

UC Santa Cruz

Institutional History of UCSC

Title

Robert B. Stevens: UCSC Chancellorship, 1987-1991

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/95h8k9w0>

Authors

Stevens, Robert
Jarrell, Randall
Regional History Project, UCSC Library

Publication Date

1999-05-21

Supplemental Material

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/95h8k9w0#supplemental>

Introduction

The Regional History Project conducted six interviews with UCSC Chancellor Robert B. Stevens during June and July, 1991, as part of its University History series. Stevens was appointed the campus's fifth chancellor by UC President David P. Gardner in July, 1987, and served until July, 1991. He was the second UCSC chancellor (following Chancellor Emeritus Robert L. Sinsheimer) recruited from a private institution.

Stevens was born in England in 1933 and first came to the United States when he was 23. He was educated at Oxford University (B.A., M.A., B.C.L., and D.C.L.) and at Yale University (L.L.M.) and became an American citizen in 1971. An English barrister, Stevens has strong research interests in legal history and education in the United States and England. He served as chairman of the Research Advisory Committee of the American Bar Foundation, has written a half dozen books on legal history and social legislation, and numerous papers on American legal scholarship and comparative Anglo-American legal history.

Prior to his appointment at UCSC he served for almost a decade as president of Haverford College from 1978 until 1987. From 1959 to 1976 he was a professor of law at Yale University. He served as provost and as professor of law and history at Tulane University from 1976 to 1978. He also taught at Oxford University, the London School of Economics, Stanford University, and the University of East Africa.

Stevens begins his narrative by describing how he became a candidate for the chancellorship, the circumstances surrounding his appointment, and his reasons for joining a public institution. His commitment to access—that students from diverse ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds have an opportunity to attend a UC campus—and to the undergraduate college system which characterizes this campus, were major motives in his decision to become chancellor.

In these interviews he comments on the major policy areas which he addressed during his tenure, provides a critique of the institution as he found it, and explains the numerous changes he initiated. He describes the context for the strained nature of town-gown relations he faced upon his arrival and his efforts to establish a more harmonious relationship between the University and the city of Santa Cruz. His dilemma was to meet the obligations of the UC system in providing education for its students, while mitigating the impacts—most notably, traffic congestion and housing—which the growing campus student population had on the city. He describes the negotiations between city and campus officials which resulted in limiting the rate of growth and the size of the campus to 15,000 students, a precedent-setting agreement for a UC campus. He also discusses in detail the history of the Long Range Development Plan and the *Report to the Committee on the Year 2005*.

Stevens speaks about the steps he took to decentralize the campus administration, to reinvigorate and reorganize the workings of the college system, and to establish a comprehensive budget process. These reforms stood the campus in good stead in light of the severe budget cuts which affected UCSC and the entire UC system during the state's recession.

He discusses the many issues which engaged him during his tenure, including multiculturalism and the undergraduate curriculum, faculty teaching loads, his evaluation of the various academic disciplines and their faculties, his administrative appointments, and his efforts at fundraising and development. He also describes his relations with students, his thoughts on student activism, the development of the performing arts complex, and how his official social life was an opportunity for outreach to constituencies on the campus and in the community.

Stevens recounts how he and his staff followed the campus emergency plan during the Loma Prieta Earthquake of October 17, 1989, when the campus suffered some \$7 million dollars in damage, but fortunately no loss of life. When UCLA sent police and medical personnel to assist UCSC, Stevens saw that these resources were directed to the city and county of Santa Cruz in his efforts to be a good neighbor during this devastating period for the community.

He described these interviews, held several weeks before he retired from the chancellorship, as a sort of de-briefing opportunity to reflect on his tenure. Stevens was unusually candid in assessing his chancellorship, freely acknowledging what he perceived as several missteps on his part as he came to better understand the culture of UCSC as a public institution.

The tape-recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim and edited for continuity and clarity, organized into chapters, and the manuscript returned to Stevens for his perusal and any additional comments. He read the edited transcript and made numerous small corrections and changes to the text, all of which have been incorporated into the final manuscript. Copies of this manuscript are available at the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley; and at Special Collections, McHenry Library, University of California, Santa Cruz. The Regional History Project is supported administratively by Alan Ritch, head of Collection Planning and University Librarian Allan J. Dyson.

Randall Jarrell

May 21, 1999
McHenry Library
University of California, Santa Cruz

Table of Contents

Introduction	viii
Appointment to the Chancellorship	1
First Impressions of UC Santa Cruz	8
Seaching for an Academic Vice Chancellor	11
Approach to Campus Administration	13
Relationship with UC Chancellors	15
UC Regents	16
The Importance of Access	18
Outreach to Underrepresented Groups	20
Retention	21
Multiculturalism and the Curriculum	24
The Budget Process	25
Faculty Teaching Loads	29
Renewing the Colleges	31
Town-Gown Relations	34
Limiting Enrollment to 15,000	38
Long Range Development Plan	41
Renewing the College System	43
Meyer Drive Extension and the Performing Arts Complex	48

Campus Fundraising Activities	50
Decentralizing the Administration	52
Faculty Recruitment of Women and Ethnic Minorities	56
Recruitment and Retention of an Ethnically Diverse Student Body	57
The “Asian Food Affair” at Crown College	59
UC Santa Cruz as a Multicultural Campus	62
Development of the Sciences	64
The Natural Sciences	65
The Arts	66
The Social Sciences	67
The Humanities	68
Santa Cruz as a Location for a UC Campus	70
Relationships with other UC Chancellors	73
The Loma Prieta Earthquake, October 17, 1989	75
Coping with Budget Cuts and the State Budget Crisis	79
Assessment of Administrative Appointments	82
Fundraising for a Pacific Rim College	84
Previous UC Santa Cruz Chancellors	84
The State Budget Crisis and UC Tuition Increases	86
Relations with Students	87
Student Activism	89

The Performing Arts Complex	90
Social Life	91
Resignation	93
Index	98

Appointment to the Chancellorship

Jarrell: In this first interview, Chancellor, I want to focus on how you found out about the chancellorship's availability at Santa Cruz and how you came to be interested in this position.

Stevens: In the fall of 1986 I had been president at Haverford [College] for some eight and a half years and I decided that I really wanted to think out the remainder of my life. I was evaluated each year by the board and they had been kind enough to ask me to stay, to take a third five-year term. I said I really didn't want to do that, but what I would do would be to stay two more years beyond that time, so I would do all together eleven years. I wanted their permission to see whether there were any interesting possibilities out there in the fall of 1986. So I let my name go forward in a couple of searches. One was Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, a president's job; the other was the vice-chancellorship of the University of Essex in England. Vice-chancellor is the same job as president. I talked, for instance, with Derek [C.] Bok, the president of Harvard, whom I'd known for a long while, and a number of other people including Sheldon Hackney, the president of Penn [University of Pennsylvania], and others. They, I suspect, sent in my name to David [P.] Gardner.

I did not apply for this job. I knew very little about Santa Cruz. Whereas I was conscious that I was being nominated for Case Western and for the University of

Essex, I was less clear about this. I did talk with Derek Bok. Among the open possibilities . . . he certainly talked about the University of California. I suspect he nominated me. I talked rather more actively with Nelson W. Polsby at Berkeley, but as I say, I knew virtually nothing about this campus.

Jarrell: Had you heard of it?

Stevens: Oh yes. But I must say, that although I'm a historian of higher education I knew very little about it. I had believed I had been nominated by either Bok or Polsby, and I honestly forget what the nature of our discussions was, but I thought I had been nominated for UC Santa Barbara. (laughter) I was interviewed both by Essex and by Case Western Reserve rather seriously around Christmas of 1987. I was called back for final interviews to those two institutions in February, 1987.

Jarrell: So someone from the UC system, then, eventually . . .

Stevens: Eventually called me. It was Jack [W.] Peltason, the chancellor at UC Irvine, who called me on behalf of David Gardner and asked if I were a candidate for a chancellorship, would I be prepared to accept it, you know, whether I was serious. I said yes. He then said Santa Cruz. I must say . . . the only conversation I'd had . . . was I think Nelson Polsby told me once that Santa Barbara was open, so I assumed I'd be nominated, if at all, there. So that's how I got in. The way these searches are run in the UC system I had only one interview . . . I heard from Peltason and then a week or so later I had instructions to appear for the final search process. I had met many times with the search committee at Case Western. I'd met many times at Essex. I was by this time also on the short list at Dartmouth. In the end, the final meetings happened about the same time, so Kathy [Stevens] and I caught a plane to Cleveland for the final interview there. We caught a plane from Cleveland, spent two days there, then went to California, and to San Francisco Airport and it was all conducted in the most remarkable secrecy. We registered under, not false names, we registered under Kathy's name. I had an hour and a half interview with the committee.

Jarrell: Where was that held?

Stevens: In one of the hotels at the airport.

Jarrell: So it wasn't on campus.

Stevens: The committee was composed of the UC President, three or four regents, three faculty from this campus, two faculty from other campuses, a graduate student, an undergraduate student, and a staff member. Janet [E.] Young, the president's executive assistant, sat in the room. Kathy was in the meeting. I imagine we talked for an hour and a half or an hour and three quarters. We were invited to come down to the campus and we met Bill [William P.] Baker down here, and we were driven around the campus. It was all very mysterious. Bill Baker said if we were met I was to say I was his brother so he wouldn't have to introduce me to anyone. We drove around the campus, went into Oakes and around University House, but we didn't go in. I met no one on the campus. The following morning I met [UC President] David Gardner for a few minutes. He called and left a message at the hotel and asked me to come and talk with him, so I went and talked with him. Then we got on a plane and flew to London for the Essex interview. So we went to spend two days in Essex and then went back to Haverford, having done a rather extensive journey in six days, or seven days. I think I got back to Haverford maybe on a Friday evening. We'd started out on the previous Sunday, heading towards Cleveland. On Tuesday or Wednesday I got a call from the chair of the board at Case and the chair of the board at Essex offering me both Essex and Case Western. The following day I had a call from David Gardner, and David always phrases these things more diplomatically to give himself a little bit of an out, offering me the chancellorship here. I said I really needed to meet more people on each campus.

I flew to Case Western and talked to a lot of people there about the finances because it was having, I felt, great financial difficulties. I talked with the dean at the medical school with whom I was very impressed and made certain he would stay. They were having tremendous financial difficulties, tremendous difficulties recruiting. It has great strengths in engineering and medicine but was weak elsewhere.

I then flew on here and I knew nobody on this campus. So I had said, before I could make a decision about this place I needed to meet some people. I was allowed to meet the three members of the committee, although Ronnie [Isebill V.] Gruhn was not in town. I met Hardy [T.] Frye, and Charles [W.] Daniel and . .

. the concession was made that I was allowed to meet Chancellor Robert [L.] Sinsheimer. But that was all. So that made it very difficult.

Then I flew on to London. And . . . oh wait a minute, I'd also in the meantime flown to Washington, D.C., on my way to Cleveland to be interviewed by the Dartmouth committee. But they were at an early stage in their discussions, or much earlier than the other three. I then flew on to London and met some people again at Essex. Then in London I effectively made up my mind. To me it was really between Essex and Santa Cruz. Case Western just had too many problems as far as I was concerned. I mean it's a large university and prestigious. But it had such endemic problems that I was seriously doubting whether it would survive as an institution, at least in its present form.

Jarrell: When you were in the process of investigating the situation at Case, were they were very forthcoming about the seriousness of their problems or did you kind of have to get this information yourself from close questioning?

Stevens: You know one of the advantages of being a lawyer is you can read a balance sheet, and they had balance sheets and it was obvious they were dipping into capital. They were not filling their classes with good students. They weren't really filling their classes. They had terrible financial problems. They had difficulty keeping their graduate programs going. The physical plant was in terrible shape. The problem was the board was a local board and didn't really understand what the problems were. I mean they didn't have good educators on it, they didn't understand, I think, some of the problems they faced. I liked the people on the board, but I thought it was not a strong board and that would really be a . . .

Jarrell: A handicap for you?

Stevens: Oh it would have been an enormous handicap. I was accustomed to a very good board and our own board at Haverford was really quite educated on higher education. This was not the situation there. So I think probably I was right in feeling that one might really end up having to phase it out as a private institution. So I don't have any regrets about that. I found the choice about Essex much more difficult, because I liked the people there very much. It was a much

more open process than the University of California. I had met all the deans; I had met all the department chairs.

Jarrell: The people you'd be working with?

Stevens: That's right. So it was really a choice between the University of California at Santa Cruz, or the University of Essex, or waiting to see whether Dartmouth came out . . . or possibly just aborting all of them and thinking about it in another year. But I felt for a whole series of reasons that I was getting on in age and if I was going to do it I probably ought to do it then. Since Dartmouth was a month behind . . . I mean I was on the short list but I have no idea whether I'd have been chosen at Dartmouth. I did have three offers. I turned down Case Western. I really agonized about the difference between Essex and here.

I was motivated by all sorts of things. I had taught at Stanford and very much liked Northern California. I liked the people I had met in the University of California. I had lots of friends at Berkeley. How does one make these decisions? I guess this more than any other reason, but I think Kathy would have preferred to live in the States rather than in England, although I must say she was very open-minded about it. So anyway those were the reasons I eventually accepted the chancellorship here. I was influenced by the fact that I'd never been in the public sector. I liked what I heard about Santa Cruz's college system, what I knew about the liberal arts and science approach, attempting to inject the residential liberal arts college into the public sector. I was very interested in the graduate programs that were developing. I thought that was a tremendously interesting challenge. But I really care a great deal about access and I was worried that in the private sector access was being increasingly restricted and the private colleges were going to end up as preserves of the rich. So, there was a general feeling that all things being equal, we wanted to stay in the States. Partly because Mrs. Thatcher was beginning to attack, or was already attacking, the English universities . . . and because we both liked Northern California, we eventually made the decision to come to Santa Cruz. But we certainly knew very little about Santa Cruz, having spoken to no one other than the three faculty members, the two students, and the staff member.

Jarrell: Were you curious at all about the secrecy with which this entire process was carried out? I mean, assuming aliases while driving around the campus?

Stevens: It seemed to me a little odd. But it was explained to me in terms of the fact that the last Berkeley search had become so public that all the good people dropped out. So it certainly concerned me, if that's what you mean. But it did not concern me dramatically.

Jarrell: What kinds of questions did the search committee ask you at the airport meeting . . . that was the only time, apparently that you had an in-depth dialogue. What kinds of things were they interested in? Did they give you a kind of status report on this campus?

Stevens: Mainly they were asking me questions. Obviously the questions they were concerned about were my academic interests because faculty members always want to know your academic interests. Students were interested in my views of students. Staff members were interested in my view of staff. Regents were interested in my management style. You know, that kind of thing. It was not an occasion, really, for me to get much information about the campus. Normally, when you are interviewed for these jobs, you are taken around the campus and you meet the admissions officer and the deans and they throw you in with the . . . I don't know, the psychiatrist or something (laughter) so you hear about the place.

I was given a great deal of material about the University but in terms of information provided by other humans, there was very little. I had an indirect link to Jim [James T.] Clifford who'd been at Haverford and I talked on the phone to him at one point. This was after I'd been offered the job, certainly. And I also, Paul [L.] Niebanck had some connections. I knew neither of them but I did talk to both of them and I'm pretty certain it was after I'd been offered the job.

Jarrell: I'm always very surprised at and interested in the way an institution carries out a recruitment and the detail and the thoroughness with which they do it. How would you evaluate the process by which you were recruited?

Stevens: I think these processes for choosing presidents, chancellors etc., inevitably are something of a gamble. I mean they are a gamble on both sides. I always tell my friends who for some reason want to be university presidents that if they're on the short list, but not selected, they shouldn't take umbrage because there are pressures to choose people that offend least. All you have to

say is one thing to some particular person to get dropped off, so you shouldn't get depressed if you're not chosen. Equally you should not get arrogant if you are chosen since it tends to be I don't think fortuitous . . . I think getting on to the short list is a relatively rational process, being chosen for one of the candidates is I don't mean to say largely fortuitous, but there's certainly an element of chance in it. I wouldn't criticize any system for choosing chancellors with diffidence. I mean, I did find it was odd that I had never been in such a closed system as this. But it was clearly at that particular time a reaction to having the enormously open process which made every choice terribly politicized, so I understand why they did it. But there are costs on both sides.

Jarrell: Did you manage to get any sense of the UCSC campus, what particular hurdles or problems it faced prior to your arrival here? You mentioned you talked to Bob Sinsheimer . . .

Stevens: Yes . . . you know I said that that was before I accepted but I'm not entirely certain it was. When I asked about problems in the interview, which was your original question, I was certainly told about town-gown relations and that clearly was seen by the regents as the most important problem facing the campus. The development of graduate programs, the sorting out of the college system—these came through to me in the interview as very important issues.

Jarrell: Did they engage you?

Stevens: Oh sure.

Jarrell: Access was your own agenda.

Stevens: Access was my own agenda but I had always been at institutions that had colleges and I was very excited by that. I was very excited about the idea of starting graduate programs and continue to be. I continue to be very interested in the colleges and . . . you saw my report last week on the colleges?

Jarrell: Yes.

Stevens: So I mean those were things I was interested in. I must say, I told them very directly that I hadn't the faintest idea whether I would be any good at dealing with the city. Because I had virtually no experience in that.

Jarrell: With local politicians and all . . .

Stevens: That's right. I had no idea whether I would be any good at that.

Jarrell: There wasn't any town-gown conflict at Haverford?

Stevens: A little problem with the local community but it was not quite the all-engaging sport it is in Santa Cruz.

Jarrell: It's interesting you put it that way. The other piece of this that you mentioned was that you were intrigued by the opportunity to operate in the public sector, and you no doubt knew something about the University of California system. But were you were very knowledgeable about the governance of the University?

Stevens: No, not particularly.

Jarrell: So what was it like when you arrived here in the fall of 1987?

First Impressions of UC Santa Cruz

Stevens: Well . . . I'm sure you have all these dates. I accepted the job sometime in March or April and started in July, 1987. I came out here and met people. One always gets a very strange sense of the campus when you began to meet the participants, rush from meeting to meeting, from dinner to dinner, function to function. It was very hard to get a clear sense of what the main issues were, but certainly they were very clearly the issues that had come through in the interview. The relations with the city were obviously very, very serious. The college system was probably in worse shambles than had been reported to me. The conflict between teaching and research was I think more acute than I would have imagined. I think the things that appalled me about Santa Cruz were actually not specifically there – the fact that we had no real budget or budgeting procedure. The quality of administration was in general appalling. I was unimpressed by at least some of the vice-chancellors and deans and I just thought the quality of administration was dramatically lower than in any of the private institutions with which I had been associated.

Jarrell: In what ways, Chancellor?

Stevens: Well the people were just basically less able. In the private sector when people aren't able you fire them. You can't do that in the University of California. The other thing I suppose I hadn't quite realized was that while there were some good students here, they were just much less bright and less well educated than I'd been accustomed to. I've enjoyed some of the students here very, very much. But that was a sort of surprise to me. I mean, the students at Haverford, for instance, had an SAT of maybe 150 higher than here. But they had been to schools where they had just had a very good education.

Jarrell: So their preparation prior to undergraduate college life was more advanced?

Stevens: Just much much better.

Jarrell: How did you become aware of this at Santa Cruz yourself?

Stevens: Well, in talking to students. I found that they were just less sophisticated and less educated and less smart. That doesn't mean there are not some wonderful students here. Don't mishear me.

Jarrell: You're saying sort of across the board, the general quality . . .

Stevens: Across the board it was sort of disappointing and I guess too, that I had assumed the faculty would be more research-oriented than it is, being part of the University of California. There's a lot of talk about research and obviously there's some wonderful research here . . . but the overall quality of the faculty was not really very different from that of the liberal arts college I come from, and on balance much lower than Yale, where I'd spent most of my life. So I guess I was to some extent disappointed both in the quality of students and the faculty, although again, these, for the record . . . if you look at a board like astrophysics, I mean it's just outstanding . . . or linguistics, so . . . you know I don't want to give the wrong impression. I guess it was an expectation that the quality of the faculty would be more like Yale. I guess I was a little surprised. It came closest in the sciences because our scientists are better and it so happened that Yale was less good in science, but in the humanities and social sciences for the most part, I

mean there were some differences, but for the most part on the whole Yale had a much stronger faculty.

Jarrell: Do you think that your expectations might have been perhaps shaped by your acquaintance with Berkeley?

Stevens: I hadn't really thought of that question but it's a very fair statement and may well be true, yes. I mean, you know the problem is that while you like to think of yourself as an academic making logical decisions, the truth is you are influenced more by your suppositions and visceral reactions than you ever like to let on. (laughter) My guess is that I was probably influenced by the fact that I'd twice been a visiting professor at Stanford and I had a great number of friends at Berkeley and I guess that I had tended to assume that Santa Cruz would be much more of a Berkeley than it was. But again I would say that throughout this campus are some absolutely first-rate faculty, I don't mean to belittle that but . . . perhaps the . . . I had expected more of a critical mass.

Jarrell: So prior to your arrival here in the fall you had visited and acquainted yourself with the various administrators, deans, boards of studies, and gotten somewhat of a feel?

Stevens: Yes . . . I came out here not as often as I would ideally have liked. There were a number of reasons for that. Partly I was very tired. I had done a presidency at Haverford for nine years and I was provost at Tulane before that and then I had an academic career. I think in retrospect I should have taken a much longer vacation that summer but that didn't seem at the time right. I came out two or three times. What I said about faculty and students who asked me what my expectations were and what the reality was, I think I've been very accurate about that. But I was also very pleased with what I found. On the whole I liked the people I met here and I certainly feel very fond of a significant number of people. My other difficulty in coming out however, was that it was near the end of the year and the chairman of the Haverford board would only let me make, I think it was two visits, before, or one visit perhaps, before the end of the quarter. So I came out, met with all the senior administrators and met with a significant cross-section of faculty. I met with students, with minority students, with staff groups, with the senate committees.

I was immediately faced with a problem by the senate advisory committee which is the executive committee in the senate, who made it very clear to me that it was absolutely essential that I terminate the academic vice chancellor, Kivie Moldave. I was reluctant to do that. He had the confidence of Bob Sinsheimer, the outgoing chancellor, and my initial meeting with him was a very pleasant one. I then spent a morning with him and it was clear to me that the senate advisory committee was correct. I had asked the senate advisory committee individually whether they really believed that Moldave had to go and each one of them said yes. So I was faced really with some kind of crisis immediately because it was quite clear that the academic vice chancellor had not got the confidence of the senate and I spent a day with him and I felt that they were right.

Seaching for an Academic Vice Chancellor

Jarrell: What was the nature of the criticism?

Stevens: Well he was very affable but he was incapable of planning and of making decisions. There was a lot of truth in those allegations. So I then had to terminate him. I asked the senate advisory committee to come up with names of possible academic vice chancellors to serve a year or two years. They had thought it should only be a one year acting vice-chancellorship. I said I really thought I needed time to find out about the place and I didn't want to start a search for somebody when I didn't really know what kind of person we needed right away. So I asked them to give me names of candidates. I forget now how many meetings this was spread over with the senate advisory committee. Essentially they gave me two names: George [D.] Gaspari and Ronnie [Isebill V.] Gruhn. They also mentioned, although they advised against them, three other candidates, [R.] Michael Tanner, Michael [H.] Cowan, and Geoff[rey K.] Pullum. But they were clearly in the second list. I met with Ronnie Gruhn and George Gaspari and had dinner with them. Ronnie Gruhn I had met because she had been present when I was interviewed and I had talked with her once since then. Of course she wasn't available when I came out the second time. I had a long conversation by phone with her. But it was only the second time. She wasn't

very enthusiastic about doing the job. But George Gaspari made it clear that he wouldn't do the job.

So I was left with Ronnie Gruhn, and in all fairness I was impressed with her. I also happen to believe in affirmative action. I thought it would look very good to have a woman. I was concerned that I didn't have a scientist because I'm not a scientist. But I asked the senate advisory committee about her defects and strengths and they were very positive about her. They were very positive about George Gaspari but less so. It's interesting because I asked them what defects she had. After she was appointed her style alienated a lot of people on campus, but as far as I remember when I asked what was the down-side of appointing Ronnie, nobody said anything negative except one person, I believe, who said that she doesn't suffer fools gladly. In an administrator that is not necessarily a bad thing. So that was the first thing I was faced with.

Approach to Campus Administration

Jarrell: So your administrative style would require really pulling together, making a team out of all those various appointments and that the people already in place would not be, you did not likely want to work with them?

Stevens: Well, that's not fair. For instance I enjoyed working very much with Michael [H.] Cowan in humanities and with Frank Drake in sciences, I liked him very much indeed. Wendell [C.] Brase is one of the most effective administrators I know. So no I don't . . . you must have misheard that. But I'm telling you what other people perceived and some of the things I perceived myself. But no, I certainly wouldn't say that.

Jarrell: But that you were aware that there was discontent, let's say?

Stevens: Well I don't know about discontent, but there was discontent on my part. I knew that there was a very weak administration. Yes.

Jarrell: And in order to build a team . . . Bob Sinsheimer, his management style . . . it was either very solitary or delegating decisions to others.

Stevens: Yes. I think that's a fair description. It's a perfectly fine way to run an institution. I'm not being critical of Bob. I think he was a very good chancellor. But it was very different from my style and I suppose it's one of the reasons I was chosen. I'm sorry . . . I'm losing your question. It's the end of a long day.

Jarrell: Quite early on when you arrived you already had a sense of the place. You'd kind of analyzed and critiqued for yourself how you would proceed in a general fashion, that the level of administration was not the quality that you were used to.

Stevens: Yes, it was weak. I mean, you probably make me sound much more logical. You at least highlight some of the frustrations I felt. It's not easy getting to know an alien system. I think that the differences between the private sector and the public sector I hadn't fully appreciated. I remember in the interview I was asked if I could adapt from the private to the public system and I said I genuinely did not know. I'd have to say it has been a real difficulty and I'm not quite certain how I would put that in. I think that the kind of things that I would associate with the public sector are the fact that virtually everybody has tenure; you can't get rid of people who are not doing a good job; you can't even get rid of people who are terribly incompetent. Every decision can be politicized in this system so that people can go around either to the legislature or to the University system itself.

Jarrell: As a public institution, it's a very vulnerable system for being criticized?

Stevens: I think that's right. What I think I hadn't realized was that while we've got a faculty that is not as strong as a Berkeley, shared governance can be used to sort of play games rather than to run the institution in a joint way, seeking shared goals.

Jarrell: You know for instance a corollary of that would be, in terms of shared governance, that it might be correct to assume that anyone coming from the private sector to this public system, would maybe assume that the chancellor would have some kind of jurisdiction over academic matters and find, for instance that the academic senate basically has it sewn up . . . there's a lot of entrenched power that resides in the academic senate.

Stevens: That's true in the private sector too. I mean, maybe the chancellor or the president has more power than here, I'm sure that's true. But essentially matters of educational policy are the responsibility of the faculty. In the private sector, where people are perhaps more conscious of sinking or swimming together, or where people have more commitment to the institution, there is more, at least in the institutions I've been in. I may have been in an atypical group of institutions. There is far more a sense of working toward the same goals, I think, than there is at least in my experience in the University of California, but then this is the only one I have seen in a sense from the inside.

Relationship with UC Chancellors

Jarrell: Also, you experienced UCSC as a small, new campus – well it's a young adult, let's say – a small campus in a very large system in which the critical mass is in Berkeley and UCLA. As a chancellor of one of the smaller campuses, how was that experience for you, in terms of the monthly meetings with the council of chancellors and . . . how did you feel representing Santa Cruz and being in the midst of that?

Stevens: Well let me say first of all that I like my fellow chancellors. I have found them on the whole great fun, very wise, very witty. We have a great deal of fun and laughter together. It took me a long time to learn the issues. I knew little of California politics, nothing about the funding of the University; very, very little of the organization and administration of the University. I hope I was a reasonably quick learner. But I always say to the vice chancellors that all the decisions in the council of chancellors are very principled. The first principle is that if UCLA and Berkeley want it, it happens.

Jarrell: (laughter)

Stevens: Undoubtedly that's true. But I found that I always got a fair hearing. I didn't always agree and on a number of issues, disagreed with the president. I felt the president went the extra mile to make me feel welcome and an important part of the team from the moment of arrival. I have always felt the council of chancellors treated me extremely fairly. I enjoyed it. I really did. It's always helpful to meet your peers when you are doing these jobs. This was a very

civilized and very important way of doing it. It taught me a great deal about things I didn't know about the running of hospitals and medical schools. It kept me in touch with my own primary discipline, which is law. I found it altogether very interesting. So I have never regretted the work involved in being on the council of chancellors.

Jarrell: How would you compare this to your experience at Haverford where you had a board that you seemed very pleased with?

Stevens: Haverford had a very distinguished board.

Jarrell: What was your experience with the regents and going to the regents' meetings?

UC Regents

Stevens: Well the regents' meetings could be monumental bores interspersed with moments of terror. It's a very California scene, the regents are not as intellectual nor as establishment as let's say the corporation at Yale or the board at Haverford. But there are certainly people who fall into that category. I am actually on the whole very impressed with the regents of this University. They do take the work very seriously. They read the papers which is certainly more than I do. They work very hard. I frequently disagree with their views but I have not really felt in any significant way that they did other than what they perceived was the right thing for the University. I think they get bad press. People blame the regents for this or that. I certainly disagree with them on some things, for instance hanging on to the weapons labs is probably a real noose around this University's neck. But I don't believe they do it because they are fascist pigs . . . They genuinely believe it's a good thing for the country and for the University. I think they go so far. Some of them are more intelligent than others but they wrestle hard with the issues of funding of the University. They certainly go that extra mile in trying to make certain they are doing the right thing for the University. I am in that sense very impressed with them. They are a very dedicated and basically very decent group of people. That doesn't mean that I don't find some of them irritating but I'm sure some of them find me irritating.

But I'd also have to say that they have always been tremendously supportive of me. They were wonderfully helpful when I got into this job. At my first regents' meeting [Supervisor] Gary Patton ¹ appeared and delivered a vigorous attack on me. I yielded part of my time to allow him to speak. The chairman of that committee, Richard Watkins, has a hearing problem and didn't hear me do that and when Gary got up to speak he refused to let him speak. Gary got very upset. There was a sort of *melée* in which some regents thought I was hit by the supervisor. I'm not certain what happened. I genuinely don't know. But he stormed out. It was a quite dramatic scene.

The regents were also wonderfully supportive throughout the LRDP, which was the first Long Range Development Plan. They and David Gardner really supported my efforts to work with the community. They were wonderfully supportive at the time of the earthquake and of me, personally, when I announced that I was going to resign. They really made every effort to discourage me from doing so. So I felt I've had enormous support from the regents. I cannot complain. Politically, I suspect I disagree with many of the positions regents take but personally they've been very pleasant and I am very conscious that they do not go out of their way to do things to make people angry. They do what trustees should do; they believe they've been entrusted with the responsibility for running the University and making certain that we have a first-rate public university in this state and they do that.

Jarrell: It's very heartening to hear the kind of support you've had from the president, the regents and your fellow chancellors, in light of some very difficult times the campus has had in terms of the earthquake in 1989 and the whole mess with town and gown. Town and gown relations were very difficult at the end of Chancellor Sinsheimer's tenure. You had to really spend a lot of energy working in what I think was a very tense situation. From people I've interviewed they feel in terms of systemwide relationships that Santa Cruz has gotten short shrift in the past. What do you think of this characterization?

Stevens: I really don't believe that to be true. In fact in terms of resources, Wendell Brase and I have worked on this issue, and in many aspects we in fact do really surprisingly well, in my considered opinion. Now I wish we did better

¹Gary Patton served on the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors from 1975 to 1995 and was known as a strong environmentalist. — Editor.

still; I wish there was more money to run the institution. I would like to think we deserve more institutional support but I believe the data suggests we already have more than our share. If we're going to have a campus like this which is heavily oriented to undergraduates then I think we probably would do well to . . . you know, if the University system wants that, it would do well to provide a system of resources more geared to undergraduates than graduate students. As you know, we've got far more money in FTE, I'd rather put it in terms of FTE, and therefore resources for graduate students, than we do for undergraduates.

Now, that sends a message and you know, I could certainly make an argument that the goals *now* attributed to this place when it began, which were not the goals that were then held by Dean [E.] McHenry and others, but the sort of rewriting of history about this being an undergraduate campus, then it should have belonged in the state college system rather than in the University of California. If it was a really intended to be an undergraduate place in the University, and of course it wasn't, the intention was that ten years out, fifteen percent of the students would be graduate students and twenty percent of them would be professional students. So it's perfectly logical that the same standard was applied to us as the rest, but it does mean that in its current transformation, in its current state, UCSC received short shrift from the University because of its heavy undergraduate orientation so it really needs to develop some more graduate programs but more importantly, good professional schools. That doesn't mean it can't have a wonderful undergraduate program.

Jarrell: Do you want to go on? Are you a little weary today?

Stevens: I am a little weary.

Jarrell: Why don't we stop a little early.

Stevens: I am delighted to.

The Importance of Access

Jarrell: To start, Chancellor, you mentioned your concern about the concept of access in a public institution. I would like you to elaborate on what that means

for you, first, and secondly how you have tried to implement that in terms of policy.

Stevens: I think we were talking about access in terms of the private sector and my concerns in the private sector because tuition in a private college at 20,000 dollars a year makes it extremely difficult, even with the most generous scholarship program to get people in, if you were not relatively affluent. One of the attractions of the public sector was that there would be more opportunity to encourage people from disadvantaged groups to get into the University. In many ways I do think that's true. In some ways, I've discovered it's not very true. The private schools, or the so called independent sector of higher education, in fact practice a form of taxation. It taxes wealthy parents to pay for less fortunate people to come in and in a funny kind of way some of the time they can provide better access than the public sector which has a less generous form of scholarships.

But the second thing to take into account is in a state system like this where there is one large University with nine campuses, frequently the decisions on access are made much more by the regents and the legislature, where the money is, than elsewhere. In other words, increasing the tuition 40% has a deleterious affect on access. The best we can do on an individual campus is to try and recruit students from as broad a socioeconomic range as possible and then to provide the kind of facilities when they get here that will encourage them to stay. In terms of encouraging broader representation, a good deal of money has gone into SAA-EOP, Early Outreach. A good deal of money has gone into recruiting in the admissions office, recruiting particular minority groups, and also a great deal of money has gone into support services. It is never enough. But I don't care very much about that. Whatever is wrong with the University of California's admissions policies, and I happen to think they are not so wrong, *not* to make an effort to recruit underrepresented minorities, would be a disaster.

I am relatively pleased. The fall I arrived 23% of our students were students of color. Next fall 45% of our freshmen students will be students of color. So there's been a very dramatic change. This is part of the University's outreach. It's always difficult of course when you are a liberal arts institution to reach out to minority groups, because they are by their very nature first-generation college attenders. First-generation college attenders find coming to a liberal arts institution less

attractive; they tend to be attracted to professional schools. I think we've done something to refute that, to get around that. In other words we have tried to explain to families what a liberal arts education really is and why even if you are the first generation to come into the University, nevertheless a liberal arts education is very valuable.

Outreach to Underrepresented Groups

Jarrell: In terms of active outreach and recruitment of underrepresented and underprivileged groups, this of course has been at the forefront of the UC mission, as defined by the regents, especially in the last four or five years, more than ever before. You said if this weren't done it would be a disaster. How so?

Stevens: Well I think we are becoming the most multicultural state, possibly with the exception of Hawaii. We will become more so very rapidly. If we do not change a new generation of leadership who will grow up in a democratic society we shall be in very real trouble. Partly the state will not have good leadership, which is very serious. But from a very selfish, University point of view, the University will become increasingly irrelevant to the needs of the state, and that's disastrous for a public institution.

Jarrell: In terms of the changing kinds of admissions policies that have been explicated over the years, such as special admits and seeking out students based on criteria besides GPA and SAT scores, for ethnic diversity, for extracurricular and varied kinds of backgrounds, there are a number of criticisms that come from widely divergent political points of view. In short, the argument is that the University of California, and UC Santa Cruz, are diluting or lowering admission standards and recruiting increasingly poorly prepared students to do university-level work. What do you say to that kind of a criticism?

Stevens: I think it's largely nostalgic. We have had relatively few special admits on this campus. The vast majority of our students of color, and our underrepresented minorities, are in the top 12 1/2 percent of their high schools and meet University requirements. So I don't think that's fair. I think that there are certainly, among the minority students, underrepresented minority students, students who have been to not very good high schools. We have to try to repair

that damage. But throughout the University there are students who come from not very good high schools.

Jarrell: Yes, you said last time, for instance that you were quite surprised at the generally less sophisticated, less advanced academic level of students here as opposed to Haverford.

Stevens: Yes, I think they are . . . obviously it's generalized . . . but I think that the typical high school in California is not terribly strong academically and perhaps not terribly rigorous intellectually.

Jarrell: In terms of the access then, and making UCSC reflect the kind of demographic diversity in the state, you were very personally interested in admissions policies, and in seeing that money was allocated to outreach.

Stevens: Yes, I don't want to overestimate that. There's a limit to how much you can do. But certainly I tried to give very strong support to SAA-EOP and to the admissions office in terms of strengthening our recruitment.

Retention

Jarrell: Can you tell me . . . I'm not clear on implementation of retention policies, how that is done and where the initiative comes from. Because I know it's problematic for some groups.

Stevens: Yes, well it seems to me that the ways to do that are to provide a learning center, we put a lot of money into that, and to also to try to improve the quality of advising on the campus. In my second year I put a lot into the colleges to try to make certain they did a better job of advising. Last year I had Joe [Joseph P.] Allen as my (inaudible) of people in the colleges. I think a lot of energy and emphasis we've put into the colleges has gone into putting more into our resources into academic advising, rather than regular student services. So those are very important ways of providing support services for students who come with less than good academic backgrounds, or who are less well prepared. As I say, I think we need to get it very clearly into the record, that the vast

majority of students of color are admitted onto the campus on exactly the same basis as the majority group is admitted.

Jarrell: Yes. I mean there is the disturbing perception . . . I think in the UC system, not just at UC Santa Cruz, in incidents of discrimination and racism and press reports that some students feel that African-American students, say at Berkeley, are there only because of some kind of reverse discrimination or some kind of special admit policies. Without having any kind of factual data, often there is that perception that underrepresented minorities are here only because of that and *ipso facto* that they are unprepared. You are saying that's not true and that there's a very small percentage of special admits.

Stevens: That's correct.

Jarrell: That by and large we are talking about people who are in that upper 12 1/2 percent.

Stevens: The vast majority are in that top twelve percent. There are relatively few special admits. What *is* true is that we will admit underrepresented minorities who may be less well qualified than white students or Asian students. But we also give some kind of preference to students from remote areas, students from near Santa Cruz. We give some preference to students who are very musical or very athletic or have run the yearbook. We have adhered to the Bakke decision.² So, you know I understand what's going on on our campuses at the moment and this hostility . . . I think it's overrated by the people outside the University. There's a relatively small hostility to our admissions policies. But the idea that we admit greatly unqualified black students is just not true. Practically all the African-American students on this campus are qualified and in the top twelve and a half percent of their classes. There may be among those a number of students who don't have as good records on the surface as majority students. But we're trying to make it an interesting class, and a class in which you can learn

²Regents of the University of California vs. Bakke: June 28, 1978. In this case the U.S. Supreme Court found that the UC Davis Medical School acted illegally by disallowing a white applicant, Allan Bakke, from competing for a set number of places reserved for minority applicants. The court, however, validated the concept of affirmative action and stipulated that admissions policies could include race as one of the criteria for evaluating applicants—
Editor.

in different directions and we do not admit unqualified students. There's no doubt about that.

Jarrell: I think it's become politically very controversial and that's why I'm directing questions at this.

Stevens: Yes of course and I understand that. The controversy, in my view is a great deal more outside the campus than on the campus. The students I talk to are far less worried about that . . . they are more worried about the fragmentation on the campus between the racial groups . . . to be a focus on themselves rather than the University as a whole. This is a very serious problem. I think it's perhaps not quite as bad as it is on many campuses. But it is a very serious problem and concerns me as a citizen as least as much as a chancellor.

Jarrell: Yes, because I'd say that the institutions of higher learning, especially public institutions, are sort of at the vanguard for the whole culture in terms of multiculturalism and diversity.

Stevens: Yes. Stanford has a more diverse student body than we do in terms of students of color. Certainly Harvard has a remarkably diverse student body. So I don't think you can necessarily say that . . . many of the battles of multiculturalism are certainly being fought in the public institutions. I think the opposition to our efforts to make our student body more diverse by the public at large, are generally unjustified, certainly in political terms and also very much in intellectual terms. What worries me is that I think there's a great deal of muddy thinking about multiculturalism. I don't know whether to call it hostility . . . I'm much more sympathetic to the intellectual concerns outside the academy in what we are doing with multiculturalism because it has become one of those politically correct areas where everything that is multicultural has been defined as good and anything that is not multicultural as bad. We live in a society which is essentially European in terms of its institutions and culture and I think we need to do a lot of fundamental thinking about what is appropriate multiculturalism and what is not.

Multiculturalism and the Curriculum

Jarrell: In terms of curriculum?

Stevens: Yes, I think there is a simplistic notion that the more multicultural we are the better. Now, I can make a case for that. I am certainly not unsympathetic to that. But we have to decide what a coherent, good liberal arts education is. Then you can decide whether in fact you want to include this area intelligently . . . just adding courses without being clear about what you are doing, what role these courses will have in the institution, except for the fact that they are politically correct . . . is I think quite dangerous.

Jarrell: We've inevitably wafted over into the very *au courant* topic of political correctness, which I want you to talk about. You're addressing it. Some militant groups have been accused of substituting multicultural representation in academic courses, for, say, excellence and tradition. What you are saying is that the curriculum has to be coherent, there has to be some thoughtfulness in terms of how this multiculturalism is going to be defined.

Stevens: Yes, I think that's a fair way of putting it. I worry that one of the things we don't do well on our campuses, and we particularly don't do well on this campus, is being clear about what we think a good liberal arts education is. As a matter of fact to challenge your point on political correctness, if that's the right word, one of the things I've been disappointed in since I've been here, is when I arrived I was very worried that for an institution that talked so much about undergraduate education . . . that we had a really not very well-thought-out undergraduate program. We had an undergraduate program that had all the elements of a 1960s program. Students did what they wanted. I think that's an abnegation of responsibility on the part of the faculty. I said that to the committee on undergraduate education, which issued a very interesting report . . . I don't agree with parts of it, but I do obviously with the commitment to have a rather more structured curriculum. So I found it interesting and important in terms of the whole of the curriculum, but also I thought they addressed the issue of multiculturalism in an intellectual way. This very often doesn't happen.

You raise, of course, the broader issue of political correctness and an approach to this. I think probably the press at the moment is overstating the issue. That does

not mean there are not problems. There always have been problems in academic life. Professors and students like to think universities live in a vacuum and of course they do not. When I began teaching in this country in the mid-1950s, the prevailing culture was very conservative. People who intellectually or socially strayed from the norms were subject to all kinds of subtle, and less than subtle, pressure from the Right, to conform. Now we live in a society where, you can say, in institutions like this one, there are all kinds of subtle pressures from the Left to conform. Issues of race or gender or issues of peace or the environment .

..

I am concerned at the subtle pressures that prevent people from speaking out honestly and I do know students who feel that their views are ignored or they are intimidated into silence because of the overwhelming hostility of the faculty as well as students to anything that might seem conservative – support for the war or skepticism about affirmative action. Whatever my own personal point of view, I find it immensely disturbing to find that students feel intimidated into not speaking in class, not expressing their views. That seems to me extraordinarily unfortunate. Because the thing I have to keep reminding myself, is that this has been true throughout society, in the universities, except the players and the unpopular causes have changed. I worry, I suppose more about what is happening in some parts of the University, in terms of hiring faculty who have a certain orientation revolving around gender, race, and ethnicity. Again I suspect here that the concerns are overstated, but there is a certain pattern of appointments in some boards where it does seem difficult for those of certain political views to get an appointment.

The Budget Process

Jarrell: You said the budget process particularly concerned you; that there was no real budgeting procedure. In terms of the administrators you appointed and budgeting procedures, how did those two interrelate, in terms of your management style, and how you addressed budgeting and allocation of resources?

Stevens: Well I know budgeting sounds extremely tiresome and tedious but it is very important. Unless you have concern with the budget you don't have control of educational policy, really. When I have been trying to do over the years is to push down responsibility to the academic vice chancellors and other vice chancellors and then to send down to managers, deans, board chairs or managers of support activities the responsibility for making decisions and giving them budget responsibility all the way down so we don't become overcentralized. In fact we have decisions made as close to the source as possible.

Jarrell: That's very interesting. You're talking about your desire to decentralize?

Stevens: That's right. In order to decentralize you have to do two things. You delegate down . . . and you need information to do that . . . you also need a competent budgeting process. When I arrived the campus had an effective executive vice chancellor in Wendell Brase. All the financial decisions were not made by the chancellor except in name. They were in effect made by the vice chancellor for finance, planning and administration, Wendell Brase, or the director of the budget. That meant there was neither control in the other divisions nor any sense of responsibility. So there was general chaos on the academic side.

I forgot to mention to you before, but the truth is that Kivie Moldave, the then academic vice chancellor, was not a planner, so there was no real planning going on there. There were no documents that were essentially what I might recognize as budgets. Of course there was a budget but nobody really had access to it. So one of the things I've been battling for four years . . . there were no budgets, the dean had no budget. The academic vice chancellor had no budget. (inaudible) So it made running the institution very difficult indeed. It made intelligent academic policy very difficult to invent. In decisions the chancellor got to make, any real budget were incremental funds that came to the campus and incremental FTE's. So there was no way of reviewing the existing budget. This was partly our fault, but discussions on FTE's only involved the new FTE's but not the existing ones. So the chances of rational decision making were extremely limited.

An easier way to get information was just to go to the catalog. But much more dramatic is the fact that I would be asked by a new staff person in let's say admissions, whether there was any document I had access to which would tell

me what the budget for the admissions office was, or how many people worked in admissions. I would have to send to the director of the budget who after some weeks would send me back a document saying the budget of admissions was \$823,000, or something of that order and that twelve people worked there. But I did not have a budget that would tell me how much was spent on maintenance, how much was spent on utilities . . .

Jarrell: There was no break-down of the entire budget?

Stevens: From time to time I would be asked for more money for utilities and at that point we would obviously work with printouts which if you searched through them told you how much you currently spent on utilities. But there wasn't anything that I could whip out as a budget. There was nothing the vice chancellors had as a budget. It was all done by the mystique in the director of the budget's office.

Jarrell: That's very surprising.

Stevens: It was surprising to me too. I had been skeptical about criticism of public institutions but the critics are right. There's far less accountability in the public sector. I had thought that Yale was a badly run institution but there is rigorous budgeting there.

Jarrell: Is it similar at the other campuses?

Stevens: It varies enormously. It's really very amateur at Berkeley. It's very efficient at UCLA.

Jarrell: So once you become fully aware of the lack of information that was available to you, what have you done?

Stevens: Within the last year we have a budget for the University. We have a budget for every board, every division, every department.

Jarrell: What kind of a struggle has it been for you to complete this and to have this implemented?

Stevens: Well it's been a really considerable struggle. You know, David Gardner lent me Adrian [H.] Harris from UCLA. He came and gave me advice and kept

giving me advice. Adrian was a vice chancellor at UCLA. He just retired. They were wonderful help to me. But there was a lot of opposition that came from this campus. There were certainly people in planning and the committee on planning and budget, who were not happy to see the changes, although if there's no budget it's very difficult for the chancellor to make . . . or also difficult for the senate committees to have any serious input into decisions that are made by thought or by conscious effort.

Jarrell: So did you have opposition from certain quarters that didn't want this to be open and on the table?

Stevens: Well you ought to interview people who opposed it to find out why they opposed it. I'm not going to speculate on that.

Jarrell: Did you express early on that this is the direction you were heading in?

Stevens: Well that's right, yes. Fairly early Ronnie Gruhn got some kind of handle on that and we developed six-year plans for each division. But what had happened before I think was that of course, for many years there was no-growth, so not much planning was needed . . . (inaudible)

Jarrell: Was static, yes.

Stevens: But when campus growth began to move again in the mid-80s, there were several planning options, which were in a sense wish lists by the deans. What Ronnie Gruhn began to do was to develop the six-year plan for each division and then tried to stick with that plan, tried to make the deans look over the educational policy, but Michael Tanner is still working on this also.

Jarrell: There was considerable opposition to Ronnie Gruhn's way of working and do you think that the heart of the matter was that she didn't want a yearly free-for-all, that she was trying to do systematic planning and that that in itself was the cause of the controversy? There were ad hominum attacks on her, for a variety of reasons and I always wondered what was the real gist of that?

Stevens: I suppose it had something to do with that. I think that it was more often her style. Ronnie was very clear headed, very firm-minded, very direct, but not a diplomat. But the opposition sprang from all sources . . . That's right,

we made it six years because at the end of six years I would be 60 and I was determined not to stay longer than that.

Jarrell: I wondered where the six years came from.

Stevens: That was the upper limit of how long I would stay. We were trying to do things by then.

Faculty Teaching Loads

Jarrell: Another topic that I am interested in is the controversy over faculty teaching loads and how that originated. Did it originate in some of your inquiries into the way this place was organized?

Stevens: I think it was my first fall here. I was concerned because as I looked at the statistics, the amount of teaching on our campus was dropping tremendously. Now the reasons for this were never quite clear, but partly there had been a tradition of applied course load on this campus. That has harmed the University of California. I assume and I believe that Kivie Moldave had encouraged some of them to lower their teaching loads so they would do more research. Kivie was a scientist and thought more research would bring in more money. That is true in the sciences and marginally in the social sciences but it's not true, basically, in the humanities. Also some visiting professors would say they thought the teaching loads were too heavy.

What surprised me and continues to surprise me actually, is that all these decisions were made unilaterally by boards, without consultation with the academic vice chancellor. On this campus it was assumed apparently that it was a faculty decision. My concern was that if the faculty decided to lower their teaching load to zero would the administration have no role there? One board chair did allow that that might be something the administration should be concerned about.

My other concern was that UC has a reputation, which I have found to be justified, regarding teaching and research as antithetical. I think people can do both very good teaching and very serious scholarship. I think on more secure

campuses there is a tradition that the chairs decide the teaching load, depending on the rhythm in their production. I know from my own experience, I've been through a period where I'm really trying to finish some project that's important to me, and at that time it would be enormously helpful to have time off and do relatively little teaching. At other times, I haven't been specifically on a major project, besides reading and thinking ahead, and I would be perfectly willing to do more teaching.

I think perhaps this is too young an institution to feel sufficiently secure about that. I was concerned with what was happening but my efforts to try to put it on a rational basis backfired. Now I think a large number of the faculty didn't want to be told that they couldn't teach less. It was unfortunate the way Ronnie Gruhn handled it in that it was issued as a preemptory punishment, but it seems to me that what one ought to have is a variable teaching load. People who are good teachers and not currently doing research ought to be rewarded for being good teachers and expected to do more teaching. I didn't see this in any sense as a punishment, but rather as a way of responding to people's career interests, and responding to the needs of students and being a good management team in terms of being on the faculty. I will say I think it was partly the way it was handled . . . Ronnie went head-on at something that probably should have been done more subtly. I may not have given her the support I should have and I suspect there were faculty members who were prepared to use any device to derail the process.

Jarrell: It seems in your reflections on this that it wasn't so much the teaching load, per se, but the arbitrariness: that the boards differed in their teaching allocations and perhaps there was competitiveness?

Stevens: If I recollect correctly, Ronnie Gruhn's purpose was to hand down the decision that was to be made on a specific faculty member.

Jarrell: Was there in this whole controversy over faculty teaching loads, a consideration at that time that the undergraduates here seemed to feel they were getting somewhat short shrift, that there was class overcrowding and students couldn't get the classes they needed?

Stevens: I was very concerned about the student overcrowding when I arrived. Because students are right to be concerned, classes are overcrowded and we only have 70 percent of the classrooms the (inaudible) legislature approved and (inaudible) but at that time it was quite difficult. Students were complaining that their classes were getting larger. I think that in one sense we should be happy because for every 19 students we admit we get one more faculty member, so growth doesn't make classes larger. In fact, what has made classes larger is faculty teaching loads and that's been quite dramatic in the last few years. I, probably undiplomatically, said to the press that one of the reasons classes are larger is because the faculty are teaching less. The faculty saw that as a formal attack . . . it wasn't intended to be. It was a statement of fact that was true.

What happened was that if you lowered the teaching load from five courses to four . . . each class tended to be 25% bigger. An interesting thing of course, is that this year, as we reconsidered the colleges, the faculty developed a very interesting proposal to encourage faculty who are not doing research to teach more. So in a sense we're getting there the long way around, and . . . you know, as I say I'm not certain that Ronnie and I handled it well. But the right time to have done it, was rather than reduce it blindly, to have reduced it selectively, planning all the while to know where we were going.

Renewing the Colleges

Jarrell: And now with the college study and the college plan, doesn't that include the idea that faculty would be teaching in the colleges as well, which had diminished over the years?

Stevens: Yes. One of the most important things I've dealt with since I've been here is the colleges. Bob Sinsheimer in 1979 reorganized the colleges. But really the structure and organization of the colleges was left there. (inaudible) At the beginning of this year I asked the academic vice chancellor to ask the senate to form a committee and the chairman was Bill [William H.] Friedland who chose Carol [M.] Freeman. So CEP [committee on educational policy] was to think about the educational side. Then I decided to appoint a committee of three academic deans and three vice chancellors to think about organizational

resources. But the most important appointment was clearly the appointment of Joe Allen. He was my special assistant for the colleges this year and he was wonderful in making sure other people were involved to open the process up. I think he did . . . remarkably. The college committee made some very interesting suggestions. But far and away the most important in my view, was that the faculty should be mandated to teach, elect a course each third year. That of course would normally be taught in the colleges. This meant that the provost job became more important because it became a more academic job.

The provosts the last couple of years have reported to the academic vice chancellor and they will report to the academic vice chancellor not on the day-to-day side of the colleges, but on the academic side. The colleges will be run by a redefined bursar as the college administrative officer, who will for the most part be dean of students there and they will report to the vice chancellor of student affairs. There really is a quite dramatic change in the colleges and I think it's a very important change of direction. It will enable the colleges to renew themselves on the academic side. On the student service side there will be some reductions in staff because we have been putting far too much money into the colleges in terms of the money we have available. So I think this change of direction is going to be very important. It's going to provide integrated student services and a much more academic atmosphere in the colleges.

Jarrell: I'm not quite following you in terms of the costs of running the colleges.

Stevens: What we are trying to do is to phase down some of the student service people in the colleges, but not dramatically. We're cutting one spot. But more importantly we are going to pay for the academic side of the colleges out of academic funds, but the student service side of the college community is going to be paid for by students out of registration fees. It's been an unintelligible jumble ever since the colleges first started and increasingly a . . . (inaudible) aggravation.

Jarrell: In their old form they are too costly?

Stevens: They're certainly too costly. But almost more than being too costly is that we were paying for a large amount of non-academic costs out of academic funds. Students were not bearing enough of the costs through registration fees. Some of the college offices were . . . pampering people; their salaries were being

taken out of housing funds, which is inappropriate. It was a shuffling and rethinking. You know, normally when you have one of these studies you never get what you hope. In this case it actually produced more than I expected. I really think we got the academic side right. We got the organizational side right. We got the fiscal side right. Now there'll be an awful lot of paperwork (inaudible) for the students and that has to be changed. There are a fairly large number of loose ends dangling. I'm well aware of that. But I'm really very impressed by what's happened. I think that the vice chancellors and Carol Freeman and especially Joe Allen have done a great job.

Jarrell: I think there's been ambiguity in the colleges' identity ever since [Chancellor Sinsheimer's] reaggregation.

Stevens: Yes. I think that's true.

Jarrell: You mentioned earlier in our talk today that a whole new dimension for understanding the colleges is their role in the retention of underrepresented students. Students from underrepresented groups are going to find restored communities and services available to them in the colleges.

Stevens: I hope that this is really a new renewal of the colleges. I feel relatively optimistic. I have been worried because the colleges in my time here have complained bitterly that they don't have a real role but have not been willing to discuss what a real role might be. I mean they have been trying to protect what turf they have. I think what was achieved here, especially by Joe Allen, was to open up enormously that process and I think that the majority of students, the majority of college staff, the alumni, the faculty, are pleased with where it's going. You know these things are inevitably compromises. Nobody is totally pleased with what has happened. But that's the good side, that everybody can see something that's good. In organizational, in academic, in financial terms, in student services — this really is a change of direction which will make certain the colleges survive, and importantly that we maintain ourselves as a collegiate institution. So I feel very good about it. You know next year there will be some terrible teething problems. I don't deny that. But basically we're off in the right direction. My hope is that we'll have a new generation of provosts. For instance, next year seven of the eight provosts are in place, will be in place, on a permanent basis. There will be one acting provost. So I'm very pleased.

Town-Gown Relations

Jarrell: To start today, Chancellor, I'd like to ask you a number of questions about town and gown relations. What was your perception of the state of town-gown relations in your first year here as chancellor?

Stevens: Well when I arrived, the very real concern of the UC president's office, and especially perhaps of the board of regents, was what appeared to be the appalling relations between the city and the county on the one hand and the University on the other. I'm not the best person to describe why those were so bad. Nor quite why I think the regents felt that took priority over everything else. But town-gown relations had a reputation for being appalling and the reality was fairly close to the reputation.

Jarrell: So you not only understood there to be a serious rift in those relationships . . . but also you were receiving comments from the office of the president, as well as from the regents, that it had gotten so blown out of proportion that at systemwide it was a concern.

Stevens: Oh, yes. It was a very real concern. When I was interviewed for the job and people asked how would I handle the city and county, I said I hadn't the faintest idea. I had very little experience in that realm . . . but it was a major concern of the president and the board.

Jarrell: Once you were here and had taken hold and had started learning about the specifics of the situation, do you recall what were some of the chief criticisms that were leveled at UCSC?

Stevens: Well the University was regarded as high-handed because it relied on its constitutional exemption. But the chief difficulty was that the University wanted to grow and the city and county did not want it to. I mean it was widespread among the old line conservatives who didn't like having a University here, at least as the University had turned out. They regarded it as a University that was populated by dangerous left-wingers, people who essentially under the guise of the environment espoused a no-growth policy. So I think there was a more or less uniform hostility to the growth of the University.

Jarrell: What about criticisms that weren't just blanket criticisms of no-growth, but let's say the more temperate kinds of criticisms or concerns even, such as the community's concern about the relationship between the enrollment size here and the rate of the growth as it would affect traffic, congestion, parking, housing, water supplies, Westside neighborhoods – those kinds of concerns that came from a more temperate constituency?

Stevens: Well, I don't mean to say the concerns weren't justified. My concern was that there were some real problems. The University had been very erratic in holding to its growth projections. I'm pleased to say for the last five years we've held exactly to our growth projections. But that had led to a lack of trust. Clearly the growth of the University led to all sorts of problems. It did lead to problems of students displacing people in housing; the traffic clearly had a deleterious affect on the Westside; and there was a very serious problem that the University was perceived as not being interested in the genuine impacts of growth.

One has to talk about this at two levels. One is the political level; the other is the real level and of course there were and are enormous impacts if you have a small town like this with a university imposed on it. I think I said to you in our first meeting that putting a university in Santa Cruz was a very unwise decision. The University having been put here, the question was how does one ameliorate this without giving up the needs of the state? What I tried to do over the years was to realize that there are obligations that we have to the state. You know, we are a rapidly growing state. One doesn't always realize that, sitting here in Santa Cruz. But we are a state that has grown by 23% in a ten-year period. We grow by almost a million people a year and not all of them can be in Los Angeles.

If the University of California is to fulfill its educational responsibilities and retain its political support, it has to grow, too. There are a limited number of places it can grow. Obviously in an ideal world one would have more campuses. But this had been planned originally as a campus of 27,500, and clearly this campus has to take its responsibility seriously and to grow. The second concern I had was that in order to be a good university you need greater breadth than UCSC has at the moment. To have a university which is composed solely of liberal arts and sciences is not healthy. We need to develop graduate programs. We need a better balance between undergraduates and graduates. We need to develop professional schools. Obviously we need to fill in some areas of the arts and

sciences. So this University needs to grow. The third thing however was that this is a tiny community. As I said, I believe the University was sited in the wrong place. Having been sited here we have to address these issues.

Jarrell: The complications of growth.

Stevens: Yes. So I set about trying to balance these three things out and especially to try and make us good citizens. In other words, to take the concerns of the responsible citizen seriously without being intimidated by the politicians who want to stop all growth. That's a very difficult line to draw. But during the first two years I spent an enormous amount of time on this and . . . let me try to recall from memory some of the things.

Jarrell: In the winter of 1988 you initiated a series of letters to the community that were published in the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* and in the *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*. I thought that was a really brilliant stroke. Effective communication seemed to have broken down—there was a lot of angry rhetoric and there wasn't a respectful two-way communication. It seemed to me as a citizen, for instance, that those letters addressed over a period of time all of the community's major concerns and also had an educational function in terms of letting the people of this community know that the UC mission was to the state, first and foremost and that it would have to balance needs. Tell me about those letters because I thought they were a very imaginative way of addressing this impasse.

Stevens: Well let me deal briefly with the letters and then push back. The letters . . . I'm glad you feel they were helpful. They were part of an idea of Stephanie Hauk whom I appointed as my assistant for community relations. I would want to say before anything else that Stephanie Hauk's and also Wendell Brase's work was absolutely essential in getting this rolling. In terms of working on campus, working with Wendell was just very good and working with the Long Range Development Plan off campus Stephanie was just excellent. But those letters were essentially Stephanie's idea, although we crafted them together. I think you have to go back . . . and I'm trying to get the chronology right.

As soon as I arrived on campus there was an effort to stop the building of College Eight and we had a long piece of litigation. It was really very unpleasant

litigation. The first few months here were really quite ugly in dealing with both the city and the county. The litigation was really very unpleasant and I thought totally unnecessary. It was an effort, I think, by the city and county politicians, especially Gary Patton, to prevent any growth in the University. The city immediately brought this College Eight litigation, which was really I think an effort to intimidate the campus. It was also in its own way really very ugly. It was an effort to prevent the Long Range Development Plan from going through. I think it was an effort to stop the University's growth . . . it was entirely illogical because the University had made a commitment to try to accommodate more students, ultimately with a goal of 70% undergraduate and 30% graduate students and to try to stop the building of College Eight was just irrational. I still don't understand entirely the process.

We had a hearing before the judge in chambers and the judge made it very clear that if he had been trying the case he would have decided for the University. Mardi Wormhoudt represented the city together with the city attorney . . . I'm blocking out her name, I'm afraid . . . Mardi was really very aggressive and very unpleasant towards the University but we eventually came to what I thought was on the whole a sensible compromise which was that College Eight would go through but we would have an annual public meeting to discuss the University's growth. We have done that and you may want put into the archives the various documents related to that because it was quite an interesting settlement. You can get the documents from Wendell Brase. But that was very contentious and very unpleasant. I think amicably solved. It was not an easy time, those first two years.

Limiting Enrollment to 15,000

Stevens: What I really was striving to do was to have the University pay its fair share of infrastructure developments and working with people on campus, I concluded that a university of 15,000 probably met all three needs. In other words, the needs of the state, the needs of the University, and the needs of the community. It seemed to me that if we paid our fair share of infrastructure we could support a university of 15,000 in this town and we certainly needed a university of 15,000 in order to be a serious university. Certainly the state

needed at least 15,000 students here. So I spent, really, a disproportionate amount of my time, in retrospect, during these first two years trying to make certain that we developed reasonable relations with the city, and to try and convince the moderates. I knew I would never convince the more extreme groups that this was an appropriate way to go. The letters you referred to were certainly part of this campaign to convince people that the University wasn't a big, bad wolf. We were basically trying to do the right thing. We had interests which conflicted with the city's and the county's but we essentially were trying to do the right thing for the state as a whole and for the University as a whole and for the city and county. At least to be taken into very, very serious consideration. My first two years were heavily involved with that and it meant really dealing with this on various different fronts. First of all, it was getting the University to agree that we would be prepared to pay our fair share. That was an enormous battle. That had never been done, not only by anybody in the University, but by any state agency. There were a lot of negotiations with University Hall and eventually President Gardner came out in favor of it but it was a long political battle.

Jarrell: It was precedent-setting also.

Stevens: Oh I think so. I still think it was the right thing to do. Some of my fellow chancellors were annoyed with me for having done it, because it put them in a more difficult position, but it was the right way to go, quite honestly. I'm very glad that David Gardner showed the statesmanship to support it because I think that there would have been problems, not only here, but certainly in Santa Barbara, probably in Davis and possibly at other campuses. It was the right way to go. But that was a long battle.

In the meantime I was also dealing with the Long Range Development Plan which was I think a very good document in the end. But trying to get the faculty to be supportive of 15,000 was not easy. There were a handful of faculty who didn't want any growth. But there were also a quite vocal group of faculty who didn't want any limits at all. The regents were very divided. Interestingly enough it was the Democrats on the regents who wanted unlimited growth and some of those regents are still there. So I had to do a lot of work with the regents to persuade them that we should be limited to 15,000.

Jarrell: Where did that figure derive from? That 15,000?

Stevens: Well, it had been floated around at different points. I think in the twenty-year plan towards the end of Bob Sinsheimer's time here, the figures had been between 12,000 and 15,000. I thought the upper limit of that was probably right. The most difficult problem, really, was dealing with the city and county here because I think in different ways [Supervisor] Gary Patton, and Santa Cruz City Council members Mardi Wormhoudt and John Laird all were interested in really bringing the University to its knees, in the sense of getting control of the University. I was perfectly willing to be reasonable and to make certain the University behaved as a very responsible citizen. I was obviously not prepared to let the politicians control the University. I have to confess, I developed some sort of working relationship with all three of them. I found them, in a sense, difficult people and not entirely honorable always to deal with. Now, the word honor is thrown around unfairly, but I found I could not entirely rely on their word. That I found discouraging. But also, so I won't be thought to be just being negative, I'd have to say that the work by [Senator] Henry [J.] Mello and [Assemblyman] Sam Farr was very important. They came in and told the local politicians that I had gone further than I ought to have. They said I'd made a wonderful offer. They in a sense forced Mardi and John and Gary to back off and to let the University grow to 15,000 in exchange for getting University support for infrastructure costs.

So in the spring of 1989 we took this agreement to the regents who approved, in principle, a cap of 15,000 and that we would pay our fair share of an enumerated list of infrastructure costs. The Long Range Development Plan is in the University Archives. That certainly hasn't solved all the problems. But after that it really distinguished between the no-growth people who would oppose the University whatever they did and reasonable people in town who felt the University at least tried to behave honorably and tried to pay its fair share. While we are a bureaucracy and we make awful mistakes as all bureaucracies do, at least people had a sense that we were trying to do the right thing. I think we have had more support in town and in the county since then and certainly relations are very much better.

Ultimately, by last year, I think it was very helpful that John Laird and Mardi Wormhoudt were no longer involved. The new generation of Santa Cruz City

Council members, both of the Right and of the Left are a good deal more sympathetic to the University. Sympathetic is perhaps not the right word; they are a good deal more open-minded. I found in dealing with Jane Yokoyama, the new mayor, that she is much more open-minded. I would say the same of both Scott Kennedy and Neil Coonerty. These are people who are just much more open-minded than their predecessors, and similarly I would say that of the Right. Both John Mahaney and Louis Rittenhouse are a great deal more open-minded than their predecessors were. That doesn't mean they agree with the University and they will take strong positions, as they should, against the University, but at least we have good lines of communication. In one sense, one of the most gratifying things is they gave a lunch in my honor the other day, and four and a half years ago the idea of the city council giving a lunch in my honor would have been . . . I don't want to be arrogant and I want to say again that I owe an enormous amount to Stephanie [Hauk] and to Wendell [Brase], but I think it would have been inconceivable.

Wendell did a lot of work with me and with University Hall and certainly did a great deal of work with me and with the city and county and the politicians. I think the crucial thing was that eventually Henry [Mello] and Sam [Farr] came in and . . . I don't want to say brokered a deal because that would not be right, but helped in putting forward what was a very attractive package nobody in the state had ever managed before and was very successful.

Jarrell: With the no-growth people there is an attitude where there's not very much compromise; there's not very much wiggle-room as they call it. But I think both Sam Farr and Henry Mello have a larger vision, a larger perspective?

Stevens: I think that's a very good way of putting it. The problem is that both on campus and in town essentially the conservation movement has been taken over, hijacked, by the no-growth movement. So it's no longer really conservation, but it's really no-growth.

Jarrell: In terms of the Long Range Development Plan that was approved by the regents in 1989 . . .

Stevens: In the spring of 1989, and that after the discussions between the politicians and the city, county, University . . . and members of the legislature that was on that hinge, the success of the Long Range Development Plan.

Long Range Development Plan

Jarrell: How do you see that document shaping both the University and its relations with the city and county?

Stevens: Well you have to see the Long Range Development Plan in its context. It is a land-use planning document. It is not an academic plan although there is a good deal about the academic goals of the institution in there. In terms of land-use we had to put a limit, to agree on the ultimate expected size of the University.

But what we had lacked and what we now have in embryo is an academic plan. Any good campus needs both a long range development plan and an academic plan. We now have an academic plan in the form of the Report to the Committee on the year 2005, which is now in draft form. It's being chaired this year by Jorge Hankamer, who has done an excellent job, and it calls for a more balanced University and the addition of professional schools. As you know one of those has already gone through the senate, the proposal for an engineering school. I think it's an excellent proposal. It was a very good committee, chaired by [Eu]Gene Switkes and I think it's come out with a proposal for a really very interesting engineering school. Now, with the state's current finances, God knows when there will be an engineering school. That's the other side of the coin.

Jarrell: Right, that's the scaffolding and then all of the academic developments, the additional professional schools, are all contingent on that other . . .

Stevens: Well, but you know we now need to implement the two documents, the academic plan and the Long Range Development Plan. The academic plan is beginning to be implemented by reports like the proposal for an engineering school, which I hope will be accomplished in the next two or three years.

The report on the year 2005 is very good on this, but we need some serious support for undergraduate education. So I really had two goals in mind there. I wanted to see that we had a really first-rate program for undergraduates. We talk a lot about undergraduates here, but the truth is we have never really thought through very carefully what we mean by a good undergraduate program and so I had a tremendous interest in trying to make certain we did think that through. That's why I established the committee on undergraduate education, which I think came out after two years with really a rather interesting report. One of my great disappointments here is that that sort of languished in the senate and nothing ever happened to it.

Renewing the College System

Stevens: The other thing I wanted to do was to reinvigorate the colleges. The colleges were reaggregated in 1979 by Bob Sinsheimer and I think the decision was quite right to put the responsibility for academic programs in the boards. On the other hand, this campus was founded as a collegiate institution and it would have been a great loss not to have fulfilled that mission. I've spent my life in collegiate institutions and one has a great advantage, undoubtedly, by having colleges. But the colleges had totally lost their way. So I had to spend four years trying to get that right. It has not been easy.

Jarrell: I would like to interrupt and ask you, in terms of this really long-range effort that you've made in redefining and refocusing the role of the colleges: you said in an interview in one of our campus publications that you had made a commitment to President Gardner to complete an analysis of the college system.

Stevens: Yes.

Jarrell: So he was concerned also?

Stevens: Oh he was very concerned. Because he thinks colleges are wonderful but he made it very clear to me that this was the last chance they had. He was not prepared to go on supporting the colleges unless the colleges got their act together.

Jarrell: I see.

Stevens: So I tried from the very beginning to talk to people about the colleges. We had an outside visiting committee in the first year. But any changes that I suggested in the colleges immediately got all kinds of people paranoid. Now that's just probably that I didn't go about it in the right way. But it also suggests, I think, partly that the colleges themselves were feeling very wounded and very threatened, and therefore any suggestion, even for strengthening them, was greeted with really childish hostility sometimes. My problems were twofold. One, I wanted to see the colleges playing a better academic role. Two, I knew that if we were to continue using the colleges we were going to have to make certain that we could afford to use them. The colleges, because they had originally been the focus of the University, and not the boards, were rather expensive to run.

I certainly wasn't interested in destroying the colleges, but I knew that we had to pare down a little in order that we could continue building colleges because if you can't afford to staff the colleges, you can't have colleges. So my goals over these last four years have been to have colleges that really play more of an academic role, and that are an integral part of and an affordable part, of the University. In each of the years I made some effort to do this. There certainly were changes. In the second year I was very fortunate in being able to persuade the colleges to put more energy into academic advising. That I think was very useful.

The third year I intended to spend a lot of time on colleges, but somehow or other the earthquake in 1989 shook us all out of our stride and I regret that I didn't push much harder in the third year. But I transferred direct control of the colleges to the academic vice chancellor at that point. I think it was more the earthquake and then I had a bout of ill health that year so somehow I lost the momentum. But I was determined this year that we would really do something. I'm just delighted. I appointed Joe Allen as my special assistant to the colleges, and asked the academic vice chancellor to work with the senate to establish a committee on academic and educational goals of the colleges.

Bill [G. William] Domhoff is a very activist chair of the academic senate and took a real interest in that. I think that committee chaired by Carolyn [M.] Clark and

Carol [M.] Freeman did a first-rate job in working with people. I'm sure that report is in your files, and it's an enormously useful document. I think the most useful thing about it was that it engaged the middle of the faculty, which is always the problem on this campus.

Jarrell: You've got people out on either extreme . . .

Stevens: That's right. And the center tends to get on with its work. That's one of the reasons why shared governance doesn't work very well on this campus. I think that the final report was a good report. But most important of all, when the faculty got engaged it really addressed the question of resources. Because without more resources you can't do anything. You can get resources in two ways. One, academic resources; you can take things away from the boards. Or two, the faculty can agree to teach more. Nobody wanted to take resources away from the boards. The faculty agreed to teach more. So we now have a potential for really renewing and reinvigorating the academic side of the colleges. That's really just immensely exciting and I'm very, very pleased about that.

So on that side of the house I was very pleased. The other thing that we set up and Joe Allen also worked with, was a committee of vice chancellors which didn't meet as a group very often, but they were charged with thinking about the organization and the resources available to the colleges. Joe Allen did a remarkable job. He worked with students, faculty, staff, alumni. He spent an enormous amount of time, and was very, very successful doing it. I admire him enormously and I'm grateful to him, as I trust the whole campus is, for what he achieved. So we now have as a result of the senate committee, colleges with more resources for the academic side. As a result of the work of the vice chancellors, we have gotten a very intelligent allocation of resources. Money will be used for the purpose for which it is intended. One of the very real problems was that our instruction and research money was in a sense being used for student services.

Okay, so on the other side of the house, the vice chancellors were working hard on the issues of organization and resources. I think we got the resources right. Particularly after the senate voted in favor of a higher teaching load in order to teach primarily in the colleges. I think it became very clear that the academic vice

chancellor was prepared to put in more money. Organizationally I accepted the recommendations of the vice chancellors rather than the Freeman/Clark Committee, so the colleges, I think, will work much more effectively because the provost will be much more an academic person; the provost will report to the academic vice chancellor and in the colleges only the academic persons will report to the provost. Then the chief administrative officer will in many ways be like a dean of students and will run the student service side of the colleges and will report to the vice chancellor for student services. That will insure that we really run the student service side in a professional way and that we have professional student service people running that side. The business side as far as possible will be taken away from the colleges, and done by the people who ought to be doing it, the people in the business office.

Jarrell: So there won't be bursars and . . .

Stevens: There won't be bursars. I think a lot of the responsibilities of a business nature done by the bursars will disappear and they will become much more like deans of students. They will report to the vice chancellor of student services. I think that putting more academic things into the colleges, getting the organization of the colleges right, scaling down very modestly the size of the student service operations there, will bring the colleges into the University much more than they've been in the past. This will leave them with a considerable amount of independence, with their own identities and styles. It will make certain that student services are well provided. That they are provided in an integrated way with the student services we provide across the campus, and I hope will make the job of provost much more attractive because it will once again be very much more an academic job.

Jarrell: Yes, which it hasn't been for a long, long time.

Stevens: I think that's right. It varied enormously from college to college. I think that this has really given the colleges a new lease on life. I'm always mildly amused because whenever there's a report, it's always said that this is a sinister attack on the colleges.

Jarrell: You mean this current whole redefinition . . .

Stevens: That's right. But I really do find that bizarre. Because I think the colleges were in danger of going out of business. I very much hope they have new leases on life both as academic and as social student service institutions. My very real hope is that we can now grow by the college system. You know one of the things I battled with the regents about, is that there were many people who thought that we should stop growing by the college system. The committee on planning and budget thought we should stop growing by the college system. I think that has now been clearly rejected and we're set to grow intelligently and responsibly.

Jarrell: That future growth on this campus will be organized and shaped by the addition of colleges?

Stevens: Well the colleges will be much more important in the life of this institution. They've really for the last ten years, or twelve years, been fighting a holding action. They're now part of the operation again. I think that's wonderful. I think it gives them new life, but I mean I'm sort of amused . . . the interpretation of what happened obviously is in the eye of the beholder. Some things have changed. Some provosts are unhappy that they are no longer going to be student service officers. But I think if we're going to get the very best faculty to serve as provosts we need it to be essentially an academic role. There's nothing in the training of a faculty member about how to handle somebody who's potentially suicidal.

Jarrell: I remember in the interview that I conducted with [F.M.] Glenn Willson, some years back, he was talking about the early history of Stevenson College, and how he happened to be temperamentally suited to working with adolescents and their sometimes very serious emotional problems. But there would be some provosts who would not find that so comfortable.

Stevens: Or who would actually be quite bad at it.

Jarrell: Exactly. So the way things are being reorganized now, you're going to have a professional staff dealing directly with students and the provost's function is going to be much more curricular, academic, in terms of defining the colleges, however they decide to go.

Stevens: But also I am pumping some money in so that the vice chancellor of student services will give pots of money to the provost to do things of an intellectual nature in the colleges. Michael Tanner is setting up a fund so that they can compete with each other to do new and innovative things academically. So I hope it's a moment of renewal. I feel very good about it. But we'll see. But I'm frustrated that people see this as some kind of conspiracy.

Jarrell: One question comes to mind about the future colleges which will inevitably be established. Since the founding of this campus, the costs of establishing one of the colleges have been enormous, and they've almost always done it in terms of finding an outside donor.

Stevens: Well, you raise a number of very interesting points. One of the problems was that from the very beginning Dean McHenry assured the regents that it was no more expensive to have the college system than not to have the college system. Of course the academic buildings are paid for by the state. The dormitory part of it is paid for by group A bonds, which are amortized through student rents. One does have to raise money for the non-academic parts of the buildings and we have done that in a number of ways, sometimes by gifts . . . obviously you've mentioned some of them. Normally though, those gifts come in after the building is operating. One of the frustrations is not being able to find a donor for College Eight. We now have two or three people who might be interested in College Nine and Ten. In the last couple of months I have been making trips to see various people in the hope that we will get support for that. But raising that sort of money is just very difficult. We don't have as good a tradition on this campus of giving as I think we should. While annual giving has gone very well and we've had four very successful years by the standards of the campus, I regard us as having done not really as well as we should. I wish I had had more time to put into development because it's an area where I do have a lot of experience. But I'm delighted to say it's also an area where Karl Pister will put a lot of his energy. So I feel, again, optimistic about that.

Meyer Drive Extension and the Performing Arts Complex

Stevens: Two controversial things, recently, have been Meyer Drive and I guess, the siting of the music building. You asked about Meyer Drive. Meyer Drive has been in each Long Range Development Plan, actually in the 1961 plan, which was not a long range development plan, but 1965, 1972, 1979 . . . Meyer Drive, and the outer ring road has been there. It's part of the original intention of the campus that we would have this outer ring road which would make it essentially a pedestrian-friendly campus. If we shouldn't be doing it then it shouldn't have been in the Long Range Development Plan and we should have had a different plan for the campus. So nobody could say that we had to do it this year because it was absolutely essential this year. Nothing is absolutely essential but we could, after all grow to 15,000 without building any more buildings, I suppose technically. But if we want ultimately to have a good campus then we need to be able to build an intelligent ring road and have a pedestrian-friendly campus. Now, like everyone else I value the meadow. In fact, I probably am a more regular user of the meadow than many of the people who are most articulate about it. It is a beautiful, beautiful spot. That's one of the reasons why I recommended in the Long Range Development Plan, and the regents accepted it, closing Hagar Drive so that we would in fact . . . preserve more of the meadow. But anyway . . . you asked me about the background of Meyer Drive. I suspect we'd have a similar problem in terms of the siting of the music facilities. We had a series of public meetings for what is called the community access area, which is just beyond the community . . . between University House and the Student Center. The idea there is that this will be the place where we reach out to the community with the music facilities . . . performing arts and those other things. I suspect this is going to be highly controversial. If I can just address the politics of all of this . . . I'm not saying that my decisions are infallible. They clearly are not. But, you know, one of the greatest difficulties I have faced on the planning side over these years has been being able to distinguish genuine conservation arguments from no-growth arguments. Just after I was appointed, there was the issue of where College Eight was going to be. I was lobbied extremely hard that it was in the wrong place. Now, I think its arguable that it was in the wrong place. The decision was actually made by Bob Sinsheimer and I can understand the argument that it was in the wrong place. The problem is that Oakes was in

the wrong place, too. But once you had Oakes out there it was very difficult not to have another college.

Jarrell: To fill in that open space?

Stevens: That's right. But I can see the argument. My real problem is that the people who were opposed to putting College Eight there lobbied very strongly to say it should be opposite the Cowell Health Center. They made this argument orally and in writing and a most impressive argument it was, too. But those same people now are arguing, as we talk about the ideas of Colleges Nine and Ten, opposite the Cowell Health Center that it's a terrible place to put colleges.

So in one sense one does become a tad cynical about what these people really want, which is very bad. I find it very difficult to distinguish, as I say, no-growth arguments from genuine conservation arguments. So on the whole Meyer Drive thing . . . we're doing it early because the senate committees said this should be the top priority. Back in 1987 they wanted this road built soon. Because logically it opens up the possibility of putting science buildings and things out there. It makes it possible for people to come in from town more easily. And so on. So when suddenly senate committees started taking neutral or hostile stands to it, it didn't make sense. You know, you cannot plan by having a vote each year of what people want or what people don't want. I want to be very sensitive on this. Planning is not my field. I obviously listen to Wendell Brase and his planners. I try to listen to Joe [Joseph] Esherick who is terrific, who is really the consultant planner. But these are long and very complex decisions. But what is absolutely clear to me is that you can't change each year.

Campus Fundraising Activities

Jarrell: Could you elaborate on your activities and your overview of University development activities, since that is such an important part of a chancellor's job?

Stevens: Dean McHenry did an excellent job as a fundraiser. Of all public institutions, this one ought to be one that could really raise money. Bob Sinsheimer, while I regard him as a very strong chancellor in many ways, wasn't

interested in development. When I arrived he'd appointed somebody as vice chancellor who really wasn't very good. I thought the quality of the development side, as the quality of the alumni side, as the quality of the public relations side, was very bad. Quite frankly, I had to ease out the vice chancellor which took a lot of time and although it was necessary, it was very painful and hurt a lot in terms of public relations. I had to get rid of the person doing our public relations. I had to get rid of the alumni director. It was a very run-down operation. Our efforts to recruit a vice chancellor were unsuccessful. We had only one decent candidate in the search. I then appointed Frank Drake for a year and Stephanie Hauk for a year. They've both done very competent jobs. But neither of them is a fundraiser and neither of them is a manager although I think Frank did an adequate job and Stephanie's done a good job.

Jarrell: If I'm remembering correctly . . . there was a recruitment for that position.

Stevens: That's right.

Jarrell: And there was going to be a very fine candidate who never came.

Stevens: Oh no. We made an offer to somebody and she didn't accept. She went as vice president of the Smithsonian. The truth was, apart from that, we got very poor candidates, although we'd used all kinds of devices to make it as strong a search as possible. I just didn't want to put in a bad person again. Development and alumni affairs are things that I've had a lot of experience with and I've been able to raise a great deal of money in my other jobs.

These have been excellent years. The best years the campus has ever had by a long way. The year before I arrived I think we raised 50,000 or 60,000 dollars in annual giving. This year we'll raise close to 800,000 dollars. We have done very well in gifts but not nearly well enough. If I had stayed for five or six years as I had originally intended, I would have spent a lot of these next two years working on the development side and pouring money in there because it's quite clear . . . it's simply very probable within the long run what's going to make the difference on a campus like this is our ability to raise private funds as well as just relying on state funds.

Jarrell: Why do you think that we didn't get good candidates for that recruitment?

Stevens: Well, I think there are two reasons. One we didn't have a very good development program. I had hoped that would be an interesting challenge.

Jarrell: Right, you can come here and make a program from almost scratch?

Stevens: Yes. The second thing is we do have a public relations problem. The reputation of this campus outside of the state, but to some extent, nationally, is as a rather crazy place with crazy faculty and a wonderful climate. An impossible situation. Undoubtedly it makes it very difficult to recruit deans from outside and it makes it very difficult to recruit people at the vice chancellorial level who are really first-rate and there's no point in having a development person or a vice chancellor of an institution who isn't first-rate.

Jarrell: So you just sort of pinch-hitted?

Stevens: That's right, yes. It's not an ideal way of doing it but it's a damn sight better than the way it was being done which was to have really incompetent people running it.

Decentralizing the Administration

Jarrell: In the letter of resignation you wrote President Gardner you said, "All the vision statements have collapsed for four major reasons." One involved college definition and you've talked about the role of the colleges and how you have attempted to address that. You've talked about the absence of an academic plan and how that has been addressed; about the absence of responsible budgeting and how you have tried to resolve that. We have not yet talked about what you described as an ineffective administrative structure – your notion of the overcentralization of the administration on this campus. I would like you to address that.

Stevens: Okay. We have obviously touched on it in different ways. One of the problems that I inherited was that there was really no administration on this campus in the accepted sense of a major university. The structure had really been

developed by Dean McHenry who ran the campus out of his back pocket. There was no effective central administration, in my view. It was essentially Bob Sinsheimer and Wendell Brase, who is extremely effective and sensible, who was a kind of executive vice chancellor . . . You can't run a university that way when you have 10,000 students. You need an effective central administration and you need to delegate. There was, I think, an absurd dichotomy which still exists, but I hope is less noticeable, between the so-called central administration and other things.

So the first thing to get was a competent academic vice chancellor. As I think I've said very directly, Kivie Moldave was not really effective as an academic vice chancellor. Bruce [P.] Moore, who was the vice chancellor for student services, I think, had not been given the responsibilities which the title suggested. As I said I think Bob Sinsheimer made an unfortunate appointment in University Advancement just before he left. So that was another problem. So first of all the question was to get good people in there. The second was to get good deans in. I then think I made a major mistake by trying to recruit deans from outside. I think I got that the wrong way around. I should have restructured the responsibilities of deans and then looked for deans on the outside. So my efforts to recruit outside deans failed in one way or another. In social sciences the dean I recruited from Cornell never actually came and the one in the humanities, the dean that came from Chicago . . . partly he was temperamentally unsuited, I think, in retrospect, but he stayed a year and took one look at the place, horrified, and left.

Jarrell: Was this [Harry D.] Harootunian?

Stevens: Yes. But what one needs is to get good vice chancellors, get the portfolios right, which we still don't have, but it's certainly on the way, get good deans, and then delegate to them. A lot of that has occurred. I delegated far more to the vice chancellors than my predecessors. They, in turn, have, especially on the academic side, pushed things down to the deans. The deans are in the process of pushing things down to the board chairs. This of course is partly a question also of getting proper budgeting, because educational decisions are, unfortunately, all too often made by economic decisions. The board chairs have had no real financial control and therefore no sense of responsibility. The deans

have had rather more. But the absence of competent budgets has meant that they really were not effectively in control of their budget.

Jarrell: So in terms of changing the concept of these divisional deans, how would you do that? Part of it's budgetary responsibility. What's been the direction that you're working towards?

Stevens: I think you do it partly psychologically. In other words you give deans a very much clearer mandate to be educational leaders on campus. You give them a much clearer mandate to raise funds. Secondly, you actually change the structure so that deans get consulted in a much more rational way in the personnel process. We have done some of that. Michael Tanner has worked with CAP to see whether we can't delegate some of the personnel decisions, as other campuses do, to the deans and maybe have divisional caps, that sort of thing. We've gotten nowhere with that but . . . the third part, and I think in many ways the most important part, is in the past deans have been supplicants to the academic vice chancellor for funds. What we have done is to give them control over their own budgets, and if they decide to spend a lot of money on a very senior professor they have less money to spend on other professors; if they decide to spend a lot of money on a research project, they will have less money for travel. So we're passing a great deal of responsibility down to the deans. Previously people just came in and gave us a sort of rush, you know, saying please give us money for this. Pay for this upgrade. Provide travel funds. Provide moving allowances. Now all of that is being shifted down to the deans, where it really belongs. So deans actually will have a lot of power now. They will have a control of their own budgets, but they won't be able to say, well the chancellor won't give me the money. They have gotten all the money now, virtually all the money, and it's now up to them to do their thing.

Jarrell: How do divisional deans work with the boards of studies, in terms of those allocations?

Stevens: What I'd like to do is to give the boards a much clearer notion of what powers they have. So that in a sense, if they want to upgrade a person they'll have to pay for that. So there will be less money for instrumentation. There will be less money for typing, less money for xeroxing, and they won't be able to afford to upgrade the next thing. At the moment, you have nothing to lose by

complaining to the academic vice chancellor because there is no rational way of allocating resources. I think we've made very important strides in rationalizing the allocation process.

Jarrell: Now, another suggestion in your letter to President Gardner was to institute more academic responsibility in the person of the board chairs.

Stevens: Well, at the moment the board chairs are chosen, really, by the last person out of the room. I'm not singling out this campus in particular, but it's perhaps more acute here than elsewhere. What we need to do is give those board chairs sufficient power, and I've named some of the things that they might be able to do. They will have much more control . . . they have really no control except of their supply hutches at the moment. I would like to see them controlling the budget of their boards. Unfortunately several boards do a miserable job of actually providing courses in a sequential order, of making rational decisions about who should teach what. The students rightly complain that they frequently find they can't get the courses they need even for the major. We have to look to the board chairs to provide that and it's not an easy job. One can pay them more, but essentially one has to give them more responsibility, to expect more responsibility, from them. It's a very real problem of administration on this campus.

Jarrell: What mechanism do you find to motivate prospective chairs to fulfill these responsibilities?

Stevens: Well, if it becomes a job that actually has some serious control over funds and appointments and other things . . .

Jarrell: Some power?

Stevens: Some power, quite frankly. On the good side. In other words if you have goodies, my hope is that you will also get people who are willing to say, "We've got to have Psychology 1, or Biology 101 taught twice a year, or whatever the needs are." I think that that's doable.

Jarrell: We have experienced here administrative over-centralization historically. I see the thrust of your tenure has been to really disperse power and authority outward into all of these entities.

Stevens: Yes, that's right. One of the reasons is that only if you get power out in a structured kind of way do you stop the more absurd criticisms about the central administration, which basically means the chancellor and the academic vice chancellor . . . that the deans are not part of the administration and the board chairs aren't part of the administration. The other reason we need to do it is if it just seems as if the chancellor or the academic vice chancellor are making all the decisions, the campus thugs, the campus barons, will tend to get involved in a disproportionate number in the decision-making processes. One of the very real problems on this campus is that decisions have tended to be made by lobbying and tantrum or one might even say, by intimidation. If you had a better structured administration, one hopes that that will diminish.

Faculty Recruitment of Women and Ethnic Minorities

Jarrell: I'd next like to move on to the whole area of ethnic diversity, multiculturalism on this campus. You cited in your letter of resignation that 27% women and 18% ethnic minorities were in tenure-track positions, which was a very fine kind of goal.

Stevens: Actually it's even better than that now. Over 30% of our tenure-track faculty at the end of this year are women.

Jarrell: What special efforts have you instituted to really raise this figure significantly?

Stevens: Really it's more a question of keeping up the pressure. I think Bob Sinsheimer had done an excellent job on this. Really the faculty had come forward with a very strong program of TOP (Targets of Opportunity) appointments. On the faculty side we've made very steady progress right across the University. But in a very real sense, especially in the case of women, we have made real in-roads in the natural sciences. I think the pressure has been kept up and now, even in the sciences, we have no board that does not have either women or minorities. So that's an important step forward. Clearly no chancellor can do this without the support of others. I think I would rank Julia Armstrong's contribution in this as a very significant one.

Jarrell: So with her monitoring and keeping abreast of all of the recruitments, the pressure has been kept up. There's been no let up?

Stevens: I think that's right.

Recruitment and Retention of an Ethnically Diverse Student Body

Jarrell: Yes, okay. As for students, you said in the academic year 1990-91, that 34% minorities are now recruited in the freshmen incoming class.

Stevens: Next fall it will be 45% minority. We are no longer the whitest campus in the system. And retention rates . . . actually I was using the end of the first, second, and third year, are essentially no different, if you exclude special admits. We don't have a significant number of special admits.

Jarrell: So just with comparing the more traditional UC student with the more ethnically diverse admits, the retention rate, you say is essentially the same. Almost identical.

Stevens: Almost identical. The retention rate for Asians is the highest. The retention rate for whites is the second highest. Then retention rate for Chicanos, Latinos is a little below whites and blacks a little below that. But it is not very significant.

Jarrell: Now in deriving this figure, this retention rate . . . what does it mean exactly?

Stevens: Retention . . . we have a dismal graduation rate for everyone on this campus. We have the lowest graduation rate in the system. When I arrived something like 19% of our students graduated in four years, 23% in five years. More than 50% of our students never graduated, even taking out the transfer students, people who transfer to other campuses. We have a dreadful record, a perfectly dreadful record. Now, each year it has gotten slightly better. I am reluctant to give the statistics, but I suggest you get Galen [M.] Jarvinen to give you the current statistics for the last five years for all of these things. We are coming closer to 30% graduating in five years. Partly it was that we had been scraping around for students. Now we are being pretty selective.

Jarrell: That's interesting. I was not aware of that. I knew that the graduation rate was low but I didn't know it was dreadful.

Stevens: Well, you know, it's often said the graduation rate for black students is only 20% in five years . . . and of course it turns out that it's not very different for white students either.

Jarrell: Is this a concern in a four-year undergraduate institution, which increasingly is becoming a five-year program because of the financial needs of students and for a number of other reasons . . . I have read that increasingly undergraduates are taking four and a half or five years to complete their basic course work in order to graduate. That's not just here . . .

Stevens: That's always been true in the University of California. It's especially true here. We have an awful lot of students who take seven or eight years to graduate and always have . . . because on the whole we have the most affluent student body and I would probably take issue with you about students' need to work. Berkeley, which has a much lower socioeconomic group of students gets far more of its students through in four or five years. We attract an upper middle-class student body, still, predominantly and it's an upper middle-class student body that likes to hang around on the beach and hang around Santa Cruz.

Jarrell: So you don't think that . . .

Stevens: I don't mean that sometimes it's not an economic problem but that's not the major problem that causes those people to hang around.

Jarrell: The lowest graduation rate in the system is here at UCSC. Is that a concern of administration?

Stevens: Of course it is. There really are two different things. What takes people time may not be directly related to money but to the system of advising and a lot of people take several majors. Now dropping out is often related to money. Both are closely related to the quality of advising and one of the things I have tried to do is to make the advising system much more effective. I had a big push in my second year in the colleges to do that. My hope is the colleges as they are now restructured, will also give much better advice. When people drop out they

drop out for two reasons. One, financial and second, poor advising. So that's why I've taken that seriously. But it's certainly a public relations problem. One of the reasons why a lot of parents don't want their kids to come here is because it's seen as sort of holiday camp where people hang around indefinitely, they even hang around after they are graduated. It has made my job of talking about the colleges, why we should have colleges, much more difficult. Here we have these very expensive operations. We put in more resources for our students here than any other campus. But we end up with students who don't graduate and hang around for far longer. A serious public relations problem.

Jarrell: Public relations problem with whom?

Stevens: With the regents and the president's office.

Jarrell: Oh I see. And the legislature. The legislature is trying to cut corners and sees one of the campuses which appears to let people stay indefinitely. There's no time limit for undergraduates, is there, as such?

Stevens: No, but we have stopped giving financial aid after the fifth year now normally and we are trying to tighten up in every way, but we've had a tradition for 25 years of sort of . . . I don't want to say anarchy, but certainly a love of casualness in what our expectations are of students and it's very difficult to change that philosophy.

The "Asian Food Affair" at Crown College

Jarrell: In assessing ethnic sensitivity, the "Asian Food Affair"³ which you mentioned in your letter was an indication that we haven't come as far as one might have thought in terms of sensitivity. I'd like you to talk about that incident.

Stevens: Sure, let me talk generally about the issue. I don't know how far you remember the case, but it was really a virtual non-event. It was a case where one of the colleges, Crown, had refused to serve Asian food on Pearl Harbor day.

³In December, 1988, Crown College postponed an Asian theme college night dinner featuring a Filipino menu, scheduled on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor Day, which resulted in campus-wide charges of racism against Crown College made by numerous student groups. — Editor.

Now the food they were going to serve, as it turns out after more investigation, was Filipino food . . .

Jarrell: Yes.

Stevens: I mean it all strikes me as incredibly bizarre. Manila was bombed the same day as Pearl Harbor. The Philippines were on our side. But that's really irrelevant. I mean the whole problem . . . the idea that one would not serve Asian food on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor still strikes me . . . I mean I'm I'm a 1960s liberal, I'm a moderate. I'm not a radical. I'm a civil libertarian. That just strikes me as insensitive. I think it's naive to expect that we're going to have massive sensitivity. We're all very insensitive, whether it's an issue of race, sex, or various other things. They clearly are very difficult issues, and as this becomes a more diverse state and, one trusts, a much more diverse University, those problems are going to become more complex and not easier. So I think that you have to start from the assumption that these are extremely difficult, complicated issues.

What I think is sad is that although the rhetoric on this campus is very much pro-diversity it doesn't mean everybody adheres to it. But I think we couldn't have achieved what we have in affirmative action if it weren't for the fact that there is really basically considerable support in the faculty and students for this.

I think the "Asian Food Affair" however, does show how far we have to go. In other words, it's a classic sort of conundrum. As an academic, rather than an administrator by training, I always assume that things could have been done better. But the truth is, in the "Asian Food Affair" I would have been hard put to do things differently if the same facts came up today. Over the years Crown College has manufactured a whole series of explanations of why they did it. Each one I find somewhat less convincing than the previous one. The provost [Peggy B. Musgrave] really added fuel to the fire by making a statement that those people can eat their food any of the other 364 days of the year. Now whether she really made that statement . . . the story has changed a number of times. I can't tell you. But it was certainly reported by the community. In those circumstances I still thought it was a relatively minor error of judgment. I urged the provost to issue an apology because clearly reasonable students, reasonable Asian students and others . . .

Jarrell: Were offended?

Stevens: Were very offended. I thought she did an excellent job of issuing an apology and I assumed the matter would be over. I urged her to sit down with the Asian students and that would be the end of the matter. I issued a statement saying that we could all learn from this and we're all capable of doing equally stupid things, or probably more stupid things. It just seemed to me one of those issues that could happen in any well-run society and I just assumed it would be over in a week. But it has dragged on and on and on. Now there was another complex . . . the director of the budget who is himself Asian, wrote a very intemperate letter, I understand . . .

Jarrell: Victor [M.] Kimura.

Stevens: I understand why he did it. But it was a tremendously unfortunate letter. I tried to distance myself from it. I couldn't order him to rescind it because of his First Amendment rights. I was advised by general counsel. I did urge him to write a letter of apology. His letter of apology did almost as much damage. It was almost as insensitive as the original letter. So that certainly dragged on. But the problem is, and this is the sort of underlying defect in this campus, it became involved in campus politics which had nothing to do with racial sensitivity. There is a group of senior fellows over in Crown who were interested in fighting me rather than interested in the implications of racial sensitivity and I think they gave thoroughly bad and reprehensible advice to Peggy [B.] Musgrave, the provost.

I should give you more of the story. In the days after this they urged her to withdraw her letter of apology, telling her she had done nothing wrong. (inaudible) I think they didn't have the provost at heart. They had the interests of just looking for a fight with the administration and that's sad. You know there are sick people on this campus.

Jarrell: Then there was the article in the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* several weeks ago . . .

Stevens: Yes.

Jarrell: Aspects of this incident, in terms of the lawsuit . . . I mean there continues to be a stench, a bad feeling about it.

Stevens: Oh clearly and I think some people genuinely don't understand what is insensitive about what was done and I feel sorry about that, but I think the bursar of the college really was very hurt by the whole event. But in fact he was intimidated, I think, more by a couple of the senior fellows than by anything that Victor Kimura said. So the whole thing has been really rather unpleasant, and I think has been used and manipulated by an unscrupulous part of the college fellows.

UC Santa Cruz as a Multicultural Campus

Jarrell: How racially sensitive is this campus? How comfortable is it for a young Hispanic or black student coming here as an incoming freshperson? What can the administration, the colleges, the boards, the counseling services do? What do you envision still needs to be done to make this a more accommodating, inviting, welcoming place for somebody from a totally different background?

Stevens: Well, let me give you two, somewhat conflicting responses to that. One is, clearly we need to do the very best we can to make this an attractive place for all people, whether they are from lower socioeconomic classes, whatever their sex, whatever their sexual preference, whatever their race. We do that by trying to sensitize people in the colleges. We do that by trying to sensitize staff, faculty . . . everyone who works here, all of us. We cannot solve the problems of the world. We do not exist in a vacuum; we may think this is a perfect place but it is not. To expect it to be a perfect place is unrealistic. I think one can only give a Delphic answer. I think that we are better than most campuses in terms of making this an attractive place for all students. We're a long way from perfect.

But also, different groups always assume that they are uncomfortable in what they see as a hostile environment, but some of it is undoubtedly the result of the kind of trauma that all of us as undergraduates experience between 17 and 21. I mean, in one sense, if you are at a good institution you shouldn't feel comfortable about life. You should feel worried about issues. You should be looking for perfection and feeling you are a long way from it. So I have to take

all these things with a pinch of salt. My other worry is that we're now in an era where multiculturalism is the watchword. Clearly we are in a multicultural society and we need this to be a university that is sensitive to multicultural issues. I also worry that we do a lot of sloppy thinking, however. Clearly we need to be doing a lot more research, a lot more teaching, in areas about different ethnic groups in this country. On the other hand, I am worried that we are moving to an era where we provide special programs for each ethnic group.

Jarrell: In terms of disciplines?

Stevens: That's right.

Jarrell: Women's studies, black studies?

Stevens: I'd rather not single out any particular group.

Jarrell: No, but in terms of the kind of Balkanization that takes place?

Stevens: I think there is a danger of intellectual Balkanization. I think it's partly our own fault. We don't have a very clear idea of what we mean by a good liberal arts curriculum at the moment. Therefore the idea that we can graft on everything in sight, without having a clear idea of what an educated person should be, strikes me as naive. At the moment what worries me is that everyone is demanding more multiculturalism without a clear vision about what the goals are. What kind of liberal arts and sciences education do you want? We say whites should not be able to graduate without some understanding of other ethnic groups. I think that's fine. But should we allow black students to graduate without understanding white students, or white history?

There is another problem that I think has been forgotten. We're trying to get rid of the so-called Eurocentrism in our curriculum, but the truth is, our institutions are European institutions. The constitution of the United States essentially comes out of English intellectual thought of the 17th century, and French intellectual thought of the 18th century. They were influenced by European thought. They were essentially Europeans. We have a language and a literature which has grown out of European languages. I think it is unfashionable, but I think we need to do a great deal of hard-headed thinking about what we mean by Eurocentrism and what we mean by multiculturalism on the academic side.

Otherwise we're going to have a mish-mash of nonsense. Well it's partly, as you say, the counterculture and the abnegation of responsibility by the faculty in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and the way that so much of the humanities has been dominated by deconstructionism, has added a sort of nihilistic impact. Much of deconstructionism is intellectually very exciting, but there's certainly an element of nihilism in it.

Jarrell: But this of course is at the forefront right now in the political arguments about higher education.

Stevens: Of course that's been overstated, but the problem is there's an element of truth in it.

Development of the Sciences

Jarrell: To move on now to a discussion of Science Hill, because that has been really a landmark development in terms of campus building that's come to fruition during your tenure. What do you think about the development of the sciences on this campus?

Stevens: Well I think it's just fine. You know the sciences on this campus are the strongest division intellectually. This nation and this state need good scientists. We have in the natural sciences an outstanding department of astronomy and astrophysics. We have, I believe, one of the strongest boards of earth sciences in the system, and also nationally excellent. The appointments made in chemistry are really transforming that into a very good department. We have a good department of physics, not as good as they think they are, but there are some excellent people there. There's some dead wood. Unfortunately the physics board gets a bad reputation because it has a disproportionate number of the campus windbags. But we have some excellent science departments, and some very competent computing. So if you have good departments you should support them. One of the things that discourages me a great deal about this generation of students is they see science as bad, and that's a terrible indictment of a good liberal arts and sciences education, and another reason why I regret that we do so little thinking about the undergraduate curriculum. I truly worry

about that. I mean students come in with such an anti-science bias, they think somehow science isn't politically correct.

Jarrell: I wonder though, how widespread that is?

Stevens: Well I don't know. Of course I see a lot of students and of course get a lot of political flak from them.

Jarrell: I would imagine that if we looked at students' choice of majors that that might belie . . . because we have all of these students who are majoring in all of these fields.

Stevens: Yes, outside of biology, the numbers majoring in the sciences are not as good as they should be. But no, I mean there is interest. But I just worry to use C.P. Snow's very trite phrase, whether we don't have two cultures.

Jarrell: Yes, that there's kind of a reemergence of that conflict.

The Natural Sciences

Jarrell: You wanted to talk today about the different boards of studies. We've gotten to the natural sciences.

Stevens: Well let me finish natural sciences . . . I think when you get good boards like that they should be supported. The original ideas came from Bob Sinsheimer. I have tried very hard to push through with those. Wendell Brase needs a lot of the credit. But it is true I have lobbied very hard with the president to make certain that we actually have decent accommodations.

Jarrell: Facilities, yes. Because I would say that the allocation of UC system resources to building the labs, the new science library, even though that's a project with a long history. I mean it was on the drawing boards quite a long time ago. Nonetheless you only get those projects funded and supported when you make a strong case.

The Arts

Stevens: Art history, which is technically a committee will, I hope, become a board shortly. I think it has made a real comeback. Four years ago people had either left or died. I think now it's an excellent board again with a good balance of conventional art history and really cutting edge trendy art history.

Jarrell: (laughter) Trendy?

Stevens: Trendy. Also that's one of the areas where I think we've done an excellent job of making it a more diverse activity. I think that's very good. I think music is an erratic board. The whole problem in the arts has been that they find it very difficult to go out and hire people nationally. They tend to hire people that have been around a while. Their own students. Lecturers who have been there forever. That is not a good way to build a first-rate operation. So rather than talk individually about music, studio arts and . . . theater arts . . . I would say that generally, the problem with the performing and visual arts boards is that they are unimaginative about their hiring and that they tend to hire lecturers and their own students. That in the end is very unhealthy. Now that doesn't mean there are not some very bright spots there. One or two good appointments in music. There are some marvelous things like Shakespeare Santa Cruz. I think Vivian [C.] Sobchack has done an excellent job as dean. But there are unfortunate weaknesses in that division. That's a division that has to be watched very carefully if it's in fact to make quality appointments, and in the end it's the appointments that you make that are really crucial.

Jarrell: How do you contradict this in-grown tendency?

Stevens: You have a good dean such as Vivian Sobchack and you have a tough-minded academic vice chancellor. I think Michael Tanner has been excellent in stopping . . . some of this. I have to say the committee on academic personnel has done a very good job. Just insisting that the boards over there bring themselves up to national standards. Visiting committees are helpful. But they can't do everything.

The Social Sciences

Stevens: Social sciences was a weak division. It had some excellent people. There are some very, very good people (inaudible) . . . psych . . .

Jarrell: Do you mean programatically it was weak?

Stevens: Well in terms of the quality of the faculty. Ten years ago we were really quite weak. We had several problematic boards. Justice Holmes said, "to generalize is to omit." I think what's happened in the last few years is that some very good appointments have been made. The senior people in economics are basically brain dead. But the new appointments in economics have been just excellent. There have been some good new appointments in psychology and sociology. I think there's been a real transformation in the last couple of years in environmental studies. Two new senior appointments, very, very good. Community studies has always been a very interesting board and continues to be so. Politics has some very good people. For reasons that still, after all these years are not clear to me, it has great difficulty working together.

Jarrell: You mean the faculty?

Stevens: Yes, but it has some good people. Social sciences is not a strong division but is getting much better. Partly of course, one is dealing with a national phenomenon; the social sciences were riding high in the 1960s, and in the 1970s and 1980s they fell on pretty hard times, with the exception, possibly, of parts of psychology and economics. Oh, and I should add that one of the real success stories of the whole University is of course, anthropology, which was a very weak board and under the leadership of Rick [Richard R.] Randolph. It has become, I believe, just a superb and excellent board, and I think under Susan [F.] Harding's guidance it will go from strength to strength.

The Humanities

Stevens: In humanities, linguistics is just excellent. You know, again it's a board that has been totally revamped in the last dozen years. The visiting committee said that it had the best undergraduate program in the nation, and probably one

of the best five graduate programs in the nation. That's a wonderful statement. I think Jorge Hankamar has been a remarkable leader in that board and it's just very, very impressive. Now it's a tightly focused subject, linguistics, and it's certainly not everybody's vision of what linguistics should be, but it's absolutely first-rate.

Overall, humanities is a problematic division on the campus. It's getting much better. It has certainly some very interesting things . . . the history of consciousness is an extremely interesting board and Hayden White is not only the most famous person on this campus, but one of the most well-known international scholars. I think it's interesting what's going on in women's studies. I certainly have some reservations about some things, but I think it's basically a very interesting board. They've made some interesting new appointments. Philosophy is essentially rather a weak board. Good undergraduate teaching but intellectually not high powered.

The way we handle writing I think is very good on this campus. Very extensive but I do believe it helps undergraduate education in a very real sense. There are a number of faculty involved, both regular faculty and lecturers. The way we teach languages is extremely good, but it's also somewhat dysfunctional, because most of the work falls on people who are not on the regular tenure track. The biggest problem we've had from the humanities is the literature board, which is anarchical, and really does make its decisions by a process of, I think, intimidation. That in the long run is not a satisfactory way of running an institution.

Jarrell: Can you elaborate on that?

Stevens: Well there are barons there. There are some very good people in that board, don't misunderstand me. But there are also a number of people who behave like intellectual thugs. That in the long run is not a very good way of making decisions.

Jarrell: Do you think that the way the literature board is organized at another institution, like at Stanford, you would have it broken down into smaller cohorts of scholars in certain fields. But it's such a large umbrella. Do you think that is one of the problems?

Stevens: I think that's one of the problems. I'm not advocating that we be bound by national groups, necessarily, or at all. But unless there is some sense of intellectual integrity and governance in the board it will continue to be a mess.

Jarrell: What about history?

Stevens: History is an interesting board. Since it's my own board I suppose I can't be entirely objective. It's basically been a disappointing board on this campus. There are some very good people. It has tended to be, I think, too politicized. So appointments are made in a somewhat strange way. It does however have good people. I think it made one or two very good appointments in the last few years and I hope that it will begin to get its act together. One of the very real problems has been that it hasn't had a senior Americanist until this year and that's a very real problem because it has tended to be a doughnut then, with rather good Europeanists, rather good people in Third World and European history, and even some interesting younger people in American ethnic history, but with no real core of American history. And that may put me into the conservative camp, but it worries me.

Jarrell: One of the comments you made just running along here, you said something very disparaging about the senior people in economics, that they were "brain dead." Now how do you form an opinion like that?

Stevens: Well obviously by talking to people. Obviously to some extent one reviews files. One sees CVs. One sees the performance. Under Carl [E.] Walsh I think it really is going to take off. There are some excellent people there.

Santa Cruz as a Location for a UC Campus

Jarrell: To start today, I would like you to discuss Santa Cruz, the community as the locale for a UC campus. You mentioned several points about this in your letter to President Gardner, but I'd like you to elaborate on Santa Cruz as a home community for a UC campus.

Stevens: Not an easy question to answer, because obviously it's a community that has many attractions. It's a beautiful area. The campus is a beautiful campus.

The town is a perfectly pleasant little town. My sense is that in the 1960s as new universities were founded there was a fad of founding universities in seaside towns. I'm blocking on the name of the famous report in England which established a whole series of new universities. Many of them were established either in cathedral towns like York and Canterbury or in seaside towns like Colchester, where the University of Essex was, or Brighton, where the University of Sussex was. Indeed Clark Kerr was in close touch with the people who were working on this report and California and England really sought to do much of the same thing: to expand the elite sector of higher education and to put it in relatively remote areas. I start from the premise that this was probably not a good idea. I think universities would have been much better sited in industrial towns. I worry that putting them out in the countryside really confirms the sense of remoteness and irrelevance. So my feeling is that being in a small town like this has worked against the University. I think we would have been a much more effective University had we been in the Almaden Valley as we had been intended to be.

Jarrell: In the Santa Clara Valley.

Stevens: Yes. We would have then been much closer to our clients. The faculty would have been very much more involved in the mainstream of political thought. It would have made certain that the University was exposed to what was going on in California, and another not unimportant reason, is it would have made fundraising much easier. It's very difficult here. The reverse of all those things I said happened. It is possible. Santa Cruz is off the beaten track. Sometimes the mountains really shield it from what's going on in the real world. Every academic wants somehow or other to be sheltered to some extent, likes living in the ivory tower. Some of that is undoubtedly good. I worry that it's gone much too far here. I think it was an unfortunate place to put a university. It's too small a town. It's led to the ill feelings between the city and the University, to a significant extent.

First of all the old-timers resented the University coming. Then fringe groups were able to take over the politics of the town. The town, very rightly, has felt that we're not paying our fair share whereas it would have been much easier in a larger community to have done that. I think it's always dangerous having a university in a very small town because everybody else knows everybody's

business. It becomes less easy to make intelligent decisions, to hire effectively, to fire where necessary. I think it has made it more difficult to recruit minority students, although there is always a difficulty in recruiting first-generation students in a liberal arts institution. But most of all, it's intellectually, socially, and culturally cut this campus off from the real world.

Jarrell: Well since the decision was made and we now have 25 plus years of that relationship established between the University and Santa Cruz . . . UCSC has a disproportionate influence on the economy and on the whole community because of its size, because it's the prime employer. How do you think a *modus vivendi* can be established? It seems progress has been made during your tenure, in terms of the relationship among the three entities. What problems do you see have been addressed and perhaps solved and what other areas do you think still need attention from your successor?

Stevens: With respect to what I said earlier, I think it's too late to move the university now; the state has 3/4 of a billion dollars invested here. So that really makes no sense. But my chief concern is not really about town-gown relations, but really about the intellectual, cultural, social, and political life of the University in the town which I think has been badly distorted and is probably on balance somewhat unhealthy. As I said in one of our earlier sessions, the relations with the city and the University . . . at least we've opened lines of communication. People understand the University is here to stay. At the same time they understand the University is serious about being a good citizen. We are something of the elephant in the tent. There is no doubt that we will trample the grass from time to time. But at least I hope we are trying to do the right thing in making it clear to the city that we care about what goes on in the city and county. We will try to be supportive to anything that goes on in the city and county. I think that's very important.

It's not a very sophisticated town. Certainly the University has made it a more sophisticated town, a more culturally interesting town. But it suffers from being off the beaten track.

Jarrell: What about the negative effect in terms of fundraising? Now for instance, during Bob Sinsheimer's tenure, he initiated the idea of the research and

development park, which was an initiative to have some kind of synergy between Silicon Valley and this campus. That was really beaten down.

Stevens: I understand why people were opposed to it but it was an artificial way of. . . I think Bob Sinsheimer, if you asked him the same question would have given you the same answer . . . the University was put in the wrong place. That was Bob's effort to try and . . .

Jarrell: Bridge this?

Stevens: I certainly have made no effort to resuscitate that because it was just divisive in terms of campus politics, in terms of politics with the city, but I'd have to say that I think Bob's idea was essentially a good one. Because we are the university for Silicon Valley. I've had to approach this in different ways in terms of fundraising with people over there. I've put a lot energy into it and in terms of the energy I put in I don't think it's been wildly successful. But we have extended our extension programs over there so that we really do have some sort of presence over in the Silicon Valley. But it would have been so much easier to have had the campus there. Compared for instance, with San Jose State, which does raise a lot of money in Silicon Valley, we are at a tremendous disadvantage. People know very little about us. Highway 17 serves in a sense as an effective barrier to people really knowing what's going on here, or wanting to know what's going on here. Each year we put in more and more energy to get people to know, but it really is an uphill battle. So from the point of view of major gifts from Silicon Valley, which ought to be a logical place for us to get massive gifts, they tend to go to Stanford and to Berkeley, which are more visible and more accessible.

I've spent a lot of time over there. I'm meeting different people, trying to persuade them to be interested. I think we've got some people now who are quite interested in the University. But raising money is a long term process, and as I say it's a much more difficult to raise it if you have to go over Highway 17 and people just don't feel the psychological links to the University they would if the University had been put where Governor Brown wanted it—which was in the Almaden Valley.

Relationships with other UC Chancellors

Jarrell: We'll move on now. I'd like you to discuss your relationships with other UC chancellors.

Stevens: You mean my predecessors or the chancellors generally?

Jarrell: The chancellors generally that you've worked with.

Stevens: Oh I must say I've found the relationship with the other chancellors just superb. I really like them all. They have been wonderfully generous and supportive, both specifically . . . for instance when we had the earthquake, they were just terrific in supplying fire, police, psychologists, you name it. But also psychologically. Whenever we've needed any kind of help UCLA has provided advice, or Berkeley's provided advice. I mean I just found them a wonderful group of people to work with. These jobs are inevitably very lonely jobs and it becomes a lot less lonely by having a very supportive president, as I have had, but also a very supportive group of chancellors. I find Chuck [Charles E.] Young marvelous. I find him wonderful company. We get on extremely well. But he's also been wonderfully helpful to me as I think through things. Mike [Ira Michael] Heyman, whom I've known for thirty years . . .

Jarrell: Oh I didn't realize that.

Stevens: He and I are old friends. Mike has again been extremely thoughtful and helpful to me as we discuss problems. I always find Jack [W.] Peltason very amusing and on scientific things Dick [Richard C.] Atkinson is marvelously insightful. So I found them all really just wonderful to work with. . . . David Gardner has really been very supportive of me and this campus. He and Roy Brophy spent a great deal of time trying to encourage me to stay and not to resign and I think he may be a little mad with me now for going, but in fairness to him, I understand that. He has been terrific. Really . . . I don't feel I know him personally at all. He's a very private person as I am a very private person. But he's been just wonderful. I have found the fellowship of the chancellors really very pleasant and attractive.

Jarrell: Well that's very encouraging because one thing you did mention is that in your experience here at University Hall, Kaiser Center, that the perception of UC Santa Cruz as perennially ungovernable . . .

Stevens: Yes. Did I use those words?

Jarrell: Not perennially, but you said its governability was definitely constantly a question, a sore point, a difficulty that any chancellor at UC Santa Cruz would have to deal with. I wonder if you could shed some light on why you feel outsiders regard UCSC as a difficult campus in terms of how it's governed?

Stevens: I'm not certain that I can articulate this very clearly. But among the things one would have to consider in answering this question intelligently would be the fact that the campus was staffed essentially in the early years by people who were unhappy on their own campuses. Now sometimes they were unhappy on their own campuses for good reason. Sometimes they were perennially unhappy people. The campus was originally staffed by people who were disgruntled. Now this brought us great talent. It also brought us great trouble. I think that tradition continues from that day to this. Shared governance has never worked very effectively, I think, on this campus. Maybe it's endemic in the public sector. Maybe it's endemic in California. Maybe it's peculiar to Santa Cruz. I don't know. But certainly I have a very real sense that on this campus the faculty and administration have tended not to see themselves as having shared goals. The relative lack of civility and rationality in the relationship between the administration and the faculty has meant that on the outside, quite justifiably, the campus has been seen as a stormy, iconoclastic, unmanageable institution. Sometimes with justification, sometimes without. UCSC's faculty does not on the whole hesitate to wash its linen in public. I think that accelerates or aggravates the perceptions of the outside world. The general counsel says he has far more cases from this campus than any other campus.

Jarrell: In terms of promotion and tenure?

Stevens: Well in terms of all the cases. Terminations, hirings, people complaining. Difficult situations. The regents get more letters from this campus than any other campus. I mean this is in a sense a marvelous exercise of First Amendment rights, but it certainly leads the regents and the University administration to the

sense that this place is a little unstable. Please don't hear me saying that I think people should not write, but you asked me why I thought the perception was that this was an unstable place. Then we tend to have a faculty who doesn't take shared governance seriously, so while we normally get a good CAP and normally a passable committee on planning and budget, we have had erratic committees on educational policy, and frequently appalling privilege and tenure and academic freedom committees. So this is a real problem. Frequently our committee on committees . . . I don't know how many people actually vote for it, but too often it has people who are not interested in seeing the success of the campus but more interested in (inaudible) their own personal political agendas. This is not good.

The Loma Prieta Earthquake, October 17, 1989

Jarrell: An event I would like you to talk about is your experience as the chief campus officer during the earthquake.

Stevens: It's an interesting question. I thought this campus handled the earthquake excellently. I don't think it handled it brilliantly . . . we could have done some things better, but we did have an emergency plan. It did work. We fed the students. We closed. We had six, seven million dollars worth of damage. But we closed for a minimum length of time, three or four days. It was altogether a very impressive scene. Let me tell you the people I was most impressed with coming away from that experience were the staff. The faculty were not heavily involved in the earthquake, except for the provosts who did a remarkably good job. Essentially the people who bore the brunt of it, who worked day and night, were the staff. We have, as you know, a command center, and within a few minutes of the earthquake I was up at the command center in the firehouse and I was just really impressed that people came back to work. Some of the fire people knew their own homes had been destroyed but they stayed on duty. The medical services stayed on duty. The Marriott staff did a wonderful job in the college dining halls.

What amazed me most of all were the janitors, many of whom were from Watsonville, many of them Hispanic. Although their families were often turned

out of their homes, they stayed on duty to get things working right. I was just really, really, really impressed with that. So the first thing I think in my mind is how grateful I am to the staff and to the administrators who were involved. Mainly Bruce Moore and the student services . . . the bursars did an excellent job, and as I've said the provosts did an excellent job. But I was really impressed by the rank and file of the staff, and there were some real heroes. Fire Chief [Joe G.] Fuentes was just excellent. Frank Zwart, the campus architect, when the UCLA helicopter couldn't land, he did the . . . structural engineering inspections so that the kids could go back to their dorms. I thought the students behaved extremely well. Morale was high. But I was so grateful to them. So I was very impressed with that. We had from UCLA police and medical teams. The campus police we lent to the city because we didn't need them. We found the police worked well here. Again I'd single out Jan Tepper, the chief was out of town and Jan was acting chief and did a wonderful job. But we didn't need extra police and UCLA sent them so we lent police to the city. UCLA sent emergency medical teams, whom we lent to the county. So we cooperated well with the city. My goal was not to make any demands on the city at all. So we didn't use their fire services, we didn't use their police; we tried to handle everything ourselves. We made some mistakes. There were some of our students who were shaken out of their lodgings downtown. So that we could get on with the cleaning up process, I said people weren't to come back on campus for 48 hours. That was basically a right decision. But I didn't . . .

Jarrell: Think of the exceptions?

Stevens: Didn't think of the exceptions. There were some people in the city who felt we ought to have done more with the city. I'm not quite certain what we could have done. I mean, we have one fire engine and we lent our extra police, our extra medical help, we tried not to use any city services, and I made it clear to the mayor that we would help in any way we could, and was there anything else that we could do. Afterwards some people complained that the University hadn't done enough for the city and maybe we didn't, but I don't know what we could have done more. As soon as it was over, when the mayor did eventually start asking for things, we lent them our cars — they needed city cars. When they started a redevelopment program we lent them staff to run that program. Several months after the earthquake we had a mortgage program which would

help them redevelop the city and we've done that. There's no point in beating a dead horse. I thought the campus performed wonderfully in the earthquake. I think we worked well with the city. I don't know what the perception in the city is to this day. But we certainly intended, as I tried in all things, to be good citizens.

Jarrell: I was interested to hear you say that one of your chief concerns was not burdening the city with the University's needs, but of being self-sustaining up here, and drawing on resources from other campuses, where that was possible.

Stevens: That's right. As I say, whenever the city asked for anything . . . police I gave them; cars I gave them. When they wanted a helicopter landing pad, we immediately complied. In other words everything they asked for, I came through. I still don't know what more we could have done.

Jarrell: Can you tell me, during the crisis period the day of the earthquake and immediately thereafter, did you have a meeting with some key people up here where you would just be in touch every day?

Stevens: Yes, at the command center, we had a daily meeting. I forget whether it was at 9 or 10 a.m. each morning. For the first week, and then in the second week we met every other week and then we had a couple of sessions subsequently to sort of debrief ourselves.

Jarrell: In terms of the pre-existing emergency plan that was in place, was there some kind of a process whereby this campus evaluated its performance and how it followed through on that emergency plan?

Stevens: Yes. Wendell Brase has done that. I mean there were gaps in it. For instance there was no effective way of communicating with the provosts. The provosts were really crucial with 4000 students living on campus. There were walky-talkies; they didn't work very well. So we now have communications established there. KZSC had to close down because the building was sort of hanging over a gully. It would have been very helpful if I could have had access via the campus radio station to speak to the whole campus. There are two other things that are being put in now. One is an extra water supply because our water pressure dropped very rapidly. As you know there's a real fear of fire. So we will

have a huge new tank up on the top of the hill. Also we're going to have direct communications with the other campuses.

Jarrell: In the aftermath of the earthquake did you personally phone the office of the president and different chancellors? Did you talk to President Gardner immediately afterwards?

Stevens: I couldn't get through to President Gardner, because if you remember, the communications were absolutely crazy.

Jarrell: Oh, I know. People could phone in but it was very difficult to phone out.

Stevens: I managed to get hold of Bill Frazer and he passed everything on. We got an open line to Wendell Brase, who was in Michigan. He went on national television to reassure the parents that to the best of our knowledge no students had been killed. There were only about five injured and those were relatively minor injuries. I reached UCLA and Chuck [Charles E.] Young and he immediately dispatched the helicopter, the police, and medical teams and they drove through the night from UCLA through the back roads. So I was in touch with all the other chancellors at different points. But I didn't actually get to President Gardner until the following morning. But he knew what was going on.

Jarrell: Well a very, very interesting chapter. Something I would imagine none of us ever expected.

Stevens: No, I must say. It's the only time I've really used my ROTC training.

Coping with Budget Cuts and the State Budget Crisis

Jarrell: You've talked quite extensively about the non-existent budget process here at UCSC prior to your chancellorship, and how you have been very concerned to rationalize that process as part of your larger administrative concerns. But you said in your letter to President Gardner that you hope to have in place by the spring of this year, really a much more accessible budget and furthermore you mentioned the establishment of an independent budget office for this campus.

Stevens: The first is in place and now we do have budgets; we have a budget for every department and we have a University budget. That's all there. I've put in a provisional arrangement so that Galen Jarvinen now works as my special assistant for budget and institutional research. My expectation is that Karl Pister will establish an independent budget office.

Jarrell: That will be concerned solely with budgeting?

Stevens: My understanding is that's his intention. Since he's about to arrive, he's the one who should decide the final form of that. For the first time chancellors will have direct input into the budget here. I don't mean to underplay the work that Wendell Brase and Victor Kimura have done. But it has been an indirect involvement in the budgeting process. Since resources are the key to the future of any campus, it's essential that there be an independent budget office reporting to the chancellor. I don't care whether it's an independent office, but there has to be a method of giving the chancellor direct access into the allocation of resources in a more effective way than has ever existed in the past.

Jarrell: I'd like you to link this whole budget initiative of yours, with the budget crisis that the whole UC system is experiencing here in the spring and summer of 1991. You have yourself written several memoranda to the campus addressing morale . . . there's a lot of uncertainty among staff and faculty. I would like you to address how you are dealing with and thinking about this real budget crunch, which seems to be not just a one-time thing, but the state of California's budget deficit is in dire straits, and I would like your thinking on this in terms of our campus.

Stevens: Well of course we will have had three budget cuts during a twelve month period. Last fall there was a budget cut which was specifically targeted towards research and administration and public services. We made those cuts. Then there was the gigantic cut where we have for this year 295 million dollars less than we thought we were going to get. There will now be another cut of probably, in total, some 17 million dollars when the budget is finally settled. So it's been an enormously difficult year. One of the reasons why one needed a budgeting procedure has been shown by what we are able to do. We had a series of budget hearings. Each of the vice chancellors and deans was asked to prioritize his interests and say how he or she would handle cuts. In other words,

rather than just taking blind cuts as we've had to do in the past because we haven't had an effective budget, we were able to be selective and decide what our real priorities were on this campus. That's been a very important step forward.

I don't mean to say that I'm pleased with all the things that happened. Obviously, it's very digressive. But we were able, I think, to make the cuts in places that really were not absolutely essential. Now the effects of the cuts is the faculty are going to have to do more teaching with the same resources. The staff are going to have to do more work with the same resources. And nobody's going to get a pay increase. There will be gradual layoffs. But we were able to husband the resources in such a way that we'll be able to transition those layoffs over a six-month period. So while one hates doing the things that are going to have to be done, they will be done in as humane a way as possible, so that people have the maximum amount of knowledge that it's coming and we're going to enforce very seriously the preferential rehire policy for those laid off. We're doing it in a way that is logical. In other words, we will make cuts in the areas which are of least importance. I mean, that doesn't mean they are not important, but in relative terms.

Jarrell: You've tried to rank things.

Stevens: Yes. So I think one can see one of the enormous advantages of why you have to have a proper budgeting process.

Jarrell: In terms of the way you've gone about accommodating the diminishing funds, having had this budget in place has made the job more humane and more rational?

Stevens: I think so. It's certainly made it more rational. I hope we would run it in as humane a way . . . That doesn't mean that if you're getting laid off that you think it's a good idea. I don't mean to be arrogant or insensitive. But you know in the past we have tried fudging because we didn't know where our resources came from or where they really went.

While we're talking about budgeting, since this is all related, I should say that I get the sense that many of the campuses in the UC system are not much ahead of us. Berkeley obviously has a pretty dysfunctional budgeting system. UCLA

has a very good one. We had the most amateur but for instance Riverside only really went to a serious budgeting process about five years ago.

Jarrell: Yes. I've read that at some of the other campuses there've been really quite startling layoffs. Like at Berkeley.

Stevens: Well you know, what I did was I knew about 18 months ago it seemed to me this was likely to come. When last spring the recession really began to hit, I began husbanding resources in such a way . . . that while we're not immune from the cuts, the cuts will be minimal compared with the other campuses. I think, for all the complaints around here, this campus will be relatively little affected. I'm also in a position to leave Karl [S.] Pister some flexible funds to begin next year which some of the chancellors won't have. So he'll be able to do good things on campus.

Assessment of Administrative Appointments

Jarrell: To close today, I would be interested in having you discuss some of your administrative appointments. Especially those appointments that you think have been really strong and successful in terms of your goals for the campus and how the campus administers and utilizes its resources. You could start with the deans.

Stevens: Okay. As I told you last time, that's been one of the disappointing things. The way the deanship is structured at the moment makes it very difficult to . . . and partly because of the reputation of the campus for ungovernability, makes it very difficult to attract first-rate people from outside. When they are attracted, they tend to be attacked. So I really feel I made a mistake to emphasize getting national figures in to run the divisions. I think that having decided to go internally, we've got a very, very competent group of people together. I think that Cliff [Clifton A.] Poodry was a very good acting dean of natural sciences and Dave [David S.] Kliger is a very competent dean of natural sciences. In the humanities, Harootunian didn't work out, but I believe that Gary Lease is the kind of Hessian one needs to deal with . . . a division that attempts to make all its decisions, or make many of its decisions by intimidation. Or lobbying, I suppose, is a more gracious way to put it. So I feel very good about that. I think Vivian Sobchack has been a breath of fresh air in the arts division, far more competent

than her predecessors, and that's very good. I think that Geoff Pullum has been a very outspoken, but also a very good, dean of the graduate division. I think that Jim [James B.] Gill did an excellent job this year in his role as an acting dean. In the social sciences, I thought Bill Friedland did a very good job as acting dean for a long period and I sense that Eugene [E.] Garcia has started very strongly, so I feel very good about all that.

I think Michael Tanner has been a very competent academic vice chancellor. He has all the strengths and weaknesses of a computer scientist. He is extremely thorough, extremely cautious, extremely careful. He has good judgment. He's too slow. He doesn't find it easy sometimes to work with others. But overall I think he's been a very good appointment. I think Wendell Brase has far too large a portfolio but has been just excellent. He is far and away the best person I've ever seen in capital planning and also in land planning. I think he's less interested in budget areas, less interested in other areas, but he's been excellent. Bruce Moore is absolutely first-rate on the business side of student services and very competent on the student affairs side. He had a wonderful compliment on the student affairs side in Arturo Pacheco, and I was very sorry to see Arturo leave. Arturo was somebody I promoted quite rapidly. As I told you on the development side I had real problems because Terry Jones was really a nice man, but not up to the job. I was grateful that Frank Drake stepped in. I've used Stephanie Hauk who is brilliant in community relations and very good on publications and p.r. Stephanie is not a development person but she's done a very adequate job there. I think I told you we've just had the best year ever in fundraising. Some eight million dollars.

Jarrell: Is there a recruitment in place right now for a vice chancellor for University Development?

Stevens: No. As soon as the budget is settled and Karl Pister is aboard, I'd expect to start a recruitment.

Jarrell: Are there other faculty or staff that you would like to address?

Stevens: Well I've worked with Galen Jarvinen and Galen is just excellent. He is my special assistant. Michael [A.] Houlemard is my executive assistant whom I

have found a delight to work with. He treads on a lot of toes but that's what an executive assistant should do.

Jarrell: Now how does he tread on toes? (laughter)

Stevens: His style upsets some people. But . . . that's what I need. Judi Tessier, my administrative assistant is just marvelous as a human being and also is the best administrative assistant I've ever seen. I have used heavily others, particularly I single out Joe Allen, who while he was dean of admissions is also a person who is just a natural administrator. He's open. He's intelligent. He's direct. He's thoughtful. He knows a lot about educational policy. I very much hope he goes much further in his administrative career. I think the associate academic vice chancellor whom Michael Tanner has hired, Mark Trovot last year, is just very good, one of the most decent people I know, one of the most thoughtful. Jorge Hankamer, very tough-minded, but marvelously goal-oriented and we owe a lot to him in terms of the 2005 committee and making the process much more effective. Ed[ward M.] Landesman is a gracious and thoughtful person whom I think has done a very good job this year looking after undergraduate relations. I think it's a long way from the perfect administrative team but I think it's a very good administrative team.

Jarrell: One other thing I'd like you to talk about today. Your thinking on the Pacific Rim colleges – maybe College Nine in the fall, and how that came to you in terms of the concept of a college.

Fundraising for a Pacific Rim College

Stevens: Both the legislature and the University are committed to a great investment in the Pacific Rim. I wanted to move quickly because there was an effort in the committee on planning and budget to get rid of the college system. They actually voted eight to one that we should have no more colleges. So I had a confrontation with them on that and said we were going to build by the college system and I made it clear in the memorandum I sent to the campus at that time that we were going to grow by the college system. I therefore needed to resurrect what we were going to do for that. I'd been in Japan recently trying to raise money for support for the Pacific Rim College. I was meeting with heads of corporations. But they tend to have heard of UCLA, rather than Santa Cruz, and

I hope that now, when they think of the University of California also think of Santa Cruz as well as UCLA. I regret that I haven't finished that off. Because I really think that if I had longer I could have pulled off a major grant, probably several major grants. But one of them for College Nine. But Karl Pister is a very experienced fundraiser and knows Japan and my hope is he'll be able to pick up where I left off.

Previous UC Santa Cruz Chancellors

Stevens: You did tell me you wanted me to talk about previous chancellors. My predecessors. I have found Bob Sinsheimer an excellent human being to work with. I would be somewhat critical of his administrative style but he's of first-rate intelligence, he's very tough-minded, he's a first-rate scholar. I have enormous respect for him and like him very much. He's not a very sociable person but I thought he did, on balance, a very good job here sometimes, particularly in economic terms, under appalling circumstances. I guess Angus [E.] Taylor was immediately before him as acting chancellor. Angus I'm very fond of. He's tried to be very helpful. I have enjoyed working with him.

Jarrell: In what capacity have you worked with Angus Taylor?

Stevens: Oh you know, he comes down to offer me advice. Sometimes it's good advice and sometimes it isn't.

Mark Christensen I really don't know well. From the little I've seen of him he seems very nice and has always been very civil to me but I don't know him at all well.

More of an enigma is Dean McHenry, who obviously as founder of this campus is a very significant figure. Much of his thinking was extremely important in the 1960s and early 1970s. I'd have to say that the campus really owes an enormous debt to him. I think that some of the things he attempted to do in terms of resurrecting the college system were wonderful in principle but probably naive in terms of implementation. But, look, very few people would have pulled it off and he pulled it off. I like him personally. I think he has found it more difficult to let go than he should have done. He, I gather, made Bob Sinsheimer's life quite

difficult by interfering in different things. I think he has interfered less in my time, but he has been involved in a number of planning decisions where I think it was probably inappropriate for a former chancellor to be involved. He's been particularly active in the Arboretum Associates and unfortunately, again, not in a very helpful way. It may not be his fault because the Arboretum Associates, while they have some wonderful people, also have some of the least attractive people in the Santa Cruz community.

The State Budget Crisis and UC Tuition Increases

Jarrell: To start with I'd like to pick up on something we talked about last time, namely the budget crisis in UC as it has been affected by the recession in the state, the state budget crisis and the decision this year to increase student tuition fees and how that's going to impact students on this campus and what mechanisms have been developed to assist students financially.

Stevens: Let me say that all parts of this community have paid the penalty for the budget cuts. The staff and faculty will not only have no cost of living increases, or range adjustments, they will have no merit increases. On this campus we shall have more students with a slightly smaller staff and a smaller faculty. So everybody, all our constituencies have, in a very real sense, suffered from these things. But you are right in the implications in your question: certainly the one I worry about most is the impact on access. I worry very much about the increase of 40% in tuition. I don't worry about it for most of our students, quite frankly, because our wealthy students and our middle income students in a sense have a tremendous bargain when you contrast the cost of tuition at this campus compared with tuition at any private institution.

The University of California as a whole has taken a position that there is no real impact on students because we've increased the amount of student aid. But I think that, quite frankly there are enormous psychological barriers as you raise tuition and that's what makes me very nervous. I worry that the increase will have a very real impact on those groups that we should be seeking to attract. At a time when we are trying in terms of admissions to make this a much more diverse campus, I worry a great deal when tuition is raised that amount,

particularly in a year when you also are increasing the qualifications to get into the University and moving out of the University remedial courses. All of these things I can justify intellectually at one level. But I worry greatly that the cumulative effect will have an enormous impact on access for those groups.

Jarrell: So where do you come up with the money to soften the blow of increased tuition costs . . . you can't just depend on student loans, right?

Stevens: Yes.

Jarrell: So where does that money come from?

Stevens: Well, what we will eventually do is what private colleges and universities do, we will engage in sort of Robin Hood activity. One of the reasons why privates charge so much for tuition is that they tax the wealthy students in order to provide tuition for the poor students.

Jarrell: Right, the rich students subsidize the poor students.

Stevens: That's right. Very dramatically.

Jarrell: Yes. So that that will be more apparent in a public institution such as UCSC.

Stevens: We are beginning to do that and my guess is that assuming that these increases continue, and whatever the legislature says, I think the chance of rolling back increases is quite limited, unless the whole tax base of the state changes. I suspect we will do more of that. We'll be into the business of having our own personal system of taxation.

Relations with Students

Jarrell: I see. To move on now to some aspects of student life here. Can you tell me, first of all, you've had office hours for students, is that correct?

Stevens: Yes.

Jarrell: How have students utilized that opportunity to have access to you?

Stevens: Well, it's awfully difficult to say. Because I think it's varied enormously with the different groups; it varies enormously with the character of who is running different organizations. There was a great deal of fuss, in either the second or third year, I forget now, when I required students to say what they were coming to see me about. Because I was mau-maued on various occasions by groups, and also by individuals.

Jarrell: (laugh) You mean intensely lobbied?

Stevens: Oh yes, there were some very ugly meetings, mainly by groups of ethnic students who would appear forty or fifty strong. They were not productive conversations, in my view. But also by individuals. Some people would come for an hour and monopolize my time on something about which I knew very little, and in a sense appeal a decision about somebody or some issue that I didn't know about. So it was often very unproductive. I think the structured office hours have been much more productive and I am very glad I went in that direction. Of course there was an enormous amount of fuss.

Jarrell: How so?

Stevens: Oh the students felt, somehow or other . . . it's like shopping, they felt they were losing something by not having open office hours, that they had to sign up for office hours. In fact, I have tried to get around to the colleges on a regular basis. If you go around to the colleges and talk to groups you tend to meet a totally different group of students from the students that come to see you. You know in the office I will tend to see students who don't want any vehicles on campus. But when I go out to one of the colleges, the students' first question is always why there's not more parking at X college.

So I try to do a balance of both. I probably haven't done enough of it. One of the problems of these jobs almost inevitably is that there is never enough time in any one day to do all the things you ought to do if you're being a good chancellor. But I would say that as in every campus I've been on . . . some years there's been just excellent leadership in the student body, other years leadership which I don't think is as good. Now that doesn't mean leadership that necessarily agrees with me. The job of a good student leadership is to disagree with the chancellor, but the question is do you disagree constructively and do you engage

in dialogue or do you try the process of intimidation. I think there have been years when the latter has applied and there have been years when the former has applied. On balance I think it's been a pretty good student government.

Student Activism

Jarrell: There have been a number of issues of student concern during your tenure here. There have been complaints about increasing enrollment and a feeling among students that there was inadequate classroom space, overcrowding, that there was difficulty in gaining admission to classes that were necessary for graduation . . . that there was a crunch, okay? That was one issue. There have been issues among ethnic minorities, seeking out some kind of a core ethnic studies course for the entire campus. I guess as sophomores or freshmen they would take such a class. There have been a variety of issues. Do any of these that I've mentioned, or others, come readily to mind and have caused you to give them some thought?

Stevens: Well each spring there's been some issue and this is true on most campuses, particularly on campuses like this, where there's a politically active student body and I can't say that any of that's horrified me. Students are here partly to learn and one of the ways they learn is by protesting. I don't have any problem with that at all. The issues that they raise seem to me sometimes sensible and sometimes not. For instance, the students are right to complain there are not enough classrooms. The students on the other hand, could help the matter considerably by having pre-registration so we could plan courses more effectively. They have consistently opposed pre-registration, which would considerably alleviate, although not cause to end, the overcrowding in the classrooms.

Concerns about diversity I'm extremely sympathetic to; that there is a need to get more minority students in, to support minority students once they are here. So in one sense the students were pushing at an open door. I have more complex reactions to the issue of multiculturalism in the curriculum. I'm not a Neanderthal; I'm not opposed to it in any absolute sense. I am opposed to it when you don't have a clear vision of why you're adding these multicultural

courses, and I have real concerns about ethnic majors. It may sound vaguely paternalistic but I am not certain that we do Chicano students a great deal of good by encouraging them to come to the University and then take a program solely in Chicano studies. So I have perhaps less sympathy there. But surely part of a good education now is to learn a great deal about all our heritages. I spoke about this in an earlier interview, but I just wish that we had a much clearer idea of what we hope to do in a good liberal arts and sciences curriculum. Then we could more intelligently judge what elements of multiculturalism we should add to the curriculum as it exists today. I'm not in favor of just adding courses without having a clear reason about why one does it. I am strongly in favor of a world cultures course that would be mandatory for everyone. But I'd like to see it as part of a total package. I'm unimpressed by the ethnic studies requirement here or at Berkeley.

Jarrell: At Berkeley, which they do have now, don't they?

Stevens: Which they do have, but it's a hodgepodge that's not a diversification of the curriculum, that is fulfilling the requirement.

Jarrell: Do you have any thoughts on the issue of fraternities which are a fairly recent addition to this campus?

Stevens: Yes. I'm basically opposed to fraternities and sororities. I would be grossly opposed to their being brought onto campus. On the other hand we can't stop fraternities from existing . . . you know there is something called the First Amendment, and if twelve people want to get together I can't stop them, nor should I be able to stop them. I can only say that in those situations in which I have known fraternities, they seem invariably to bring out the worst in people. So I have no enthusiasm for fraternities or sororities, quite frankly.

The Performing Arts Complex

Jarrell: Another development that was in the *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, I guess on Saturday, was the report was that the UC Regents had turned down UCSC's plans for the performing arts complex.

Stevens: Yes.

Jarrell: I wondered what are your thoughts on that?

Stevens: You know I don't feel particularly discouraged. They didn't turn it down, they postponed it. I saw a report in the newspaper, suggesting it was the siting, that one of the regents had a concern about siting. Basically they had a concern with the architect. I didn't share that concern but I have to say it's reasonable concern since I think; we got the wrong architect. I mean it's a very distinguished architect, Amacord, Antong, Pedok . . . but several of the regents made it very clear they thought the design was awful. We have the money for it and it's in the capital budget. I still don't understand why, but they really thought the architect's design was awful. But who am I to pontificate on architecture? But I have to say that I couldn't say they were unreasonable in their concerns.

Social Life

Jarrell: I would like to ask you about your social life here, along with your wife. What kind of an experience has that been for you both? Could you please characterize it . . .

Stevens: One of the things that clearly was a problem when we arrived was fragmentation in the campus, and I certainly don't feel we've made much of an impact there. Our predecessors made a perfectly rational choice to spend much of their energy entertaining the community. We certainly have done a lot of that. But we've really focused on faculty, staff, and students in terms of entertaining, as a way of trying to build bonds. I think it's important. If you were to say to me, give me tangible evidence that it's been worthwhile, I couldn't do that. But we do entertain virtually every day I'm in town. Either for lunch or dinner, and sometimes for both. So we do a lot. We had a small apartment in San Francisco and each second or third weekend we tried to get away on Friday evening and back on Monday morning. You know I had a daughter born while I was living at University House. That insured that we had some real family life. We live terribly private lives in San Francisco. Although we have a number of friends in San Francisco we very rarely saw them and we just lived a very pleasant and very private life there.

Jarrell: Just to have a few days here and there where you were just completely alone by yourselves.

Stevens: That's right. Partly for family reasons. Partly psychologically. If you are living on the campus you feel you are on parade the whole while and the phone does go (inaudible) from time to time during the night. I have a rule that I was to be called if there was any violent act on the campus or any major injury to a student so that I would try to go down to the hospital if anyone were injured, that sort of thing. So one does feel a little tied but it's important. If there was an attempted rape on campus I want to know it. I don't want to hear about it in the morning.

Jarrell: Yes. You wanted a direct report?

Stevens: Yes. That did mean, however, that one was always conscious of being available and being at people's beck and call, but that's part of the job. I don't resent it. But you asked me what it was like and I think that would be a fair answer.

Jarrell: You say you've really focused on the campus community. Was there any systematic kind of effort to include different groups . . . how did you organize this and think about it?

Stevens: Well, I . . . probably didn't put as much thought in as I should . . . let me put that as the first statement. But in the first couple of years I had almost every board to lunch. Whenever there was a public lecture I gave a dinner so that there was an opportunity to entertain that board. We gave receptions whenever a board was having any kind of a conference. We tried to give a number of dinners for new faculty during the year and used that as an opportunity to introduce them to a range of senior faculty. In the old days, new faculty dinners were just gigantic affairs with all new faculty. We tried to spread them out throughout the year and maybe do ten or twelve of them so the new faculty would meet a group of other faculty, and it was an opportunity of trying to build bridges, to develop bonds both for the younger faculty with the senior faculty, but also from the administration to the faculty.

Jarrell: How active has your wife been? She has been a student here part of the time she was here. Is that correct?

Stevens: She was a re-entry student; she wasn't getting a degree. She took a number of courses in linguistics, one or two courses in art history, and one or two others. But essentially she's interested in linguistics and was doing courses in linguistics. She found that very exciting. She put in an enormous amount of time. I mean she did all the entertaining with me but when I wasn't here she would give receptions for events that I couldn't attend. She would represent me and make speeches. She speaks well. She was headmistress of one of the Quaker schools in Philadelphia. She's been fairly actively involved in the education board and in town she was on the Gateway [School] board. She was on the board of the Santa Cruz Baroque Festival. She of course is the mother of a small child and so a combination of doing that, being involved in a fair amount of community work in town, doing a great deal of work on the campus and also trying to take courses, was from her point of view, and I think absolutely rightly, a full-time job.

Jarrell: Absolutely. Having a child, and then to trying to juggle all of these other roles.

Stevens: Obviously living at University House there's nobody close by. So she took Robin, our daughter, to all kinds of new things with other mothers and children so that our child would not feel totally isolated seeing only adults.

Resignation

Jarrell: Could you talk about what influenced your decision to leave Santa Cruz?

Stevens: Well the strange thing was what I said was very true. I had told David Gardner when I came that I wouldn't stay beyond six years. I would do five or six years. I am now 58 and I have done a little over four years. I actually offered to do four and a half if he wanted to have a national search. So I am cutting it a little bit short on the time. The reasons were really two-fold. There are inevitably a pull and a push. One is I have to confess I am feeling tired. I've done these jobs for fifteen years. That's a long time. I'm now in fact in my sixteenth year of trying to run a university. I'm weary. I know that time is running out on me. If I'm going to do something different, and I feel I have one very different job left

in me, I need to make a move. The other side of the pull/push, whichever it is, is that I have a stunningly attractive offer. Also, there had been a bomb threat on University house and we were living in the Dream Inn.

Jarrell: There was a bomb threat on University House?

Stevens: Yes. We were living in the Dream Inn and we'd gone to see some friends in San Francisco. I'd been asked if I would be interested in joining this firm several years ago and I said no. Actually the offer came just as I arrived here. I thought, of course, I couldn't do that. But they have now opened a London office. They inquired whether I would be interested. I realized that it was a very attractive offer and a very distinguished Washington, D.C., law firm that has a large number of governments as clients, and corporations. The opportunity of living in London, working in Europe as the Common Market comes into full force, working in Europe over the next few years while Eastern Europe opens up, seems to me just very, very exciting. I've always had at the back of my mind that at some point I'd like to spend the last few years in England. So that's what I'm going to do. And I *think* I will enjoy it. You can never be absolutely certain but everything I've done I've really enjoyed. I've spent twenty years as a professor. I found that time very rewarding. I was very fortunate and I think most of the while a very successful teacher and certainly a productive scholar. Then I've had fifteen years of running institutions, which I've really enjoyed, but I'm stale. I hope I have fifteen years left of practicing law.

Jarrell: Yes. Have you ever practiced law?

Stevens: Well . . . the answer is yes. I was called to the bar and I went through the requirements as you used to have to do over in England, and over the years I've always practiced a little on the side. I've represented a number of African governments over the years. I have even done a little practice dealing with some rather interesting international commercial cases. I've always retained, as the English pretentiously call them, chambers, which is really an office in the Temple. So while I can't say I spent very much time on the practice of law, I have some legitimate claim to have continued practicing law every year as an English lawyer.

Jarrell: Well this sounds as if it's going to be quite adventurous.

Stevens: Well I think so. Life has been very good to me. If I loathe the practice of law I won't hesitate to come back and be a professor.

Jarrell: (laughter) Okay. In concluding, how would you characterize the match between you and this institution?

Stevens: You know trying to judge yourself is always very, very difficult. I think obviously I had some strengths in that I think I'm very good at trying to put structure in. I had less success here than I would have hoped but I'm very pleased with many of the things that were accomplished. We do now have, I think, proper administration. We do have a very good academic administration. We do have intelligent budgeting. We have really made enormous strides in developing graduate programs. We have a proper academic plan. We'll begin to see that develop with the establishment of an engineering school in due course. I am very much interested in undergraduate education, and very frustrated with the committee on undergraduate education. I am very pleased that we were able this year, with the good offices of Joe Allen, to put into place, really a total renewal of the colleges. I find that all very exciting. Those things are very good.

I have spent thirty years in the private or independent sector of higher education and it was much more difficult to integrate myself into the public sector, where there is less a sense of mission. That's perhaps not a very tactful way of putting it or a very accurate way of putting it, but there are not the same shared goals you have in the private sector. It was very difficult for me. I found that very frustrating. I probably didn't handle it very well. This is a campus where, I think I said in the letter that I showed you, there are perhaps a disproportionate number of people who are still fighting their fathers as they reach their fifties, and I'm not certain I handled them well. I think I suffer fools less gladly than I did a few years ago. I think I told you when I had an inquiry from Harvard; when Harvard was looking for a president they called me and asked whether I wanted any hand in it and I told them I'm just too old, too tired, too crotchety and too sensitive to want to do one of these jobs again. All those things have an element of truth to them. You know, I would have wished I had more energy. You know, I wish I wouldn't have wasted time on trying to get deans from the outside. It would have been much more sensible to restructure the deanship which is what we're now doing. I think the relationship with the city was

evidence that things can be changed. I think we've done a lot in the last four years. A lot remains to be done.

Jarrell: Well I want to thank you, Chancellor, very much for agreeing to participate in this series of interviews, on really such short notice, but I didn't imagine that UCSC would send me to London . . .

Stevens: (laughter)

Jarrell: . . . to visit you, as much as I would have liked that. I want to thank you very much for fitting me in your schedule during the last month that you were here.

Stevens: I've enjoyed . . . you know as a lawyer by training I enjoy talking, and it's actually been very interesting. It's been like a debriefing session and I found it really quite interesting and you know, I am here for another week, so if as you go through it there are things you really feel we ought to have covered, you should not hesitate to come back and have one last session.

Jarrell: All right. Well I thank you very much. I have gone over my outline and all of the cards, and topic lists and I think that I've covered everything that I wanted to cover.

Stevens: Okay.

Jarrell: So it's on to the transcriber now.

Stevens: For the next six months I'm going to be finishing a book and . . .

Jarrell: Will you be in London?

Stevens: No, I will be in our summer home in Canada for a couple of months and then in Oxford for a couple of months. So I won't be in London until January.

Jarrell: Thank you so much.

Stevens: Well thank you. You have been long suffering and very sweet.

Index

academic plan 42
academic vice chancellor 12, 26, 32, 44, 53
administration 9, 52
admissions office 19
admissions policies 21
advising system at UC Santa Cruz 58
affirmative action 12, 60
African American students 22
Allen, Joseph P. 21, 32, 33, 44, 45, 83
Almaden Valley 70
alumni affairs 51
Amacord, Antong, Pedok 91
anthropology board of studies 67
Arboretum Associates 85
Armstrong, Julia 56
art history 66
arts division 66
Asian food affair 59
Asian-American students at UC Santa Cruz 57
astronomy board of studies 10
Atkinson, Richard C. 74
Baker, William P. 3
Bakke decision 22
black students 57

- board chairs 55
- boards of studies 54, 55
- Bok, C. Derek 1, 2
- Brase, Wendell C. 13, 17, 26, 37, 38, 40, 50, 52, 65, 78, 79, 82
- Brophy, Roy 74
- Brown, Edmund G., Governor 73
- budget 9, 26
- budget crisis 80, 86
- budget process 25
- bursar 32, 45
- California
 - as a multicultural state 20
 - budget crisis of 86
 - growth of 36
- campus growth 35, 37, 38
- Case Western Reserve University 1, 2, 3, 4
- chemistry board 64
- Chicano students 57
- Chicano studies 89
- Christensen, Mark N. 85
- Clark, Carolyn M. 44
- Clifford, James T. 6
- college administrative officers 32
- College Eight 37, 48, 49
- College Nine 84
- college system 5, 7, 8, 32, 43, 44, 48
- Colleges Nine and Ten 50

committee on academic and educational goals 44
committee on academic freedom 75
committee on academic personnel 67
committee on committees 75
committee on educational policy 32, 75
committee on planning and budget 28, 46, 75, 84
committee on privilege and tenure 75
committee on undergraduate education 24, 42, 95
community studies board of studies 67
Coonerty, Neil 40
Cornell University 53
council of chancellors 15
county of Santa Cruz 37
Cowan, Michael H. 12, 13
Cowell Health Center 49
Crown College 59
Daniel, Charles W. 4
Dartmouth College 2, 5
development 50
Domhoff, G. William 44
Drake, Frank 13, 51, 83
earth sciences board 64
economics board 67
emergency plan 75
engineering school 42
enrollment increases 89
enrollment limits 38

environmental studies board of studies 67

Esherick, Joseph 50

Essex University 2

ethnic diversity of faculty 56

ethnic diversity of students 20

ethnic studies 89, 90

faculty teaching loads 29

Farr, Sam 40, 41

fraternities and sororities 90

Frazer, William R. 78

Freeman, Carol M. 32, 33, 44

Friedland, William H. 32, 82

Frye, Hardy T. 4

Fuentes, Joe G. 76

fundraising 48

Garcia, Eugene E. 82

Gardner, David P. 1, 3, 17, 28, 38, 39, 43, 54, 70, 74, 78, 93

Gaspari, George D. 12

Gill, James B. 82

graduate programs 36

graduation rate 57

Gruhn, Isebill V. 4, 12, 28, 29, 30

Hackney, Sheldon 1

Hagar Drive 49

Hankamer, Jorge 42, 68, 84

Harding, Susan F. 68

Harootunian, Harry D. 53, 82

Harris, Adrian H. 28

Harvard University 1, 23, 95

Hauk, Stephanie 37, 40, 51, 83

Haverford College 1, 6, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 21

Heyman, Ira Michael 73

history board 69

history of consciousness 68

Houlemard, Michael A. 83

humanities division 68

Jarvinen, Galen M. 57, 79, 83

Jones, Terry 83

Kennedy, Scott 40

Kerr, Clark 70

Kimura, Victor M. 61, 62, 79

Kliger, David S. 82

KZSC 78

Laird, John 39

Landesman, Edward M. 84

Lawrence Livermore Laboratory 16

layoffs 81

Lease, Gary 82

linguistics board of studies 10, 68

literature board 68

Loma Prieta earthquake 17, 44, 75

Long Range Development Plan [LRDP] 17, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42

Mahaney, John 40

McHenry, Dean E. 18, 48, 50, 52, 85

Mello, Henry J. 39, 41
Meyer Drive extension 48
minority students 19
Moldave, Kivie 11, 26, 29, 53
Moore, Bruce P. 53, 76, 83
multiculturalism 23, 24, 56, 63
Musgrave, Peggy B. 60, 61
music board 66
music facilities 49
natural sciences division 65
Niebanck, Paul L. 6
Oakes College 49
Pacheco, Arturo 83
Pacific Rim college
 plans for 84
Patton, Gary 16, 39
Peltason, Jack W. 2, 74
performing arts 49
performing arts complex 91
philosophy board 68
physics board 64
Pister, Karl S. 48, 79, 81, 83, 84
planning
 at UC Santa Cruz 49
political correctness 24
politics board of studies 67
Polsby, Nelson W. 2

Poodry, Clifton A. 82
 pre-enrollment
 student opposition to 89
 private and public education
 differences between 13
 professional schools 36
 provosts 32, 46, 47, 76
 psychology board of studies 67
 Pullum, Geoffrey K. 12, 82
 Randolph, Richard R. 68
 reaggregation of colleges 33, 43
 recruitment
 of minority groups 19
 Regents of the University of California 16, 39
 relationships with other UC chancellors 73
 reorganization of colleges 31
Report to the Committee on the Year 2005 42
 research and development park
 plans for 72
 resignation 52, 93
 retention 21, 33, 57
 Rittenhouse, Louis 40
 San Jose State University 72
 Santa Clara 70
 Santa Cruz 34, 37, 40, 70, 71, 72, 76, 77
 Santa Cruz Baroque Festival 93
Santa Cruz Sentinel 36, 61, 90

Science Hill 64
 sciences at UC Santa Cruz 64
 senate advisory committee 12
 Shakespeare Santa Cruz 66
 shared governance 14, 44, 74
 Silicon Valley 72
 Sinsheimer, Robert L. 4, 7, 11, 13, 17, 31, 39, 43, 49, 50, 52, 53, 56, 65, 72, 84, 85
 six-year plan 28, 29
 Sobchack, Vivian C. 66, 82
 social sciences division 67
 sociology board of studies 67
 special admits 20
 Stanford University 5, 10, 23
 Stevens, Kathy 3, 5, 93
 Stevens, Robert B.
 administrative appointments 82
 administrative style 13
 and views on multiculturalism 89
 assessment of UC Santa Cruz faculty 10
 career in higher education 11
 career in law 95
 concerns about access to higher education 8
 decision to accept offer for chancellorship at UC Santa Cruz 5
 decision to resign as chancellor 94
 family life 91
 first impressions of UC Santa Cruz 7, 8
 interview for chancellorship at UC Santa Cruz 2, 6

- relations with students 87
- relationship with other UC chancellors 15, 73
- self-assessment of strengths and weaknesses as chancellor 95
- social life as chancellor 91
- views on access to higher education 18
- views on multiculturalism 24
- Stevenson College 47
- student activism 89
- Student Affirmative Action and Educational Opportunity Programs [SAA-EOP]
19
- student aid 86
- Student Center 49
- student services 45
- student-faculty ratio 31
- Switkes, Eugene 42
- Tanner, R. Michael 12, 28, 47, 54, 67, 82
- Targets of Opportunity (TOP) appointments 56
- Taylor, Angus E. 85
- teaching and research 9
- Tepper, Jan 76
- Tessier, Judi 83
- Thatcher, Margaret 5
- town-gown relations 8, 17, 34, 38, 71
- Trovot, Mark 83
- tuition fee increases 86
- Tulane University 11
- UC Berkeley 5, 10, 15, 22, 27, 81

UC Davis 39

UC Irvine 2

UC Los Angeles 15, 27, 28, 73, 76, 81, 84

UC Riverside 81

UC Santa Barbara 2, 39

UC Santa Cruz 28, 35, 38, 39, 89

- administration of 9
- admissions standards at 20
- and overcrowding 31
- and the Loma Prieta earthquake 75
- as a multicultural campus 62
- as an undergraduate campus 18, 24
- balance of research and teaching at 30
- budgeting at 26
- decentralization of power at 55
- development of graduate programs at 7
- fundraising at 50
- growth of 35, 36, 38, 49
- relations with systemwide 17
- students at 9, 21
- town-gown relations 7

undergraduate education 17, 42

underrepresented students 33

University Hall 38, 74

University House 3, 49

University of Essex, England 1, 3, 70

University of Pennsylvania 1

University of Sussex 70
vice chancellor of student services 46
Walsh, Carl E. 69
Watkins, Richard 16
Watsonville Register-Pajaronian 36
White, Hayden 68
Willson, Glenn F.M. 47
Wormhoudt, Mardi 39
writing program 68
Yale University 10, 16, 27
Yokoyama, Jane 40
Young, Charles E. 73, 78
Young, Janet E. 3
Zwart, Frank 76