

# UC Santa Cruz

## Institutional History of UCSC

### Title

Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor David Kliger

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/66q09369>

### Authors

Kliger, David  
Reti, Irene

### Publication Date

2012-12-21

### Supplemental Material

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/66q09369#supplemental>

## Table of Contents

Introduction	i
Early History	1
Studying Chemistry at Rutgers University	3
Graduate Studies and Political Activism at Cornell University	6
Postdoctoral Work at Harvard University	10
Applying to UC Santa Cruz	11
Arriving at UC Santa Cruz in 1971	14
Chemistry Board of Studies	16
The Early Years of Kresge College	18
Transferring to Oakes College	25
Chancellor Robert Sinsheimer	28
Chair of the Chemistry Department at UC Santa Cruz, 1985-1988	32
Chancellor Robert Stevens	34
The Loma Prieta Earthquake of 1989	36
Chair of the Academic Senate, 1988-1990	37
Dean of Natural Sciences, 1990-2005	40
Planning an Engineering School	47
Other Accomplishments as Dean	51
Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor, 2005-2010	56

Establishing Six Priorities for the CP/EVC	57
The Long Range Development Plan of 2005	62
Working with Chancellor Denice Denton	63
Student Protests during the UC Regents' Meeting at UCSC in 2006	66
Campus Academic Plan	67
Budget Crisis	74
Delivering the Bad News: The Challenges of Being CP/EVC	76
Key Colleagues	78
Chancellor George Blumenthal	81
UCSC's Silicon Valley Research Efforts	82
Chancellor MRC Greenwood	85
Rebenching	86
More on Student Protests	90
Reflections on Serving as CP/EVC	99
Reflections on UC Santa Cruz	103
The Kliger Research Group	107

## Early History

**Reti:** Today is April 25, 2011, and this is Irene Reti of the Regional History Project at the library. I'm here with David Kliger, retired CP/EVC, and we're going to start Dave's oral history today. We are at the Science & Engineering Library. So Dave, let's start with what year were you born?

**Kliger:** I was born in 1943.

**Reti:** And where?

**Kliger:** In Newark, New Jersey. I was born in Newark. I lived in Irvington, which is a town right next to Newark. I lived in an apartment building with my parents and my three sisters until I was twelve. Then we moved out to Springfield, New Jersey, which is a suburb, and was a whole different life from the city.

**Reti:** The Springfield area of New Jersey at that time must have still been pretty rural.

**Kliger:** Springfield was fairly rural. We lived in a complex of five or six houses that were built fairly recently and then just maybe a quarter mile from us was farm country. It was nice. You could get fresh corn.

**Reti:** Yes, it's great corn country. So what did your parents do?

**Kliger:** My father was a court reporter and my mother stayed at home until we were ten or eleven, and then she was a receptionist at a beauty parlor.

**Reti:** Were you the first person in your family to go to college?

**Kliger:** My sisters and I were. I have two sisters. Both of my sisters went to a teacher's college. My oldest sister went on to become a kindergarten teacher. My younger sister—both of my sisters were older than me—but the middle one started out teaching art, hated teaching, and then became a social worker, where she ran a program for youth in a town in southern New Jersey.

**Reti:** And were you interested in science going way back in your life?

**Kliger:** I can't remember exactly when I started being interested in science, but I was interested in science at a pretty early age, which is kind of strange because when I lived in Irvington the schools never offered any science classes. So I didn't have any science until about the eighth grade, when I moved to Springfield. But I was still interested in science. My interest in chemistry probably started when my parents bought me a chemistry kit as a toy. So for me, science *was* chemistry. I didn't know that there were other kinds of sciences.

**Reti:** And after you got that chemistry set and you got interested in chemistry, did you actually think, I'm going to become a chemist when I grow up?

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** Wow.

**Kliger:** It was kind of strange. This was pure accident, I'm sure, but when I was in high school I had a teacher who gave us an assignment to say what you want to do when you grow up and how are you going to get there? I said I was going to be a chemist, and since I lived in New Jersey I said I would go to Rutgers as a chemistry major and then I would go to graduate school at Cornell because I had

read that it had a really good chemistry department. I didn't know anything about these things, really, but that's exactly what I wound up doing.

**Reti:** That's incredible, Dave!

**Kliger:** Yes. (laughs)

**Reti:** So were there mentors at the high school besides the teacher who helped you think about the future?

**Kliger:** No, not really. And my experience in high school chemistry was pretty bad. I mean, we would have a chemistry lab and all we would do was heat up glass tubing in a Bunsen burner and then put it in water and watch it break. (laughs) It was a pretty bad class.

### **Studying Chemistry at Rutgers University**

**Reti:** So what year did you go to Rutgers?

**Kliger:** I went to Rutgers from 1961 to 1965. I was a chemistry major. I really did not like organic chemistry, but when I got to be a junior I had physical chemistry, and I loved physical chemistry so that sort of set my direction. I took a lot of physics and math as an undergraduate because as I went on and on I discovered that I really loved physics even more than chemistry. I suppose I'm not supposed to admit that as a chemistry faculty (laughs) but—

**Reti:** (laughs) And what was it about physical chemistry more than organic chemistry that drew you?

**Kliger:** Well, the organic chemistry class that I had as an undergraduate was all memorization. It was all about these exotic reactions you had to memorize. I hate to memorize things. I just like to understand things. I figure, if it's in a book I can look it up. I don't have to remember things. But in this class you had to memorize everything, so that just drove me crazy.

**Reti:** That sounds pretty ghastly.

**Kliger:** Yes. But in physical chemistry you were actually thinking of the physical principles behind the reactions and trying to understand what was happening, and what were the driving forces. That just fascinated me.

**Reti:** Okay. So Rutgers in the mid-sixties—what was the social environment like there?

**Kliger:** It was very conservative, actually. In the mid-sixties it was the start of the Vietnam War, but you wouldn't have known any of that at Rutgers. I was not exposed to any of those things at that time. I just did my work and studied. I got involved in senior research starting in my junior year. That was a great experience. That actually set the direction for what I was going to do later.

**Reti:** How so?

**Kliger:** Well, I worked with a faculty member, Irwin Tobias, who was a theoretician. He was studying lasers and how lasers worked. So I would do these calculations. He was an incredible teacher. I would work over the summer with him. I would come in and I would sit down with him, and he would teach me something, and it all made perfect sense. I would go home and I would think

about it and I'd realize that there were some things that didn't make sense about what he was telling me. So I would come back the next week and I'd say, "I don't understand this part." And he would say, "Good. You're right. It's more complicated than what I told you. So here's what's really going on." And the same thing would happen every week. It would get more complicated but he would let me figure out what didn't make sense. It was just a great learning experience.

**Reti:** That's a great teacher.

**Kliger:** That's a great teacher. So not only did I learn to really think about things more deeply, but also I was interested in how lasers worked, so when I went to graduate school there was a research group that was using lasers to study chemical kinetics. I just naturally went in that direction.

**Reti:** Was that all new at that time, the lasers?

**Kliger:** Yes, it really was—I mean, thinking back about the experiments we did then—it was pretty remarkable. Things that would have taken me a couple of months to do in an experiment people can now do in five minutes. It's just amazing. We had lasers where you'd take a shot of a laser and then you had to wait precisely three minutes before you took another shot because the laser had to cool down just to the right temperature. So you'd take a shot every three minutes, whereas now there are lasers that give pulses a thousand times a second. So it's a very different world.

## **Graduate Studies and Political Activism at Cornell University**

**Reti:** Yes, it is. So then you went on to Cornell?

**Kliger:** Yes. I went there in 1965. That was a whole different experience. I wound up working with a faculty member by the name of Andreas Albrecht, who was really a good scientist but also very politically active. So people in his group sort of naturally got involved in politics more than I had been used to before.

**Reti:** What kind of politics?

**Kliger:** Well, he was a Marxist. He was a hard-core leftist. So we used to have really interesting political arguments in that group all the time.

**Reti:** Where were your political leanings at that point in your life?

**Kliger:** Well, when I first entered Cornell I really hadn't been thinking very much about politics. But I pretty quickly became fairly leftist myself.

**Reti:** I remember reading that, and this was of course in reference to some of the protests that happened at UCSC, which we will get to hours from now in the oral history we are doing. But you had said that you had been active in protests yourself during your college years.

**Kliger:** Right.

**Reti:** I was wondering if you would be willing to talk about that a little bit.

**Kliger:** Yes. There were actually three aspects of the protests during the Cornell years. One was that the Vietnam War was going on, and this was in the later

sixties when people got much more aware of what was going on, and so I got involved in anti-war protests. I would go down to Washington, D.C. to the big protests in Washington, and there'd be lots of rallies on campus and that sort of thing. So that was one aspect. A second aspect was that it was a time when African American students were just starting to voice the problems that they had at Cornell. I got involved there as well in supporting the Black Student Union and trying to get things changed at Cornell to make it a more hospitable environment for those students. Then the third thing—I think it was probably because of the general atmosphere of protest and all sorts of things—the graduate students were protesting how they were being treated. So I got involved in a group that was forming a graduate student union, at the time.

That actually was a really important part of my development as a professional. You wouldn't think so, but I was extremely shy at that point. So when I went to a seminar in the department, for example, if I even thought of asking a question I would get sick to my stomach. I knew that I couldn't ask the question, but even thinking about it upset me. But these issues made me really angry, so I started speaking up. What happened was that I noticed that no terrible things happened when I spoke up, and I could actually speak and have some influence in what was going on in the department, on the campus. So that really opened me up to being able to speak more in public and say what I believed in.

**Reti:** Were you afraid of being drafted at that point?

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** That was happening to everybody.

**Kliger:** That was happening to a lot of people, yes.

**Reti:** But you didn't end up having to go.

**Kliger:** I didn't. I wound up having a low enough draft number so that it never became an issue for me.

**Reti:** And did you ever travel South for any of the Civil Rights work?

**Kliger:** No, I knew some people who had and I was in touch with them on local protests, but I never went down South to do that.

**Reti:** I don't really think of Ithaca or Cornell as being a very African American friendly place, even now.

**Kliger:** Right.

**Reti:** So I could imagine that there would have been a lot of work to do just right there in Ithaca.

**Kliger:** Yes. Yes. The same with the Vietnam War, actually. One of the people who I worked with on my research committee was Roald Hoffman, who was a theoretician. He actually later got the Nobel Prize in chemistry. And he was very much against anti-war protests. But he could see that people cared passionately about it. He talked to his students and said, "If you care deeply about this you have to go to Washington and protest. If you can't afford it I'll pay for your way."

**Reti:** Well, that's extraordinary.

**Kliger:** So even though he was against the protests, he thought it was important for people to speak out about what they believe in, and he put his money where his mouth was. I thought that was very impressive.

**Reti:** Did you have a sense when you were living through those times that they were of historical significance?

**Kliger:** Yes— The protests in Ithaca were never that big. It's a fairly small place. But when you go to Washington and you're—I don't know how many people were really on the Mall in some of those protests, but it felt like there were a million people when you were there, and it was just body-to-body from the Capital all the way to the Lincoln Memorial—you felt like it was part of history. We probably felt more powerful than we really were, but it felt that way.

**Reti:** Yes. So you were at Cornell and then you got a postdoc at Harvard?

**Kliger:** Yes. At Cornell I was doing experimental work where we used pulse lasers to try to understand what the absorption of excited states of molecules would look like. I was studying that, and I decided that I should get a postdoc. I wanted to do something different. I wanted to learn some theory. So I looked up who was doing interesting theory in the country and I came up with twenty, twenty-five names. I went to my thesis advisor and he said, "Just tell me who you really want to work with and I'll write a letter." I told him about this one person at Harvard, Martin Karplus. He said, "Okay." He wrote and called Martin. And Martin offered me a postdoc. (laughs)

**Reti:** That's great!

### **Postdoctoral Work at Harvard University**

**Kliger:** That was an easy way to do it. So then I spent about a year and a half at Harvard.

**Reti:** What was that like?

**Kliger:** I was one of those very rare people who hated Boston. (laughs) Everybody loves Boston. But I got used to the country life in Cornell. Ithaca is very much like Santa Cruz—it's this beautiful country. Boston is a city. It's dirty and crowded. So I really did not like it. And also, at Cornell I would be talking to Andy, and I would just go in whenever and ask him questions and argue about things and that sort of thing. Whereas at Harvard I would have to make an appointment to see Martin two weeks in advance, and half the time he would cancel at the last minute. So it was a very different experience. It wasn't as rich an experience as Cornell had been. I still got involved in protests there, but there it was all anti-war protests and not as intense as it had been at Cornell.

**Reti:** Not as intense?

**Kliger:** Right.

**Reti:** More sort of New England restrained or—

**Kliger:** (laughs) I'm not sure why. Maybe it was just that I knew a bigger group of people who were involved in the protests at Cornell than I got to know at Harvard.

**Reti:** I don't know quite how to ask this—but here you were interested in theoretical chemistry—and then there's all this political protest going on. Were those two separate worlds for you?

**Kliger:** Yes. They were both pretty intense. I was working hard in the lab but then there would be time to go and get involved in protests. But it really was separate worlds.

### **Applying to UC Santa Cruz**

**Reti:** Okay. So then came time to look for a job.

**Kliger:** Right. So this was 1970. It was not a great time to be looking for jobs. There weren't a lot of jobs right then. I must have applied to, oh, over a hundred places. And this is going to sound strange, but I was married at the time and my wife and I decided that there were two areas where I would not apply for jobs. One was the South. I had a bias that people in the South were bigoted and I didn't want to live there. The other was California.

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** (laughs) Because California had these earthquakes and it was so dangerous and it was just silly to move to California.

**Reti:** Well, that's a real East Coast view.

**Kliger:** I had never been west of Ohio and even that just once. Usually I spent my life between New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts. I was very much East Coast.

I remember the 10 o'clock news—when they were talking about California they would always say, “And now a story from the land of fruits and nuts.”

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** (laughs) There was a very strong anti-California bias on the East Coast. But it was really because of the earthquake danger that we decided we weren't going to apply to California.

But the person I worked with at Cornell took a sabbatical here. He called me and said, “You know, they have a job opening at Santa Cruz and you should really look at that.” I had never even heard of Santa Cruz. But I looked into it. It looked interesting. So I applied. And because the people here knew Andy and he gave me a good recommendation, they invited me out for an interview. Although that actually took a long time, because just like now, Santa Cruz didn't have much money. And it cost a lot to fly somebody out from the East Coast. So I would get a call—Roger Anderson was actually on the search committee and he would call me. There's a place where all the theoretical chemists hang out at Harvard called Prince House, and a whole bunch of us were looking for jobs at the time. So I would get a call from Santa Cruz and I would be talking to Roger for a half an hour or so. Then he'd say, “Well, it was good talking to you,” and he hung up. Everybody said, “What's going on?” Because usually when you get a call it's to invite you to give a seminar or something. So I figured maybe I said something wrong and they're not interested in me. But then a week or so later I would get another call. So he was interviewing me over and over again on the phone and it took several calls before they finally decided that they were going to invite me

out. I think part of it was that it was really complicated at Santa Cruz at the time because every faculty member was a faculty member in a department and a fellow of a college. The college, and the department (which at the time was called the board of studies) jointly decided who would be hired. So at that time it was going to be chemistry and Kresge College.

**Reti:** Why Kresge?

**Kliger:** Because they were the ones who had a position at that point.

**Reti:** Boy, that sounds so complicated, to try to figure out which college wants to take on a faculty person at the same time that that had to be coordinated with a board of studies—

**Kliger:** It was kind of messy. Yes. So actually I was talking to the person I was working with at Harvard, and he said that somebody from Kresge College had called and they weren't asking about my chemistry. They wanted to know about my politics. Was I involved in politics? So he said, "Well, he's so involved in politics I never see him around the lab." Well, apparently he figured out that that's what they wanted to hear. Because the very next week I got a call to invite me out to give a talk at Santa Cruz. You interviewed in the department and you interviewed in the college and somehow they decided that I was okay.

**Reti:** What was the interview at the college like?

**Kliger:** It was interesting. This was the first year of Kresge, 1971. The college hadn't even started yet but they had a core group of students and a few faculty who were doing the hiring to get the college going the next year. So you'd sit

around—they were big on T-grouping in the college, and you'd sit around in a circle and people would have—

**Reti:** T-grouping?

**Kliger:** It's what's called an encounter group, I guess. They wanted to know what I was doing. I would tell them how I was involved in political things, and I would tell the chemists what I was involved with in my research. Somehow the two groups thought that was okay and so they hired me.

### **Arriving at UC Santa Cruz in 1971**

When I came out here—again, I still had this anti-California bias, but I looked at this place and it was just so beautiful. I figured okay, there might be an earthquake, but until then (laughs) life will be pretty nice. Although I do remember seeing the hills of San Francisco and the hills of Santa Cruz and I wondered, how do people do this when it snows? Then I realized, oh, I guess it doesn't snow very much. (laughs)

**Reti:** Where did you live? Were you on the Westside someplace?

**Kliger:** The first year I had an apartment at what was called Married Student Housing. Now it's called Family Student Housing. But they would have a few apartments for new faculty. Gene Switkes and I were both hired in the same year and we lived next to each other down there. It was very nice. It was interesting because I remember that a lot of the students were complaining about how small the apartments were there. I just thought it was luxurious. It was one of the biggest places I'd ever lived in. I could never understand why people were

complaining about this great housing that they had. They had a nice view of the bay. They were very nice.

**Reti:** And what were your impressions of the campus generally, when you got here?

**Kliger:** Well, first of all, it's a beautiful place. I remember I would go in the morning and walk from the housing to Natural Sciences II. You walk through these paths through the woods and it was just so peaceful and nice. It seemed like a lot of people were upset all the time. I could never understand how people could be so upset living in such an idyllic place. But it seems like there were a lot of people—well now, too, a lot of people get upset about all sorts of issues. I've always thought, if they just walked through the woods for a little while it wouldn't be so bad. (laughs)

**Reti:** Was it politics that they were upset about?

**Kliger:** Yes, the standard faculty politics, I guess.

**Reti:** So it seemed more *kvetchy* and complaining than the East Coast?

**Kliger:** I don't know that it was more than the East Coast. It's just that I was in a new role and I got to see it more. I'm sure the politics at any university are at least as bad as here. In fact, I think in most places it's much worse than here.

**Reti:** Were you aware that you were joining what was quite a new institution? At that point the campus itself was six years old.

**Kliger:** Well, in fact after I came out here and saw what was going on, that's one of the things that really attracted me. Because I had interviewed at some other places that were much more traditional, and I really didn't like the atmosphere there. But here there was much more of an emphasis on the students, much more caring about the quality of teaching, much more care about societal issues in general. I thought, this is what a university should be like. So it was really the very different place that attracted me here. I had interviewed at MIT, for example, and after one day of interviewing there it was clear to me they didn't want me and I didn't want them. I just could not see being in a place like that, whereas, this just felt like home.

### **Chemistry Board of Studies**

**Reti:** How did you find your students in chemistry?

**Kliger:** They were brilliant. It was a wonderful time because I would have a class of fifteen students and it seemed like they were all just brilliant. In fact, I think what's happened over the years as the campus has gotten much bigger, I think the average quality of the students has gone down but you still have a similar number of really great students. But Santa Cruz at the time was the hardest campus to get into, so the quality of the student body was really quite extraordinary.

**Reti:** That was before the enrollment crisis?

**Kliger:** Much before, yes.

**Reti:** Because I know by the time I got here in 1978 as a student there was an enrollment crisis. So somewhere in the late seventies is when that started.<sup>1</sup>

**Kliger:** Exactly.

**Reti:** But when you got here it was still this very prestigious, cream of the crop, public university.

**Kliger:** Yes. Right.

**Reti:** What about the chemistry board? What was that like when you got here?

**Kliger:** [pause] That was interesting. Generally the faculty are very nice and people tend to be very cooperative. But there was one senior faculty at the time who pretty much ran things, and the other faculty in the department were pretty much afraid to disagree with him. That was something that really bothered me. By that time I had gotten used to speaking up when I disagreed with something, (laughs) maybe more than I should have if I wanted to get tenure. But I would speak up. Frankly, I always assumed I would not get tenure here because I spoke up too much. But then George Hammond was hired here as the dean—at the time it was called the vice chancellor for natural sciences, but it's what since then become the dean of natural sciences and then physical and biological sciences. I pretty much agreed with George's philosophy on everything, so he really protected me from any of the political problems that I might have had for disagreeing with senior faculty. I always figured he saved my career.

---

<sup>1</sup> "See <http://planning.ucsc.edu/irps/enrollreports.asp> for a table of historical enrollment data at UC Santa Cruz.

**Reti:** And then you mentioned, also, in an interview that you did in *Currents* that—as you were saying earlier, there was the college, Kresge, and then there was the chemistry board. How was that in terms of dividing your time between the department and college service? I know there were issues in the early years in terms of faculty not getting tenure because they spent so much time in the colleges.

### **The Early Years of Kresge College**

**Kliger:** Yes. It was a difficult time. The first year I was here there were probably fifteen new faculty in the college that came there with me. I think by the end of the second year or so, all but one of them had gotten a divorce.

**Reti:** Oh, my God!

**Kliger:** Because it was very intense. At that time the standard load was teaching three courses in your board of studies and three courses in the college, per year. So you were teaching six courses. And then, it was a new college and they had to figure out all the things to do. So there were lots of committees. It was just a huge amount of work. I realized later that a lot of the problem was me because I just got involved in a lot of those committees. I didn't realize that a lot of the faculty just didn't do it. But when I get involved in something I just get involved in something. So I was spending an enormous amount of time in the college. I remember the chair of the department sitting me down once and saying I had to stop this because I would not be getting tenure if I continued to do so much work in the college. But fortunately he was wrong.

**Reti:** The provost of the college—was that Michael Kahn?

**Kliger:** No, it was Bob Edgar. The people who started the college were Bob Edgar as the provost; Michael Kahn, who was a psychology faculty; Matt Sands, who was actually the vice chancellor for natural sciences before George Hammond; and Henry Hilgard. They were the senior faculty there.

**Reti:** A lot of science folks.

**Kliger:** A lot of science folks. The very first year we came, there was this crisis because they wanted to take the new faculty and go off on a retreat and sort of get to know each other and get to decide what the college was going to be like. There were a group of students who were in the *Forming Kresge College* class who were very much against that because they didn't think the faculty should be going off without the students. So you had the senior faculty who had this very strong opinion that the faculty had to go off, and you had the students. And what the students did (they were very smart students), they sat down with the spouses of the faculty and got them angry about the faculty going off on their own and talking. So there was this huge fight in the college in the very first week I was here. I took the sides of the students and the spouses. I said, "You're talking about creating a living, learning community. How can you talk about a community if you're not going to include all of the community members?" So I figured, (laughs) I'm really off to a bad start because I'm alienating the senior faculty in the college and the chair of the department is saying I'm doing too much in the college.

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** So I figured, I won't be here long but I'll do what I think is right while I'm here.

**Reti:** Wow. I mean, Kresge had a wild reputation during those years. Was it as wild as people say it was?

**Kliger:** It wasn't as wild as people talk about. There was a lot of T-grouping and there were what they called kin groups. So there was a group of maybe twenty-five students with a faculty member and they would meet on a regular basis, one or two nights a week they would meet and talk about lots of issues. It was like a little seminar. But people just assumed that there were all kinds of wild things going on in these meetings. At least in my groups there were no wild things going on. (laughs)

**Reti:** There was some very interesting architecture at Kresge as well.

**Kliger:** Yes. I never really liked the architecture of Kresge. But again, the students had a big influence on what the architecture would be like.

**Reti:** That wouldn't happen now.

**Kliger:** It wouldn't happen now, no.

**Reti:** So what kind of classes were you teaching?

**Kliger:** Well, actually the first chemistry class I was assigned to teach was a class in statistical mechanics, which was interesting because I had never had statistical mechanics. I stayed about two weeks ahead of the class. (laughs) I was really struggling with that class. But it was good. I learned a lot when I taught that

class. I would teach physical chemistry in the chemistry board and I would teach these core course sections in Kresge College. We had a three-quarter core course. As a faculty member you'd give one or two lectures in the core course and then you had the discussion section in the core course as well.

**Reti:** What was the theme of the Kresge Core Course?

**Kliger:** It had an environmental emphasis but it was also a lot of sort of pseudo-psychology stuff. I don't remember the details. We should look that up.<sup>2</sup>

But actually, that was another interesting experience—with this T-grouping there was another experience that was really unpleasant at the time but really helped me in my career later. Because there was supposed to be a special way of communicating in groups where you wouldn't have a small subset of the group taking control. It would be a way to really get everybody's ideas out. But what I noticed was there was a special language, and the special language could be used to control the group just as much as any other group. But it was great seeing that because it was like a class for me of how to run committee meetings and groups, and how to get ideas across in groups and how not to, how people can manipulate a group and how to stop a group from being manipulated. That was really very valuable later on when I got involved in other kinds of committees. Bad experiences are good teaching lessons, very often.

**Reti:** I can imagine. It must have been an awful lot of psychology being applied in interesting ways, and the lingo of the time—

---

<sup>2</sup> The *UCSC Catalog* title of Kresge College's core course was *Our Human Environment*.

**Kliger:** Yes. It took me a while to learn the language, but once I learned the language then I could really see how people were being manipulated.

**Reti:** What about Santa Cruz, the community? What was it like at that time?

**Kliger:** The community was wonderful. It was a small town and mostly the town was quite conservative. So you had these real liberal people up on campus, and quite conservative people downtown. But everybody was really respectful of one another. I didn't see a lot of the fights that you see now, where conservatives think liberals are awful and liberals think conservatives are awful. People were able to talk to each other even though they disagreed with each other. So that was really nice. Also, it was small enough so if you walked downtown you'd always bump into people that you knew. It was just a nice atmosphere. The fact that it's changed so much and people take their politics so seriously and dislike people who disagree with them, I don't think is a Santa Cruz issue. I think it's a national and maybe international issue. The whole country is much less tolerant of anybody with opposing views, which is a real sadness for me.

**Reti:** Yes, me too.

Related to that, did you continue as a faculty person at UCSC to be involved in lefty politics, anti-war politics? Because that was certainly still going on here as well.

**Kliger:** Yes. I would still go to protests. Now I would go to San Francisco instead of Washington.

**Reti:** What about on campus?

**Kliger:** Not as much on campus.

**Reti:** I know some faculty have always been sort of visibly out there with their politics, even in the sciences. And some not. It's just an individual choice.

**Kliger:** Here there were two issues. One was the Vietnam War, and as that wound down there was less of that. The other was the whole diversity issue. I got involved in that through Kresge. Actually, one of the interesting things—going back to Cornell—because there was a lot of protest over the treatment of minority students, particularly African American students, two things happened: one, the university decided that they needed to have more sensitivity among their undergraduates for this. So they developed a program so that there would be an orientation week. In the summer before the students came they were to read a bunch of books and then there would be discussions during that orientation week. So I volunteered to do that. I would read all of these books in the summer along with the students and then I would run seminars on sensitivity towards minority students.

**Reti:** This was at Cornell?

**Kliger:** This was at Cornell. This was just a volunteer thing. The other volunteer thing that that got me started in this area was that a group of us started something called Ithaca Neighborhood College. Ithaca is actually a pretty poor area and there are lots of people who never had the opportunity to even finish high school. So we started a neighborhood college and would teach basic high school or college classes to people for free. That was a nice experience, actually. I wound up teaching basic algebra. So that actually then got me started in being

involved in diversity issues—when I went to Harvard I also taught during the summer—they had a program where they would bring minority students from historically Black colleges in the South in the summer to take classes. So I taught there as well.

So that got me started with some of the diversity issues when I came here. This was actually a big issue for Kresge because there were very few minority faculty, very few women faculty when Kresge started. Kresge had the attitude that we needed to increase the diversity. So they would have a program where they would go to the department and say, you need to invite women and minorities to be interviewed. There was a lot of resistance among the departments. After a year there were no women and minorities hired. So Kresge said, “Well, we’re not going to hire *any* faculty until we hire some women and minorities first.” That caused a huge stink among the departments—Kresge was ruining the campus.

**Reti:** So it was really coming from Kresge?

**Kliger:** It was really coming from Kresge.

**Reti:** Interesting. This was before Oakes College existed.

**Kliger:** Yes. There was a lot of resistance. In fact, I believe it was one of the things that pushed the campus to no longer have the colleges involved in hiring faculty. It was that intense.

**Reti:** Very interesting! I don’t think anyone has talked about that in our oral histories thus far.

**Kliger:** Well, that was a big issue for the college. So that got me involved in a number of diversity issues that now seem quaint. It's a whole different level of issues now, and that's because since then we've hired a lot of women and minority faculty who have gotten new ideas presented on campus.

**Reti:** What about the student body at Kresge? Was there an attempt to make that more diverse, or was it diverse to begin with?

**Kliger:** Not as much. It was not very diverse.

**Reti:** Was there a focus on that?

**Kliger:** No, I think the focus on that really came with Oakes and with finally hiring some faculty who raised that as a more important issue.

**Reti:** Because you had Merrill College. Merrill wasn't really involved in this diversity issue?

**Kliger:** Not to my memory. But I was really focused so much on Kresge to the point that I didn't really know what was going on at the time at Merrill and some of the other colleges.

### **Transferring to Oakes College**

But then in the mid-seventies [1977] when Robert Sinsheimer came and he wanted to reorganize the colleges, it was clear that Kresge was going to become a humanities college. So at that time I had to decide what I wanted to do. Even though I had been involved in every aspect of Kresge, I decided that I didn't really have as much to offer a humanities college as I would at Oakes. Because

Oakes at the time really wanted to get minority students involved in science. I figured, I can contribute to that. So then I asked to transfer from Kresge into Oakes.<sup>3</sup>

**Reti:** About when was that?

**Kliger:** The mid-seventies sometime.

**Reti:** Was that when Oakes was just starting?

**Kliger:** Yes. Well, I didn't come in the first year of Oakes. It was probably the second or maybe even the third year of Oakes. There was a Science Center at Oakes.

**Reti:** I remember that.

**Kliger:** It was set up so that you could teach labs there and teach science classes there.

**Reti:** Bill Doyle was one of the early faculty members.

**Kliger:** Bill Doyle was an early faculty member. Jim Gill, Barry Bowman. Actually, George Blumenthal was an early faculty member there. So a number of science faculty.

**Reti:** What was Oakes like during that period?

---

<sup>3</sup> See Roseanne Shensa, Interviewer and Randall Jarrell, editor, *Oakes College: An Oral History* (Regional History Project, University Library, 2011) at <http://digitalcollections.ucsc.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p265101coll13/id/3769>

**Kliger:** It was fairly traditional. Herman Blake was the provost. I learned a lot from Herman. Herman was great. Herman could see the strain that was placed on a lot of faculty at Kresge and other places. So he really took faculty development very seriously. He didn't want to burn out faculty. He took student diversity very seriously and really cared a lot about making this a good experience for students. But he also cared about the faculty. He thought that it was important that all of the ethnic groups should understand each other and work together and appreciate each other's diversity. That often didn't happen. What happened at Oakes to some extent, and it tends to happen everywhere, is that where you get groups of minority people they go off and they stay together and they don't really mix. So the hope of getting all of the different groups to mix together is a very difficult thing to do.

**Reti:** Herman Blake was a real visionary.

**Kliger:** He was. The one bad experience I had at Oakes was when I was the chair of the faculty at Oakes and Herman was going to take a leave. I don't remember if it was a sabbatical. He was going to be gone for a while. They needed a new provost to be there. Bob Sinsheimer called me in and asked if I would be the provost. I said that I needed to talk to the faculty first. I went to the faculty executive committee and they said no, I should not be the provost because they needed to have a minority person who was the provost of the college. So I went to Bob Sinsheimer and I said, "No, I won't do it." Bob was upset because he said

that that was a racist attitude. I said, "Well, maybe so, but I'm not going to be the provost of a college that doesn't want me as the provost."<sup>4</sup>

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** I went back, and actually the way the faculty had said it is, "The leadership of the college has to be minority." So I went back and I resigned as chair of the faculty. A lot of the faculty got very upset that I would do that. I said, "Well, you made it very clear that the leadership of the college has to be a minority and I consider the chair of the faculty to be a leadership position, so you need to find a minority faculty to do that." The only person in the college who understood what I was saying and supported me was Herman.

**Reti:** Hmm. That's kind of paradoxical.

**Kliger:** It was. It was strange.

### **Chancellor Robert Sinsheimer**

**Reti:** So how did the campus change as Chancellor Bob Sinsheimer arrived? I certainly remember the reorganization in 1979.

**Kliger:** Right.

**Reti:** But before that.

**Kliger:** Well, the reorganization was the big thing. I think Bob's view was he wanted to professionalize the campus and make it more research-active. I didn't

---

<sup>4</sup> See Randall Jarrell, ed. *Robert L. Sinsheimer: University of California, Santa Cruz during a Critical Decade, 1977-1987*, (Regional History Project, University Library, 1996.)

see that much change because I was mostly involved in the sciences and they were already pretty much research-active. There were graduate programs in every one of the science departments. So I didn't see that much of a change in the sciences. I think it was a huge change in the humanities and social sciences because most of those programs did not have graduate programs. The faculty were involved in research but it was a different type, and they were spread all over the campus in the colleges so that they weren't talking to each other as much. So Bob really was the catalyst to start that whole process of reimagining what the departments were. He focused on reorganizing the colleges. But I think the biggest effect was what happened as a result of that in the departments. Because now you see departments together. The economics department is all over in the engineering building. Psychology is all in one college. Now we have social sciences buildings and humanities buildings, where there was none of that at that time. It was Bob Sinsheimer who sowed the seeds for that to happen.

**Reti:** How did you feel about that at the time? Do you remember?

**Kliger:** Okay— Other than, I felt like Kresge was my home at the time and I would no longer fit into Kresge. But when I realized that I could contribute to Oakes and move to Oakes then it was fine. So it didn't really change my life very much at all.

**Reti:** Did Oakes have a core course as well?

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** So you still had a college-focused existence.

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** Did the reorganization make a kind of sense to you.

**Kliger:** Yes, it did. I taught a little bit in the core course at Oakes and I also taught a chemistry course in Oakes with a lecturer, Peter Nemes. He was actually a graduate student in chemistry and he was a lecturer in Oakes. He was a great teacher so it was a good experience teaching with him. He's now a lecturer at San Jose State.

**Reti:** I realize we skipped over something that I should at least touch on, which is the Christensen years.<sup>5</sup>

**Kliger:** Yes. I wasn't involved so much in the Christensen years, the Christensen year, I guess. It wasn't a very long period. I know the faculty were very upset and got him ousted. But I wasn't really involved in any of that. My only experience of him was that when the chancellor would have parties his wife would never participate in any of those. So he would have a life-sized cardboard cut-out of his wife standing next to him in the reception line. I always thought this was really strange. But that was my only contact with him.

It caused an interesting problem for me in later years. (This is jumping ahead a little bit.) But when I was chair of the senate, Robert Stevens was the chancellor. There was a lot of faculty upsetness over his chancellorship. There were actually some faculty and some administrators who went up and talked to the president

---

<sup>5</sup> Mark Christensen was the second chancellor of UC Santa Cruz and served from July 1974 to January 1976. He resigned because the UCSC faculty expressed a lack of confidence in his performance.

of the University and said, “This isn’t working out. He’s got to go.” But the senate was not involved in trying to push out him at all. But I got a call from the vice president of the University [of California] saying that I better keep the senate under control because if we kicked out Bob Stevens he was going to park this campus.<sup>6</sup>

**Reti:** Whoa!

**Kliger:** It was a very direct, very blunt threat that I needed to— (laughs)

**Reti:** “Park.”

**Kliger:** Yes. It was a strange time to be chair of the senate because a lot of faculty were very upset at me because they thought I was supporting the chancellor too much. The chancellor was upset at me because he felt I was not supporting him enough. So everybody was mad at the time. It was a strange couple of years.

**Reti:** I guess that contributed to the reputation UCSC has at systemwide as being ungovernable.

**Kliger:** Exactly. Exactly. Which I don’t think is true. I don’t think it was ever ungovernable. But it certainly got that reputation from the combination of Christensen and then Stevens.

**Reti:** There are some people who say, “Well, Bob Sinsheimer saved this place.”

---

<sup>6</sup> See Randall Jarrell, ed., *Robert B. Stevens: UCSC Chancellorship, 1987-1991* (Regional History Project, University Library, 1999).

**Kliger:** I don't know if he saved the place. I think he was one of the real influential people on the campus. I think people don't appreciate how influential he was for the campus. Of course Dean McHenry was the most influential in getting the campus started. I think the others who were most influential would be Bob Sinsheimer and MRC Greenwood.

**Reti:** Today is Monday, May 9, 2011 and this is Irene Reti and I am here with David Kliger for our second interview. We're at the Science and Engineering Library. Today we're going to focus on your time as chair of the chemistry department, as dean of natural sciences, and chair of the academic senate.

### **Chair of the Chemistry Department at UC Santa Cruz, 1985-1988**

So let's start with your time as chair of the chemistry department, how that happened, and what that was like.

**Kliger:** I was chair of the department from 1985 to 1988. I would say the most significant thing was that at that time the department didn't have a great reputation on the campus. The department really, like every department, wanted to expand and improve. Frank Drake was the dean at the time. I would talk to him about what are the prospects of the department increasing, and trying to convince him that in fact the department actually was higher quality than the on campus reputation suggested. But it seemed clear that we weren't going to dramatically change the on-campus reputation. So I made the decision at that time that what we needed to do is focus on one area of chemistry and really create a very strong program in that area, because we weren't going to grow

dramatically, and if we tried to just put one in column A and one column B we would never really dramatically improve the quality of the department.

**Reti:** And that was because there were limited resources for growing dramatically?

**Kliger:** Yes. I mean, that's been an ongoing issue for the campus in general, but I think it was particularly true at that time in the sciences and within the sciences in chemistry. Looking at the department at the time, it seemed to me that the strongest faculty were in the area of biochemistry/biophysics. So I convinced the department that that was an area that we really needed to focus on. Over the next—actually for many years—we really focused on that area, got a very strong biochemistry/biophysics group. It's only been in recent years that the department has said, "Now, that's really strong. Let's start focusing on another area." And they began focusing more on materials chemistry in recent years.

I think that really helped to do several things: One, it improved the reputation of the department on the campus. Probably the reason for that is we hired some very good faculty who brought in a lot of extramural funding. That always helps your on-campus reputation, when the department can bring in funding, not only because it's an external recognition of the quality of your work, but it helps everybody if a department can bring in money from the outside.

**Reti:** Sure. Who were some of those faculty who arrived at that time?

**Kliger:** Glenn Milhauser. One person we hired at that time who wasn't in biochemistry was Ilan Benjamin. Joe Konopelski was hired at that time. Pradip Mascharak was hired at that time.

So that was my main accomplishment as chair of the department. That was 1985-87. Then in 1988-89 I became chair of the senate. That was an interesting time.

### **Chancellor Robert Stevens**

The chancellor at the time was Robert Stevens. It was a strange time because there were problems between the faculty and the chancellor, and actually between other administrators on campus and the chancellor. So it was a time when it was hard to be chair of the senate because a lot of faculty were upset, feeling that I was too supportive of the chancellor. The chancellor was upset because he felt that I wasn't sufficiently supportive of him. It was a time when several—I'm not sure how many—but at least two or three senior administrators went up to talk to people in the Office of the President about problems that were going on. I actually got a call from the vice president of the University, who was very upset that he thought the senate was trying to bring down the chancellor. Since the senate had done that before with Mark Christiansen, he was concerned that we were doing that again. I assured him that there was not a push from the senate at all to get rid of the chancellor. He actually threatened, saying, "Well, if we tried to do that he would park the campus."

**Reti:** Park. That's pretty radical language.

**Kliger:** Yes. So he made it very clear that we were not to do this. Fortunately, we weren't planning on doing that anyway. I don't know what I would have done if the senate was trying to do that. It would have been a very tough decision.

**Reti:** Can you—I realize this is delicate, but generally what was the nature of the problems that were occurring? Because that's not something that has come up in our oral histories.

**Kliger:** Yes. The chancellor had a tendency to just make comments which sounded good at the time but just weren't true, and that caused a lot of problems within the administration, the details of which I don't know, but I know that a lot of administrators were upset by that. It got to be sufficiently bad that the vice chair of the senate and I—the vice chair at the time was Marta Morello-Frosch—made an appointment with him to talk about the fact that he had to be very careful what he said; people really pay attention to what a chancellor says and what he says has to be strictly true. We were very nervous going in there and talking to him about that, because you don't go and tell a chancellor, you're lying, you know? (laughs) He was very gracious. He said that he was thankful that we came in and were so blunt with him, and said that he would be more careful in the future. I'm not sure he was. Like I said, it was a very awkward, strange thing to have to go and have a meeting like that with a chancellor.

**Reti:** Yes. What other kinds of issues were coming up—

**Kliger:** I'd have to go back and look. I don't remember other major issues. That was the major issue that I remember, probably because it was so dramatic for me.

### The Loma Prieta Earthquake of 1989

Oh, one of the other things that was interesting in a bad way was that it was the time of the big [Loma Prieta] earthquake.<sup>7</sup>

**Reti:** Oh, that's right! Of course.

**Kliger:** That obviously caused problems for the campus. But beyond that, I remember going to one of the academic council meetings. Every month or so we'd have a meeting, usually in Berkeley or Oakland. I remember going up there with one of the earth sciences faculty who was explaining to me how when there was a big earthquake on the San Andreas Fault, it was followed shortly afterwards by a big earthquake on the Hayward Fault. So I talked at this meeting about that and about how the University should really look at the earthquake safety issues on the Berkeley campus because that was probably the most dangerous area at this point. I remember, again, the vice president of the University being very upset with me that I would bring that up. He, it turned out, was on the top floor of the Office of the President which was in a building right by Lake Merritt. It apparently was very frightening. That building was really moving around. So he didn't want to think that there would be another big earthquake up there and he just didn't want to admit that it was possible that there would be an earthquake. So that was dismissed. Later, Berkeley figured out that actually this was a way that they could get a lot more building on the

---

<sup>7</sup> On October 17, 1989 at 5:05 pm a 6.9 earthquake centered approximately nine miles from Santa Cruz in the Santa Cruz Mountains hit Santa Cruz County and the neighboring San Francisco Bay Area, causing extensive damage. See Irene Reti, *The Loma Prieta Earthquake: A UCSC Student Oral History Documentary Project* (UCSC Library, Regional History Project 2006) for much more documentation of the earthquake. <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/quake>

campus. So they actually did do a lot of earthquake retrofitting, probably because they wanted new buildings. But for whatever reason, it was a good thing that they did that.

**Reti:** (laughs) Now, that was also the time when enrollments started to increase again, in the late eighties.

**Kliger:** I really wasn't involved very much with that directly. That's a job for the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid who works directly with the registrar and the admissions director. But I wasn't directly involved in many of those discussions.

#### **Chair of the Academic Senate, 1988-1990**

**Reti:** Okay. So the chair of the Academic Senate is basically the leader of the faculty?

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** Did you deal with some of the affirmative action issues of the late 1980s?

**Kliger:** Yes, all of those things came up in normal senate business. You know, my attitude at the time was that the senate is a partner with the administration and we were trying to figure out how we could work most effectively for the campus. My concern is that too often the senate views the administration as the enemy and as a result the administration views the senate as the enemy. Rather than helping each other, they hinder progress for each other. I was trying to avoid

that. And, you know, when you have a history of antagonism, the people who want to eliminate the antagonism cause problems.

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** I still think it's a problem, actually. I think the senate and the administration have worked much better together than they used to, but there's still a lot of room for more cooperation and less suspicion.

**Reti:** We have a shared governance system at the University of California.

**Kliger:** Yes. There's a need to cooperate. It's difficult because what happens too often is that you essentially get two administrations. Given the budget situation at the University, I think that's a terrible waste. There needs to be a way that the senate and the administration can make each other more efficient rather than less efficient. But all too often the senate wants a lot of reports, a lot of information that is not really value-added. A lot of that is because of suspicion, which is too bad. The senate should be checking on the administration, it's part of their job. But they should do it in a cooperative way and not in a gotcha way. Frankly, it depends on who's the chair of the senate how well that works. Some chairs have been absolutely wonderful and others have been more problematic.

**Reti:** I know it's come up in some of the oral history interviews that were done during the Christiansen era, right during the period when the faculty were asking him to step down—or, whatever exactly what happened there—I know one person was talking about how people who are faculty members don't

necessarily make great administrators. So there's always that tension, depending on who you get, whether they have those skills.

**Kliger:** That's absolutely right. I was trained to be an academic. I never took any courses in administration. It's one of the reasons why I think it's really important that administrators come up through the ranks. I think it's generally a bad idea to have a dean who was never a department chair, generally a bad idea to have an EVC who was never a dean; it's probably a bad idea to have a chancellor who was never an EVC. Because you learn a lot by going through those different processes. I feel that I was really fortunate to be a chair, and then chair of the senate before I became a dean. I don't think I would have been as effective a dean if I hadn't had those other experiences, partly to get a thicker hide and partly learn how to get things done in the university. One of the things that you have to learn is that people will be upset at you and it's not really you, it's the position, so don't take it personally. But it takes awhile to develop that.

**Reti:** I bet. That seems incredibly tough.

**Kliger:** Yes. I had one faculty member, a fascinating person, very smart guy, who would come to me every week I was chair of the senate, saying I was incompetent and I should resign as chair of the senate. I would listen to this every week. It took awhile but I realized, this is actually a very smart guy and he had a lot of important things to say so I needed to ignore the bluster that was offensive and listen to the bottom line of what he was saying, and pick the valuable things and reject the things that were not valuable. It takes some

practice to actually be able to do that, but it's a very valuable thing to be able to do.

**Reti:** Yes.

**Kliger:** Not always easy, (laughs) but valuable.

### **Dean of Natural Sciences, 1990-2005**

**Reti:** So then you became dean of natural sciences in 1990?

**Kliger:** Yes. Cliff Poodry had been interim dean and he took a sabbatical, so I became interim dean for a year. During that year they were doing a search for a permanent dean. I wasn't really interested in being dean or any administrator, but a lot of people encouraged me to apply for the position, which I did. So for one year I was interim dean and then I became the permanent dean in 1991.

**Reti:** So people urged you to apply because they had worked with you as department chair and had a good relationship, or what do you think was behind that?

**Kliger:** I think some people liked working with me as chair and in that year as interim dean, and other people just wanted me to be dean because I was not as bad as the other person who might have been dean. (laughs)

**Reti:** (laughs) It sounds like the presidential elections we've had lately.

**Kliger:** Yes, exactly. Right. (laughs)

**Reti:** Okay, so at the time that you became dean did UCSC already have a pretty stellar reputation for some of its science departments?

**Kliger:** I think UCSC had very strong science departments, but it didn't have a reputation for strong science. The reputation was not nearly as good as the reality. I think people really thought of this campus as a humanities campus. It was amazing to me how many times I would talk to people from off the campus, especially in Silicon Valley, and when I would say I was from UCSC and would say that I was the dean of natural sciences they would be shocked that we had any natural science departments on the campus. So it became pretty obvious right away that we needed a lot of work to develop our reputation in the science area.

**Reti:** Why do you think that that was such a little-known fact?

**Kliger:** Well, the reputation of any university is often at least ten years out of date. I think in the early years of the campus, because of the nature of the discussions about the emphasis of the campus, a lot of people thought that this was really a humanities, social sciences campus. I don't think it ever was that, but I think that's where the reputation was developed.

**Reti:** It's really quite a paradox to me and something I've thought about for a long time. From the very beginning—we had Ken Thimann here building up the

science faculty—phenomenal.<sup>8</sup> Lick Observatory moved down here very early in the campus's history, and the astronomy department was very strong.<sup>9</sup>

**Kliger:** Absolutely. Every science department had a Ph.D. program. That was not the case in other areas. There were some Ph.D. programs in the humanities, but very few in the social sciences, none in the arts. So the sciences were really the only part of the campus that was really research-active at the graduate level. But it wasn't really recognized very much. I think it is recognized much more now.

**Reti:** Yes, because, for example, in 2001 we were ranked second worldwide in physical sciences research.

**Kliger:** Not in physical sciences research. We were ranked number one in impact. In other words, if you looked at the number of citations per publication, we were ranked number one. We didn't have as many publications as some of the larger research universities. But the research that we were doing was being recognized with citations.

**Reti:** So when you were dean, did you note which departments were really strong and try to increase their visibility?

**Kliger:** Yes. Well, I think right from the start I recognized this particular problem. There was a lot of pressure at that point, as there always is, to develop fundraising capabilities. It seemed to me that it was too early, so in the first few

---

<sup>8</sup> See Randall Jarrell, ed. *Early UCSC History and the Founding of Crown College* (UCSC Library Regional History Project) 1997.

<sup>9</sup> See the UCSC Library's Regional History Project's volumes documenting the history of Lick Observatory at UCSC at <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/lick>

years of being dean, rather than focus on fundraising I focused on making sure our programs were high quality and that people knew more about the fact that they were high quality. I made the assumption that people give money to strong departments. They don't give money to a weak department to make them strong. They give money to a strong department so that they can make them stronger. So I really focused on that issue. I focused on trying—not in the first few years—but really tried to focus on what was the academic plan for the division. Before that, each department would have to develop an academic plan but we didn't really have a coherent plan for the division as a whole.

So that was actually one of the most important things that I did as dean—really got people to think about the plan for the division as a whole. The way I did that is to sort of think about the university in a different way. The normal way that people think about the university is to say that we do research, teaching, and service—in that order. The most important thing we do is research; the second most important is teaching; and then, if we have time we do service. I see it in the opposite way. I think what the university does is service. We serve society. And we serve society by doing research that's important for society to advance, by teaching students so that they can become the leaders of society, and then we also do what most people think of as service in many different ways. But all of it I saw as service to society. So I really thought about what is it that we do in the science division that really serves society. I said that the three most important things that I thought we did was deal with the health of society. So we should focus on biomedical research in order to advance human health; we should focus on environmental research to enhance the health of the environment; and we

should focus on technology development to ensure the health of the economy of the state. All of those things are things that the division did. But by saying this is what we do and this is a service to society, people could think about it in different ways and see why what we were doing was important.

So each department then would come up with a plan and they would want to fit in with those goals of the division because they were more likely to get resources if they were contributing to the goals of the division.

**Reti:** Then when tenure review happened, would those goals enter into tenure review?

**Kliger:** No, tenure really was looking at the quality of the faculty member in traditional areas: research, teaching, and service. But not that you would get tenure if you contributed to this divisional goal and not otherwise. Because not every faculty member would contribute to one of those goals but that doesn't mean that they weren't doing things that were really important, really high quality. But when you think about the contributions of the division as a whole, it seemed to me that if we could make a strong case that this is an important contribution that we're making—that it's easier to sell that to the state; it's easier to sell that to donors. Donors have lots of places that they could donate their money and they want to donate money to do something that's important. So it's up to us to show them that what we're doing is important and worthy of their support.

**Reti:** Which gets to a key issue of this being a public university.

**Kliger:** Exactly.

**Reti:** Was this also during a time when state funding was disappearing? What was the status of state funding during that period?

**Kliger:** (laughs) Yes, state funding is always a problem. It used to be that there would be a ten-year cycle, that there'd be a big budget cuts to the University, and then that would last for a year or two and then the economy would get a little better, and then over several years the budget would go back up to what it was before, and then ten years later we'd have a big drop. In recent years, of course, it's speeded up. So we don't wait ten years. For a while it was every few years we get more budget cuts and now it seems like we get budget cuts every year. But it's always been this boom and bust approach because of the way the state does their budgeting.

**Reti:** So during this period in which you were dean of natural sciences, my recollection is that there was a recession in the early 1990s.

**Kliger:** Yes. Just about the first or second year I was in there we had sizeable budget cuts.

**Reti:** Prefiguring your later—

**Kliger:** (laughs) The campus should see. I must be an unlucky person because every time I go into a position the budget gets cut.

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** They should learn to get rid of me. (laughs)

**Reti:** Okay. (laughs) Then the division name change. At what point did that happen?

**Kliger:** I don't remember the date. But again, when I would talk to people about science on the campus, the first question was, "I didn't know there was science on the campus." The second question, when I would say, "I'm the dean of natural sciences," they would say, "Well, what is natural sciences and what is unnatural sciences?" (laughs)

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** So it seemed to me that if we wanted to make it clear to people what we were doing we needed to have a name that they understood. Everybody seemed to know what physical sciences are. They seemed to know what biological sciences are. But they didn't know what natural sciences are. So that resulted in the name change to Physical and Biological Sciences.

**Reti:** I wonder where "natural sciences" came from?

**Kliger:** Well, people think of natural sciences as the study of ecology.

**Reti:** But I wonder why it was named that originally at UCSC?

**Kliger:** I don't know. That's a good question.

**Reti:** We have some interesting criticisms on this campus. I wonder if it came from that? Do other universities also have natural science divisions or was that unique to UC Santa Cruz in the founding period?

**Kliger:** I don't know. I think most of the other UC campuses talked about physical sciences or biological sciences, not so much natural sciences.

**Reti:** We didn't have an engineering school at that point.

**Kliger:** That's right. There was actually a plan right when the campus was being developed that there would be an engineering school, right from the start. In fact the Applied Sciences Building was going to house the engineering school. For some reason there were some legislators who decided that California had plenty of engineers. We didn't need another engineering school. So they killed the engineering school. We actually even hired a dean of engineering [Francis Clauser] in the early years but then the school never developed.<sup>10</sup>

So what happened was that we, within the science division, started pretty early on to develop two engineering-type departments. One was a department of computer science. Then later, much later, in the late eighties, we developed a department of computer engineering. But those two departments were within the science division.

### **Planning an Engineering School**

I think another major accomplishment that I was proud of as dean was to really work hard to convince the campus that we should have an engineering school. I remember we had weekly lunches with all of the deans to talk about this. The

---

<sup>10</sup>For more on Francis Clauser and the aborted early plan for UCSC's engineering school see Randall Jarrell, ed. *Kenneth V. Thimann: Early UCSC History and the Founding of Crown College* (UCSC Library Regional History Project, 1997); and Randall Jarrell, ed. *Robert L. Sinsheimer, UC Santa Cruz during a Critical Decade of Change, 1977-1987* (UCSC Library Regional History Project, 1996). These and other oral histories are available at <http://library.ucsc.edu/regional-history-project>.

other divisions were very reluctant to have an engineering school because they were convinced that all of the resources would go to engineering and they would lose out. So there was a lot of discussion about that. We talked about how big the school would be, concluded from a report—there were a couple of reports about an engineering school. I think Gene Switkes headed a committee and then later Abe Seiden headed a committee to study an engineering school. They concluded that we should have a focused engineering school in areas that were important to Silicon Valley, and that because it was going to be focused it didn't have to be huge. They were talking about something like ninety-four faculty. I talked about the fact that we were planning on growing to about 20,000 students, so if you look at how many faculty you would hire with that growth, the engineering school would only be about fifteen percent of the faculty and that would not harm any other division. So it took about a year but we finally convinced other people that an engineering school was a good idea. Then, I think frankly the big thing that put the idea over the top was when Jack Baskin went to the chancellor and said, "Okay, I'll put some money into this. I want this to happen."

**Reti:** Would part of your job as dean be to go and meet with potential donors like that and talk about the program?

**Kliger:** I didn't do too much of that. The people who did the most for that were, one, Pat Mantey. He was the chair of the department but when there would be systemwide engineering meetings, Pat would always go and represent this campus and that sort of thing. He became, for all practical purposes, the founding dean of the school of engineering. So he probably talked more with Jack than anybody else, and then the chancellor as well.

**Reti:** I know that as UCSC has lost state funding, the campus has become increasingly focused on the cultivation of private donors. Certainly the role of the University Librarian has changed over the years.

**Kliger:** Right.

**Reti:** I wondered if that shift had affected the role of the dean as well?

**Kliger:** It has affected the role of the dean a lot in recent years but not as much back then.

**Reti:** You were dean quite a while ago.

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** So how long were you dean?

**Kliger:** Fifteen years.

**Reti:** Oh, my gosh. I had no idea it was that long.

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** So you were pretty consistently in administration, starting with being chair of chemistry.

**Kliger:** Right.

**Reti:** So that would be until about 2005—1990 to 2005.

**Kliger:** That's right. Then in 2005 I became EVC.

**Reti:** Did I read somewhere that that's the longest anyone has been dean of a division on this campus?

**Kliger:** Yes. I started in 1990, which was the twenty-fifth year of the campus and I was the eighteenth dean of natural sciences. So (laughs)—

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** Before that, Frank Drake was the longest serving dean and he served for about five years. So we went through deans very quickly.

**Reti:** Is it a burnout job?

**Kliger:** I don't think it's a burnout job. I'm not really sure why that happened, but it did.

**Reti:** Is there anything else you want to say about being dean?

**Kliger:** I was thinking, you had asked before what the major accomplishments were.

**Reti:** Yes.

**Kliger:** I was thinking about that between our last meeting and this one.

**Reti:** Oh, great.

**Kliger:** My first reaction was I hate that question because any significant accomplishment isn't an accomplishment of any one person. I don't like to take credit for things that other people did. All of the major things involved lots of people. I think mostly what a dean does, or any administrator does, is encourage

other people who have good ideas to pursue those ideas, or in some cases discourage some people who have bad ideas, or at least ideas that we can't afford not to do them. So the trick is to know what to encourage and what not to encourage.

### **Other Accomplishments as Dean**

That said, the major accomplishments from my point of view were the two that we already mentioned. One was creating a divisional plan and the other was supporting the start of the engineering school. Along with that, also encouraging the campus to develop an applied math program. It was clear that we needed an applied math department to support many programs, not only in the sciences but in the social sciences as well. But we were never going to get an applied math program within the math department that we had. So it seemed to me that the only way to do this would be to develop a separate department of applied math, which really irritated the math department. Because of that, it would be best if it were started at the new engineering school. So I thought that was a useful thing.

We also started a number of programs—the good thing about being dean for fifteen years is you actually get to accomplish something over that long time. We started a new department of environmental toxicology, which has since then changed its name—instead of Etox to Metox—because it's microbiology and toxicology. I helped start the Institute for Geophysics and Planetary Physics on campus. That was a multidisciplinary ORU on many campuses, but we didn't have a chapter here. So we finally got one and that really helped support a number of departments. We developed an ocean sciences Ph.D. program. I

oversaw the splitting of the biology department into MCD (molecular, cellular and developmental biology) as one department, and ecology and evolutionary biology in a second department—which at the time I wasn't really pleased about. I wanted them to stay together but it became clear after a little while that that wasn't working and we needed to separate them and have two departments.

The other thing that I did at the time was really push the campus to develop material science programs. I was not very successful at getting strong material science programs going but I got enough of it going so that now we actually have pretty strong material science programs in physics, in chemistry, and engineering. I think that's a good thing for the campus.

So the other sort of miscellaneous things that I thought of— We actually built a lot of buildings during those years. I was surprised when I thought about how many there were. But we developed Earth and Marine Sciences, Interdisciplinary Sciences, the Physical Sciences Building, the Center for Ocean Health, the Seymour Marine Discovery Center, and the Center for Adaptive Optics. That's a lot of buildings.<sup>11</sup>

**Reti:** Yes, if we were sitting up here in 1990 it would look very different.

**Kliger:** It would look very different.

**Reti:** Actually, the Science Library opened about then. But everything else would be quite different.

---

<sup>11</sup> For a detailed narration of the planning and design for each of these buildings see Irene Reti, ed., *Growth and Stewardship: Frank Zwart's Four Decades at UC Santa Cruz*, (Regional History Project, University Library, 2011).

**Kliger:** Right. And I guess also the new Biomedical Sciences Building, which is not finished yet, but we actually started planning for it back then. That's going to be a great building.

One of the things I did was to really support and protect the Science Writing program. This is a small program. It only has ten students a year. But it's clearly the best in the country. It wasn't really a program that was in the mainstream of what we did in the science division. So whenever there would be budget cuts it was always a target. I always thought it was important to keep that program going and I had great department chairs who ultimately agreed that even though it would hurt them budgetarily we needed to keep that program going.

The same is true of a number of diversity programs that we had on the campus. We had a number of programs to support underrepresented students on the campus in the sciences and we always protected those from budget cuts.

We also started an undergraduate research symposium within the division. Now there's an undergraduate research symposium for the campus but it actually started in the science division. That was always a great thing.

I organized an academic computing group which got absorbed into the ITS division. But we actually started consolidation where, instead of having an IT person in every department, we said we need a centralized IT organization within the division.

I brought a grant writer in to help faculty write grants, which is ever more important these days. I established a staff scholarship fund. This was also one of

the things that happened during budget cuts. Budget cuts were so bad that we had to lay off some lecturers. It just really bothered me. I realized that we had programs for university students and we had all these staff who were really working hard, but they couldn't afford to have their children go to the school that they were supporting. I thought that was terrible. So we developed a scholarship fund specifically for staff within the division.

So those are the things that I was thinking about. In general, during that period, because of budget cuts, because of a number of reasons, there wasn't a lot of new resources going into the science division. But I managed to, I think, actually improve the quality of the division even though we didn't get a lot of new resources. That was a tricky thing to do but probably the most valuable thing that I did during those years. That's probably mostly due to my wife [Rachel Kliger], because I would come home and I would complain about how we couldn't get this resource or we couldn't get that resource. She finally said to me, "You know, you've got to stop that. You have to think about what can you do with the resources you have instead of complaining about what you can't do with the resources you don't have." That sort of flipped the switch in my mind and I thought, that's a good way to look at it. It actually helped to be more creative in thinking about what can you do with the resources you have. It also made it a lot more fun to do those things instead of always being negative.

**Reti:** Yes! At UCSC we've long had a focus on interdisciplinary research. I know that that's certainly become more and more important in the sciences.

**Kliger:** Right. Well, that also became more obvious when we focused on those three areas. Because biomedical sciences is very broad, as is environmental sciences, and technology and development, it involved people across departments. If they wanted resources, they would be more likely to get resources if they would partner with another department to make a case that a couple of faculty in this department and that department would actually enhance that part of what the division does. That's another reason why I think it's really important to have a divisional plan, because it gets departments thinking about how they can cooperate with each other, because when there are limited resources you want the resources to have the biggest impact that you can.

**Reti:** Well, thank you. That gives me great insight into what really went on when you were dean in those fifteen years.

**Kliger:** Thanks. It's kind of interesting. Because I usually don't think about those things. When you think about what did you do, it's kind of nice to say, okay, you actually did accomplish something. (laughs)

**Reti:** Yes. That's one of the gifts of oral history—it gives you that chance for reflection and retrospection.

**Kliger:** Yes, exactly.

**Reti:** Okay, great. Well, I think we'll stop for today.

**Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor, 2005-2010**

**Reti:** So today is May 12, 2011 and I am here with David Kliger for our third interview. Today we're going to be focusing on your time as campus provost/executive vice chancellor, which began in 2005.

**Kliger:** Right.

**Reti:** So when you were first appointed it was an interim appointment, right?

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** What made you want to take the job? What were your considerations at that moment?

**Kliger:** Well, I actually didn't want to take the job. What happened, this was shortly after Chancellor Denton came to the campus. It was clear in her very first month, in fact even before she came on campus, that there was a real conflict between Chancellor Denton and Peggy Delaney, who was the EVC at the time. There were several discussions that Chancellor Denton wanted to replace Peggy. She talked to me about taking this position. I tried to encourage her to keep Peggy. I thought Peggy was doing a good job. But for whatever reasons, and I don't know the details, she lost confidence in Peggy and thought it was important to replace her. When Chancellor Denton pushed me to take the job, I realized after several discussions that since I had been critical of a number of administrations on the campus, it was time for me to put up or shut up.

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** (laughs) So I decided that I would do it. But the agreement with Denice was that I would take this on for a few months while she did a search for a permanent EVC. This was going to be a temporary thing. My plan was that I would do this for a short time while the search went on and then I would go back to being dean. But the search never happened. After about a year it seemed that the search was not going to happen and I agreed that I would stay on because it was clear that the campus had some problems at that point and it was important to stay on. So I guess Denice went to the Regents and asked for me to be made permanent. That happened in 2006. I don't remember the exact timing of when I went from interim to permanent. Maybe it wasn't a full year. Maybe it was late in 2005 that I became the EVC, as opposed to interim EVC.

### **Establishing Six Priorities for the CP/EVC**

**Reti:** Okay. So at that point you gave an address to the academic senate where you outlined some priorities for your office. There were six priorities. The first one was: Increasing the rate of faculty hiring.<sup>12</sup>

**Kliger:** Right. We are a small campus and it seemed to me that we were underinvesting in the academic enterprise and it was important to do that. If you looked at just about any department on campus, ours was the smallest in the UC system. It seemed that if we really wanted to enhance the reputation of the campus, we needed to concentrate on increasing the size and the quality of the faculty. So that was a high priority.

---

<sup>12</sup> See "Campus Provost Outlines His Office's Priorities" *UC Santa Cruz Currents Online*, November 28, 2005. <http://currents.ucsc.edu/05-06/11-28/priorities.asp>

**Reti:** Okay. Then we have: Providing additional support to units and/or activities that generate money. You mentioned University Relations as one of those.

**Kliger:** Right. The campus really never focused very strongly on private fundraising. It was very clear that we couldn't rely on the state to provide all of the funding that we needed to do what we wanted to do, and so it was important to build a much stronger development office.

**Reti:** Yes, I know that that's been an issue for the campus. We haven't had a big pool of wealthy alum. We're a younger campus.

**Kliger:** Yes. We are now getting to an age where we do have a sizeable number of very well-off alumni. So it's the right time to do that.

**Reti:** Yes. Then the third one was: Replenishing UCSC's leadership team. I guess there were a few recruitments going on for high-level positions at that point?

**Kliger:** Yes. In fact, looking back at that time, during my time as EVC I replaced every member of the senior management team, with the exception of Tom Vani. So all of the deans were new. All of the vice chancellors were new. It was just a complete turnover.

**Reti:** What was the reason for that?

**Kliger:** Mostly people left for a whole variety of reasons. In most cases it wasn't a matter of pushing people out as much as refilling positions. A number of people just left for personal or professional reasons.

**Reti:** Okay. Then another was: Continuing to consolidate UCSC's Information Technology and Business Processes.

**Kliger:** Right.

**Reti:** That was something that you had also done when you were dean, right? The centralization of information technology, at least.

**Kliger:** We did that within the division, but then later John Simpson and MRC Greenwood started that whole process of consolidating units for the campus. They had hired an outside consultant who suggested that we could save a lot of money by consolidating these administrative functions. It's debatable how much money we saved. Some people say, well, we haven't saved a lot of money. But in fact, when you look at it, shortly after we consolidated is when the campus started getting huge budget cuts. We absorbed those budget cuts with this centralized unit, so in effect we did cut the budget dramatically by consolidating. In some cases, it was improved services; in other cases it was money savings. But the interesting thing to me is that as much as people on the campus didn't like it at the time, virtually every other campus is now doing what we did five years ago, in order for them to save money. So we've actually been a model, both for consolidation at Office of the President and on other campuses.

**Reti:** It's kind of interesting since we have such a history of decentralization that we were a model for consolidation.

**Kliger:** Right. But consolidation just for the business functions.

**Reti:** I understand that, sure.

**Kliger:** There are still grumblings. One of the problems with it was we did a huge amount all at once. It would have been nice to deal with one process and then another, and then another. Instead, we just did all of the IT consolidation, all of the business consolidation. It was chaotic for awhile and it took a few years. But I think we're actually reaping some benefits at this point from doing that. Some people complain that they're not getting all of the services that they used to have. But the campus took fifty million dollars in cuts. So there's no way to provide all of the services that we used to provide, when you take that kind of budget cut. The fact that we've been able to maintain as many services as we have been able to maintain, I think, in part is due to the consolidation.

**Reti:** Okay. The next item was: Improving employee compensation.

**Kliger:** Yes. This was a real problem, both on the faculty side and the staff side. In fact, one of the things that Chancellor Denton and I spent a lot of time on in our first year was really working very hard to increase the wages for the lowest paid workers on campus. It was a struggle because not all campuses wanted to do that. So it was a fight with Office of the President to allow us to do that. But ultimately we were successful to increase the wages of the lowest paid workers, which very few people actually recognized or acknowledged, but it felt good to me anyway.

**Reti:** Yes. Is it still true that UCSC is classified as a rural campus and our pay scales are lower because of that?

**Kliger:** No. I think that's confusing another issue. That's medical costs in Santa Cruz County. It's not the university. It's the county that is classified as rural, so

reimbursements from Medicare and that sort of thing for the medical community are lower than in other places.

Wages at the Santa Cruz campus *are* lower, but that's something that we're working on. But in terms of staff, it really varies by position. In some cases the staff salaries are lower than market rate. In some cases we actually do better. So that was something that we had a lot of analysis of, to try to understand who was meeting market, who was not meeting market, and how to fix that. The faculty clearly were lower than the UC average and we spent several years in the process of increasing faculty salaries. We're still low but I don't think we're any more the lowest of the campuses. We're making progress but we still have a ways to go.

**Reti:** Okay. The last goal listed was: Looking for additional solutions to UCSC's faculty housing difficulties. That would include the Ranchview Terrace project.

**Kliger:** Right. So this was a huge issue. If we're going to hire more faculty, how do we do that in a town when our wages are low and the housing costs are so high? So we spent a lot of energy trying to get Ranchview Terrace built and ultimately were successful, but not until we had a lot of pain over that process.

**Reti:** Yes.

**Kliger:** But I think it's worth it. Ranchview Terrace seems to be a real success. What we tried to do is make it so that people would move into Ranchview Terrace and out of some of the lower cost faculty and staff housing options. That seems to be working. The ultimate goal was to create a master plan where there

would be really low cost housing for new staff and faculty. And as they stayed here for a while and their salaries increased, there would be intermediate level housing, and then higher level housing, so that people could move from one housing area to another, so that there would always be low cost housing available for the newest workers. That sustainable model is something that we've worked toward. We're still not there. But it's a hard thing to do because in the intervening years, with all the budget cuts, the rate of hiring faculty and staff has decreased a lot. You can't just build the housing if you don't have the market because housing is not paid for by the state. We have to figure out how to have the housing pay for itself.

**Reti:** The cost of housing has also gone down in the regular market.

**Kliger:** That's right. So there is a master plan that sets the cost of campus housing in comparison to the cost of housing in the local community. And there are formulas for how to do that so that it can be sustainable.

**Reti:** Okay. So those were your goals as you came in—

**Kliger:** (laughs)

### **The Long Range Development Plan of 2005**

**Reti:** The long range development plan was also approved in 2005—

**Kliger:** That's right.

**Reti:** But then immediately we got into some negotiations with the city over water. Were you involved in those?

**Kliger:** Yes. That was a very difficult time. At one point the campus had something like fifteen lawsuits against us by the city. There's a sizable number of people in the community (and still are) that just don't want the university to grow at all. But I think that issue has eased a lot. We finally did get approval of the LRDP. The community sued us over that. We had probably a year long (at least it seemed like a year long) negotiation with the city and finally came to an agreement. The lawsuits were removed and we have plans for: how are we going to deal with transportation; how are we going to deal with housing; how are we going to deal with water issues—which I think is fair to the city and fair to the university. It was costly to the university, but we have to be neighbors to the community and we have to make sure that not only the campus is sustainable but that we live in a sustainable community and that we're not doing undo harm to the community itself.

That all happened after George [Blumenthal] became chancellor. There were LRDP issues that were going on while Denice [Denton] was chancellor, but most of those negotiations and settlements came when George became chancellor.<sup>13</sup>

### **Working with Chancellor Denice Denton**

**Reti:** Would you talk about your time working with Chancellor Denton, and her administration?

**Kliger:** Yes. That was a very difficult year. In fact, when I look back over those five years as EVC I would say that the two biggest things that I accomplished

---

<sup>13</sup> See: <http://lrdp.ucsc.edu/final-lrdp.shtml>

was one, dealing with Chancellor Denton's death and all of the issues that led up to that, and two, the budget cuts, which were the biggest budget cuts that the university ever suffered from. So just getting the campus through that time was difficult.<sup>14</sup>

**Reti:** (laughs) He said with great understatement.

**Kliger:** (laughs) Yeah, right. But Chancellor Denton was really a brilliant person. When she was up, she had tremendous rapport with students. She had a real vision for the campus. She had real empathy for students and for staff. So in that sense it was good working with her. But frankly, she became chancellor too early in her career. She wasn't sufficiently experienced in administration, particularly the part of the administration where you have to have a thick skin and realize that people are going to criticize you as the chancellor, and the criticism is your position, not you. So that was a major issue.

But the main issue was that I think she had some mental illness problems resulting from some other health problems. That really caused huge problems within the administration. There was a lot of fear. The first week she came in she fired a number of people in her office. She was always threatening people around her. So I had to go to all of the senior administrators and tell them, "If you have any bad news, you don't go to Chancellor Denton. You come to me and I give her the bad news." Because I felt I couldn't afford to lose (laughs) the rest

---

<sup>14</sup> See "Suicide of a Chancellor," *Inside Higher Ed*, June 26, 2006, <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2006/06/26/denton>

of the administration, and so I felt I really needed to protect them from what was happening. So that was a difficult year.

Then of course when she committed suicide that put the whole campus in a crisis and we needed to both find a replacement chancellor and also figure out how to heal the campus from that process. One of the other things, by the way—it wasn't all Chancellor Denton herself—the campus and the community were very unkind to her. They really attacked her mercilessly. Maybe if she was in a more stable mental state, or if she was more experienced in just letting those things go, and not take them personally, it wouldn't have been so bad. But the combination of all of those things and people trying to take advantage of her and attacking her, just made it intolerable for her and for the people around her.

**Reti:** There was some talk at the time of her death of you becoming chancellor?

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** That was something you decided not to pursue.

**Kliger:** Yes, I was asked to be interim chancellor and I told the Office of the President that I thought that was a bad idea. The campus had been through too much change. We had John Simpson, who left, and then we had Marty Chemers. Then when MRC Greenwood left as chancellor, Marty became interim chancellor. So then we had a new EVC in Peggy Delaney, and then me. It just seemed like we were never getting things done. We were never getting any stability. In my opinion, the most important person in getting things done on the campus is the EVC. So to start another EVC who would have to start all over

again was just not in the best interest of the campus. So I thought it was really important for me to just stay there, keep things as stable as we could, and find a new interim chancellor. Because I thought that it would not be as harmful to have a new person in the chancellor position as it would be to have a new person in the EVC position at that time.

### **Student Protests during the UC Regents' Meeting at UCSC in 2006**

**Reti:** Okay—I wanted to ask you about the Regents visit of 2006.

**Kliger:** Oh, I had tried to forget that. (laughs)<sup>15</sup>

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** Well, the campus suffered from a lot of protests during these years. I think the early protests we didn't handle all that well. We unfortunately got lots of practice and learned how to handle the protests more effectively. But that was a particularly difficult one because the students were upset over fee increases and that sort of thing, and since the Regents came to campus this was the opportunity for the students to protest.

Earlier, the campus had a practice for many years to work with student protesters, to say, "okay, how can we work with you so that you can have an effective protest?" and the students generally worked with the administration to have protests so that they weren't violent. In some cases students wanted to be arrested; usually they didn't want to be arrested. But you made agreements

---

<sup>15</sup>See: "Regents' Visit Termed a Success Despite Protest," *UC Santa Cruz Currents Online*, October 23, 2006, <http://currents.ucsc.edu/06-07/10-23/regents.asp>

about what are the ground rules for a protest, what's acceptable, what's not acceptable, and students could follow the rules and get an effective protest without negative consequences.

But around this time, students decided they weren't going to do that. So there was no way to negotiate with these students. It was a relatively small group of students. When there's a big protest and it shuts down things on campus, people think about how the whole campus is closed down. But usually you're talking about a hundred or so people out of a student body of 15,000. It's really a very small fraction. But that very small fraction can have a very big effect. And when the Regents came, that's what happened.

The Regents had a meeting in the new Humanities lecture hall and the students essentially locked them in, or were sufficiently threatening that the campus police decided to leave the Regents in the room and not have them go through the protesting group. In fact, a couple of people did leave and go through the protestors and got physically attacked so it became clear that we had to leave the others in there. The Regents were not happy about being stuck in that room, particularly since there were no bathroom facilities in that room, and they were in there for a while. So it was not the most pleasant experience. I don't know what more you want me to say about that one.

### **Campus Academic Plan**

**Reti:** Okay, so now moving on to the campus academic plan, which was really a big chunk of your accomplishments as CP/EVC—first of all, I was trying to

figure out when the last plan was written before 2007, the last academic plan. It had been quite awhile.<sup>16</sup>

**Kliger:** Well, I don't think we ever really had a campus academic plan.

**Reti:** Oh, that would explain why I couldn't find any record of one. (laughs)

**Kliger:** I think what happened is that the campus had a long history of collecting five-year plans from the academic divisions, and recreated five-year plans every year, which got departments really upset because they were doing all of this work. It's a lot of work to put together a new plan. When you have a five-year plan and you have to develop another one a year later, when we didn't accomplish anything from the first one, it seemed like a real waste. We talked last time about how when I was in the division, I thought it was important to have a divisional academic plan. When I got to be EVC, I thought the same thing: the campus needs to have an academic plan. And it shouldn't be stapling together the academic plans of the different divisions. It should be a vision for where the campus as a whole should go.

So we had a whole process where, again, each department would come up with an academic plan, a five-year plan, and then each division would take those department plans and put together a divisional plan. Then we would take the divisional plans and turn that into a campus-wide academic plan.

We took two parallel approaches. Alison Galloway at the time was our vice provost for academic affairs. She looked at all the divisional plans and looked for

---

<sup>16</sup> See *Strategic Academic Plan*, 2008 [planning.ucsc.edu/acadplan/docs/AcadPlan.asp](http://planning.ucsc.edu/acadplan/docs/AcadPlan.asp)

what are the threads that tie together the desires of the faculty in the different divisions. While she was doing that—we actually didn't talk to each other about this—but separately from that I went through a process similar to what I had done as dean, of saying, okay, what are the strengths of the campus? Thinking of the campus in terms of service to society, what are the things that we should emphasize that would really serve society well? How can we best serve society given the strengths that we have? When we both had gone through this exercise, we came together and we were actually flabbergasted. Because we had each come up with six priorities. We hadn't talked about the number of priorities, but we each came up with six and they were identical, which I thought was not only amazing but really a good sign that what the faculty wanted to do were the things that were the most important way that we could contribute to society. So that's how we came up with the six themes that should be emphasized on campus.

**Reti:** Okay, so these six themes— I will read these out loud and then we can talk about them.

**Kliger:** Okay.

**Reti:** Public documentation and communication; science and policies of evolving environments; human health; cross-cultural initiatives; transnationalism and globalization; and technological development and societal impacts.

**Kliger:** Right.

**Reti:** So, I can really see the service to society theme embedded in these goals.

**Kliger:** Yes. The trickiest one in terms of the title was the environmental one. I just wanted to make it simple, to talk about environmental science and policy. But there were enough people who wanted to be included who were sort of peripheral that there was a lot of debate about the specific name. But I think the overall goal of that particular emphasis was clear regardless of exactly what we called it.

Not only did I think it was important to develop things like this to guide as we grew, but also, to the extent that it was important for us to raise more money to support the campus, it was important for us to be able to go to donors and say, this is what we stand for, this is what we want to accomplish. If you can help us, here are some things we can do in these areas. Because I doubt that there are many people who wouldn't be interested in one of these areas and want to support it in some way.

**Reti:** Did you find that that was true as time went on, that there were donors who wanted to support these areas?

**Kliger:** I think so but I think it's too early to really tell. We're still working on developing a comprehensive campaign approach.

**Reti:** Fundraising.

**Kliger:** Fundraising. A lot of that has been building up the development staff so that we have the infrastructure to do a campaign and developing a donor base. We've worked with consultants; we've worked with our foundation board. I think these themes resonate with people but I think we're still at the early stages

of a comprehensive fundraising campaign so it will take several years before we know how successful this was.

**Reti:** Then of course a year after you came out with this plan is when the recession hit.

**Kliger:** (laughs) Yes.

**Reti:** So there is that to take into account.

**Kliger:** Timing is everything. (laughs)

**Reti:** Yes. What kinds of tensions or conflicts emerged in this academic planning process?

**Kliger:** It was fairly smooth. The biggest problems first, were those departments that felt that they didn't really fit into this. Every department thinks that what they do is the most important thing, so if they don't fit in with the campus plan, the campus plan must be wrong. So that is not surprising. What everybody wants is so many priorities that everybody fits into the priorities. But then it's not really a plan.

**Reti:** Or a priority.

**Kliger:** Yes. A priority means that you have to not do some things in order to do something else. So that was just an inevitable negative consequence. I think as a result of some of that, the senate never really bought in. We had a lot of discussions with the senate about these priorities. They would never say these were the wrong priorities, but they would never say clearly, we endorse this.

They would disagree with this characterization, but my characterization is that a prime goal of the senate is to keep the faculty happy. So if there are some faculty that are unhappy, they don't want to be associated with whatever is making those faculty unhappy. So it's difficult for the senate to endorse priorities like this that would exclude some areas. Even though we made it very clear that we're not saying that other areas are not important. It's just that those are not the areas that we need to stress on the campus.

**Reti:** Perhaps I'm wrong about this, but I'm wondering if some of the opposition came from the humanities departments. Because I'm looking at this list and these priorities are fairly focused in the science direction, although there are certainly interdisciplinary implications of many of these.

**Kliger:** Well, I think just about all of these were, in my view, areas that all of the divisions could contribute to. You look at human health and people think, well, that must be science. But in fact, there are lots of bioethics issues; there are lots of humanities issues around human health. There are all kinds of social issues around that, even artistic issues. We have a new dean of the arts whose primary research area is using the arts to support biomedical research. Human health is something that people think of as a science issue, but I think it's something that every division could contribute to. I think that's true of most of these. The areas where there's less capability for all of the divisions to contribute to, actually are more focused on areas where humanities and social sciences could contribute, but science and engineering would do so to a lesser extent. But just about all of the areas where science and engineering—

**Reti:** Can you give me an example of that?

**Kliger:** Well, cross-cultural initiatives. There are few science departments that would be contributing directly to that. But even technology—it's not just technology development, but it's technology and the impact to society. I think there are huge issues that we don't pay enough attention to concerning the social impact of technology. We are developing all this wonderful technology, like this amazing recorder that you have here, but what are the social impacts of that technology development, and how can we maximize the benefits to society and minimize the negative aspects of technology? These are all things that I think really need much broader investigation than anybody has done in the past. It seems to me that this is the perfect campus to really push that kind of cross-disciplinary approach.

**Reti:** Yes, that's the other theme I see here, is the focus on interdisciplinarity. I was wondering about that. That very much ties into UCSC, our strengths historically.

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** Anything else you want to say about the plan?

**Kliger:** Right from the beginning we saw this as a three-part process. The first was the academic vision, and that's what these themes are. The second actually is an implementation plan. Okay, this is our vision: what do we need to do to implement the plan? So we developed that second plan. Then the third plan, which hasn't really been completed but it's something that I had our planning

and budget department work on a lot, is an accountability plan. What do we measure to know that we're actually making progress in this plan, and if we're not making progress in certain areas, then what do we need to do to make progress? I think the first two parts of the plan wound up being in pretty good shape. The third I think still needs some work. It sort of got short-circuited because rather than focus on that our planning we had to turn to how are we going to deal with budget cuts? That became the thing that we really needed to focus on the most.

### **Budget Crisis**

**Reti:** Was the academic plan at all helpful in establishing priorities for those budget cuts?

**Kliger:** A little bit, but not a huge amount, because we took different approaches for the budget cuts. In the first year of the budget cuts we said, okay, there are certain areas that we need to protect. Things like academic programs need to be protected to the extent that we can, and health and safety issues needed to be protected—that sort of thing. So we assigned cuts—smaller cuts to academic divisions, bigger cuts to support divisions. The cuts within the academic divisions were really prioritized by the academic divisions themselves, so they may or may not have used these priorities. But I don't think this was a huge factor in that.

The second year of the cuts, the cuts were of sufficient magnitude and we had already taken so many cuts in the academic support divisions, the business and administration divisions, that it didn't seem possible to protect the academic

divisions as much as we had the year before. So we really had a whole different process for approaching the budget cuts. We looked at specific functions and impacts to those functions, and had a budget group working with the senate to say, okay, what would be the biggest negative impact of budget cuts, and really try to assign cuts to those areas where it would do the least harm. That's always debatable, but I think we did a pretty good job in figuring out how can we take the cuts with the least harm to the campus.

**Reti:** The last few years have just been constant budget crisis, so it all blurs together. So when you're talking about the first year—

**Kliger:** I see this year [2010-11] as being the third round of budget cuts.

**Reti:** So we're talking about 2008-09 as the first year; 2009-10 as the second; 2010-11.

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** Okay.

**Kliger:** Of course one of the big things that the campus has never been very successful at, is even though we've said over and over again for each of these budget cuts that we have to stop doing some things, people really don't like to do that. Again, it's because everybody thinks what they're doing is very important. And that's a good thing. If people didn't think what they were doing was important (laughs) they wouldn't be doing a good job. So it's valuable for individuals to say, what I'm doing is really important. But the campus needs to decide what is *most* important. There are lots of important things that we can no

longer afford to do. But at every level of the campus, people just don't want to get rid of things. So the result is that we do everything a little bit worse. That's okay in the beginning when you are taking initial cuts because there's always some fat in an organization. But after a couple of cuts like that there's no longer much fat and you either have to say we're just not going to do things as well in general, or you can say there are certain things where we have to maintain the quality of what we're doing so we're going to completely eliminate something else. That's always the most difficult thing to do.

### **Delivering the Bad News: The Challenges of Being CP/EVC**

**Reti:** How did you cope with that? I don't mean that particular problem, but with being the—I had this question for the end of our interview sessions, but it seems like we're talking about this right now—the EVC is the one who has to deliver the bad news. You are the front line person for these budget cuts. Of course in the media, especially, but for student protests and—

**Kliger:** Yes, well I think the most important thing is to realize that people are protesting what's happening. They are protesting against you because you are in that position. But it's not personal. Most of the people who protested didn't know me. What we do way too much, not only on this campus, but in this community and this country, is that we demonize people we disagree with. So it's not enough to say, "I don't like your decision," it's that, "You must be evil if you made a decision that I disagree with." That can be hard to take but it's just the way things are and you just have to realize that. I had very good people in administrative positions so there was a lot of support from them. Even when the

senate, for example, would disagree with me they did it in a respectful way. So my position is that I just have to make the best decisions I can and be clear about why I'm making those decisions, and then people are going to be unhappy. But what's the most important thing for me in administration is to not try to please everybody. Because the kind of decisions you have to make, there's no way that everybody is going to be happy about it. If you try to please everybody, my experience is you please nobody. So—(laughs) So I just tried to do the best I could. If the senate and the chancellor or whoever didn't like what I was doing, I was always happy to step down at any point and let somebody else take over. I never felt that I needed that job.

**Reti:** You already had many years of experience as a manager, a high-level administrator. So you weren't walking in like Chancellor Denton without that tough hide.

**Kliger:** That's right. Yes, I had long experience in administration and I had a long experience in this campus. I had been chair of the senate, so I knew the way the senate worked. That really made it much easier for me. The other thing was that I [was] dean of the science division, and the science division is the most complicated of all of the divisions. It's got a lot of business functions because it's got a lot of contracts and grants functions. It's got a lot of shops to support, research and that sort of thing. So a lot of the business-type functions on the campus have related functions within the division. So I had some sense of what to expect by going into the EVC position, and that was very helpful.

## **Key Colleagues**

**Reti:** Who were some of the key people that you worked with? I know Charlotte Moreno was one.

**Kliger:** In my office Charlotte was certainly a key person. Charlotte actually began working with me shortly after I became dean. She started out being an administrative assistant to me in the division and later she became one of the assistant deans, and did that for many years. When Peggy Delaney was the EVC, she was asked to come in and be the assistant provost. So she left my office and went down there. But that meant that when I moved to the EVC office I worked with Charlotte once again.

**Reti:** (laughs) She was waiting for you.

**Kliger:** (laughs) Then she was my assistant provost at that point. So she was in that position for most of the time that I was EVC, until she left that position to go to be the assistant vice chancellor for human resources. But that was good continuity. I mean, it got to the point where she knew what I was going to say before I said it, and I knew what she was going to say before she said it. It is extremely valuable to have somebody like that.

**Reti:** That's great. And who else?

**Kliger:** She was certainly the most important person within my office. Alison Trybom, who is now Alison Lucas, became my administrative assistant. She was also extremely valuable. The other people that I worked with mostly were the different vice chancellors, certainly Tom Vani, who is just incredibly valuable to

this campus. He's been around for a long time. I'm happy for him, but really sad that he's retiring this year.

**Reti:** I heard about that.

**Kliger:** That will be a huge loss for the campus. In a crisis, nobody is better than Tom. I knew that when I was dean, too. When I was dean, we had the fire in Sinsheimer Labs. It was a huge issue and Tom was there the first morning and was there through the whole crisis. So things like that, things like all of the protests—he was always the person that you could rely on for good advice. He knew the system incredibly well. It's amazingly valuable to have somebody with that kind of experience in your administration.

I had a good set of deans. So there's a whole team that works cooperatively. One of the things that I did that had not been done before by EVCs is really mix up the academic and administrative people. There had been vice provosts who dealt with academic issues. There had been vice chancellors who dealt with business administration, the budget, and all sorts of administrative things. But they would never be together. It seemed to me that that was a huge mistake, because people on the academic side didn't really understand the value of the support divisions, and how important they are, and how the academic divisions cannot prosper without them.

**Reti:** Support divisions being places like the library, or—

**Kliger:** Well, the library is one—the academics understand the value of the library. But they don't understand the value of the budget office, or human

resources, or environmental health and safety, or the police—all of these units that mean they actually get a paycheck—you know, when they want to buy something somebody actually has to do that. So I thought it was really important for academics to understand what those support services are and how they work. I also think it was important for people in support services to understand the thought processes of the academics so that they could know what it is that they're supporting and how they could better support the academic enterprise. So I started having weekly meetings of what we called the provosts operations group, where all of the vice provosts, who were on the academic side, and the vice chancellors, who were on the administrative side, would meet together and we would talk about issues that were coming up and how to deal with them. It got to be a much closer team of people who really learned to appreciate each other. I think that was a big advantage for me because I could go to any one of the people and know that they knew the issues at various levels.

**Reti:** Is that kind of cross-fertilization something that other universities do?

**Kliger:** I don't think so. I don't have experience at the highest level of administration on other campuses but it certainly wasn't something that we had done here before.

**Reti:** It's great. It's a great model, I think.

**Kliger:** It's always a good idea to get all of the people in the same room who are dealing with some issue because not only will they understand each other's position but, as we said before, there's a lot of suspicion. There's always suspicion about somebody when you don't know who they are or what they're

thinking. When you're sitting in those meetings every week you really get to know people's thought processes and you really get to respect people. I don't think many people realize how hard most administrators work, and how much they care about the institution, and how much they're trying to support the institution. People just assume they're there for the money and they're just trying to support themselves. But it's certainly not my experience on this campus. They're extremely dedicated people who work very hard.

**Reti:** Yes. I certainly have seen that in doing oral histories with many administrators over the years.

**Kliger:** Yes.

### **Chancellor George Blumenthal**

**Reti:** Now, can you talk about George Blumenthal?

**Kliger:** Yes. I had worked with George earlier because he was actually department chair when I was dean. Then he became chair of the senate here, and then chair of the systemwide senate. So when, I guess it was Rory Hume in the Office of the President who talked to me about being interim chancellor—I told him that that would be a bad idea and told him I would think about who would be a good person. The first person I thought of was George. Because at that point we really needed somebody who was well known in the Office of the President. This campus really needed support from the Office of the President to get through this period and they needed somebody that they knew well. So I called George and said, "I want to tell Rory that you're the person. Would you do it?"

He said yes. When I said, "Rory, this is the person you need to get as interim chancellor," he agreed right away, and that's what happened.

I think he was the right person, both because of that issue of really knowing the system and having the people in the Office of the President know him. But also, the other issue that was going on at that time was fights with the community over the LRDP, and I thought George had the right personality to work with the city. In fact, not only was it his personality, but he had been long time friends with Cynthia Matthews because Cynthia's husband was an astronomer, Bill Matthews. So they had known each other for a long time. Again, personal relationships really help. With many chancellors we get a chancellor because the campus is going through some issue and the person is valuable to deal with that issue. I think that's what happened with George as well.

### **UCSC's Silicon Valley Research Efforts**

**Reti:** Today is May 24, 2011. This is Irene Reti and I'm here with Dave Kliger at the Science and Engineering Library for our final interview in this oral history. Today we're going to start by talking about UCSC's Silicon Valley research efforts.

**Kliger:** This really started with MRC Greenwood, who saw real potential in Silicon Valley in a couple of ways. First of all, in terms of development, MRC saw that there was a very large, influential community in the Silicon Valley that nobody was paying any attention to. They were very talented people, very influential people. She wanted to make more contact with that community, which she did very effectively and it's been very good for the campus. The other

thing is she saw huge potential with the presence of the NASA-Ames Center, and that UCSC should be partnering with NASA to develop research opportunities over there. There was a real vacuum there because it was a little far from [UC] Berkeley and they weren't really interested; Stanford was right across the street but Stanford had more things than they wanted to deal with, so they didn't want to get involved. So there was a vacuum that MRC stepped into. She worked with a couple of different vice chancellors for research to really get something going and managed to get the largest contract of any UC campus ever—it's roughly a \$300 million dollar, ten-year contact with NASA to essentially partner with NASA on research that would be of interest to NASA, but which could be advanced by UC faculty, not just UCSC, but UC. UCSC would essentially administer this program. For NASA it was a great deal because there were a lot of researchers that they could have working on projects that they couldn't afford as part of the government work. They had the money but they didn't have the rules that allow them to do a lot of this stuff. For UC, it was an opportunity, not only to get involved with interesting research, but also was a substantial source of revenue for the campus at all sorts of levels. The work has primarily been engineering work, though the fees that the campus has gotten have really been used a lot to support research in the humanities and the social sciences. So it's really helped engineering faculty to get direct research funds and others to get graduate fellowships and that sort of thing. So it's been a very good program.

**Reti:** So tell me more about how some of the funds went into the humanities and social sciences.

**Kliger:** Well, some of the funds were overhead funds for the research and there was a fee for service for administering the program. Some of that went to the vice chancellor for research, who then used that to support research in primarily, I think, the humanities, and the arts, and to some extent the social sciences. The idea to expand that research into a NASA research park developed, and plans were begun to have a major research center at NASA-Ames that would be a joint program between NASA, between industry in the Silicon Valley, and between several universities such as UCSC and Foothill/De Anza, because they wanted to expand but they didn't have any space. They could get more classroom space. We had a lot of talks with Santa Clara University, which did not go as far as we wanted. There were talks with San Jose State, and a lot of the faculty at San Jose State were interested in this, but the administration wasn't. Cal State East Bay was very much interested, but it got to be a very tricky political issue because we didn't want to offend San Jose State by developing a partnership with Cal State East Bay. It's still an ongoing issue to see who is going to be involved and how. It's a very tricky issue to get partners that would really make it an exciting place, but make it a really collaborative effort and not get into a delicate situation where we are making enemies because San Jose State, for example, would be upset if we partnered with Cal State, East Bay, even though they didn't want to be involved. So there was very delicate diplomacy going on this whole time.

**Reti:** I'd imagine so.

**Kliger:** It's still up in the air because this could be a large investment and we don't have the money to invest, we needed to get outside partners to put development money in. There are all kinds of legal issues. So a limited liability

corporation was set up so that there would be a separate liability corporation that would have on its board people from each of the participating universities, but it would be a separate legal entity so there wouldn't be any financial liability to any of the universities. They actually went and found developers that were interested in doing this. It's still an ongoing issue in terms of getting the development going, in part because the whole budget situation in the country made the financing a lot more difficult. It's not obvious to me that this is going to work, and it's not obvious that it's not going to work. It really depends on what happens to the economy in the Silicon Valley and how the developers feel that they can make money on the project and still accomplish what the various universities want to get out of the whole thing. So stay tuned. I'm not sure what's going to happen.

### **Chancellor MRC Greenwood**

**Reti:** Thank you. That reminds me, I think it was in the first interview you mentioned that Chancellor Greenwood was, in your opinion, one of the strongest chancellors we've had. I don't think we came back to the topic. Did you want to say more about that?

**Kliger:** Yes. MRC was very ambitious for the campus, and was a real cheerleader for the campus, and had tremendous energy. So, on the one hand, I think she probably got us involved in some deals that were not very good in the long run. But she also got us involved in deals that turned out to be great. So, for example, the National Science Foundation has these science and technology centers that are very big deals. It's very large grants for five years. It can be renewed for a

total of ten years. We had never gotten one of these before, but the Center for Adaptive Optics was developed. Certainly that got approval because of a very strong proposal from the astronomy faculty, who partnered with other universities and came up with a great idea. But it wouldn't have happened without MRC pushing and MRC making commitments that she knew would be necessary in order to finalize the deal. So there are things like that where MRC just was tuned into political issues and knew how to get things done that I have not seen any other chancellor be able to do.

**Reti:** Okay, great.

### **Rebenching**

You were involved in the beginnings of the rebenching project. Maybe you could explain what that is and how that began.

**Kliger:** Yes, the rebenching project involves the relative state money budget that goes to the different campuses. It's a new project but it really has its roots for a very long time. [UC] Santa Cruz's budget planning has always been, in my mind, sort of anti-budget planning—

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** —in the sense that in the early years of the campus there was a process where you got a certain amount of money for lower-division undergraduates, more money for upper-division undergraduates, more money yet for beginning graduate students, and more yet for advanced graduate students. It was dramatic. There was a lot more funds per graduate student than undergraduate.

In spite of that, the campus made the decision that we were going to emphasize undergraduate education. So at a time where you got more money for graduate students, we emphasized undergraduates.

Much later, the university as a whole decided that they were going to do the budget differently. They weren't any longer going to weight students. You got the same amount of money for students at any level.

**Reti:** This was a UC-wide decision?

**Kliger:** It was a UC decision. So there was a certain amount of state money that goes into every new student, regardless of whether they were an undergraduate or a graduate student, even though graduate students generally cost more than undergraduates, the decision was made to do it this way. At about the same time, UCSC decided we needed to grow our graduate programs. So (laughs) budgetarily that did not really make sense. In terms of the goals of the campus, prestige of the campus, it was the right decision. In fact, we still should be growing our graduate programs even more. But budgetarily, it meant that there were difficulties.

Now, that wouldn't be so bad, except that when UC decided to change the way it did budgeting they said, we're changing the way we're doing budgeting from this day forward. Up until this point the base is the base is the base. So whatever money you get total, is what you get. As you add more students, you get incrementally more money. Well, because of the emphasis on graduate enrollments earlier on other campuses, but undergraduate enrollments here, the campus got a lot less total state money per student than other campuses. The

campus argued for a long time that that's not right. But we weren't very successful at doing that.

Then when Mark Yudof became president, I and George [Blumenthal] really continued to push the issue. And showing them the effect—nobody had really looked at what the effect was. Part of the discrepancy in budgeting between different campuses was this graduate versus undergraduate issue. But there were all kinds of special deals that were made for each of the campuses.

The person who controlled the budget, to a large extent, was Larry Hershman. Larry had a sense—in his mind he knew he was going to give this to one campus and something else to another campus, and in his mind he would sort of balance things out. But nothing was ever written down. Nobody ever really knew exactly how all this worked. Not until Larry retired was it possible to go back and say, okay, well, how did we get here? Nobody knew how we got here. But they could see that there was a large discrepancy. The Office of the President could acknowledge that this was a problem. But it was a problem that was very difficult for them to solve, because obviously the campuses that were most influential were the campuses that had the most dollars and could scream the loudest in terms of not changing the system.

**Reti:** Would those be UCLA and Berkeley?

**Kliger:** Well, Berkeley and UCLA were the big ones. This was a large amount. So if, for example, UCSC were to get the amount of state funds that was the average for UC, not even the same as Berkeley and UCLA, but just the average, it would be an additional thirty million dollars a year for the campus.

**Reti:** An interesting number.

**Kliger:** An interesting number. We would not have to take a cut this year.<sup>17</sup> So it's a large effect. When we started taking cuts in the budget, we would have budget meetings with the Office of the President every year, and we would point out that this is a problem. We would always acknowledge that we weren't asking them to solve the problem by destroying Berkeley and UCLA, but as new revenues came they needed to figure out how to distribute the new revenues to make us more even. Or when budget cuts came they needed to look at cutting the budgets of those campuses that had more flexibility rather than those campuses that had less flexibility. They have not done that, to date. But last year they had this big effort to really envision the future of the University, where the chairman of the Board of Regents combined with a whole group of people looking at what should the University be. One of the groups said we have to look at how do we fund each of the campuses. That's when it started being called rebenching.

So there's a lot of talk about rebenching, and there's a lot of acknowledgement that something like that has to be done. But there's still a lot of resistance by mostly Berkeley, to some extent UC San Francisco, and surprisingly not as much by UCLA. Even though UCLA benefits a lot by the present system, they have tended to take a much more UC-wide approach. But Berkeley and San Francisco really are resisting the rebenching. This really hurts not only Santa Cruz, but it

---

<sup>17</sup> Due to a severe state budget crisis, in February of 2010, the state of California asked the University of California to take a \$30 million permanent budget cut. See <http://socialsciences.ucsc.edu/news-events/news/budget-update.html>

hurts Riverside, and Irvine, and Santa Barbara almost as much—Irvine, in fact, the most. But I think it's even worse for Santa Cruz than Irvine. Even though they get less funds per student than Santa Cruz gets, because they have a medical school they have a lot more flexibility in different fund sources and that sort of thing. So I would say that Riverside and Santa Cruz and Merced now are the ones where this causes the most problem. And Santa Barbara, to a lesser extent, but to a substantial effect, also, is affected by this.

**Reti:** *Rebenchmarking*, the term itself, would refer to that benchmark place, the bottom line that was established so many years ago.

**Kliger:** That's right.

### **More on Student Protests**

**Reti:** Great, thank you. So, to get into talking about campus protests. There were quite a number of them. As you said earlier, this was a very active period in campus protests, partly because of the budget and partly because of the expansion in building on campus during this period of time, and who knows what else, just the social and political environment. What was your general approach to campus protests, your philosophy in dealing with them?

**Kliger:** It really changed over time. In the beginning, I think we really tried to not be very heavy-handed on this. Partly, there was very strong opposition from the senate to essentially do anything. I don't think the senate reflected the wishes of the majority of the faculty, but the active people in the senate very strongly believed that our students could not have any bad intentions, and that protest is

part of being a college student, and we should encourage this rather than try to stop it. Which all sounds very nice in an ideal world, but the world has not been ideal for quite some time. So I remember early on there was a protest—I don't even remember what the protest was about—in most cases it doesn't really make much difference what the protest was about other than having protests, but it was a protest down at College Eight, I believe it was, where there were students who came with, not just banners, but all sorts of things, and were pushing against people. I remember having to pull the chair of the senate and one other faculty out of the way because they were going to try to talk to this group. And the group was approaching them with barriers and was about to trample them, and I actually had to physically pull them away so that they wouldn't get hurt.

**Reti:** Yikes.

**Kliger:** I actually got trapped in front of a glass plate wall, where I thought I was going to be pushed through the glass—and fortunately it eased up before that happened. Oh, I do remember. This was about military recruitment on campus.

**Reti:** Oh, is this the protest about military recruitment in 2005?

**Kliger:** Yes, that's right.

**Reti:** Okay, so that was early in your tenure.

**Kliger:** That's right. I remember talking to the students and then going in and talking to the recruiters. That ended when the military recruiters actually decided that they did not want to cause problems and they voluntarily left. We had worked with them to actually put them in a different place from all of the

other recruiters, because we knew that this could be a problem. They were always very cooperative with us and they decided to leave. But it then caused real problems for the campus, because there were some legislators who thought that this was terrible, that we were not following the Solomon Amendment which said that we needed to have military recruiters having the same access as other recruiters on campus.<sup>18</sup> They were threatening to take our funding away from us. So it actually was a big deal for a while, and I don't think the faculty ever realized what the threat to the campus was. The Science and Engineering faculty knew because they realized that all of their research grants were in jeopardy. What the students did not realize, and what most faculty didn't realize, was it wasn't just research grants, but it was all student loans, any kind of federal financing of students or faculty would have been eliminated.

So fortunately UC fought that and we did not get that taken away. Each year we tried to figure out ways to have the military recruiters on campus in a way that would satisfy the Solomon Amendment but wouldn't be as undesirable from the point of view of the students or the faculty. We did make progress. We did work with a group of students to let them have a protest that would allow them to make their points without preventing other students from having the access that they wanted. This was the basic principle that I had, that protest is fine, but in the process of protesting you can't take away the rights of other people. There were a few faculty like Bettina Aptheker and Helen Shapiro, who really worked

---

<sup>18</sup> A 1996 federal law that allows the Secretary of Defense to deny federal grants(including research grants) to institutions of higher education if they prohibit or prevent ROTC or military recruitment on campus.

with us and worked with the students to help out and allow for effective protest without disruption. That started to work fairly well.

Then the other major protest that lasted for a very long time was the tree sitting to stop the Biomedical building. Although, in fact, when you actually talk to the students, it was never clear what the protest was about. There were a group of students who wanted to stop a Biomed building because they were against animal research. There was another group that wanted to do it because they wanted to stop the LRDP. There were probably a dozen different reasons and when you talked to the students, nobody wanted to take responsibility for the group as a whole, so it was very difficult to actually sit down and come to a resolution. If you don't know what the group wants, it's hard to respond.

**Reti:** It's hard to sit down with people who are in a treetop, too. (laughs)

**Kliger:** Yes. Although (laughs) there were some funny stories there. There was actually a filmmaker from Europe, I can't remember which country, but they came to us one day and they wanted to film these people. So they had actually gone up in one of the trees, even though there were signs posted everywhere that this was illegal, no trespassing and that sort of thing.

**Reti:** These are giant redwood trees.

**Kliger:** Giant redwood trees. They went up there to talk with the students and—actually they weren't students, the people in the trees were mostly not students—but they went and talked to the people in the trees. They left some equipment there. So they came to us wanting to know if they could go back and

retrieve their equipment. This was very awkward. Basically, we told them, “We don’t want to talk about this.” (laughs) You do what you have to do, but we’re not going to—you know, we assured them that we were not going to arrest them if they went and did this, but we were not going to sanction this either.

So this went on for a very long time. We really did not stop it, because we were not in the position to start the building anyway. I didn’t want to be in the position where we did something major, got these people out of the tree, and then could not start building anyway. Then we would have to protect that site for a very long time. So a lot of the faculty on Science Hill were very upset that we let this go on too long. Faculty on other parts of the campus were upset because we were being mean to these people. So everybody was upset about one thing or another. But we managed to have a dialogue with, not the people in the trees, but people who were representing them at different times. At one point, we started having talks with them that went on for a long time. But we made it very clear to them that there is a date when we’re going to start building and you need to be out of the trees at that date. If you’re not, you will be arrested. We wouldn’t tell them the exact date, but it came down to the wire, where we were going to have to arrest them. We actually had a large contingent of police that were prepared to do this. It turned out that the night before we were going to go in they clearly got the word, and even though they said that they wanted a confrontation, they were almost all gone by the time people got there. There was one person who clearly didn’t get the message and he was arrested. But everybody else was gone and as soon as we went in there and saw that they were

gone, then the clearing started so they wouldn't go back up in the trees after the police left.

It was messy and at times tense, but I think it worked out reasonably well. And one of the things—after it was clear, and I can't say that there was a direct correlation, but after it was clear that we were prepared to arrest people, there were no more violent protests like that on the campus. I don't know how much—I think partly it was clear that we were prepared to arrest people. Partly it was because the students and the other people who were involved in these things lost the support of the faculty when one of the faculty's houses was firebombed. And even at that point, a lot of the humanities and social science faculty were defending this group because they said it couldn't have been students who did that. But there was a meeting of the senate where there were discussions about this. A lot of the science faculty got up and started describing what they had to put up with, with all of these protests, and how much they were afraid for their lives. There was a house that was firebombed with kids inside of the house. I think that shocked people enough so that the faculty said they're not going to support this kind of thing anymore. Then it pretty much ended.

**Reti:** You did have the protests at Kerr Hall.

**Kliger:** We had a protest at Kerr Hall, yes. That was (laughs) also interesting. A large number of students rushed into the building, really traumatized a lot of the staff there. It's another thing that the faculty never really realized, that there are staff who are still traumatized. After the whole thing was over, we brought in a

psychologist to talk to the staff for awhile to try to get resolution for them. But there are a number of staff who were extremely traumatized.

Anyway, the students came in. They took over the building for several days. We made it clear at one point that they were going to have to leave. We also made it clear to them that there was an exit and they could exit the building and not be arrested. Or they could stay in the building and they would be arrested. They opted to leave. They were actually filmed as they were leaving so we could identify who was there, but they left the building and nobody was arrested. But they really trashed the place. So one of the things that I did was call in several leaders of the faculty immediately when we had access to the building, and I said, "I want you to tour the building with me." They saw all of the destruction that had taken place and they were appalled.

**Reti:** This was things like—soiling things?

**Kliger:** Soiling things. Graffiti. Furniture that was wrecked. In the conference room all the wires were pulled out. A refrigerator was totally destroyed. There were lots of things. In the heat of the moment, the faculty realized that things had gone poorly and that somebody had to pay for this. But later, after the whole thing was over, those same faculty insisted that there was not a lot of damage, and we shouldn't make the students pay, and again they wanted no consequences. For most of the students, actually, there were no consequences. That's partly because we did not do a good job in identifying exactly who was there at different times.

**Reti:** Well, don't they often wear masks over their faces?

**Kliger:** They wore masks, but they were pretty stupid about it in that there were cameras in the building. We had pictures of them. They would see that there was a camera and then they would put a bandana over their face, but there was a picture of them beforehand. But there were consequences for a number of students, where we not only could clearly show that they were involved in some of the destruction, but that they also had been involved in some earlier protests where there had been destruction, and so we could show a pattern. But for most of the students not much happened to them. But that was one where I was really disappointed in some of the faculty who, even when they saw the evidence directly, could not acknowledge that there should be consequences. My point to them is: this is an educational institution. What is it that you're trying to teach students, that you can be destructive and that there are no consequences to being destructive? Or do you want to teach them that you're responsible for your actions and when you do something wrong you have to pay a price for it? They could never really acknowledge that point.

**Reti:** One of these protests—I believe it was towards the end of your tenure—ended up at your house.

**Kliger:** Right. (laughs) Yes, I was actually riding my bike home, and I don't remember if it was one of the student affairs staff or one of the campus police saw me. They stopped me and said, "You know, there's a protest walking toward your house." (laughs)

**Reti:** (laughs)

**Kliger:** So I continued. I rode my bike home and I got there a little before the protest. There was a group of somewhere between twenty and fifty people, mostly union people actually, and some students. They were just getting in front of my house and making a lot of noise. By the time they got there, there were some campus police and some student affairs people there. My wife was very upset. We had a cat who actually had cancer at the time. It was really sick. It was just freaking out. So my wife was really upset that they were really traumatizing our cat. Some of our neighbors across the street were very upset. I was worried that one of my neighbors would get out his shotgun and just start going after people. But fortunately he didn't do that.

So I went out and talked to the people, and they were telling me how terrible it was that I was cutting their salaries and I was continuing to make big increases in my salary. I informed them that I actually had taken a ten percent cut in my salary, which was a bigger cut than they had taken, and that in addition to that I was making substantial contributions to the university because I thought that I should be paying back, and that they should get their facts right. Then I told them that as far as I was concerned the meeting was over, and I went back in the house. Shortly afterwards they left. They left a mess in the front yard but the campus police and student affairs people cleaned it up, so not much happened. It wasn't a big deal for me, but I was bothered because some of my neighbors were traumatized by the whole thing.

**Reti:** Yes, understandably. So, okay, I think we've gotten to the point in our interview where we are reflecting back on your whole time here at UCSC,

including your time as CP/EVC. Clearly, student protests are one of the challenges of this position.

**Kliger:** Yes.

### **Reflections on Serving as CP/EVC**

**Reti:** But what would you generally say are the rewards and challenges of being CP/EVC at UCSC?

**Kliger:** Well, I think one of the biggest challenges is that there is a general atmosphere of distrust on the campus. Normally you think that it's the students who distrust the administration. There is a group of one or two hundred students who always want to protest and don't trust the administration. But mostly it's the faculty who don't trust the administration. That distrust winds up causing conflict that really is not very productive. So I think that's the most difficult part.

The other part is when there are big budget cuts, in particular, you've got to make decisions that affect people's lives. That's a difficult thing to do. Frankly, it's harder on other principal officers who actually have to lay somebody off. But it still feels bad when you know that there are a lot of staff, for example, who dedicate their lives to the university and you have to let them go. So that's a tough thing. I think that's the hardest part of the job.

Also, you're never off. There are always issues, 24-7. If the phone rings in the middle of the night, you know it's bad news. There were several middle of the

night phone calls that turned out to be very bad news. So I think that's the hardest part.

On the other hand, you work with really great people who are very dedicated. I got to know a lot of the staff on the campus that I wouldn't have known without being in that position. So that was really nice. Although at this point it's a little strange, because I'll walk around campus and people will say, "Hi, Dave," and I don't know who they are. (laughs) I always feel bad that they know me but I don't know them. But I do know a lot of people on the campus. There's a lot of very special people on campus so it's nice to get to know them and to get to know what's going on. All the faculty in a department always know what's going on in their department, but as EVC you get to see what's going on across the whole campus, and there are lots of really exciting things in every academic division, in student affairs, all over the place. So it's nice to know that you're part of that and doing whatever you can to support those activities.

**Reti:** I kind of stepped over something I should ask you, which was, why did you step down? What was behind that decision?

**Kliger:** A number of things. One is, it's a lot of pressure, and I'd been doing it for a long time. You know, fifteen years as dean and then five years as CP/EVC—at some point you say, I'd like to get a good night's sleep. So I think part of it is just saying, that's enough. I actually talked to George [Blumenthal] a year before I stepped down and told him it was my intention to leave, but I wanted to see what was going to happen with the budget, and if it looked like the budget might get better in a year then I would stay on and get us through that. But if it

looked like this was going to be an ongoing issue for a long time, then somebody else could start doing that. Or if the budget was going to get a lot better, then somebody else could take over. It was clear after awhile that the budget issues were just going to be with us for a long time, and saying that I couldn't leave because of the budget—there was never going to be an exit. So it was time.

**Reti:** Okay, thank you. So do you have any advice for your successors? (laughs)  
That's always a tricky question.

**Kliger:** Yes. Well, I think the main thing is to do what you think is right, right for the campus, and don't worry about who is going to be upset by it. Because pretty much any decision that an EVC makes is going to make somebody unhappy. If you try to make everybody happy, you will make nobody happy. So that's one thing.

And the other is to keep your ego out of it. People will protest whatever you're doing, and you have to realize that this is about the job. It's not about you. On the other hand, any accomplishments that you have are not really your accomplishments, they're accomplishments of a lot of people on the campus. Anything that's significant that happens is happening because a lot of people are working to make that happen. So I think the biggest mistakes that people have, is that they get their ego too much involved and they try to please people.

I guess the other thing is just be honest and do what you think is the right thing to do. And be prepared to leave the job. One of the reasons why I always wanted to keep an active research group is I never wanted to be trapped into a job and have to make decisions that would keep my job. I always wanted to make the

decisions that I thought were the right decisions, and if people didn't like it, I could go back to my lab and do my research and I'd be just as happy. I think it's really important not to let the job trap you, but to do what you believe is the right thing to do in the job.

**Reti:** There's something I'm a little confused about, which is [the title] "Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor." I'm very clear on what an executive vice chancellor is. But I'm not clear on what a campus provost is.

**Kliger:** Yes, it's kind of silly. Actually, when I first got into the job, the first thing I said is, you know, let's pick a title. This idea of having two titles just seems silly. The chancellor said, "No, first of all, all the campuses now have provost and executive vice chancellor. Number two, we'd have to go to the Regents and get them to change the title and we don't want to do that." I think the origin is that a provost is considered the chief academic officer of the campus. The executive vice chancellor would be in charge of all of the business, and non-academic parts of the campus. So both titles are there. It always seemed a little pretentious and overdone to me, but I think that's the original rationale for having those two titles. And every other campus has that. This is a strange campus in that we are very proud of being different, but we don't really want to do things differently from the way other campuses do it. (laughs)

**Reti:** (laughs) Because for years the only provosts we had were provosts of the colleges.

**Kliger:** That's right. That's what makes it confusing. On most campuses it's provost and executive vice chancellor. On this campus it's *campus* provost and executive vice chancellor, to distinguish from the college provosts.

### Reflections on UC Santa Cruz

**Reti:** Okay, thank you. There is something I want to ask you about, and this is part of this whole section about UCSC in general and reflecting back on having been here since 1971. One of the things that you said in an interview was, "If there's one thing I could change about UCSC it would be a tendency to see the glass as half empty instead of half full." You said this to the academic senate and I think it was toward the end of your tenure.<sup>19</sup>

**Kliger:** Probably.

**Reti:** Can you expand on that?

**Kliger:** Well—it gets back to budget issues. We don't have as much money as some other UC campuses have. People too often take that as an excuse that therefore we can't do things. I think that's really dangerous. First of all, it's true that we don't have as much resources as other UC campuses. But we probably have a lot more resources than many state universities across the country. We should be grateful for that. By always focusing on what it is that we don't have, rather than focusing on what we do have, and focusing on how can we make the most of what we have—first of all, I think it's bad for morale and second of all it

---

<sup>19</sup> See David Kliger, Remarks to the Academic Senate, May 21, 2010.  
<http://www1.ucsc.edu/administration/evc/communications/transcripts/05-21-10.Senate.asp>

holds us back. Because I'd rather have the attitude of: We really want to do this. How do we go and find the resources to do it? And if you're always focusing on, well, we can't do it because we don't have the resources, you're never going to do all of the things that you could do if you were just more entrepreneurial and said: This is important, I'm going to find the resources one way or another, which I think is more possible than we realize.

**Reti:** Okay, great. So you've been here a long time and seen a lot of changes on the campus, from less of emphasis on the narrative evaluation system, really in some ways, the dismantling of the NES—

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** Much less emphasis on the college system, reorganization. I remember Sinsheimer taking most of the academic load away from the colleges—these key elements of what made Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz at a certain time in history. We are approaching the fiftieth anniversary of the campus in 2015 and a lot of people are reflecting back on where we came from and how do we go into the future? I wanted to give you a chance to share any reflections on those changes.

**Kliger:** Yes, there certainly are a lot of changes, mostly for the better, I think. We always like to look back and think that things were better in the past. But I'm not sure that things were better in the past. Certainly, as a campus of the University of California, which means that we are a research university, the quality of the campus is much, much higher than it was. If you were thinking of us strictly as an undergraduate institution, there are probably some things that we've lost along the way. But that's not all that we are. We are a research institution that

has undergraduate as well as graduate programs. I think we have managed to build graduate programs and build strong research programs very effectively at the same time that I think, to a large extent, we've kept our ethos of having a strong commitment to undergraduate education. When we hire faculty, in most cases we really take into consideration what kind of teachers they will be and what kind of commitment they will have to undergraduates. I think that's a rare thing in major research universities. So we have a lot to be proud of. The original goal that Dean McHenry had was that we would be a research university with the feel of an undergraduate institution. Even though the colleges may not have as much power as they did in those early years, I think that ethos of being a major research university with a strong commitment to undergraduates has lived on and is something that the campus should be proud of.

**Reti:** Do you see us building on that in the future?

**Kliger:** I hope so. I'm pretty hopeful that we will be able to, because the reality is that when you hire a new faculty, the people who hire the new faculty are the old faculty. So if you start out with a group of faculty who have a strong commitment to undergraduate education they're more likely to hire people who also have that commitment. So I'm hopeful that that will continue. Might it get weaker? Maybe. But I think the basic philosophy should be maintainable.

**Reti:** Are there other directions you'd like to see the campus pursue?

**Kliger:** Well, I think we talk a lot about interdisciplinary work and the reality is not as strong as the rhetoric is. I'd like to see a lot more of that. Some of that is happening with collaborations between the engineering school and the arts, for

example. But in principle I think there could be a lot more collaborations between the sciences and humanities and social sciences, and that sort of thing. That's a difficult thing to do because the languages of the different groups are different, and it takes a real commitment to really do interdisciplinary work. I think we do have a number of faculty who *do* that and are committed to that. Most are not. But you don't need everybody to do that. You just need a substantial number of people who are interested in that and you can do really exciting things.

**Reti:** This is a big question. (laughs) What do you see as the future of public universities in the state of California?

**Kliger:** Whew! (laughs) That's a good question. That's a really good question. I don't know. I don't see the commitment of the state of California to a strong higher education system the way they had in the past. I think there is still a really good system. I think with all the budget cuts UC is still an extremely strong institution as a whole. And CSU is a really good institution. I think the basic structure of the UC-CSU-community college structure is a good one. I think it's not going to be as inexpensive for students as it was in the past, and I think that's really too bad. The thing that I'm most worried about is what is that going to do to the middle class? Because frankly, we have a very strong commitment at this point to families making less than \$80,000 a year so they don't pay the fees. So for families that are poor, they can get a high quality UC education at a price that they can afford. For families that are wealthy, they can afford it so it's not a problem. The middle class is the one that gets squeezed, and I think that's very dangerous for the state. I just hope there's more recognition of that, because I see

more and more everybody focusing on trying to get a good education for the poor. But I don't see people fighting for the middle class as much as they need to. So that's the biggest worry I have for UC being sustainable. Because I think the university needs that middle class.

**Reti:** Well, politically, certainly, as well.

**Kliger:** Absolutely, yes.

### **The Kliger Research Group**

**Reti:** Okay. You've always had the Kliger Research Group but you are continuing your work in that area.

**Kliger:** Yes.

**Reti:** What is your current research focusing on?

**Kliger:** I work in the area of biophysics where we are using tools of laser spectroscopy, meaning that we look at how proteins interact with light and how that changes when you excite them with the laser to initiate various protein reactions. We're trying to understand how proteins function by looking at how they change their shape and the way they work over broad time scales, from a billionth of a second, up to seconds. It's a lot of fun. It might seem that trying to understand how things happen in a billionth of a second is irrelevant, but that's the time scale of molecules. So if you really want to understand how a protein works, you need to understand how it works on a time scale that's relevant to the protein. So that's what we do. One trick is, how do you start the reaction? By

using very fast pulses of light, we use various tricks to start the protein reactions. Then how do you measure how the protein changes with time? By seeing how it interacts with light as a function of time, you can say something about what's happening within the protein to tell what it's doing.

**Reti:** Is there an application to the research?

**Kliger:** Well, ultimately. There are many different aspects of it. So for example, one of the proteins that we study is rhodopsin, the protein in the eye, that is in the retina. It's what absorbs light in your eye. And it undergoes changes which change it from an inactive form to an active form, that then causes it to interact with other proteins that send an electrical signal to your brain saying that you saw something.

**Reti:** That's so wild to imagine.

**Kliger:** I'm interested in just fundamentally, how does it do that? We've learned a lot about what it does. Now what we're looking at is what happens to mutants of rhodopsin when they absorb light? Because there are a number of forms of diseases like Retinitis pigmentosa which are essentially caused by point mutations in rhodopsin, in the rhodopsin gene. So hopefully if we could understand how the protein functions in its normal state and what happens to it in its diseased state, we could then help people figure out how to correct those problems.

**Reti:** Who is in the Kliger Research Group?

**Kliger:** Well, Jim Lewis is a researcher who has been in my lab for decades. Bob Goldbeck similarly. Bob was actually a graduate student with me. He then went off to do a postdoc at Stanford and then he came back, and he's been in the group forever. Eefei Chen is a researcher who has been in the group for about fifteen years. Istvan Szundi works partly in my life and partly in Olóf Einarsdóttir's lab. And then, we've got at the moment one graduate student, Rosa Nguyen, who is about to graduate. I've got a couple of undergraduates and a couple of visitors. One, Ray Esquerra, is a faculty member at San Francisco State who works with us. Atom Yee is a faculty member at Santa Clara. He's actually the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences now at Santa Clara. He's worked with us for a long time. And at the moment I have another researcher from Einstein College of Medicine who is working in the lab for just a short time.

**Reti:** Exciting.

**Kliger:** It's a good group.

**Reti:** Is there anything else you're wanting to pursue now that you're no longer CP/EVC?

**Kliger:** Well, the big thing that I'm trying to pursue at the moment is to convince NIH to continue to give me grants so I can continue to pay these people and can keep the group together. (laughs) So that's the thing that I'm really focusing on at the moment.

**Reti:** Okay. Well, thank you so much, Dave. This has been fascinating for me personally and I'm so glad you agreed to do this oral history for the historical record.

**Kliger:** You're welcome. It's fun. Over all this period of time you tend to forget what happened, so it's nice to go back and try to remember what you did over the last twenty years. So thanks for that opportunity.

**Reti:** You're most welcome.