I signed that with in my drawer here, come to think about that. Edith Johnson was the mayor at the time and I remember remarking at that meeting because there were many citizens there that night who said, "We want jobs. People are getting laid off." I

¹⁹ The 605-acre Fort Ord Natural Reserve was incorporated into the UC Natural Reserve System in June, 1996.

said, "I'm sorry, but the University's presence there is not going to provide jobs for you and your neighbors in the next few years. The reason the University is here is we want to basically establish a presence to put our foot in the door, so to speak, keep the door open, to the next century. We're really talking about an impact in this area in the 21st century. We can't do it in the short term. That's not the way things work." Silicon Valley wouldn't have grown up when it did in the 1960s if it hadn't been for the fact that Stanford and Berkeley had already been around for a century. Or San Jose State, for that matter. Because San Jose State University supplies a lot of people to Silicon Valley. The entrepreneurial researchers typically are coming from Stanford and UC. But all three institutions historically . . . and Santa Clara University as well, contributed. So this is a long-term situation we are talking about.

Jarrell: All we have down here now is UC Santa Cruz and some smaller private schools and now the CSU campus. It's probably twenty-five years before this thing has a shape.

Pister: It's really hard to predict. There's an amazing concentration of researchers around the Bay, the region.

Jarrell: Yes, well, you've got Hopkins.

Pister: There's Hopkins Marine Station of Stanford University, the Naval Postgraduate School, the Monterey Institute of International Studies. Then there's the incredible U.S. Navy installation by the airport called the U.S. Navy Fleet Numeric Oceanographic Center (FNOC). They have some of the most powerful computers in the world doing world weather predictions. They broadcast weather information for U.S. Navy ships at sea over the whole world.

Jarrell: Yes. Then there's the whole development of the Monterey Bay Aquarium and its ancillary . . .

Pister: . . . the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute; Moss Landing Marine Laboratories of the CSU system. Now there is CSU Monterey Bay; and Monterey Peninsula College, as well. We have Cabrillo College and UC Santa Cruz and the Long Marine Laboratory. At one time I think Jim Gill made an estimate there are some fifteen hundred researchers associated with marine and ocean science around the Monterey Bay. I think the total budget for annual expenditures was something like a hundred million dollars.

Monterey Bay Educational Consortium

So that's why the Monterey Bay Region is an important entity. It was exactly that regional idea that motivated me to start the Monterey Bay Educational Consortium. The consortium is an activity now that transcends a number of divisions on the campus; because there are faculty across campus working on that area.

Jarrell: Would you describe the Monterey Bay Educational Consortium, its genesis and what it actually does? Because it falls under the regionalism concept, it's town and gown; it's outreach; it's educating minorities and less well-served populations. It's so many things.

Pister: Exactly. I think it would be interesting to record the history of how this got started. I had a visit from the new superintendent of the Pajaro Valley School district, Tony Avina. Tony came to Pajaro Valley from San Luis Obispo. He came up one day just to get acquainted, and told me that when he was at San Luis Obispo he worked with California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, with Warren [T.] Baker, the president. I told him that Warren was a good friend of mine. We had a good program going in teacher training. So he said, "I'd like to talk to you about doing something like that." I said, "Sure." I think Roland [G.] Tharp was in on that discussion. I can't remember who else from the faculty . . . But I said, "Let's think more broadly than that. Let's set up a group that looks at a set of issues important to K-12 and our universities and suggest ways that we could work together more productively around the Monterey Bay region." So out of that initial meeting and several subsequent meetings at which we brought in people like Diane Siri from the Santa Cruz County Office of Education, and other members of the education board here . . . Roland though was instrumental in writing the draft of the original purpose of this group. He is on the education board of studies. He's now the director of a new center for the study of children at risk, a fine center that he's acquired.

We developed a charter and the purpose was to bring together senior administrators from the three counties around the Bay—Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz; to bring together the chief executives in a way that would enable us to get acquainted and identify critical areas that collectively we could address across the segments of education to benefit public education in the area. We restricted the group to the chancellor of UC Santa Cruz, the presidents of the community colleges around the bay,

the three county school superintendents, and the president of California State University, Monterey Bay. Then we asked the county superintendents to nominate some representative district superintendents in the counties. Altogether I think there were about fifteen of us.

We didn't want this to be a group that does hands-on work, but rather to show leadership, to inspire and support, and motivate project teams. We recognized there was already a lot going on and we didn't want to say, okay we've arrived on the scene and we've got the message. Follow us. But rather, to support a lot of good work and to look at some other ways to work together. We've only been working in what you might call a productive mode since last October. We had the very good fortune to hire an executive director for this consortium in the person of Carrol Moran who was just finishing her Ph.D. in education at Stanford. Carrol had extensive experience teaching in the Monterey Bay region. She was a classroom teacher for I think at least fifteen years. She's bilingual, in Spanish and English, and she's turned out to be that ideal person to help bring this group together. What the executive board of the founding members has done, is to meet monthly and go over agenda items that deal with project teams working in different areas.

One area of focus is early literacy. What can we do collectively to maximize the number of young kids in this area who can read by the end of the third grade and deal with the early literacy problem? That group has gone off by itself and done some very good things. Another group has worked on educational technology, building on extensive efforts already underway to essentially wire the whole region together and to share educational technology. The campus has made available a staff person to help in schools and facilitate all that.

Jarrell: It's interesting. CSUMB is the wired campus and now with this project with K-12, you're getting them linked up with the Internet.

Pister: Exactly. Another important area is teacher preparation. This campus is very well respected and highly regarded in the quality of its teacher training programs. So that's a focus we're working on. CSU Monterey Bay is just coming on stream in teacher training, so they are connected. The fourth task is trying to develop in all the school districts the capability of communicating what public education is about. So often public education is being whipsawed in the media. People tend to generalize; if something is bad in this class, in this school, the whole thing is wrong. So we need a better way to

communicate what's good about public education. I don't mean to hide the bad things, or the things that need correcting but . . .

Elizabeth Irwin has been chairing that group and she's a real pro. I think in the long run that will help public education in Santa Cruz and the other adjoining counties. So that's MBEC. I'm very proud of that because an important thing I did is to commit three years of funding for the coordinator position to keep the thing going. So I'm very hopeful that it will continue at the rate that it's been going.

If you'll notice, this week we had Delaine Eastin, the state superintendent of public instruction here. We sponsored her visit. I spent the entire day with her and she was very impressed by what MBEC has done and is doing. It's a model of a regional collaboration that could be replicated elsewhere in the state. I'm hopeful that we'll get some recognition for being pioneers in regional educational collaboration.

Jarrell: I'm really quite impressed by the way you have extended and redefined the whole notion of town-gown relations, with UCSC reaching out, not just to Santa Cruz but to San Benito, Monterey as well. I've always thought that the UC presence should kind of wash over in a benign way the entire area, not just its own little place up on the hill in Santa Cruz.

Pister: Exactly.

Jarrell: You know it used to be that even doing outreach with Watsonville was considered a big deal.

Pister: We've made a start. There's so much more we can do and I think we're moving in the right direction. By the way, the one division of this campus that really understands regionalism is University Extension.

University Extension

We have Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino, Santa Cruz, and Fort Ord. Dean [Janice V.] Corriden has done a splendid job in building an incredible network of outreach to Santa Clara County as well as the counties up here. I'm going to predict in the next decade that University Extension activities are going to be brought much closer to what you might call the traditional activities of a campus.

Jarrell: So interesting. You are the first UCSC chancellor I have talked who's ever mentioned University Extension as having anything to do with UCSC. Carl Tjerandsen was the first dean of extension under Chancellor McHenry, and it just seemed that the two were sort of spinning in different orbits. You're saying that there could be more of a relationship.

Pister: I think that we have to draw the two together. You know extension is self-sufficient.

Jarrell: Yes, it has to pay its own way.

Pister: It's an auxiliary enterprise. But what I see is the fact that University Extension at this campus and other campuses has a lot of experience in the delivery of modular kinds of courses, courses tailored for this or that particular group. They also have developed a huge network and know how to do marketing, because they have to do it. I think that there's a growing need for part-time instruction, part-time students, students taking classes remotely.

Jarrell: Continuing education is more important than ever before.

Pister: Absolutely. Extension knows how to do these things. We need to bring them closer to the campus. The faculty needs to be sensitized to the complementarity of what they're doing and how they understand the world and not basically retain the position that everything important goes on on the campus. Because I think the whole concept of campus is going to change.

Jarrell: It's interesting you bring this up. I was a re-entry woman, Chancellor, before there was such a term. There was no re-entry program here and the difficulties put in the way of a single mom who wanted to go back and get a master's degree or an advanced degree were incredible.

Pister: They were horrendous.

Jarrell: It was like, what do you want to do here? You don't belong here. Now I see the antagonism between the traditional faculty in their ivory tower where the "rubber meets the road" reality of UC Extension. You're saying you see that the traditional campus itself is probably going to be reconceived?

Pister: Well I think that educational technology will force the campus in this direction. The reason it will force the campus in this direction is that the market is going to change in dramatic ways. It's already changed.

Jarrell: Because of demographics?

Pister: No, I'm thinking of the market in a different sense. Already there are what I call storefront universities that can put together courses using very high quality people and combine their courses and then deliver these courses interactively.

Jarrell: Right, the syllabi you get on-line and . . .

Pister: Right, you get on-line . . . they can pay for the tutors and the people to work but they've got the big name who's produced the course. I just saw a multimedia presentation this week. I can't remember the name of the university but it was a fantastic marketing job. Enroll in this university. We've got the faculty and they list the names of faculty. You never have to leave your living room basically, and you can get your degree that way. It's not like the old La Salle correspondence courses that you see in the backs of magazines. I mean those were fine for the time, but this is high quality instruction with a high degree of interactivity. What I see is the cost of education in the traditional mode continuing to go up so much that you have to be able to increase productivity in a university and there's no other way to do it but to rethink the way learning and teaching go on at a campus. You can't continue to have one person stand in front of twenty people or forty people or whatever.

Jarrell: You really think that?

Pister: I think it's going to change. You know, when it will change, or how fast, that's an open question. But a lot of people are worrying about this and a lot of universities are worrying about this. Anyway, University Extension is an excellent model for us to look at. But the cultures are very different and I don't mean to be naive and say that this will happen effortlessly. Because the academic senate jealously guards its prerogatives. Ironically, Randall, when the University in the early 1970s, maybe you've talked about this . . . President Hitch came up with the idea of the extended university, and he was thinking this way twenty-five years ago.

Jarrell: I remember that notion.

Pister: He wanted to do it, I think, for political reasons; to improve the image of the University, reaching out to a broader public, just as we talked about. The extended university idea started and the person he put in charge of that was David Gardner, who was an assistant vice president I think at the time, or maybe vice president. I was thrown right in the middle of that because I was chairman of the statewide academic senate committee on educational policy. So I was the guardian of the treasury, so to speak. I had to work with David Gardner who was in the administrative role trying to push the idea of the extended university, which meant setting up satellite centers away from the campuses and trying to deliver education at a distance. In part this was motivated by the British open-university idea, which was a televised university at the time. I remember many conversations I had with David Gardner about senate approval for what they wanted to do. Everything had to go through that process. I was on the other side of the issue and I mention this because I know how jealously the faculty hold the delegated authority for courses and curriculum.

Town-Gown Relations

Jarrell: I would like you to talk about town-gown relationships, and your perception of what the relationship was as you came here between the city and county of Santa Cruz and the University of California, Santa Cruz. Your diagnosis.

Pister: Yes, well what I guess I walked into was a situation in which different people talked to me about the state of affairs and the history of town-gown relations. We should bear in mind that when I arrived it was not that long after the long struggle over the Long Range Development Plan.

Jarrell: And how high enrollment here would grow.

Pister: Exactly. The compromise worked out dealt with the potential growth of UCSC and what percentage of students ought to live on campus, a whole range of issues that had been the subject, I am told, of very, very serious, heated discussions. Indeed I think there was even a lawsuit at one point, at least one lawsuit. I was warned about the political structure of the city of Santa Cruz and the county board of supervisors as being quite unfriendly to UC Santa Cruz. Certain members of the board and the council were very unfriendly. I guess the way to put it would be that the campus was often used as a political scapegoat by a number of people on either the council or the board. I walked in

and I had as my political advisor at that time Acting Assistant Chancellor for University Advancement, Stephanie Hauk. She had been brought in by Chancellor Stevens to help him with town-gown relations. Stephanie was a long-time resident of this area; she knew the figures very well and had very clear views about how to deal with them. Certainly Stephanie was very helpful to me in those early months to get a sense of where we were. More than that, Stephanie was very proactive in getting me out to meet the city council to meet the board of supervisors, to go to Scotts Valley, to Watsonville, to Salinas, and to attend council meetings or board meetings and be introduced and give me a chance to be recognized. I think that was very important because it began what I think turned out to be a successful set of interactions that I believe greatly improved the town-gown relationship of the campus. There was one amusing anecdote that I ran across in reviewing the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* some weeks ago. When I went down to the board of supervisors meeting the first time, I went with Stephanie. We got tied up in traffic and arrived I think about a quarter of an hour late. Supervisor Gary [J.] Patton was given the responsibility of introducing me. I had never met him. I remember we walked in in the middle of the board meeting and Gary got up and said, "Where's the chancellor? Is this the new chancellor that just arrived," or something like that. Gary said some words and I said something like, "I'm pleased to be here and I look forward to working with the board and with you, Mr. Patton." And he made some wry comment you know, "I'll bet you are," something like that. Anyway, that was the beginning.

Then in the fall of 1991, I think even before the Elf Land crisis, for reasons that I'll never know except that it had to be some kind of political motivation, Gary Patton in an article in the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* really jumped all over the campus and me. Just kind of unannounced . . . I'd have to go back and read it to get the words but I think it was around November of 1991. He was quoted as saying the campus was out of control, and blah-blah-blah . . . a bunch of stuff like that. That was the first and last time that Gary ever publicly spoke out about me again, during the rest of the time that he was here before he went to Sacramento. I learned later on that Bill [G. William] Domhoff, who was chairman of the academic senate, was also a friend of Gary's, prominent in Democratic politics, and essentially a supporter of Gary. He apparently went to talk to Gary and said look, lay off the new chancellor. Give him a chance and you know . . . it was more than just lay off . . . if you want our continued political support you'd better leave him alone. Well I really owe a lot to Bill for doing that because it gave me a

breathing spell, really. As a result of that, thanks be to God, events continued to improve.

The LRDP settlement requires an annual meeting between the city council and the campus. Each of us has a chance to put things on the agenda. We have to sit together and discuss these issues, and there's a comment period at the end. I was told that before I got here the meetings used to be in the Civic Auditorium, because there was so much acrimony, so many people wanted to be heard. Well, fortunately we seemed to have gotten over that hurdle and we had meetings either downtown in the library or up here on the campus. We never had more than ten or fifteen people come to those meetings. The last two years when Kathy [Katherine] Beiers was mayor and later when Mike Rotkin was mayor, they've been virtual love feasts. Kathy Beiers and Mike this last time couldn't say enough good about the campus and about me. And in fact Mike gave me a proclamation, you know . . . he created Chancellor Karl Pister Day in Santa Cruz, gave me a key to the city.

Not that there weren't continuing issues such as the erosion of the Pogonip and we're working together on that. We're looking at the city's future water supply, and UCSC's share in that; how the transportation plan of the campus is going to impact the city; the continuing problem of students raising the price of housing in the city because they rent houses and pack twice as many kids in as are supposed to be there. But at least we're talking with city officials, and thereby minimizing trouble.

Relations with Elected Officials

In addition to attending city council meetings in Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, Watsonville, Capitola and Salinas, as well as the Board of Supervisors meeting in Santa Cruz where Gary Patton introduced me, Stephanie Hauk and I made a number of personal calls. In the give-and-take of local and education politics these contacts were very important to the campus and to the University as evidenced by a number of instances, some of which I would like to mention here.

I believe the first person I met was Sam Farr, who at that time was a State Assemblyman from Carmel. I had met Sam earlier when he and John Garamendi carried a bill which established the California Council for Science and Technology—this happened when I was Dean of Engineering at Berkeley. As an aside, I have served as

Chairman of the Board of Directors of this Council since 1992, having been appointed by David Gardner to succeed Bill Frazer. Sam and I established a very good working relationship from the beginning, and he continued to be a strong supporter of the campus and of the University. One of my earliest recollections is his visit when he presented me with a copy of the bill that he carried to establish the Oiled Wildlife Recovery Facility on the site of the Long Marine Laboratory. Later on he was critically important in the role he took to facilitate our acquisition of property at Fort Ord. Sam's father, former State Senator Fred Farr, was also a wonderful supporter. He was an active member of the UCSC Foundation; in addition he really became a mentor for me, introducing me to the Monterey Peninsula power structure and encouraging my appointment as a trustee of the Monterey Institute of International Studies.

I was fortunate to meet Leon Panetta and his wife Sylvia, while he was still a Congressman. Leon was instrumental in setting in motion the conversion of Fort Ord and making education a key element in the reuse plan. This contact proved critical to us several years later when I paid a visit to him in the West Wing of the White House where he was Chief of Staff to gain his support for releasing funds held by the Army that had been allocated to us for our Fort Ord project. (We did receive the funds, thanks to Leon.)

Senator Henry Mello was a strong supporter of the campus and the University. I enjoyed a productive relationship with him, with one exception noted elsewhere in this history. He was very involved in the Fort Ord re-use process and we benefitted from his long experience in politics.

Senator Alquist and his wife, Elaine, were special favorites. The Senator had a grandson attending UCSC and we shared a delightful lunch with the three of them on one occasion at University House. The Senator could always be counted upon to come to the support of the University when needed.

I first met John Vasconcellos when he was an Assemblyman, chairing the Assembly Committee on Higher Education. He was a most impressive figure, dominating budget hearings at which our budget was often attacked. Over the years I maintained personal correspondence with John, as we seemed to share similar points of view on many issues. I respect his honest, forthright approach in discussing tough issues and have always found him, in the final analysis, to be a real friend of higher education and of the University.

When Bruce MacPherson decided to run for state office on the Republican ticket (a brave step for someone in Santa Cruz County), he sought me to arrange an introduction to Regent Tirso del Junco, who at that time was the Chairman of the State Republican Party. I recall that the introduction took place at a Regents' meeting at UCLA—the rest is history. Bruce was elected. I found Bruce a wonderful supporter of the campus. He was always willing to give his support to our needs when called upon.

UCSC Foundation

Every campus has a foundation, which is an entity incorporated to act in behalf of the campus, under guidelines established by the regents. Foundations can and do raise money and make investments of their resources for use by the campus. The key to success is to build a group of interested, dedicated people who have a clear understanding of campus needs and priorities.

I have already mentioned what I viewed as the somewhat chaotic state of development activities when I arrived. It was not a surprise that the foundation members, though dedicated to UCSC and well-intentioned, were not clear as to what their role should be. I still recall the first meeting that I attended. My first shock was to find four previous chancellors at the table. I had not known that chancellors, after leaving the position, remained on the foundation board. By the way, I made it clear when I retired that I would not participate on the board unless my successor explicitly requested me to do so for a particular matter. That has happened once. I have also mentioned that it took time for me to establish the appropriate campus bodies and procedures to deal with development activities and priorities. For this reason there was a troubling period of time in the first years of my administration during which members of the board repeatedly asked what they should be doing. Gradually we became more focused on a list of campus priorities and the board members really took increasingly productive roles. Among the successful projects were the Arboretum educational building²⁰ and gift shop, strengthening the organization for the Long Marine Laboratory Educational

²⁰ Chancellor Pister added the following written remarks: The Arboretum educational building project broke new ground for the campus in important ways. The Foundation took responsibility for the project, thus avoiding much of the cumbersome red tape that surrounds University building projects. In taking this approach we were able to not only construct the building more inexpensively (there was substantial work done at cost or less) but to complete it expeditiously. A great deal of the credit goes to Jack Baskin, whose experience and selfless dedication to the campus made it possible.

Facility and acquiring an endowment for the Leadership Opportunity Award Program.²¹

Rita Olsen Pister

Jarrell: I'd like you to tell me about your wife, Rita Olson Pister, and about living in University House. I've heard some absolutely lovely things about her. Tell me what her role has been during your tenure.

Pister: Well thank you, Randall. I'm glad you reminded me of that. Because let me go back to the community relations issue. I would just say flatly that a major part of the reason that community relations have improved is a consequence of my wife's interaction in the community. She and Anne [Neufeld] Levin and Eileen Tanner conceived of and then carried out a program called Discover UC Santa Cruz. That involved inviting women from the community to come up and spend half a day on the campus. Campus staff and faculty gave talks and led tours around the campus. That program has been very, very successful and received a lot of plaudits from women in the community who've said, "I've lived here for thirty years and I've never come up on the campus. No one's ever invited me." That's one kind of outreach that they did. By the way (laughter) I think it would be interesting to note here that these three are called, not to their faces, the Big Three. I once, when someone came in, I said, "do you know who the Big Three are?" They said, "Yes, Ford, Chrysler and General Motors." No, not at Santa Cruz. You have the wrong Big Three. Anyway, and they're not the big four, Huntington, Hopkins, Crocker, and Stanford. Anyway, they started that program.

Rita then also became a member of the Cabrillo Music Festival board. We've had several wonderful receptions for the conductor, Marin Alsop, each year when she comes into town. Rita also became a member of the boards of the Santa Cruz County Museum of Art and History and the Santa Cruz Baroque Festival. She went out and got

²¹ Chancellor Pister added the following written remarks: The Leadership Opportunity Award Program was embraced by the Foundation with enthusiasm. Here I would like to single out Anne Levin, who as president and long-time board member took a leadership role in moving this program to its initiation. She not only took an active role in selecting the first cohorts but also brought a major fundraising activity to the area to build up the endowment fund. This was only one of many examples of her talented and energetic support of the chancellor and the campus. During my tenure her culminating gift was the establishment of an endowed chair for Holocaust studies, the first of its kind in the United States.

involved in the community and became known and we had a number of social affairs at the house, that brought people from the community in. We did that in different ways. Rita, being an artist herself, was quite anxious to support the arts here. Her board memberships indicate that. She conceived of fundraising events to get money for the Mary Porter Sesnon Art Gallery. I've forgotten how many auctions of different kinds we've had for the Sesnon gallery to raise money for them. She has also been very supportive of the University Women's Club which meets once a month at University House. She worked with their leadership to find ways to raise money for the Women's Club. And indeed they were so taken by her efforts that they created a scholarship in her name, an endowment which really touched my wife tremendously. I think in the house itself what Rita did was to bring a certain dignity, she created a sense of what a social affair at our house could mean for this campus. She's a formal person herself and she felt that if we were going to have affairs at University House there ought to be a certain level of dignity and decorum. I remember seeing a noticeable transformation in the attire of our guests, if you compare how people dressed when they came to the first few events that we had until later on.

Jarrell: The Santa Cruz dress code for parties at University House is not shorts and Birkenstocks!

Pister: Without ever writing that out we, I think by example, at least changed the way that sensitive caring people would recognize. This can be carried to extremes, obviously, one way or the other, and I don't think we carried it to an extreme of formality in any sense. But it's a question of just showing a certain level of respect for your hosts or for the institution. If you have a black tie dinner, in honor of a major supporter of the campus then that event should command a certain amount of respect and behavioral conformity that some of the non-traditional people might find hard to deal with. You know we certainly didn't want a stuffy old society affair.

Jarrell: It doesn't sound like you're talking about being stuffy at all.

Pister: Rita made a very substantial contribution to the social events that we had at University House. We typically had several thousand people a year come through in receptions, in dinners, in various social events.

In her role as associate of the chancellor, which I have already described,²² she was effective in mending and strengthening town-gown relationships. Another important contribution that she made on the campus: Rita and I are both “people of faith,” and regularly attended Holy Cross Church in Santa Cruz. We therefore felt that it was important for us to do what we could to support and encourage interaction between faith communities in Santa Cruz and our students. To express this we held an annual event to which we invited staff from the many religious groups that worked with our students. This ecumenical group was very appreciative of our efforts and we in turn were pleased by the response that we received.

A second “first” for the campus was our annual celebration of Hannukah with members of the Jewish community on the campus. Although there had been a long tradition of having a Christmas celebration at University House, there had never been a recognition of the interests of members of the Jewish community. We were very pleased and gladdened by the response of the campus community to this event, which grew in popularity over the years.

Finally, on a personal note, Rita served the indispensable role of being my “confessor” each evening when I returned to University House. She patiently listened to my recollections of each day, what were the troubling issues and who were the villains. Her understanding of my life, its ups and downs, and her unwavering support of me was a source of strength that was absolutely critical to my continuing to serve as chancellor.

Life at University House

Jarrell: What is it like to live there? I remember Karen Sinsheimer used to say that she’d come down to get her coffee in the morning and there’d be a gaggle of people in the kitchen. Do you think that there should be a place for entertaining that’s separate from University House?

Pister: Well, the way the house is configured now, and the way we used the house I think works all right, thanks to Bob and Karen Sinsheimer. They split the house in a way that would provide a reasonable amount of privacy to the occupants. Until they put the kitchen in what I call the private quarters, the back of the house, there was no way to get your morning coffee except to go down to that huge kitchen with a huge

²² Chancellor Pister added these written remarks about Rita Olsen Pister.

stove that has 12 burners on it or something like that and get your coffee. It was ludicrous. What my wife saw right away is, I'm not going to have to do my laundry after I do the hundred-yard dash, you know. There was a washer and dryer way down in the end of the kitchen that must have been fifty or sixty yards from where we lived. Let me tell you an amusing story. When Rita first saw the house, she said, look there's a back bathroom that I'm not going to use as a bathroom; I'm going to turn that into a laundry room. That was the famous washer and dryer incident.

Jarrell: I haven't heard about that!

Pister: Oh, you haven't heard about that? Oh Lord. So we had a washer and dryer put in there. This was our first year here when we were still trapped in the previous way of doing things. That meant that we had a freshman reception. So all the freshpersons on the campus were bussed up to University House in the evening to have an ice cream social. So kids are pouring in the door, we're shaking hands, greeting these freshpersons coming in. One young lady came up to my wife and said, "Is it true that you had a washer and dryer installed in your part of the house?" Rita said, "Well of course. Doesn't your mother have a washer and dryer in her house?" Anyway, that was written up either in the *Fish Rap Live!* or the *City on a Hill Press*, slamming my wife for this unnecessary expenditure of putting a washer and dryer in the private quarters of the house. The other part of that article that Rita and I chuckle about is she was also accused of spending \$100,000 on new china.

Jarrell: Kind of like Nancy Reagan!

Pister: Yes. Well we did put the washer and dryer in but we didn't spend anything on china. At any rate, with the kitchen that the Sinsheimers put in, and with the washer and dryer that Rita had installed, the private part of the house was starting to be more comfortable and private. You go out of the great hall, there's a long hallway and there was nothing between the doors of the great hall and the private part of the house. There were no doors. And we said, that doesn't look good. Because there are two bedrooms in that quarter and there's no privacy. People can walk out of the great hall and go anywhere. That's no good. So Rita insisted on installing a set of doors. Well, having done that, the private part of the house was very comfortable . . . it's a small apartment. We have a bedroom and bath, a small living/family room, a kitchen, and this laundry room and that's it.

Jarrell: And the rest are public rooms.

Pister: Yes. It's a T, and the stem of the T is a long hallway, two guest bedrooms and then our private quarters and the top of the T has a study, a living room, a dining room and a massive kitchen. The private part is small but for two people it's great. If you had kids it would be a disaster. The public part of the house is fine for entertaining but it has a very limited capacity. We can't have more than about sixty people for dinner, comfortably. With the campus growing, that's not large enough. The last dinner we had for the foundation I think there were 77 people. So we had to set up a tent on the lawn. It was summer so the dinner was outside. But what Rita wanted to do was to build a kind of a solarium extension out from the dining room. There's a patio there right now. But she couldn't ever interest the architect in destroying the magnificence of the original creation. Some chancellor in the future is going to have to worry about that.

The house I think has played a very important role for us in that it's given us an opportunity to express in our own way, and I've talked about Rita's important role there, our sense of what it means to be on the campus and to be the leader of the campus. One of the things we did in the first year was to schedule dinners for all the faculty leaders, the academic senate committee chairs, and spouses and significant others. We got into an awful problem the first time we did that by not recognizing the protocol of Santa Cruz, how to address professor so-and-so and guest and leave it at that. (laughter) Because you don't know if the spouse is the same sex.

Jarrell: I think the etiquette is being written as we speak.

Pister: We tripped and almost smashed our faces the first dinner we had on that issue. At any rate we then broadened the guest lists at those dinners to include senior level staff people across the campus over the years. By doing that we met almost all of the people in the divisions. We couldn't do everybody of course, down to a certain level. In a fairly intimate group of no more than twenty at a time. That really paid off because everyone had a chance to see us at close range; we got a chance to meet them, to learn something about them. It built a team spirit that was badly needed.

The University Staff

Jarrell: You're the only chancellor I've known who seems to have a genuine interest in the staff level which kind of holds the whole campus together. You started out in our first interview talking about that.

Pister: I may have said to you that when I came down here before I was a chancellor in May, 1991, I talked to the academic senate and said that I sincerely believe and recognize that the faculty is not only uninterested in doing the work that has to be done by staff, they are really typically totally unequipped to do the work the staff has to do. There's a complementarity of staff and faculty and staff and academic administrators that is not well understood and appreciated by many people but is absolutely vital to the survival of the institution. The continuity of the place rests on the continuity of senior staff. The day-to-day operation of the campus depends on staff almost entirely, and for better or for worse the quality of the campus operation is affected right down to the most junior, entry-level person on the staff. If the gatekeepers, that's what we'll call them, the people that answer the telephone, the people that meet students across the desk, if they don't do their jobs well and don't feel that they are part of the whole operation, this place doesn't work right. They can kill the organization. The only way in my view to try to make that work right is to do whatever you can to convey to the most junior person, whether it's greeting people across the desk or answering a phone, you have to keep reinforcing them and valuing them and validating what they are doing. It's no big deal. I would never think of going by my receptionist at night or in the morning without saying good morning, or at night without greeting them and taking the time to say you know, thanks for handling these complicated calls that come in, or . . . you know, I really appreciate what you are doing, I could never do your job. Just so simple . . . but we tend to forget those things.

Jarrell: I appreciate your simple appreciation of all the parts that make up this place.

Pister: Yes. Maybe it's because I'm an engineer that I understand systems that have to work together.

Jarrell: Yes, but I think you're a very interesting mix of an engineer and a social worker. I mean, a genuine people person. I think we all have stereotypes of engineers who are not comfortable with or interested in people.

Pister: Yes. Certainly there are such people. But I agree. We live with stereotypes.

Jarrell: I want you to know my stereotype of engineers is blown right out of the water.

Pister: Thanks a lot! Good. Well, Randall I share that pleasure with you.

Jarrell: I thank you so much for your time and your thoughtfulness.

Pister: It's a pleasure. You've drawn me out. You're a real pro.

Jarrell: Well, thank you so much.

Index

A

academic advisory board for development, 95, 101
 academic council, 7, 19, 59
 academic planning, 111
 academic senate, 7, 14, 20, 21, 24, 29, 38, 44, 74, 75, 82, 107, 122, 123, 125, 133, 134
 Adams, Robert F., 35
 administration, 44
 admissions, 70
 affirmative action, 23, 59, 62, 64, 68, 69
 Aldrich, Daniel G., 23, 93, 94, 95
 Alsop, Marin, 129
 American Society for Engineering Education, 61
 annual fund, 96
 applied mathematics program, 47
 Archer, Dane, 88
 Armstrong, Julia, 15, 23, 64
 Asian-American students, 67, 68
 Atkinson, Richard C., 79, 82, 84
 Avina, Tony, 118

B

Baker, Warren T., 118
 Baker, William B., 13, 14
 Bechtel Engineering Center, 99
 Beiers, Katherine, 125
 Bender, Richard, 36, 38
 Berumen, Catalina, 102

biology board of studies, 9
 board of supervisors, Santa Cruz County, 124
 boards of studies, 7
 Brase, Wendell C., 13, 20
 Brown University, 68
 Brown, Edmund G., Jr., 42
 budget council, 43, 44
 budget crisis, 1, 42, 62, 108
 building and grounds committee, 35
 Burns, Jim, 2
 bursars, 53
 Bush, Vannevar, 11

C

Cabrillo College, 117
 Cabrillo Music Festival, 129
 California Civil Rights Initiative, 72
 California Institute of Technology, 6
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, 118
 California Post Secondary Education Commission [CPEC], 108
 California State University, Monterey Bay, 113, 118
 campus academic planning council [CAPC], 46
 campus advisory board, 28
 campus advisory council, 24
 campus facilities, 20
 campus growth, 46
 Campus Master Plan, 35, 36
 campus physical planning advisory committee, 37
 campus physical planning committee, 34

Casper, Gerhard, 78, 100
 chancellor's professorship and lectureship
 program, 66
 Chicano/Latino students, 67
 Christopherson, Carolyn, 106
Chronicle of Higher Education, 77
City on a Hill Press, 17, 66, 90, 132
 Civil Rights Movement, 59
 Cold War, 12
 college system, 51, 53, 55
 Colleges Nine and Ten, 39
 committee on academic personnel, 10, 98
 committee on educational policy, 20, 28,
 107
 committee on planning and budget, 28, 107
 Concerned Students, 26
 Connerly, Ward, 70, 74
 core courses, 57
 Corriden, Janice V., 120
 council of chancellors, 24, 81
 council of provosts, 54
 Cowan, Michael H., 19
 Cowell College, 15
 Crook, Ruth, 13
 Crown College, 14
Currents, 67, 107

D

Daily Californian, 10
 Department of Defense, 116
 development, 23, 93
 Discover UC Santa Cruz, 129
 distance education, 122
 diversity, 78
 diversity task force, 64
 Dizikes, John, 20
 Domhoff, G. William, 125
 Dyson, Allan J., 98

E

Eastin, Delaine, 120
 education board, 118
 electrical engineering program, 47
 Elf Land, 31
 Elf Land crisis, 41
 endowed chairs, 104
 engineering school, 47
 proposal to establish, 108
 enrollment crisis, 91, 109
 environmental studies
 graduate program in, 109
 environmentalism, 36
 Evans, J. Handel, 115

executive vice chancellor, 16
 extended university, 123

F

faculty
 diversity of, 65
 Farr, Fred, 126
 Farr, Sam, 126
Fish Rap Live!, 132
 Fisher, Andrew, 116
 Fort Ord, 115
 Fox, Laurel R., 112
 Frazer, William, 126
 Frazer, William R., 1, 126
 Free Speech Movement, 10
 Friends of the Great Meadow, 14
 fundraising, 57, 98

G

Gardner, David P., 1, 2, 5, 79, 80, 82, 84,
 123, 126
 Gardner, Libby, 80
 Gill, James B., 114, 115
 grade option, 93
 graduate education, 89, 108
 Graduate Student Association, 29
 Great Meadow, 14, 33, 39
 Greene, Billie L., 18, 26
 Gruhn, Isebill V., 17
Guidelines for Campus Planning, 38

H

Hall, Paul J., 35
 Hance, Judi, 13, 18
 Hankamer, Jorge, 107
 Harvard University, 77
 Hauk, Stephanie, 13, 23, 34, 124
 Hernandez, Francisco J., 25, 63
 Herschman, Larry, 110
 Hewlett Foundation, 54, 57
 Heyman, Ira Michael, 5, 99
 Heyns, Roger W., 10
 Hitch, Charles J., 14, 84, 123
 Holst, James E., 69
 Hopkins Marine Station, 117
 Hopwood v. Texas, 72
 housing needs, 126
 Hullar, Theodore L., 82
 human resources, 23

I

Ilano, Eli, 30

institutional planning, 47
 Irwin, Elizabeth, 120

J

Jensen, Richard W., 22
 Johnson, Edith, 116
 Junco, Tirso del, 127

K

Kerr, Clark, 5, 7, 8, 33, 42
 Kliger, David S., 113
 Kresge College, 40, 56
 Krevans, Julius R., 82

L

labor relations, 23
 Laporte, Leo F., 57
 Leadership Opportunity Awards Program,
 70, 97
 Leadership Opportunity Program, 19
 Leiman, Arnold L., 3
 letter grade option, 93
 Levin, Anne, 129
 Lewis, Anthony, 45
 logging, 40
 Long Marine Laboratory, 97
 Long Range Development Plan, 35, 37, 50,
 123
Los Angeles Times, 69, 80
 Loshkajian, Nancy V., 106

M

Machotka, Pavel, 38
 MacPherson, Bruce, 127
 Marina, California, 116
 Martin, Lora Lee, 114, 115
 Mary Porter Sesnon Art Gallery, 129
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 5, 7
 Mathematics Engineering Science
 Achievement Program [MESA], 59
 Matute-Bianchi, Maria Eugenia, 25
 Mauchlan, Errol W., 22, 44
 McHenry, Dean E., 7, 38, 47, 57, 121
 McQuitta, Willeen, 64
 Mendoza, Manuel R., 21
 Merrill College, 14, 57
 Meyer Drive extension, 14, 33, 39
 Minority Engineering Program [MEP], 60
 Moll, Richard, 92
 Monterey Bay Aquarium, 117
 Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute,
 111

Monterey Bay Educational Consortium, 117
 Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary,
 112
 Monterey Bay Regional Studies program,
 112
 Monterey County, 118
 Monterey Institute of International Studies,
 117, 126
 Monterey Peninsula College, 117
 Moran, Carrol, 119
 Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, 117
 Moss, Peat, 41
 Museum of Art and History at the
 McPherson Center, 129
 music facility, 14, 34, 41

N

Narrative Evaluation System [NES], 88, 93
 National Science Foundation, 11, 12
*Natural History of the UC Santa Cruz
 Campus*, 36
 Natural Reserve System, 115
 natural sciences division, 9, 111
 Nauenberg, Michael, 14
 Naval Postgraduate School, 117
 Nelson, Randy, 67
Notice, 7

O

Oakes College, 25, 57
 Oakland Tech High School, 59
 Oberlin College, 106
 ocean science and technology, 111
 Oiled Wildlife Recovery Facility, 126
 Orbach, Raymond L., 82
 outreach programs, 71, 78

P

Packard Foundation, 111
 Packard, David, 111
 Packard, Julie, 111
 Pajaro Valley Unified School District, 118
 Panetta, Leon E., 113
 Patton, Gary J., 124
 Peltason, Jack W., 74, 79, 82
 Pepper, James E., 34
 Pister Report, 1, 7
 Pister, Karl S., 6
 accepting chancellorship at UCSC, 4
 appointment as interim chancellor of UC
 Santa Cruz, 2
 as dean of engineering, 93

interaction with students, 28
 investiture of, 62
 United States Navy, 21
 Pister, Kristofer S.J., 12
 Pister, Rita Olsen, 2
 Poodry, Clifton A., 63
 Predock, Antoine, 34
 Proposition 187, 33
 provosts, 53

Q

Quann, James C., 30

R

rate attentive outreach, 78
 Reagan, Ronald W., 42
 recession, 46
 recruitment, 93
 Regents of the University of California
 and affirmative action, 69
 Regents of the University of California v.
 Bakke, 73
 research universities, 11, 89
 retention, 93
 Rotkin, Michael, 34, 125
 Ruby, Ronald, 33
 Rudenstine, Neil, 77

S

Salinas, California, 124
 San Benito County, 118
San Francisco Chronicle, 80, 98, 100
San Jose Mercury News, 2
 San Jose State University, 115, 116
 Santa Barbara Normal School, 90
 Santa Clara County, 120
 Santa Clara University, 116
 Santa Cruz, 125
 Santa Cruz Baroque Festival, 129
 Santa Cruz City Council, 124, 125
 Santa Cruz County, 118
 Santa Cruz County Office of Education,
 118
 Santa Cruz Foundation, 96
Santa Cruz Sentinel, 2, 40, 50, 124, 125
 Santa Cruz, California, 124
 Saxon, David S., 12, 14, 82, 84
 Schraer, Rosemary S.J., 82
 Scott, Peter L., 14, 34
 Scotts Valley, California, 124
 Seaborg, Glenn, 58
 shared governance, 32, 75

Silicon Valley, 116
 Simmons, Valerie M., 62, 64
 Sinsheimer, Karen, 131
 Sinsheimer, Robert L., 5, 7, 11, 28, 47, 51,
 87, 88, 90, 92, 131
 Siri, Diane, 118
 Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, 38
 Smith, Brant, 30
 Smith, Mary Perry, 59
 Somerton, Wilbur, 59
 staff
 at UC Santa Cruz, 20, 134
 Stanford University, 7, 78, 100, 116
 statewide academic senate committee on
 educational policy, 123
 Stevens, Robert B., 1, 13, 111, 124
Strands of a Life, 86
 student activism, 25
 student affairs, 25, 63
 Student Affirmative Action and
 Educational Opportunity Programs, 62
 student center, 35
 student demonstrations, 41
 student organizations, 28
 Student Union Assembly, 29, 30
 Sullivan, James, 103
 Swain, Donald C., 59

T

Tanner, Eileen, 129
 Tanner, R. Michael, 15, 16, 22, 26, 44, 77
 task force on faculty rewards, 6
 Taylor, Alice, 4
 Taylor, Angus E., 5, 20
 Taylor, Marion, 4
 tenth campus of University of California
 planning for, 1
 Tepper, Jan, 27, 40
 Tharp, Roland G., 118
 Thompson, J. Michael, 63, 92
 Tien, Chang-Lin, 3, 4, 68, 82, 98
 Tjerandsen, Carl, 121
 town-gown relations, 38, 51, 120, 123, 124
 transportation planning, 125

U

UC Berkeley, 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 23, 43, 51,
 59, 60, 61, 63, 88, 94, 110, 116
 UC Davis, 36, 59, 87
 UC Irvine, 2
 UC Los Angeles, 7, 87, 88, 110
 UC Riverside, 87
 UC San Diego, 36, 76, 87, 90, 110

UC Santa Barbara, 87, 90
 UC Santa Cruz
 campus growth, 50
 involvement at Fort Ord, 113
 UC Santa Cruz Alumni Association, 106
UC Santa Cruz Review, 70
 UCSC Arboretum, 97
 Uehling, Barbara S., 82
 undergraduate education, 58, 89
 undergraduate internship program, 30
 undergraduate teaching, 7
 underrepresented students, 59, 66
 United States Army, 114
 United States Department of Commerce,
 114
 United States Navy Fleet Numeric
 Oceanographic Center (FNOC), 117

university advancement, 95
 University Extension, 121
 University House, 13, 39, 41, 129
 University of Texas, 72
 University of Texas law school, 72
 University Women's Club, 130

W

Watsonville, California, 120, 124
 Wilkening, Laurel L., 82

Y

Yang, Henry T., 82
 Young, Charles E., 82, 83