

*From Complex Organisms to a Complex Organization:
An Oral History with
UCSC Chancellor M.R.C. Greenwood, 1996-2004*

**Interviewed by Randall Jarrell and Irene Reti
Edited by Irene Reti**

Santa Cruz
University of California, Santa Cruz
University Library

2014

This oral history is covered by a copyright agreement between M.R.C. Greenwood and the Regents of the University of California dated March 7, 2014. Under “fair use” standards, excerpts of up to six hundred words (per interview) may be quoted without the University Library’s permission as long as the materials are properly cited. Quotations of more than six hundred words require the written permission of the University Librarian and a proper citation and may also require a fee. Under certain circumstances, not-for-profit users may be granted a waiver of the fee. For permission contact: Irene Reti ihreti@ucsc.edu or Regional History Project, McHenry Library, UC Santa Cruz, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA, 95064. Phone: 831-459-2847

Table of Contents

Interview History	1
Associate Director for Science in the White House	6
Arriving at the University of California, Santa Cruz	21
Meeting UCSC Faculty and Staff	31
Changing UCSC's Image	34
Relations with the City of Santa Cruz	38
The Evolving Role of Chancellor	44
Proposition 209 and Diversity Issues	48
A Female Chancellor	58
Campus Growth Issues	73
Expanding Graduate Programs	82
State Demographics and Campus Growth	84
UCSC School of Engineering	93
The Silicon Valley Center	103
Interdisciplinary Research	108
Two New Colleges: Nine and Ten and Thoughts on the UCSC College System	113
Narrative Evaluation System	125
Student Activism	130
Graduate Students at UCSC	132
Key Staff Appointments	137
The Council of UC Chancellors	151
Budgetary Challenges at the University of California	154
Reflections on the Master Plan for Higher Education in California	158

Interview History

The Regional History Project conducted this oral history with UCSC Chancellor M.R.C. (Mary Rita Cooke) Greenwood as part of its University History series. Greenwood was appointed as chancellor of UC Santa Cruz in July of 1996 and served until April of 2004. While at UCSC, she also held an appointment as a professor of biology.

M.R.C. Greenwood was born in 1943 in Gainesville, Florida. She graduated summa cum laude in biology from Vassar College in 1968, and earned her PhD in physiology, developmental biology, and neurosciences from Rockefeller University in 1973. After graduation, she joined the faculty in human nutrition at Columbia University's Medical School, where she taught until 1978, when she moved to Vassar College. At Vassar she was the John Guy Vassar Professor of Natural Sciences, chaired the department of biology, and directed the Undergraduate Research Summer Institute. In 1989, Greenwood was hired by the University of California at Davis, where she was professor of nutrition and internal medicine, served as dean of graduate studies, and later vice provost for academic outreach. Her research interests are in developmental cell biology, genetics, neurosciences, physiology, women's health, nutrition and science, and higher education policy.

From November 1993 to May 1995, while on leave from UC Davis, Greenwood served as associate director for science in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy under President Bill Clinton. She spearheaded the creation of two major science policy documents: "Science in the National

Interest” and “Meeting the Challenge: Health, Safety, and Food for America.” In addition, she played a leadership role in coordinating interdepartmental and interagency science activities and co-chaired two National Sciences and Technology Council committees.

The political savvy she developed in the White House, as well as her experience in the world of government-funded scientific research, was to greatly benefit the UC Santa Cruz campus. Under her leadership, the campus finally established its first professional school, the Jack Baskin School of Engineering, which had been planned since the days of Chancellor Dean McHenry, but cut for budgetary reasons. Her years also saw many other strides forward: the founding of the NSF Center for Adaptive Optics; an increase in the number of academic programs by 52 percent, from 63 to 96, including a 41 percent increase in graduate programs; the building and opening of Colleges Nine and Ten; the hiring of 250 new faculty members; and a doubling of extramural research support. Greenwood’s tenure also saw the construction of nearly one million assignable square feet in academic buildings for the arts, the sciences and engineering; the founding of a UC Silicon Valley Center at Moffett Field; and collaboration with NASA Ames in developing the nation’s first NASA University Affiliated Research Center, the largest competitively awarded contract (\$330 million) at the University of California up to that time.

In addition, under Greenwood’s leadership the campus raised more in private donations than the previous total for the campus’s entire history. She built strong bridges with the city of Santa Cruz and surrounding communities, worked to preserve what she saw as the best aspects of the UCSC residential

college system, and to diversify the student body and faculty even in the wake of Proposition 209 and other backlashes against affirmative action. In this oral history she discusses her own experience as the first woman chancellor of UCSC and being part of the first generation of women to hold senior leadership positions in higher education administration.

In a tribute honoring Chancellor Greenwood before the United States House of Representatives, Congressman Sam Farr said: “With the campus now reaching a regional annual economic impact of almost \$1 billion, her leadership has proven advantageous not only to the students at the university, but to the local community as well.”¹ In an editorial, the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* said, “Relations between the university and the local community have been excellent during her years here—and that hasn’t always been true.”²

The first part of Greenwood’s tenure took place during affluent years that saw a tech boom in nearby Silicon Valley, but later she encountered the budgetary challenges that continue to undermine the fiscal health of higher education. In her parting email to the campus community she remarked, “Both political pressure and budgetary constraints are making it increasingly difficult for all public universities, even the great ones like UC, to prosper. Whether California will honor the promises of the internationally revered Master Plan for Higher Education is a question we must face.” It was that deep concern for the future of the University of California which inspired Greenwood to accept the

¹ See “In Honor of MRC Greenwood,”
Congressional Record Volume 150, Issue 75 (June 2, 2004)

² “Greenwood’s Achievements,” *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, 2/23/04.

position as provost and vice president of academic affairs at the Office of the President, the second highest post in the UC system. She became the highest-ranking woman in the UC administration and the first woman to hold this position.³ After her time at the UC Office of the President ended, Greenwood became president at the University of Hawaii. The demands of that position prevented her from editing her oral history transcript, a task to which she returned after her retirement in 2013.

Greenwood is a member of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, and a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, where she served as president in 1998 and chair in 1999. In 1996, President Clinton nominated her to serve as a member of the National Science Board, a prestigious group comprising the nation's top twenty-four leaders in science and education, which advises Congress and the President on science policy issues. Her research on the genetic causes of obesity is recognized worldwide and she is the author of numerous scientific publications and presentations. In retirement she plans to pursue policy issues, is serving on the board of the Monterey Bay Aquarium, and wants to spend more time with her family.

The first four interviews for this oral history were conducted on March 11, 12, and 22, 2004 by then-Regional History Director Randall Jarrell shortly before Greenwood left UCSC. After Jarrell's retirement, I conducted the final interview on June 22, 2005 at Greenwood's office at the University of California's Office of the President in Oakland, California. I transcribed and edited the transcript of the

³ Greenwood's tenure at the UC Office of the President and at the University of Hawaii is beyond the scope of this oral history.

audio recordings, and Greenwood reviewed the transcript, making corrections and clarifications, and meeting with me several times to go over the edits. I thank her for her keen eye and gracious spirit of collaboration.

Copies of this volume are on deposit in Special Collections and in the circulating stacks at the UCSC Library, as well as on the library's website. The Regional History Project is supported administratively by Elisabeth Remak-Honnef, Head of Special Collections and Archives, and Interim University Librarian, Elizabeth Cowell.

—Irene Reti, Director, Regional History Project, University Library

University of California, Santa Cruz, April 4, 2014

Jarrell: This is Randall Jarrell. It's March 11, 2004. I'm in the Chancellor's Office at UCSC, and this is my first interview with Chancellor M.R.C. Greenwood. She will be leaving the campus at the end of the month. To start, Chancellor, I'd like to ask you about the circumstances surrounding your appointment here, and that process. I believe you were up at UC Davis immediately prior to your appointment here. Maybe you could tell me how you became aware of the position opening. Did someone say, "We think you should apply"? Were you looking for another position?

Associate Director for Science in the White House

Greenwood: Let me give you a little background prior to my becoming aware of the opportunity to come to Santa Cruz. I had come to the University of California at Davis after having been an East Coast person for forty-seven years: Vassar undergraduate, Rockefeller PhD, some time at the Columbia Medical School. Then Vassar lured me back with a tenured position and a lot of laboratory space, and the opportunity to give back to an institution that I felt had given me a career.

I had been graduate dean at Davis for about five years when I was approached by the White House during President Clinton's first term, to come to Washington, D.C. to serve as a political appointee. I had never entertained such an idea. I hadn't contributed to the campaign in any major way. As far as I knew, my politics were not known.

The experience was like something out of the *Doonsbury* cartoon. I was sitting at my desk one day with my phone to my ear, which is a common position for deans, and my assistant was standing in the doorway on one foot and then the other foot, so I finally put my hand over the phone and said, "Okay Maria, what is it?" She said, "Well, it's the White House. Shall I tell them you'll call them back?" I said, "Well, maybe not."

So I hung up and took the call, and conversed with the person who was on the transition team looking for science appointees. The particular opportunity that they presented to me was not something that interested me. But I spent about a half an hour on the phone with him talking about this opportunity, and I gave him a list of other people's names, folks whom I thought might be interested. They called back about two weeks later and said, "We have another position we want you to look at. It's the associate director for science in the White House. It reports directly to the science advisor, who reports directly to the president. So it's a very high-level position. Would you like to be considered for that?" I didn't even know really what the job was all about, but I said yes.

Without getting into too much detail, I did go to Washington. I did interview. They offered me the opportunity and I decided to do it. So I took a leave of absence from Davis for a couple of years. The chancellor at UC Davis was thrilled to have someone from their administration and faculty going to the White House.

The White House experience shaped my perspective on higher education. I think it made me a better chancellor than I would have been, had I gone through the

usual academic paces of being a dean, a provost, and then eventually, potentially a chancellor or a president. I had never considered doing anything political. No one had ever suggested to me that I take a political appointment. But I had been graduate dean at UC Davis for a number of years and I had gotten very interested in national policy issues, admittedly, at that time, mostly related to the health sciences, to medicine, to the National Institutes of Health. I was very interested in science policy, and I had been doing work at the National Academy of Sciences. I had chaired one of their major policy boards, interestingly, the one that does the Dietary Reference Intakes, which is what they're called today. That's the committee that writes the report that helps you figure out how much Vitamin A and etcetera that you should be getting. So I had had some interaction with Congress, and with rule making, and with the political process, but not much.

It was probably the most exciting two years in my career since I graduated from college. It was an enormous growing time for me. When you are a scientist, even if you are really good at what you do, you know only a very narrow slice of what's going on. When you take a job like the associate director for science in the White House, you have to know what's going on in all scientific fields, and in a lot of technical areas as well, and you have to learn very quickly who the important players are, and what the theories are. It's a lot of work. I probably worked harder there than I'd worked maybe any time since I was doing my PhD thesis early mornings, six a.m. arrivals, quick dinners, staying 'til midnight—that sort of thing. But what I learned is that politics is actually a very predictable

process. You may not like it, but once you begin to understand what people's agendas are, and how they interact, and the leverage they have on an agenda, you begin to understand consensus or coalition politics.

Probably the most important lesson I learned was that political agendas are decipherable, that political agendas require compromise, that political agendas are predictable, and if you can establish a relationship you can actually work in that environment and get things done. It is also quite dependent on personal relationships.

And, of course, when I first arrived, I met people like Leon Panetta, who was the director of the Office of Management and Budget. I was in many meetings that he chaired in which issues related to the science budgets and the agencies were discussed. So I watched the playoff of the domestic agenda against the science agenda, against the economic agenda, against the national security agenda. He is a master politician, and he was a very good leader of that office. I learned a lot from him.

And then I got to watch people like George Stephanopoulos, and Dee Dee Myers, and David Gergen and others. They're seasoned politicians or press relations people. I was with them in very intense environments. After a period of time, I gained confidence in how to work in those environments myself, and we began to do some work on getting the very first detailed statement by a president of the United States to the American public on the value and importance of science to the nation, and what that might mean.

Those two years gave me a perspective on politics. Of course, by that time I was familiar with the entire national budget, national priorities, and the politics of the whole seventeen-billion dollar science budget. It's much larger now, but it was about seventeen-billion dollars then. I knew what the agencies' priorities were. I knew where the fights were. I knew where we could get money and where we weren't going to be able to get money. By then I had spoken to most of the science organizations in the country. So I had a pretty good grasp on what was going to happen in the national funding arena, at least in that area, for the next half decade.

If one thinks about what made me different from most of the other chancellors, the most obvious answer is that I'm a woman. And the second most obvious thing is that I had had a different path because of this experience in the White House. So that's part of what I brought to the job as chancellor. I was able to make contacts and talk to people about what was going on. I was able to help our scientists here, and also our humanities and social science people, anticipate what the next move might be in the funding arena. I think that made a big difference when I came to UCSC.

For example, we were trying to finish the National Marine Fisheries facility. It's so difficult to do that with the federal government because it's an annual budget process (it's sort of like it is in the state) and you have a twenty-million dollar building you want to build but you can only get it in three or four million dollar chunks. And then the players change. Leon Panetta leaves the White House; Sam Farr moves into a different committee. In the meantime, you need to keep the

pressure up to be sure that the agency is able to deliver the money to finish the facility that they're building next to your property and that you're counting on for important long-term partnerships and for opportunities for students. I knew a lot about how that had been done around the country, so I knew how to help that process a little, and why it was important to get to know our congressional people early, and be there.

Another example. At UCSC we developed, with NASA-Ames, a University-affiliated research center, which was at that time the largest competitively awarded project to the entire University of California. The defense labs are bigger, but they had never been won competitively before. So this was the largest contract. It was exceedingly difficult, very complicated, substantially beyond anything the campus had ever done before, getting into all of the politics of intellectual property protection, and international rights, and research that the government had rights to, that the University had rights to. It was a very, very complicated land deal, intellectual property deal, and academic deal. It was a very difficult process. I don't think I would have had a clue of how to proceed with it had I not had my experience in Washington.

So I consider those two years in Washington, D.C. really important. And, of course, I did personally get to know the president of the United States, and Vice President Al Gore. I won't say the president and the vice president have remained personal friends, but several of the other people that I met I would consider at least good colleagues, and people that I could and have called for advice when I was in various university positions.

Events Leading to Greenwood's Appointment as Chancellor of UC Santa Cruz

While I was in the White House, after a couple of years of exciting service, Dick Atkinson, who was then the chancellor at UC San Diego, approached me to consider becoming the academic vice chancellor at UCSD, the position we would call the executive vice chancellor position at UCSC. Dick discussed the position with me. We talked about the fact that I would have put in two years at the White House. I said, "Well, I could come next January, if you could wait that long." We were negotiating that.

The short version is that I interviewed with the UCSD search committee. President Atkinson verbally offered me the position. I went on a trip for the White House to Antarctica, and basically had accepted the position at UC San Diego. When I came back to the White House, I discovered that my closest friend, and the person that I had run a laboratory with for twenty-four years (the two of us had a very active lab at Davis), and had raised a family with, had been diagnosed with very aggressive breast cancer. The prognosis wasn't good.

I'm an expert in biology. I know a lot about the literature and I am fully aware of the fact that the quality of your support group, etc. can be very important in determining outcomes. So I ended up making the decision that I was not going to go to San Diego, and that I was also not going to stay at the White House any longer, that I needed to get back to Davis to do what I could to either get her through what we thought was going to be a hospice environment, or to help her recover. Fortunately, she recovered. It's been now close to ten years and she's still cancer-free. Our families are very involved with each other, and her two

daughters lived far too far away to be able to provide ongoing support. One is in the Virgin Islands and one is in Texas.

So I went back to Davis. My primary purpose in going back to Davis was to insure that she had as much support as she could possibly have until we knew whether she was going to pull out of it or whether she was going to deteriorate. And I needed to stabilize the laboratory. Things began to look better as the year went on, and Atkinson was by now the president of the University of California. I thought he might never speak to me again, because I had really gone very far down the line in accepting the position at UCSD before withdrawing. People knew that I had been the candidate and then he had to back off and chose somebody else (incidentally that turned out to be Bob Dynes), who then became the chancellor at UCSD, and is now the president of the University of California.

Jarrell: Yes.

Greenwood: Anyhow, what happened was that Dick called me about eight months or so later— Probably in February of 1996 he called me, or maybe it was Janet Young who called me, but the Office of the President called me and let me know that I was under consideration for several of the open senior positions, and that he wanted me to consider them all. I've come to know Dick pretty well since then, and I know he knew which one he thought I'd be best suited for. One of them was the Santa Cruz position. So I studied up on it, learned about Santa Cruz, got very excited about its history and where it was going, where it could go, and talked with Dick and interviewed for the position. It's a very quiet process. There's a search committee that does a lot of vetting. They get down to a

few finalists. They interview the few finalists. The president makes the decision and makes the recommendation to the board.

So I interviewed for the position. Very interesting interview.

Jarrell: The search committee was a combination of UCSC people and the president?

Greenwood: No, the search committees had five Regents, and then the chair of the Board of Regents is ex officio. It has five faculty members, three from the UCSC campus, one from another campus, and one of them is the chair or the vice chair of the Systemwide Academic Senate. Then there's an undergraduate, a graduate student, an alumni, and a member of the UCSC Foundation, or a past member of the foundation. The president of UC chairs the committee. The way it usually works (I've never actually sat on one of these committees), but as I understand it, usually a search firm is hired and the faculty screening committee goes through a lot of names, and compares candidates to the criteria, and recommends which of many, many names, usually hundreds, would be acceptable for further discussion. The Regents can bring in names at any point. If they think that there's someone who is a nontraditional candidate whom ought to be considered, that the faculty haven't recommended, there's nothing to stop them from bringing those people in to the search. Then, I gather, the whole committee considers, and they really vet the candidates, and get down to a short list, usually three or five. No less than three and no more than five.

Jarrell: It's very interesting because I know that over the years this whole process has become much more formalized and much more systematic than it used to be.

Greenwood: Yes, it's very systematic now. Then the people are interviewed and there's quite a lot of additional vetting. Then the president makes his decision or her decision, (so far there hasn't been a *her*, but *his* decision) and makes a recommendation to the Board of Regents, which is normally unanimously approved. There may have been some historical exceptions. To my knowledge, I was not any kind of exception. I think that I was unanimously endorsed.

I know Roy Brophy was the chair of the board at that point and so he was definitely on the search committee. The faculty member from the campus whom I remember being on it was Sandra Faber. After I was interviewed, at some point during the process, Sandy really wanted me to take the job and was perhaps afraid that I wasn't going to take the job. So she and I talked about the reasons that she was at Santa Cruz, as I was interested in why someone of Sandy's national stature had continued to be a faculty member at Santa Cruz, when I knew full well that she had been considered for the head of the National Science Foundation and that other campuses had tried hard to recruit her over the years. I wanted to know what kept her here. She gave me some very satisfactory answers which encouraged me to consider the position.

So I interviewed. And the day after I interviewed with the committee and President Dick Atkinson, he had his assistant, Janet Young, call and ask me if I was going to take the job. I was a little irritated, actually. I ended up saying to her, "If President Atkinson wants to know if I'm going to take the job he's going

to have to call me himself, and tell me why I should. We should discuss this.” And so he did. I think he was worried, because there were lots of rumors about Santa Cruz and I was under consideration at a couple of other institutions at the same time.

When it looked as though my friend was not in imminent danger of dying, I had decided that probably I had done most of what I could do for UC Davis in the graduate dean’s job and I wanted to try to do something else. I didn’t really want to leave the West Coast. I really actually didn’t want to leave California. But I was looking at a couple of other positions and giving them some thought.

When Dick called and offered me this I thought, what a great idea. It’s such a perfect match in a way. Because I’ve had UC experience but I’ve also been at a small liberal arts college and in private universities, and I understood those mentalities, and the positives and the negatives of different types of institutions. I have really strong professional credentials and I thought that would be a really important thing for the chancellor at Santa Cruz. In other words I thought, and I still think, that it’s very important for the chancellor at Santa Cruz, maybe even more so than on some other campuses, to have the level of academic credentialing that allows one to carry one’s weight in the circle of chancellors, and to be a national spokesperson on your own terms, not just because you are the chancellor of UC Santa Cruz, but because people know you in some other context. I think that’s very important, because on the smaller, growing campuses it’s a little bit like being Avis rental car agency. You are always having to prove that you deserve being in the game.

Jarrell: (laughs)

Greenwood: And that you are just as good as anybody else.

Jarrell: That's a cute way to put it.

Greenwood: Basically from my point of view, I came to town, and although I've been given credit for a lot of things and some of it I deserve, I just started telling the truth about what the campus was really all about, who was here, and what we were doing, and who *could* come here, and what we *could* do.

Jarrell: He did phone you?

Greenwood: Oh yes, he did phone me. Dick does not like to be held off at all. You better know what you are going to say when he calls you because you've got two minutes to say it. So I asked him a few things. Santa Cruz had a reputation at that point of being very hard to work with, and I had some colleagues who cautioned me against taking the job. One of them called it a career breaker. Some very distinguished people at Berkeley later came up to me about a month or so after I had been announced, saying, "Why did you do that? You could have done something else." I said, "I did it because it feels like the right match. It feels like the kind of campus that I can really enjoy, that I can work with. I have some ideas of how to advance it. It's a nice, manageable size. It's not such an overgrown octopus that you can't ever figure out where the next tentacle is. It has lost focus but it can get focus again. And I think it's the best opportunity in the country, frankly."

I'd always rather be in an institution where I can help it grow, where I can look back on it and say: these were the things that happened; there is a change that I had something to do with. As opposed to going to an institution which is a large, very prestigious institution but which one will have almost no impact on. I've had those opportunities in my career, and have consistently decided not to accept them. Now Bob Dynes has persuaded me that going over to the Office of the President is a really important thing to do for the University of California. When the president of the University of California makes the right kind of appeal and you believe in the institution, then you move in that direction. That's the way I feel about it.

But to get back to your question, the search committee was kind of interesting. The first question that I was asked in the interview was if I knew what the mascot of UCSC was. It was in a slightly hostile sort of way. It was, "Do you even know what the mascot of this institution is?" Because I guess there were rumors out there that I was being courted by larger institutions and I think there were some people on the search committee that thought I might not be serious about UCSC. And so it was a little like, what kind of homework has she really done for this interview? At least I felt that a little bit. So I answered those questions. Yes, I did know the mascot. It was a fascinating interview. The next day when Dick called and asked whether or not I would accept the position. I said, "I'd love to take the position. I think it would be an exciting opportunity."

So I did. It was that quick. I think the offer came—I can't remember the exact date—but it was either around the end of March, or the very first week of April,

because the special meeting of the regents was April 9. It was probably about a week before that, before they were able to get the special phone call done. And I snuck into town. This was supposed to be hush-hush. Nobody was supposed to know. I couldn't stand it. So I got off the phone with Dick and I canceled the rest of my calendar for the next two days. Didn't tell anybody why. I just said, "I've got to get out of here for a couple of days." So I went back to Davis, went back home, packed up a few things, got in the car and drove down to Santa Cruz and stayed at the Dream Inn.

Jarrell: Solo?

Greenwood: Solo. I called Karl Pister and said, "Can I come and see you tomorrow?"⁴ He knew by then and he said, "Of course you can." It was Easter Sunday. I had forgotten that it was Easter Sunday. All the cherry blossoms were in bloom. The campus was just exquisite. And, of course, all the camellias. Nobody knew that camellias were my favorite flowers in the world, so walking up to the door to University House was an astonishing experience. Karl and Rita Pister showed me around the house, and I chatted with them and had a light lunch with them.

Then Karl and I sat down and he told me what things they tell you the day after you say yes. There were some issues, as you probably remember. Some serious conflict was happening with the executive vice chancellor and the senate. Karl

⁴ See Randall Jarrell, Interviewer and Editor, *Karl S. Pister: UCSC Chancellorship, 1991- 1996* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2000) <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/pister>

was pretty unhappy with the senate at that point. The UCSC budget had been more or less fully expended—virtually no reserve. The next day I learned some very disturbing things. But nonetheless, being the optimist that I am, I said, “Oh well. I said yes. Now we go on.”

It turned out that the day they announced my appointment was also a day that Karl was up in Sacramento for one of these annual dinners at Steve Arditti’s house. Chancellors attend with selected faculty and students and Steve invites some UC friends and some legislators. Every campus is requested to do this once a year. The chancellor there tells the campus story, what’s going on at Santa Cruz. It was Karl’s night to do that. So he very graciously included me, so that people could meet me as the incoming chancellor. Regent Ward Connelly was there. He took me aside and told me he understood that the position that the chancellors who had been there before SP1 and SP2⁵ were in, that they had gone on record as opposing this, and had to remain consistent with their positions, but that he didn’t expect insubordination from new chancellors.⁶

Jarrell: Insubordination?

Greenwood: Yes, from the new chancellors. So I very quietly said to him, “Well, Regent Connelly, if we can just be sure that we know the difference between

⁵ In 1995, the Regents of the University of California passed two landmark resolutions, Standing Policy 1 (SP1) and Standing Policy 2 (SP2), prohibiting “preferential treatment” on the basis of race, ethnicity, sex, and national origin in admissions, employment, and contracting. These resolutions were followed by the passage of the 1996 voter initiative Proposition 209, which incorporated similar prohibitions into the California State Constitution, effective August 1998.

⁶ See Irene Reti, Interviewer and Editor, *“It Became My Case Study”: Professor Michael Cowan’s Four Decades at UCSC* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2013) for more detail on the opposition by some UC chancellors to SP1 and SP2. <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/it-became-my-case-study-professor-michael-cowans-four-decades-at-uc-santa-cruz>

when we're talking politics and when we're talking policy, I'll think you'll find that you won't have any insubordination problems with me." And then he went on to tell me how Angela Davis was out of control. She was out there using University time and resources to oppose him. He basically said he was going to give the campus and me trouble over this. I don't know what happened. Something must have happened between us that night, because he never did. He is always cordial and polite and he never followed up. So maybe he was just trying it on that night to see what kind of person I was. And when I pushed back a little and said, "Well, Regent Connelly, you know, I am entitled to my politics. I have to follow policy but I'm entitled to my politics," he backed off. We've had a pretty cordial relationship ever since, and he's never come after Santa Cruz.

Then everything was quiet until July, because UC has the "one chancellor at a time" rule. Karl was the chancellor until July 1. I came down one time and met with the staff here, and met with some of the Academic Senate leadership and looked around a little bit more. But I didn't come down again. He was unfailingly cordial but didn't really want me on the campus, and I was busily trying to finish up my job as graduate dean at Davis, and get organized to make a move to get here on July 1.

Arriving at the University of California, Santa Cruz

I arrived on July 1 and it all began. Judi Hance [now Tessier] and Billie Greene came up to Davis a couple of times to deal with details like changing the office, and figuring out what I needed to be able to move into a provost's house until they could get University House ready.

Jarrell: To backtrack for a moment. You'd been at Vassar and had the experience with a small liberal arts undergraduate institution. And you'd been at the White House and that was quite a landscape. You weren't working in your lab, so you had shifted over from your scientific endeavor to becoming an administrator and a policy maker in higher education. Was this a conscious decision that you made, that you wanted to have this kind of a shift in your career path?

Greenwood: Not conscious, in the sense of a forward-thinking plan. I think that my career path is probably best described as being ready for opportunities and being willing to take advantage of them. Not so much as having thought and planned sequentially—now I'm a scientist. Now I'm moving into policy. Now I'm doing this—I considered myself a scientist. I still consider myself a scientist. I spent twenty-five years running a very successful laboratory, made some contributions that still get quoted, would have brought my lab to UCSC had Pat been well enough to relocate the lab and resupervise it and get it rolling, but she wasn't. In addition, my lab depended on access to a fairly large colony of genetically obese animals which would have put a huge stress on the animal facilities here, to house my colony. While I had spent a couple of years in the White House, I could not be a principal investigator on any grants. So I just turned all that over to Pat Johnson, my colleague and coinvestigator. She was doing all of that.

There was a time after her illness that grants were coming up for renewal and I decided when I took this job, after a lot of consideration, that it was probably not going to be possible to reestablish my laboratory here and do the job I knew I

was going to have to do as chancellor. Some of the other chancellors have very active laboratories and graduate students. Bob Dynes, the president, still has graduate students. But they became chancellors on campuses where they already had an established program. Or the campus was prepared for them to establish laboratories for them. For example, Ray Orbach [chancellor at UC Riverside] moved his physics program from UCLA to UC Riverside, and that set a campus precedent for France Córdova to move her physics lab from UC Santa Barbara. But I chose not to make that move.

And because of the Washington experience, I was in some demand as one of the national science policy wonks. There are more of them but I'm one of the still relatively scarce women who've had this kind of experience. So I've basically turned a lot of my intellectual interests and writing in that general direction. I'm about to become the director of the policy division at the National Academy of Sciences. So the time that others might spend in their lab I'm spending on these issues. That's been very satisfactory for me here at Santa Cruz because it has allowed me to continue to take the Santa Cruz message to other parts of the country.

Jarrell: And to other eminent scientists so they know what's going on here.

Greenwood: And also other fields.

Jarrell: Yes.

Greenwood: I think being a biologist, particularly the way I was trained, which was more as a systemic biologist—I'm a cell and molecular biologist but that's an

evolutionary change. My degrees were in physiology, developmental biology, and neurosciences. Those are integrative areas in biology. Sometimes I say I took my love, interest, and training in complex organisms and just transferred that into a love and interest in complex organizations. A real intellectual continuity exists in my mind.

Jarrell: That's a beautiful metaphor.

Greenwood: Yes, I see it as a net progression and evolution of the same kind of intellectual processes, of having to integrate a lot of information from a lot of different areas, a lot of complex inputs that go into a very complex organization, and sometimes with some fairly unpredictable outcomes. You have to be able to live with a lot of ambiguity in order to be able to assess, massage, synthesize, and move an organization forward, or encourage others to move an organization forward. Some people say, "Oh, my goodness, it must have been very difficult to move out of the scientific arena and into—" For me it was not. It was a natural, orderly progression of life.

Jarrell: I'd like you to elaborate on something else that you said, that you'd heard characterizations of the campus as being a difficult campus. It used to be called some years ago "the ungovernable campus." Once you got here, before we're talking about personnel or whatever, what was your first assessment of the systemic problems? You'd done your research. You'd decided to come here. You'd made a commitment to spend ten years here. What did you see that you thought needed work and attention?

Greenwood: Well, I have another personal rule of behavior, which is that I would never take a job in an organization, at a campus, that I was not willing to be a faculty member in.

Jarrell: Very interesting.

Greenwood: Which meant that I wouldn't come to an institution at which I did not respect the faculty, didn't have reason to believe that they would respect me. I had done my homework on the faculty. I knew who the very strong faculty members were. I knew where we had some weak spots. I had come out of fairly strong governance organizations. Vassar had very strong faculty governance, and even when I was a student there, I was aware of the power that the faculty had. When I was a faculty member, I was one of the more active faculty members in the faculty governance process there.

So when I came to Davis and into the University of California, into a strong governance organization, it didn't surprise me. I learned how to work with it. I was expecting it, really. I have seen administrators come into the UC system that have come out of other large university systems where the faculty governance component is much weaker, and they are shocked by the inexorable level of consultation that can sometimes go on. They get frustrated with it, because they are used to a little more autonomy than you can normally at the UC campuses.

The UC campuses vary. Berkeley and Santa Cruz are probably the most difficult governance models. There could be a lot of reasons. I have often thought that one of the reasons is because those two campuses are the ones that don't have

representative senates. There's sort of a senate of the whole, which means that it is both possible, likely, and maybe even from the point of the faculty, desirable, that a relatively small group of faculty can capture the senate. Whereas when you have a representative assembly, at least when I was at Davis, the people who were elected by the departments to be their representative took it seriously, and they went to the meetings, and the viewpoints represented were not just their own but those of their departments. Now, that had its downside too, which was that *all* those viewpoints were represented. Sometimes with a committee of the whole and a relatively small group you can get more work done because there's not such a broad need for consensus. Every organizational structure has its difficulties. Before I came I had done my homework on the faculty, so I knew we had some very strong faculty here, but in my view we had the opportunity to jump forward. I knew the engineering school was ready to be approved.

Jarrell: Yes, just as Karl Pister was leaving.

Greenwood: I knew that could happen. I personally immediately saw the opportunities in Silicon Valley and began to figure out how we could start making those moves. I liked development and I knew we were behind in raising money and it was time for us to really start putting a professional development organization in place.

I thought the big problem with the senate and administrative relations (and I'm going to be really frank here), was the consequence of a few things. One, there had been a series of chancellors, several of whom had been very effective, but who really did not want to be on the campus. It wouldn't have been their first

choice campus for their own faculty appointment. And while they came and did an excellent job in some ways, their heart was never in it. The faculty sniffed that, and they knew that they were dealing with someone who did not perhaps have mutual trust and respect. So I wanted to try to change that.

I've had pretty good relations with the faculty, and I think it's because I respect most of them. And I think I have made it very clear what you can push me on and what you can't push me on. By and large, I would say there are faculty that not only respect me, but probably like me. And there's a small cadre that have had some substantial control, even during the eight years I've been here, who have not earned my respect. Perhaps I haven't earned theirs either.

That will continue to be a problem for whoever comes next. There are a group of faculty who will always want to see themselves, not as the collaborative helpers, or the consultative helpers and understanders of how to move the institution forward, but as almost auditors of administrative functions, who are always out to try to nail some administrator over some decision they've made that they don't think the senate got enough consultation with, or that was wrong. That's true in most institutions. It's not terribly unique here. But then again, we've hired 250 new faculty members, so over time things may change. I have really pushed the senate by saying, "If you want to have the kind of role you say you want, then put some of your best people in the leadership roles. Get the people that everybody respects in the leadership roles." I would say that I've had very good relations with the senate in the last four years. And they weren't bad before that.

I've only had one time when I felt that there was a move on the part of a few to do what they could to create a hostile environment.

Jarrell: This is Randall Jarrell. It is March 12, 2004 and this is my second interview with M.R.C. Greenwood at the Chancellor's Office. To continue from our interview yesterday, who were the most important people in initiating you into the institution, whom you depended on, who gave you good counsel, so you could get up and running?

Greenwood: One of the first was Michael Cowan.⁷ Michael had been the chair of the Academic Senate. He was one of the first people to greet me when I came down on the one visit I made to the campus before I actually arrived in July. Michael helped to organize the meetings with different members of the senate and he organized a dinner. I believe that it was with the Senate Executive Committee crowd. Michael was a very good counselor with respect to who was who in the senate and what the different committees were called at UCSC. There are slightly different names on different campuses. That this was not a representative assembly, that it was an assembly of the whole. He basically gave me some good background on administration/faculty relations, and at least from his perspective what some of the difficulties had been, and what some of the successes had been over the years.

Jarrell: He'd also been a dean of humanities, so he knew both sides.

⁷ See the oral history with Michael Cowan, op cit.

Greenwood: He'd been a dean of humanities, and was going into his position up at the Office of the President. I don't remember when I first came whether he was here for a year and then he went into the sequence where he became the vice chair of the systemwide senate, and then the chair, and spent the time with the Regents. But at some point in there, he had that experience as well. So he was a good counselor. When he returned to the campus he became my faculty advisor, and an excellent one indeed.

A second excellent counselor was Eli Silver. He was the chair of the Academic Senate in my first year. Eli was very helpful in helping me understand how the senate worked and how to work with them. There had been a lot of tension the year before. So I was trying to figure out, okay, Eli, how do we have a trusting, open relationship? That was when I suggested that there be regular, what we called, CAB/SAC meetings, which were meetings of the Chancellor's Cabinet and the Senate Advisory Committee, and that these be fairly regular, at least once a quarter, and that they be what I call "no-surprises" meetings. We were having these meetings for the purposes of helping each other understand where there were problems. We would get them on the table and try to resolve them. We started that process with Eli. I had hoped that Eli would stay as the Academic Senate chair for two years, but he only did it for a year, and that was primarily related to the fact that his research is ocean-going and he frequently needs to be gone for a block of time.

Another person who did a lot to acclimate me to Santa Cruz, and who in many ways was my best advisor, and the person with whom I worked most closely

when I first arrived, was Michael Tanner. Michael was the executive vice chancellor. When I came, Michael had been thinking of stepping down and I asked him not to do so, because I felt that I needed someone who actually knew how the institution worked.

Jarrell: And have that continuity.

Greenwood: And have that continuity, so the place would run while I was trying to understand what was going on. Michael and I worked very well together. In fact, we became quite close friends. He said he'd stay for a year and I think he stayed for three. Then he said, "It's time. I've been doing this job or the academic vice chancellor's job for ten years." He was ready to do something else, take a break from it all, which he did. He actually took a break for a couple of years, took a sabbatical, went back as a faculty member. Now he's a very successful provost at the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle campus, which is a big campus. And apparently he's doing very well. I've seen him a couple of times.

In that very first year there were a few others. Roger Anderson and I talked quite a bit. I had some conversations with Helene Moglen⁸, and of course all the deans, for example, Dave Kliger⁹ and Ed Houghton. I met a lot of faculty members. Sandy Faber is another person who should be on the list. Sandy proffered advice, both solicited and not, and has continued to do so over the eight years, and is a very thoughtful person, so I'm always very happy to hear what her views are.

⁸ See Irene Reti, *Interviewer and Editor, Helene Moglen and the Vicissitudes of a Feminist Administrator* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2013) <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/helene-moglen>

⁹ See Irene Reti, *Interviewer and Editor, Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor, David Kliger* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2011) <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/ucsc/campus-provostexecutive-vice-chancellor-david-kliger>

We've worked very closely on some things. I've gotten to know some of the biologists in the department that I'm in, Harry Noller, also Adrienne Zihlman in anthropology.

Jarrell: So there were more than a handful of people that you could consult with if you had questions about the structure of the institution. I know you'd been at Davis, and yesterday you were talking about representative academic senates as opposed to a committee of the whole. So you had a previous knowledge about how the UC system basically operated, which I think is very helpful for a chancellor.

Meeting UCSC Faculty and Staff

Greenwood: Yes, it was, certainly. One of the things I did when I first arrived in July was to get out of my office. So very early in July I did what Judi and the staff sometimes refer to as a walkabout. I got out and visited just about every unit. I met mostly staff, because it was summertime. Went out and met staff, shook hands, saw where people worked, and got a feeling for that part of the campus. Some people had an agenda that they would bring up with me. Others were just happy to meet me. I walked around and spoke with people. Then in the fall I began a very aggressive program. I met with every single department in the university. It took us two years to do it, but we visited every single department. I had a series of questions I asked each department. I said, "This is not a budget hearing. When I come to visit you, I want to walk away with three to five things that I could tell outside people about your department that they might not know, or that are particularly meaningful. I'm looking for this list from every

department. Anything else that's on your agenda I'm happy to talk about, but what I want to do is come away learning more about you than I know now, and I'm giving you an opportunity to know about me." We did the entire campus. Every single department.

Jarrell: That's absolutely singular. Do you know no one's ever done that before?

Greenwood: No, I didn't know that.

Jarrell: I believe that is the case.

Greenwood: I went to every single department and Michael Tanner went with me to most of them, and Leslie Sunell accompanied me, when she came. She didn't come initially. I had a search for the assistant chancellor and she was selected. She'd worked with me before, so I was obviously pleased that that was how it worked out. But we did have a search committee and interviewed several people. The visits helped, because that helped me meet a large number of faculty members who at least knew me on sight.

The other thing I did over the years—and I never did get to have the whole faculty, a regret of mine—but I probably did get two-thirds of the faculty; I had dinner parties of no more than fourteen people at the house. No more than two people from the same department. We mixed up people and we would have a discussion of what people were doing. And I had a "no jargon" rule. Everybody at the table had to be able to tell everybody what they were doing and why it was important and why anybody should care.

Jarrell: In English. (laughs)

Greenwood: Yes, in plain English. Harry Noller was the first speaker at the first dinner, and I remember I had to say, "Harry, this is going to come as a great shock to you, but there are people sitting around this table that actually do not know what RNA means." He said something like, "Oh, my God. Oh, my dear." He backed off the jargon and he did an impressive job.

I took very specific steps to get out, to know people, to hear them out. After that I did divisional meetings. I didn't do department meetings. John Simpson did a subsequent round of department meetings. I'm not sure he got to every one. We would have divisional meetings and sometimes I'd have topical meetings with faculty from different areas.

Jarrell: Roughly how many departments?

Greenwood: Oh, I think it was fifty-six at the time we did it. It was a very aggressive schedule. Two-hour meetings. Every department. We just were relentless until we got it done. I think it went a long ways towards helping me understand the institution, and I hope it did some good for the departments. It certainly helped me understand, when the deans came forward with some issues, who the people were and what the strengths were. UCSC has changed. We've hired 250 people since I did that. So there are faculty out there that I've met at new faculty events but I haven't gotten to visit in departments.

Jarrell: It's quite remarkable that there's been this incredible turnover in the faculty population. So many people came here in the last five, eight, ten years,

and they are not aware of the early history of the campus. That natural, generational change has changed the whole complexion of UCSC.

Changing UCSC's Image

Greenwood: We have the roots of the old Santa Cruz, but it's changed into a slightly different flowering organism.

Jarrell: Now, I also noticed that very early on you made a concerted effort to get out into the community and really pay attention to town-gown.

Greenwood: Yes, I did. And I still do. I've made a point of serving on community boards like United Way, Second Harvest, and to regularly attend Chamber of Commerce meetings, the Rotary Club, etc. I think it is important that the chancellor be part of the local community efforts, in addition to doing the university's work.

Jarrell: And you still do. Not only that, but you made a proactive effort to educate the community. I remember the big ads you had in the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* every year.

Greenwood: Elizabeth Irwin's idea. Liz was a very talented communicator and it helped that she had worked in the Santa Cruz area for many years.

Jarrell: It was a full-page spread that highlighted all kinds of things that UCSC has accomplished. So tell me how you strategized in acquainting yourself with the local community.

Greenwood: Well, there were a couple of things. Karl Pister and I had had several conversations before I became chancellor. He had said that he thought one of my strengths was my communication skills, and that I would probably need them, and that I should get out in the community and get to know people. I should get out and let the people know what the university was about, because he was constantly running into people who didn't know very much about the university. That was my experience, too. I would get out, particularly in South County, and people would ask me questions like, "Don't you do any sciences at Santa Cruz?" And I would go, "Whoa! Yes, we do." Then I would lay that out.

Of course, we were growing and there were pressures on housing, etc., so Liz Irwin and I started talking about annual messaging. Every year we wanted to have a message that we were trying to get out, that I would incorporate into my public speaking. It was her idea to do the ads. We did the ads for two reasons. We did the ads a couple of times because we really had housing problems and we wanted to encourage people to take students into their homes. So we did those ads that were about the students. You could be housing the next astronaut—

Jarrell: Nobel Prize winner.

Greenwood: Yes, exactly. With our alumni examples, and then along the side of the case we would list all the new things that were happening. The inserts worked. We had people call in and say, "Well, you know, I'd be happy to have a science or an art student live in my house." They had preferences but— That worked out and we actually got quite a few new listings while we were building

the housing. There were about three years where we were really pretty crunched because although we were building housing, it wasn't ready yet. We were taking students, and that was when the peak of the dot com boom was going on in Silicon Valley, so housing was scarce in Santa Cruz. Today housing is not particularly scarce in Santa Cruz. It's still not cheap but it's not terribly scarce. Now we have the other problem. Students are finding that it's just as cheap to live in town, as it is to live on the campus. We may have problems keeping the dorms full all of the time. It's always a cyclical sort of problem.

I asked Liz for her advice when I got here, because she was the public information officer and she reported to me at the time. (She still reports to me on public information, although she responds to Ron Suduiko as the vice chancellor for communications.) Liz and I started talking about the dismal condition of the University of California at Santa Cruz's promotional materials. They were a mish-mash. There were no standards for these.

Jarrell: I was going to ask you about that. Because I have never seen such an array of brochures and booklets and ads in the *Sentinel*, and explanations of various programs and organized research units.

Greenwood: That has evolved over time. In the last year we hired one of the best public relations firms in the country that works for higher educational institutions, a firm in Chicago. One of the senior principals is a UCSC alum. We were going into a major campaign, so we needed to test our messages, see how we segment the market—how do we target to alums; how do we target to friends; how do we target to business leaders?

We've been working hard on, "what is the image of Santa Cruz?" And the one that's current right now is: "Thinking at the Edge," which I believe really does capture our essence. I actually had suggested: "Santa Cruz: Where Innovation Is Tradition," and then San Diego used it first. Or maybe we had the same idea and they just got there first, but in any case, that's where I had wanted to be. "Thinking at the Edge" is actually a really good way to go too. In addition, Liz, who had had a lot of experience in marketing and knew the local community, helped refine our program—we made a list of every important group that I should try to speak with. We went through all the chambers of commerce for about forty miles around. A lot of Kiwanis and Lions and Rotaries. I didn't do them all, but I did a lot of them. We talked about really getting to know the city council members and the city manager, and I've tried very hard to have a good relationship with them. But at the same time I'm developing relations in the Silicon Valley, joining an important group over there, speaking at their chambers of commerce, talking at the Commonwealth Club, doing the things that you need to do to be visible over there. Liz and I started with the very simple things when I got here. Even our UCSC Foundation materials, which were supposed to raise money, were gray.

Jarrell: (laughs) That's not exciting.

Greenwood: The student brochures all talked about the beauty of the place but talked nothing about the academic rigor at all. The faculty weren't happy about that either. So we started a systematic process of changing the look and the content of everything we were doing. Then we moved on, probably about the

third or fourth year, into really bringing coherence to the entire collection of materials. And then of course you've always got these runaway departments that do something different. But I think now even they have gotten to the point where they like these one-pagers that we're now able to do with desktop publishing. You don't have to spend a huge amount of money, but they can be standardized. They can look pretty good.

Jarrell: What's a runaway department?

Greenwood: Oh, a department that decides that they've got their own way of doing something. So they invent their own logos and you can't tell the materials are really from Santa Cruz. What we were seeking was a look that is consistent. People look at Stanford's materials and they know they are Stanford's materials. They don't look like they are somebody else's. Ours are beginning to have that kind of look.

But it was mostly the content I was concerned about. I was concerned about what we were conveying. We were conveying that this was a nice, beautiful place to come and be, which it certainly is, but we were not conveying the quality and the content of our academic programs, our faculty, or the fact that you had to work hard to get a degree here. So we tried to change that, and I tried to develop messages that way.

Relations with the City of Santa Cruz

Then we started working with the city on real issues related to the long-term survival of the city of Santa Cruz. The city of Santa Cruz, until recently, has not

really been talking seriously about an economic development plan. They know what they don't want, but they hadn't started working on what they *do* want, could attract, or might be able to sustain as a tax base. Because if you are a city that really wants to have a lot of progressive social programs you've got to have some tax base. So there was a lot of unhappiness about not having enough tax money to do the programs. But there wasn't really any real activity to try to bring the business community and the progressive community closer together. We tried to broker some of that. Now, I wouldn't consider that a perfect success, but it's a lot better than it was.

Jarrell: Somebody might think you were dipping in where you didn't belong, but we are partners. Like it or not, the city of Santa Cruz and UCSC have to live together. So you were taking the initiative. I know in a lot of those ads, in a lot of the speaking engagements that I saw on public access television, you emphasized over these years the economic contributions of the university to the whole economic well-being of the community. So it's a very difficult thing to do, but I think it's pretty radical.

Greenwood: Well, it was fairly radical. Just a simple example, which we've talked a lot about recently in the economic development council, is a currently ongoing enterprise between the city and the chamber of commerce. You do an analysis of your opportunities for economic growth and development. And at most places where I've been when they do this analysis, education is considered a segment of the economy.

Jarrell: Yes.

Greenwood: But here we did tourism, agriculture, high tech. An analysis of the economic impact of the educational component was not there at all. Period. So I started talking about it, saying, "You know, the jobs that you want to have here in Santa Cruz, some of them are generated by the university. I mean, when our faculty members get grants, 80 percent of that money, more or less, goes to pay for people's jobs, and benefits. And taxes in the county and city, when these individuals buy houses, and shop in the community. So when you're talking about how is the city going to sustain itself, you need to be talking about how many more jobs of a certain type can we expect the university to generate? And are those jobs that will replace jobs we are losing in some other sector?"

I recently did do this. I recently did an analysis for them that showed that of the 1200 high tech jobs they have lost on the Westside starting in about the year 2000, we've already replaced about 800, because we've gotten a laboratory for adaptive optics; we've gotten several major grants in the education area. We've got 250 more faculty members, and the ones that are in the sciences are already generating new grants. So these create technical jobs. They create secretarial and support jobs. They create some new entry-level jobs in maintenance, etc.

One must consider those. Yes, we get the students, and they are an economic positive impact, in that they buy stuff, and they eat in the restaurants, and their parents come to town, and their families come to town and stay in the hotels, particularly in the off-time of the season. All these factors exist. But then there are the most important factors, like the real jobs that the university creates, which don't disappear when a dot bomb happens. Individuals lose their grants but then

somebody else gets a new one. This is something the city had not focused on. Because of the local politics, they had focused only on how many students came, and how are those students causing trouble.

Jarrell: The negative impacts.

Greenwood: Yes. And they weren't focusing on the fact that Santa Cruz needed jobs that pay above a certain amount. We need people to be able to buy homes in Santa Cruz. We need them to be able to pay property taxes. We need them to want goods and services in Santa Cruz. And university people will come. Their kids will go to our schools. They'll become part of the community. The other option is that Santa Cruz becomes a bedroom community for Silicon Valley, which changes the politics and the tax base.

Jarrell: And which the city council has been vociferously fighting for twenty-five years.

Greenwood: But they've let it happen.

Jarrell: But it's happened by default, almost.

Greenwood: Yes, because they had no other plan. I walk West Cliff Drive. I walk fifty miles a month and I'm up and down West Cliff Drive many times, and probably half of those houses appear to me to be weekend houses. Those are people who are not really engaged in the community. They may be wonderful people. I'm not saying they aren't. But they are not people, like our university

community, who are going to volunteer for one council or another and who are going to pick up the beaches and—

Jarrell: And be volunteers in commissions and things like that. The other sidebar to that is a constant refrain about recruiting faculty, new faculty, and the price of housing. And anecdotally, of course, I've heard many stories of recruitments that one department or another has carried out. People come here from the Northeast or the Midwest and they just— Talk about sticker shock. I know that that is impinging upon our ability to recruit new faculty as the veterans retire. Has that been a concern that you've talked about with the city or the county?

Greenwood: Oh yes, I talk with the city about this all the time. We've been trying to focus on some kind of a project that we might be able to do together that would amount to affordable or middle-priced housing that faculty and/or staff would find attractive, in town, as well as what we're trying to build on the campus.

And of course the university has done some work as well. The university's faculty now has a new mortgage origination program that gives a forty-year mortgage and doesn't have points, doesn't have a down payment. These are really significant. We can still get some of our faculty into houses. We do lose people in the recruitment process over the price of housing. But we are still getting our first and second choices most of the time. This was true in Davis too, you know. Once everybody could afford to live in Davis. But now many of the new faculty live in Woodland or Winters, places like that. That's happening here too. We have faculty that are commuting from as far away as Salinas.

Jarrell: Or Morgan Hill. The whole development of Watsonville also, housing down there.

Greenwood: There's going to be a lot of housing down in the Seaside/Marina area. As Fort Ord builds out there are going to be thousands of new homes there. That will lead to better schools. So some of our faculty will undoubtedly decide that they'll live in that area.

Jarrell: And they'll make the commute.

Greenwood: Yes, and then maybe we'll have to be running shuttle buses back and forth or something, but it's just unfortunately the case in these coastal communities that they get more and more expensive in the cores and people live further and further out. It's true at Santa Barbara. It's true at Davis now. It's not a coastal community, but it's certainly true of Berkeley, Santa Barbara, San Diego, and San Francisco.

Jarrell: I'm interested in how the planning goes on for making these very attractive packages for helping out these young faculty families when they come to a community like this. You're saying we give them a forty-year mortgage, no points, a low interest rate. Who does that planning? Is it from systemwide?

Greenwood: It's systemwide. This is a systemwide program that's put together to assist all of the campuses, because they all have this problem. It still doesn't work as well as we would like it to. We've taken some steps here. We're building housing. It's just taking us forever to get through the Department of Fish and Game, but I guess we will get through. The problem is not even the usual issues,

but that they've had so much turnover and their budget's been cut. You think you have settled the issues with one staffer, and the next day they're not there and you're dealing with somebody new who has to start from scratch again. It's a problem. But we also bought the Laureate Court apartments, and they have provided a place for new faculty when they first come. In addition, we revamped the Hagar Court apartments into condos. A number of those went to staff, so some of the pent-up faculty need was probably not as pent-up as we thought.

Jarrell: But it's interesting what you said, that notwithstanding this housing crunch and the high real estate, in the recruitments you're still getting the top one or two people that you want to make offers to.

Greenwood: If they are people we really truly want and they are teetering between two good offers, I sometimes make a call to the faculty member to try to use my own chancellorial influence to see if I can persuade them to come to Santa Cruz. Last year there were at least two calls I made where the person was deciding between here and Berkeley and they came here.

The Evolving Role of Chancellor

Jarrell: This whole notion of what is expected of a modern chancellor seems to have evolved into a completely new kind of position. It used to be you'd have a scholarly-type elderly fellow who would preside in a kind of hands-off way, maybe do a little bit of fundraising, but sort of be a titular head. Now it seems that you have to be Jacks and Marys of all trades. I have this wonderful quotation from this woman at the American Council on Education. She says, "A college

president has to be someone who really doesn't only walk on water but can skip on it." And the gist of her comments was that these are impossible jobs. Now, it doesn't seem to have been impossible for you. You seemed to have taken to it like a duck to water. Tell me what you think, because you know all kinds of other heads and undoubtedly you compare your own situation here at Santa Cruz. I'd like you to talk about the role of the chancellor at Santa Cruz, but also the role of the modern head of an educational institution.

Greenwood: Well, let me start with one set of comments. First of all, I do not believe the job of chancellor or president of the university is an impossible job. I do believe it's difficult, and I believe that it requires being sensitive to, responsive to, and able to balance a variety of constituents. I've spoken at great length with friends of mine who are CEOs. A lot of CEOs, especially if they get on a board of regents, they think, why aren't you running this place just like a business, right? And they come to understand over time that running a university, being a chancellor, is a little bit more like being a governor than being a CEO. It is essentially a political job. I don't mean political in an elected political sense. It's essentially doing an assessment of the various constituents, determining what level of response is going to be required over time in responding to some constituents. Some constituents are clearly going to be more important in your decisions than others, but you have to be aware of the fact that coalition politics can occur and surprise you as well.

So it's a different kind of job. I think it requires thoughtfulness about what outcomes people are expecting of your performance, and recognizing that the

students are going to rate you differently than the faculty, than the alums, than the friends, than the Office of the President, and the Board of Regents. And then there are general political influences like your local state senator, assemblyperson.

Jarrell: And the legislators who are determining the budget of the UC system.

Greenwood: You have a lot of people whose criteria for your performance are not commonly shared. You have to recognize that. Having said that though, the job has changed. It used to be that chancellors and presidents—I don't know that I would say they had a titular role, but they basically were academic leaders, and now in addition they have to run a business. UCSC is almost a half a billion-dollar business that must be run. When I became chancellor, people asked me what was the biggest surprise and I said, "Well, the biggest surprise to me was how much time I was going to spend on real estate." That's the thing that surprised me the most. How much I had to learn about financing buildings, how much I had to learn about housing and how it's constructed, how it's financed. The decisions we had to make about whether to do this CEQA or that CEQA [California Environmental Quality Act mandated environmental impact reports]. I mean, lots of time. Lots of money, lots of energy. There's a business side. If you are as fortunate as I am you have very good business people, and they basically run it, except when there needs to be an unusual and precedent-setting decision made.

Then, of course, the students expect you to understand and be involved with them. I spend a lot of time with students. Every year I go at least once to

individual colleges. I've taught a class of approximately forty students every year for the last seven years.

Jarrell: What is that class?

Greenwood: The Chancellor's Undergraduate Internship class. We meet every Monday for the entire year from five to seven. I don't make every class. I co-teach it with Lynda Goff, who is the dean of undergraduate education. Some years I make almost every class. This has been a bad year. I've been there for the presentations, but only for four or five other sessions. The year before I was there for nearly every class. And I generally speak to students at random. I pick students up when they are hitchhiking.

Jarrell: That's what Karl Pister used to do, too.

Greenwood: Yes. I stop and talk with them. And, of course, I have regular standing meetings with the undergraduate student government groups and with the Graduate Student Association. I know enough students, that every year at graduation when I'm shaking hands (because I shake hands with every student at the graduations when I confer), every year there are at least a few hundred who come across the stage who know me well enough to hug me, that sort of thing. Nobody's thrown anything at me yet, so— Every once in a while somebody will wear a sign or something, but— (laughs)

I don't believe that you have to walk on water. What I believe is that you have to demonstrate that you understand who the constituencies are. You have to have enough time and energy to respond to at least some of the constituent demands

over a period of time. You need to have a system of being informed. You have to take the time to get to know the Alumni Council, so that they know you well enough that they do the work of spreading the word about what you're really doing. I'm a very proactive type.

Proposition 209 and Diversity Issues

I really do believe in pay now or pay later and I'd rather pay now. That wasn't usually the strategy here. The strategy here was to try to keep everything nice and calm, and then if a problem arises it is dealt with. My attitude is to try to identify the problems as they arise and try to be sure that we have an answer to them.

A particular example was when Proposition 209 passed.¹⁰ I said, "Look, I'm going to be there watching the news with the students that night. I'm going to talk to them about how they feel, because this proposition is going to pass and students are going to be unhappy. And we need a solution. What are we going to do?" And that's when I appointed the 4-C Committee¹¹ that made excellent recommendations and quite a lot of progress, actually. And UCSC developed the proposal to recruit cluster hires for faculty for the "new California curriculum." So that was a way for us to begin a process of hiring faculty who would be interested in teaching new Californians and about California in areas that were previously underrepresented in the curriculum. We didn't talk about race and

¹⁰ Proposition 209, passed by California's voters in 1996, banned the use of race, ethnicity, gender as criteria in admissions and hiring and contracts.

¹¹ The 4-C Committee refers to the Chancellor's Commission on a Changing Campus, whose work resulted in the document *Making Diversity Work*, published by the Office of the Chancellor in 1997—Editor.

ethnicity. We just talked about faculty members who could contribute to this new curriculum. It was a very effective strategy and it allowed us to hire interesting and diverse faculty.

Jarrell: You had a message dated November 6, 1996 in which you talked about strategies for alternative ways of achieving diversity. Of course you couldn't talk about race and ethnicity anymore. How effective do you think you've been in that regard, because that is a huge new issue that's been bubbling up and emerging from years, since the 1970s. But Regent Connelly and then Proposition 209 blew the whole thing wide open. I know that all of the campuses and systemwide have been attempting to find alternative ways to maintain what has been achieved. How do you think we're doing here?

Greenwood: I'm happy to say that UCSC has the most diverse faculty of any campus in the system. We have more minorities and many more women than most of the other campuses. Our percentage of underrepresented minorities has been climbing every year. Some would say not fast enough. Others probably would say, too fast. Who knows? But it's been climbing every year. I think our outreach programs were particularly effective because they were targeted towards delivering to the schools what the schools said they needed, not what we thought they needed.

So it's a great tragedy that the outreach funds are being cut. For example, there was an article in the newspaper this past summer that the Pajaro Valley schools achieved increased math scores. Basically, it was attributed to us, that we had tripled the eligibility rate of students in the Watsonville High School that were

eligible for the University of California. The math scores had gone up. It was a very substantial change in just a three-year period. And that was very much part of the concentrated effort that the Educational Partnership Center had put into focusing an outreach effort on issues that actually made a difference to the school and the kids in that school. What we do there might not be what we would do in Santa Cruz High. I think we've done a lot. Francisco Hernandez, who is the vice chancellor for student affairs—there is nobody who is more devoted towards trying to bring the best and the brightest of the new California students to Santa Cruz. He's worked hard with his recruitment and admissions officers.

It is still the case that only about 4 percent of African American public high school graduates in the state of California are eligible for the University of California. That means they meet the A through G requirements, have an appropriate GPA and SAT score. And only about 12 percent of Latinos. Now, those are 1996 data, which was the last CPEC [California Postsecondary Education Commission] study. I think the new CPEC study will probably show the Latino eligibility rate has gone up quite a bit, but we don't have data yet. CPEC is the state agency that has traditionally vetted our eligibility requirements. They are the public agency that says what the African American eligibility rate is.

We've been doing better, but there's good news and bad news. The good news is that Santa Cruz has become hot among students and parents, and so for the first time in awhile we are actually turning students away, and are getting more and

more selective. I predicted this would happen in a year. It's just happened a year earlier.

We're likely to become very selective again, because we have a really first-rate institution here. And we have a residential environment for students in their freshman and sophomore years that focuses on educational community building. We are probably unique among the public research universities in the country. You come here and you really get almost a liberal arts college experience for the first couple of years if you live in the colleges. The academic programs the colleges are offering are not what was planned originally in the Dean McHenry days. What he really wanted was a coalition of independent colleges, all of which would be a complete academic environment—the antidote to the megauniversity.

Jarrell: Intellectual centers.

Greenwood: Sure, if you get funded at an 11:1 student-faculty ratio, like selective liberal arts colleges, we could probably do a pretty good job of that. But we don't get that level of funding. Nonetheless, what we still have are very good co-curricular and learning environments. If the reforms that we've tried to put in place actually work the colleges will be the places where the students are getting their writing, their focused study skills, and some exposure to the variety of majors that are possible. They will have an interesting couple of years and then a much smoother transition into the majors. We have had some difficulties with that transition, and it has been a very tough issue to tackle. Some people call it the third rail of politics at Santa Cruz. If you touch the colleges, you're dead.

Jarrell: That's very apt.

Greenwood: Yes, and in fact the people who have touched the colleges in this administration have had some difficulties. (laughs)

Jarrell: I have some friends who work in residential roles in the colleges and I know that they are sorely disappointed, and in some cases their morale is bad because there has been a real change in the emphasis. I'm not being critical of you. I find it very interesting that every chancellor has had a heck of a time. When Bob Sinsheimer did his reorganization, he touched the third rail and boy, did he get a shock!¹² Many chancellors have paid little mind to that. I'm quite interested in the array of issues where you've been hands-on, and gotten deeply immersed in analyzing the structure of the colleges, or what their role in the total configuration is going to be. It reminds me of the analogy you used yesterday when you were talking about a very complicated organism.

Greenwood: Well, of course I'm very interested in the colleges because I spent my own early career in a liberal arts college. I was a faculty fellow in a college dormitory. I know how excellent in-residence programs work. I know what the up sides and the down sides are, and I know what you can do with half the money or less, which is what we have. I don't mean this as a criticism of Dean McHenry, because criticizing Dean McHenry would be something I think probably most chancellors would be very hesitant to do—

¹² See Randall Jarrell, Interviewer and Editor, *Robert L. Sinsheimer, the University of California, Santa Cruz During a Critical Decade, 1977-1987*, (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 1996).
<http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/sinsheimer>

Jarrell: Well, actually I think not necessarily.

Greenwood: But Dean and Clark Kerr¹³ came up with a concept, which was a counterpoint to the megauniversity, which was nonetheless going to be a very large institution. The original plan included 25,000 students, a medical school, a law school, a school of natural resources, an engineering school, and the twenty-plus colleges. And Clark certainly, and Dean also, had the opportunity to argue for Santa Cruz as a counterpoint, for example, to San Diego where the founding principle was in graduate education, and to say, at Santa Cruz we want to try this experiment where we're going to focus on the undergraduate component, and we want to try to build the graduate programs out of the undergraduate programs. Whereas San Diego really adopted the other model, which is let's build first-rate graduate programs and develop the college system. We'll have great faculty and they'll figure out what the college system will be. And that's what they did.

And then, times change. Funding models change. We went into a phase where campuses were reimbursed for graduate students at almost three times the rate of undergraduate students, and there was no Santa Cruz exception. Nobody argued for that. At least if they did, I have found no evidence for this. Nobody argued that in order for Santa Cruz to be the experiment, then at least for a period of five or six, or eight, or ten years there should be a Santa Cruz subsidy—

¹³ See Randall Jarrell, Interviewer and Editor, *Clark Kerr and the Founding of UC Santa Cruz* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 1988) <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/kerr>; and Elizabeth Calciano, and Randall Jarrell, Interviewers and Editor, *Dean McHenry: Founding Chancellor of UC Santa Cruz*, (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 1974-1987) <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/mchenry>

let's assume they are only at 10 percent graduate students, and give them the same weighted amount of money as San Diego and Irvine.

Jarrell: Right. Commensurate with that.

Greenwood: Commensurate with their mission, and then their graduate programs will come later, but there will be a reserve to provide capacity to do that. It didn't happen. I think that Dean and Clark [Kerr] (and I told Clark this), that they share some responsibility for creating a model which they said in the initial stages was not going to cost more than the other models, and then they were not prepared to fight to the death to get a funding model that would allow the experiment to succeed. So after that what every UCSC chancellor faced was a deficit and a growing divide—at least until Dick Atkinson came along. Now we get paid for the marginal student. It doesn't matter whether you are a graduate student or an undergraduate student. So it didn't get worse with our period of time, but it didn't in any way replenish a residual gap that just can never be closed. That's what I had to face. I had to face that there was a sentimental attachment to a model in the colleges that we had no feasible financial way to support.

Jarrell: I think that that's the terrible flaw right from the get-go.

Greenwood: But furthermore, some of the early faculty who were so loyal to McHenry felt that any deviation from the urban legend of McHenry's legacy amounted to an act of disloyalty to Dean. They believed that any faculty members who didn't appreciate the original model were really not "Santa Cruz"

faculty members. For a lot of years, because the early faculty dominated the senate, people who had any new ideas of how one might take the current situation, and the unique residential and co-curricular environment and make the most of it, were more or less seen as traitors to the old model. That, until now, and maybe even now, has prevented a hard-nosed look at the fundamental financial dilemma. We can't operate the way we were founded. But we still have got, among research universities in this nation, one of the most unique residential environments for students anywhere. Our faculty are increasingly recognizing that that's what will bring good students to us. Not just that we've got good faculty. Every UC campus has got good faculty.

Jarrell: It's a social and cultural and environmental—

Greenwood: Yes. So now we have to figure out what would bring faculty back into the colleges in a different way. My view is that what brings faculty anywhere is the opportunity to interact with each other and with students over serious intellectual issues. So I feel that rather than trying to argue over this core course or whatever, we ought to be putting research units in to the colleges, so that there's a group of faculty that want to be there, that are going to be there. That's what we tried to do with Colleges Nine and Ten. We have the Center for Justice, Tolerance, and Community, the International Living Center, etc. Try to put something into the colleges that draws some faculty in.

Jarrell: It has intellectual substance.

Greenwood: And involves the students and has scholarships for students and opportunities for students to work in the programs. So you don't say, "If you don't want to be a fellow of such-and-such a college, and if you won't come to these meetings, and if you won't do this, you are not a real Santa Cruz faculty member." You say, "The Center for Justice, Tolerance, and Community is one of the best centers we've got in the university. It happens to be physically located in College Nine." That means the faculty are going to be going in and out of College Nine daily. They're going to have their seminars there. It means that the interns who are going to work with those faculty members are probably going to want to live in those colleges. And you begin to create an environment. It's not the old concept. It's a *new* concept, a powerful one. But it's not the diminished old concept, which is what we are dealing with right now, or what we were dealing with. I actually see that it's beginning to change.

Jarrell: And turn around.

Greenwood: And turn around. And begin to feel that the core course has a specific function, that it's basically the writing course. Every student needs one and everybody across the nation agrees. We could do it better than any other university. There are a lot of things that could be done that would really make it the new model, one that we can sustain.

Jarrell: But it was never funded and it was never explicitly recognized that maintaining the colleges financially was just way more expensive. That was never built into the whole process.

Greenwood: Well, and not only that. When the model changed so that campuses that had more graduate students got more money, then UCSC really suffered. None of the champions of the original model, as far as I can tell, even made compelling arguments, let alone successful ones. I don't mean it as a criticism. I just mean it as a dose of reality. That's what happened, at least from my point of view. It doesn't mean we're failing. It just means that we need to be smart enough to figure out what today's model is. I think we are smart enough to figure out what today's model is. I loved that one of my granddaughters came here. I think this is a wonderful institution. I think if I were a parent in the state of California and I looked carefully at the quality of the faculty we have here, I would see that our faculty are among the best in UC. And for freshmen and sophomores, the living environment, the co-curricular environment that they're going to be in, the physical environment that they're going to be in, and the quality of the education here is actually better than it is on most other campuses.

Jarrell: I agree.

Greenwood: So I think we can't lose the colleges. I am a big fan of the colleges. I just don't want to constantly be bewailing the fates of the past.

Jarrell: Things change.

Greenwood: They do.

A Female Chancellor

Jarrell: This is Randall Jarrell. To continue from our last interview, you gave a very interesting commentary on the fact that you didn't believe that being a chancellor was an impossible job at all, and you embraced and welcomed it, which was a contrary view, actually, in terms of a lot of the articles I've read in higher education publications.

Today I'd like to talk about two things. First of all, being a female chancellor, a rarity in the UC system. I did some research on the number of college and university heads, and somewhere around 15 percent are women. Certainly your generation is the first generation to have a meaningful place at the table in these kinds of positions. I'd like you to discuss, what is it like to be a woman head of campus in a system that historically has been all-male? Have you experienced negatives? Has it mattered? How has it affected your ability to do what you see as necessary?

Greenwood: Okay. Let me just say a few things. First of all, when I became chancellor at Santa Cruz, I was the first female chancellor. I was the fourth female chancellor in the UC system. And the history of the female chancellors before I became chancellor—I used to say well, the female chancellors in the UC system are a little bit like Henry VIII and his wives. The short version of the first three chancellors would be: divorced, beheaded, and died. One of them divorced us. One of them died in office. And one of them was taken down by political opposition on the campus. And so, there are three new female chancellors. I was the first of the new three.

I said, okay, the second sequence is divorced, beheaded, survived. (laughter) I don't know how it will work out for me but I have a preference. I guess I clearly have survived as chancellor, since I am about to be UC Provost. But in fact, female chancellors as heads of research universities were extremely uncommon when I became the chancellor here. There were increasingly more female heads of community colleges. We were beginning to see substantially more in public comprehensive four-year universities. But still very, very few at the highly recognized research universities.

Judy Rodin, who was a close personal friend of mine, was one of the very first female presidents of a research university; she was at the University of Pennsylvania. She had been a University of Pennsylvania undergraduate, I believe. We knew each other early in our careers when she was a graduate student at Columbia. Then she went on to a very productive scientific and administrative career at Yale, and I went on in my own career. We both studied obesity, but in different ways. As we got into our late forties we got interested in women's health issues. Both of us commented at the time that we would never have done it when we were in our twenties because there would have been a, "oh yes, she's working on women's issues," as opposed to, "she's a leader in the discipline." So we both got involved in a number of women's health issues, later in our careers published together, and were part of a MacArthur Foundation major award that involved Yale, Penn, and Vassar, and I think also Rutgers, that studied health-promoting and health-damaging behaviors. Judy was one of the first female presidents of a research university. There were a couple of others.

When I came to Santa Cruz, I got asked that question a lot, "What's it like to be the first female chancellor at the University of California at Santa Cruz?" It was in the newspapers. Just yesterday, as I was sorting through some files, sorting out, pitching and purging, I came across an article. One of the comments I had made was, "Well, folks you have to understand that for me the new part is chancellor. I have the female part down. The chancellor part is what I'm learning." I just got asked that question about being the senior vice president and provost, the first female at that level in the whole UC system ever. I said once again, "For me the new part is the senior vice president provost piece. The female part I've probably learned how to do."

Jarrell: You've got it down.

Greenwood: I've got that part down. It's the job that I have to learn. When I came into the system, Laurel Wilkening and I were the only two female chancellors. Laurel and I overlapped for only a year. When she decided that she had had enough of chancelling, and that she was going to retire and move on, and go back to doing some things in her personal life that she had really wanted to do, I really questioned it. Because even though they were having a lot of problems at Irvine over the embryo scandal and all that, Laurel did not create this environment. All of the actions that took place in this scandalous case where the UC doctors allegedly took ova from women who did not know they were giving them to other women for the purposes of having children, all of this happened on another chancellor's watch, not on Laurel's. But Laurel had to clean it up. And she felt very much, I think, that the system did not give her the

support that it should have. The person who was president at the time had been the previous chancellor. She was a bit unhappy, I think, and she and her husband decided to retire. I've talked to her twice since then and she seems quite happy with that decision. I said, "Oh, I just can't imagine, Laurel. You're doing so well and everybody thinks so highly of you. I just can't imagine why you would leave." She said, "Call me at the end of four years and see if you feel the same way." In fact, I did call her. I don't think it was necessarily at the end of four years, but it was several years later. And she did ask me, "Well, are you ready to retire yet?" I said, "No, not at all." I was feeling at the peak energy level, so to speak. Anyway, she overlapped with me for a year.

After that I was the only female chancellor for a couple of years. And to be honest, there is a distinctly different feeling to a meeting when there's only one female in the room, and when that particular female is representing one of the smaller campuses. However, I have spent much of my life being the only woman in a meeting. So I've learned how to deal with it, how to ensure that my voice gets heard. Mostly I do that by humor. I have a good sense of humor and learned to break into a conversation, a skill I had to train myself to do because I was trained not to interrupt people, and I had to learn how to do that as a scientist when I was younger. Because if you don't you could wait for two hours before some of these guys stop talking. So now I probably overdo it.

And then Carol Tomlinson-Keasey was named chancellor of the aspiring UC Merced campus. She joined the table, but that didn't change the dynamics that much because Carol didn't yet have a real campus. The issues surrounding

faculty and students and other issues had not yet happened at UC Merced. Of course, she has views because she's been on two UC campuses, but it wasn't quite the same.

And then just this past year, France Córdoba was chosen as the chancellor at Riverside. I guess she's in her second year now. France and I worked together in Washington, D.C. She was the chief scientist at NASA when I was the associate director for science in the White House. In fact, I was one of the people who was sent out to persuade her to become the chief scientist at NASA. So we know each other, and we respect each other, and we enjoy being in the same room with each other. The three of us now have actually changed the tone of the meetings. Now there's a fourth because Marsha Chandler is the acting chancellor at San Diego. This may be a fairly short tenure at UC. Unless she becomes the chancellor, she will only be there for a short time.

Jarrell: She replaced Dynes?

Greenwood: She replaced Dynes, just like Marty Chemers is replacing me. It's an acting appointment. The San Diego search is coming to a close and I don't know whether she's going to be the chancellor or not. But we'll see.¹⁴ So yes, it was kind of unusual. On the other hand, most of the chancellors are scientists. The only exception when I joined was and is Bob Berdahl, who is an historian. He is a very well-known historian, very well respected. All the rest of them were

¹⁴ Marye Anne Fox was appointed April 12, 2004—Editor.

scientists. I'm a member of one of the branches of the National Academy of Sciences, and so are all but two of the existing chancellors. Of course one of our chancellors is a Nobel Laureate, Mike Bishop. So there's a certain esprit d'corps that surrounded having a similar kind of background that in some ways compensated for any gender differences that existed.

So, while I noticed the difference when I was the only female chancellor, it was not any kind of a debilitating difference. It was just different. The kind of jokes that were told. The fact that there clearly were conversations going on in the men's room that you don't hear. That sort of thing is just a little clearer when you are the *only* female. But it was not overwhelming. And I never found any of my male chancellor friends unwilling to share their views with me.

I have to be honest and say that one of the reasons I think that UC has been able to keep the quality of chancellors it has is the collegial environment of the Council of Chancellors. The quality of the collegial interaction among the chancellors and with the president at UC, Dick Atkinson, has been such that it has compensated for some of what in other circumstances might be considered lonely isolation. Other institutions may be compensating for this isolation by increased cash and benefits. I wouldn't want to be misinterpreted as saying that I'm complaining about my pay. I'm not complaining about my pay. I'm just saying that there's a demonstrable difference. And the question is why these very high-quality, well-qualified chancellors, who could go any place in the country, and most of them have been called on a monthly or at least bimonthly basis to test the waters to see if they'd move to Cornell, or move to Emory, or move to

Penn, or move to wherever— The fact that they stay, I think, is testimony to the fact that the relationships between the chancellors has been very collegial. They have been mutually supportive. Not that we don't compete. We certainly do. But we respect each other. We understand each other. And in most places where you are a chancellor or a president you don't have any peers that you can see on a regular basis and let your hair down with. We are able to do that in the UC system.

Jarrell: That's very interesting especially in light of Chancellor McHenry's oral history of thirty-five plus years ago, where he also discussed this collegial relationship between the UC chancellors.

Greenwood: I did read McHenry's oral history. I promised myself I wouldn't read any of the oral histories until I'd been here at least a year. And then I read most of them. But I was very struck reading his volumes (and it's probably because I am a feminist and I have taught women's studies in several institutions and I taught a course in women's health here), but I was very struck by the fact that the pronoun "she" showed up very sparsely in most of his work. Now, in the early volume where he talks about his personal life and where he grew up etc., there is a lot of "she" because there are female members of his family, but one of the things I remember about reading the later volumes was how he was always looking for the "right man for the job." "We have to find the right man for this job. We've got to find the right man. The right man." And I remember a section in one of the volumes, probably volume two, where he talks about Adrienne Zihlman, and about what a slip of a girl she was and about he wasn't

really convinced that she was the right appointment but he'd guessed he'd give it a chance. It was like a really big thing for him that he was going to let this woman touch the students and come to the university here. There were a couple of other women, too, but not very many.

Jarrell: There were about two.

Greenwood: And he made what I would consider pretty disparaging comments about—

Jarrell: Yes, Julia Zautinsky, who was in the music department and of course, Mary Holmes over at Cowell.

Greenwood: But Mary Holmes came later. She wasn't one of McHenry's choices. She was one of Page Smith's choices.

Jarrell: Absolutely. However, she had to have the okay from McHenry. I have this beautiful classic photograph of the early faculty, the first founding faculty.

Greenwood: Men in suits. Yes, I saw one at Cowell not too long ago at some event I went to. And if you look at the pictures of the chancellors in the UC system that they have at systemwide it's the same thing. They take a picture of the chancellors every year. There are two years in which I am the only female in the group. It's not the only group that I've been the only female in over the years, so, as I said, that wasn't such a shock. It's also kind of interesting. Tomorrow morning I'm sitting for my portrait.

Jarrell: For the famous portraits that used to hang on the wall of McHenry Library.

Greenwood: Yes, behind the staircase, with the only next obvious option being a bathroom door, so I thought, maybe it was time to move them. Anyhow, they've been moved to the University Center now, where there is yet again some criticism of how they're being hung in a hall, but it's fine. They are at least being reasonably preserved and given some dignity there, I think. They had to be moved, in any case, because the library's going to be remodeled so it was time to move them.

There was an interesting discussion about my portrait. What will I wear? So my staff has said, "No navy blue suit. You cannot wear a navy blue suit. That's what all the men are wearing except for Robert Stevens, who is in his gown." I said, "Okay, I'll wear my gown." And they said, "Oh, no, no. We don't want you to wear black." I said okay. So now the decision becomes, do I do a formal portrait with formal attire, or do I do a business jacket, etc.? So we're doing both to see which one we like when it's done.

Jarrell: And they take a photograph?

Greenwood: Yes, they take a photograph and then it is used to paint the portrait. I think I'm probably going to prefer the more formal one.

Jarrell: It's the dignity of it.

Greenwood: So I probably will prefer that. It is very interesting that even when it comes to something like doing your portrait, what a woman is going to wear, and how she is going to look in the official chancellorial portrait is of great concern, because if I'm a little dressier, then is it too girly?

Jarrell: Is it too girly? See, if you were a male chancellor, we wouldn't even be talking about this. He'd just put on his red tie and his blue suit and that would be the end of it.

Greenwood: Exactly. So this has been quite an amusing conversation for the last couple of days. Anyhow the moral of it all is I'm taking a business suit, and I'm taking a more formal outfit, and we'll let the photographer do the photographs and then we'll decide which one we think is most appropriate. I'm a Vassar graduate and there have been a few female presidents there.

Jarrell: My daughter went to Vassar. Frances Fergusson was wonderful.

Greenwood: She was president when I left Vassar and came out here. So she's been one of those very long-lived presidents. She's been there almost twenty-five years. But a number of presidents that I've seen under those circumstances have been in more formal attire for the formal photograph.

There is an organization on campus called the Women's Club. It probably had its antecedents in the Wives Club that Mrs. [Jane] McHenry would have been responsible for getting started, and other chancellor's spouses had promoted. It's been a supportive group of women who do two things: one, they meet once a month to listen to faculty members or others give a speech, and they enjoy the

camaraderie. They raise some money for student scholarships for reentry women. Of course, they're no longer the Wives Club; they're now a broader group of women.

But they have struggled. I was a particular challenge to them because they always met on the first Wednesday of every month. Well, the first Wednesday of every month is the Council of Chancellors meeting. The women's meeting time was really clearly designed as the date when the spouse of the chancellor would likely be on the campus, because spouses don't come to the COC meeting. There's no entertainment associated with it. It's strictly a business meeting. Even if there's a dinner the night before, it is strictly business. No spouses come with chancellors to these dinners. Thus the first Wednesday of the month is a day that is reasonable to expect the chancellor's spouse is going to be on the campus and will not have any social demands associated with the male chancellor that *she*, typically, is married to.

I got a complaint the first year. It was that the chancellor clearly didn't care very much about the Women's Club because she didn't even show up. So I had to go talk to the president of the Women's Club and say, "Look, if you want to change the date of the Women's Club, I will try to make some meetings. But you need to understand that if the chancellor is a woman, and she has to make a choice between going to the Council of the Chancellors meeting and coming to the Women's Club lunch, it's not a choice. She's going to have to go to the Council of the Chancellors." I was able to attend one or two Women's Club meetings in the last eight years. They never did move it.

Then there were other issues when I moved into University House. Most of the other chancellors have had a spouse who basically ran the house and approved the social calendar. I had to change that to have a professional staff at University House that could really run the events and manage the house for me. I was incredibly lucky to find Jeff Rockwell, who was, and is, the consummate manager, and then Jonathan Miller, originally hired to help Jeff, turned out to be excellent and a great chef as well.

Jarrell: I was going to ask you about that, because the only wife of the chancellor I've ever interviewed was Karen Sinsheimer, and she is clearly a feminist and talked about the idea that this is an unpaid position.¹⁵ Essentially it's like being a First Lady or something, First Lady of the campus, or however you want to characterize it. It's uncompensated, and it's an enormous amount of work.

Greenwood: It's even worse than that, because the spousal position was compensated in many places, including UC for a while. There was a movement around the country, to compensate chancellor's spouses— (The title was changed to "associate to the chancellor," or something like that) and I think on some campuses they are given at least a part-time secretarial assistant. Then they're given help to run events in the house. They used to actually be paid themselves, and get some small salary a year. It wasn't a lot of money, but it did allow them to accumulate some retirement benefits themselves. I think that there was a brouhaha over it at some point and it stopped happening in many public

¹⁵ See Randall Jarrell, Interviewer, Irene Reti, Editor, *Karen Sinsheimer: Life at UC Santa Cruz, 1981-1987* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2011) <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/ucsc/karen-sinsheimer-life-at-uc-santa-cruz-1981-1987>

institutions. If you have a spouse, a partner, who chooses to spend their time to be the First Lady (or Associate), and is therefore working on behalf of the University constantly, either in the socialization, or bringing people to the campus, or working with young students, whatever the story is, it is an uncompensated position.

The issue has been tested around the country because we now have some women who have male spouses, and some of these males are willing to be the “associate” of the chancellor, and others aren’t. Without the “wife” at the post, the chancellor doesn’t have somebody at the house to organize events and social agendas. This was the case, I think, with Laurel Wilkening. Her husband was willing to show up for certain fundraising events, but had his own career. He was a very distinguished scientist himself. So she had to find a way to compensate for some of that, too. Nationally, Yale had a flurry of articles when Benno [C.] Schmidt [Jr.] was a president, commenting that his wife never showed up at Yale. There was this apocryphal story that others had a large photograph of her, one of those cardboard cutouts and that it was brought to university events.

Jarrell: Like a mannequin or something.

Greenwood: Yes, that people would stand up the photo at a party to satirize Benno’s wife not being there. (I have no personal evidence that this actually happened.) It was really shocking to me when some of these things were happening that these attitudes were still possible in university settings, that people were still so catty, that a man could be married to a woman who had a successful career, and because she was unwilling to devote herself to her

husband's social responsibilities, he was in some way diminished in his value to the institution. Every once in a while I've dropped in on one of these "spousal meetings" at national meetings, and they're usually still full of gripes about how much work they have to do and how little they're appreciated. Some of them are compensated, but others are not.

Jarrell: It's interesting. That brought to mind Senator Hillary Clinton. There's this group of the senator's "wives," and Bill Clinton has actually gone to some of these meetings. He's probably one of three or four men who've participated.

Greenwood: That happens at the professional meetings, AAU [Association of American Universities], and NASULGC [National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges], now APLU [Association of Public Land Grant Universities] as well. There're usually, maybe less than half a dozen, usually three or so men who are accompanying their female spouses, who either are chancellors or presidents, to these meetings.

Jarrell: I guess all of these roles are evolving and morphing.

Greenwood: Well, the really historically important thing, that I think suggests "we're evolving," is that very often when there's been a female president or chancellor, whether it's a professional society or a campus, people feel almost an obligation for not appointing another female. It's sort of like, "Okay, we did that. Now let's get back to business." I was very pleased to see at the University of Pennsylvania that Judy Rodin was succeeded by Amy Guzman, who was the provost at Princeton. That's a first, to have two women in a row at a major

research university. That's very positive. When I became the president of the AAAS [American Association for the Advancement of Science], I was the fourth woman in a row. It was kind of interesting because there had been only one or two women in the previous, almost hundred years. It was a really rare event that there had been a female president, and there hadn't been one for almost thirty years. Then there were four of us in a row. I got elected as president, after three previous women—

When I got elected, I won't say who, but one very distinguished scientist came up to me at the AAAS meeting and said, "Boy, this is really turning into a hen's club." I said to him, "Well, there's a scientific data point for you." And he said, "What are you talking about?" I said, "Well, you can have thirty-five years of nothing but male presidents and no one thinks it's remarkable. You have four female presidents, and after the third one, when the fourth one gets elected, it turns the organization into a hen's club. I guess the quantification is four women are the equivalent of thirty men, which so many of us have suspected for a long time, but now you've given me some real scientific validation." (laughs) He cracked up, and we went on. Actually there have been a number of women who have now been in that sequence at AAAS, but it was years and years and years before it happened with regularity. Jane Labchenko, Rita Calwell, Millie Dresselhaus and then me. I may not have the sequence correct, but those were the four women.

Jarrell: They're heavy duty.

Greenwood: Really heavy-duty women. They've certainly paid their dues everywhere. For them to sequence each other was considered unusual. I guess that was the thing that got this gentleman alarmed, that maybe the women were taking over the organization, and if so, it wouldn't be as valuable to him.

Campus Growth Issues

Jarrell: I'd also like today to talk about your assessment, your point of view on eight years of town-gown relationships. The university is autonomous, is not under legal obligation to do certain things, but certainly in terms of the interpersonal relationship between the community and the university, I think it benefits everybody if things are cordial and cooperative. There have been down points, certainly, over these years. You talked a little in our first interview about this, about the enormous energy that you spent in meeting and greeting, and attending meetings, and really being involved. What's your sense of how the university, and you in particular, have succeeded in repairing and in fostering this relationship?

Greenwood: Let me just say that the university and the city share a common history with respect to the evolution of the university and the changing, if you will, terms of engagement that the university and the city have had to deal with. In some cases, these changes were really out of the hands of either the city or the university. The city fathers and city politicians (and we saw it again recently in some of the newspapers), will say, "You know, the university can do whatever it wants to do. They're autonomous. They don't have to do what we want them to do." That is, in fact, a half-truth. We do have constitutional autonomy. We do not

have to have their permission for every permit that we need. It is also, however, the case that we have to abide by all the CEQA rules and regulations, that we have to have a long range development plan, which, while the city doesn't get to approve, they can certainly influence.

Jarrell: What are the CEQA regulations?

Greenwood: The California Environmental Quality Act. We can't dig up a field; we can't build a building without going through an environmental impact statement. Now, while the city and other parties can't say, "Down with the environmental impact statement," they can sure make it really tough, and they can string it out for years and years and years.

A good example is that we've been trying to build faculty housing on campus. Actually, the city has wanted us to do that. They want us to build as much housing on campus as possible. But we've been having some difficulty with the California Fish and Wildlife Service. We think we have a deal with them, where we're devoting some other campus property to the preservation of certain organisms, while at the same time using the proposed faculty housing property for a purpose that's critical to our faculty and our students' needs. But that process has taken over four years, and cost us many, many hundreds of thousands, maybe even millions of dollars, just to get through the regulatory component. So it is not the case that the local community doesn't have an impact on our decision, and doesn't shape decisions. Not because they get to vote it down, but because they can make it so difficult.

But there are some things that have changed dramatically. When Dean McHenry rode into town, the tax laws in the state of California allowed for the city to get substantial real estate taxes, which they then promised to use to build infrastructure, including the eastern access to the campus, and other roads and bridges that were needed on the campus. Santa Cruz wanted the university. Go back into the UCSC archives and you'll see. The county promised all sorts of things to try to beat out the competition in Almaden. When Dean McHenry came into town, the city had every expectation that it would be able to provide these services. Well, the 1986 tax laws, Proposition 13, and other things changed the tax base that the city had to work with, which then changed the politics a lot in terms of whether the university was seen as a boon to the local community, or a drain to the local community.

So part of what I did that started repairing and working out relationships with the city council, was to learn the history. I learned the history of what had happened. Not just who owed whom what, but what the terms of engagement were. What had changed? Why is it harder for the city to do this? Why do they really react, or in my view overreact, when we do something? Why do they think that we should do different things on the campus? Why did Bob Sinsheimer get in trouble when he proposed a research park, and now the city wants one? What is considered acceptable in order to have a tax base to provide social services changes over decades.

What I've always tried to do, whether it's here or in Silicon Valley, is to try to understand what the local politicians are having to deal with. What is their

constituency base? What are their main concerns? What levers do they have to get what they need to stay in office and to provide services? Then, how can the university try to play to those strengths, and not run up against them?

We did not have any obligation to have any more city-university meetings after the last meeting associated with the College Eight lawsuit, which was settled in December 1987. Instead of saying, "Okay, that's it. We're done," which is what I was advised by some to do, and what another chancellor might have done, I decided to continue the meetings. These had typically been annual "bash-the-university" meetings. One particular one was headed in that direction, in part because of the parking garage. I decided, I'm going to try to stop this bashing, so I asked the UCSC staff to find out how many parking garages the city had built. How many parking spaces does the city have? Why is it that when they build a parking garage, it's said it is not to draw traffic? I'm going to have those numbers when this issue comes up at the meeting.

That was one of their first encounters with me. I think, when whichever one of the then councilpersons started down that road, I let them go all the way down the road for a while. Then I said, "Well, now let me give you some perspective. From our point of view you've done this and this, and I think you're about to build another parking garage. We propose to build a parking garage and it's going to draw traffic." I just used a little humor. I said, "So I've asked our physicists if they can help me explain why it is that the materials in our parking garage will draw traffic, while the materials in your parking garages apparently repel traffic, and we'll try to modify our building plans to include the repelling

materials in the garage.” Of course they all cracked up. I mean, what can you do? Politicians are politicians. They know when they’re playing politics and they know when their good case has been undermined.

We had a little brouhaha, and that was the only time since I’ve been chancellor that a group of local dissenters came to the Regents meeting to protest our plans—in this case, the parking garage. Mardi Wormhoudt came up to the Regents meeting and several others testified during the public period that they were opposed to this parking garage. We posted the EIR for comments for months, but they didn’t notice it until the week before, in spite of the fact that we had actually gone out of our way to notify them that it was on the street. Nobody got around to reading it. They had some objections, and we took them into account.

So they showed up at the Regents meeting. Basically, they said that we were going to build this and the Regents should prevent it. I was presenting at the Regents table and one of the Regents said to me during the hearing on the parking garage, “Chancellor Greenwood, after listening to the public comment period,” (Let’s see if I can get this right. It would be in the minutes of the Regents’ meeting.) I think what she asked was, “I believe that we heard from the county supervisor that they might sue the university over this parking garage. Do you think that that’s likely?” I said, “Yes, I think it’s probably likely. I think that they will probably try to sue.” I said, “I wouldn’t want to say differently.” She said, “Well, thank you. Then I’m going to put it into the record that we have heard that and will be prepared.” So that was the beginning and the end of that

particular episode. The city was going to sue, but then I ended up talking to several of the city council people privately, and saying, "Well, if you want to spend the taxpayers' money this way, go ahead, but I don't really think it's a very productive use of your time or my time. Can't we do something?"

That's when Fred Keeley got involved in helping mediate the discussion around the parking garage. The city backed off of their threatened lawsuit, and we agreed to pay a quarter of a million dollars for the transportation study. They agreed to support all of our on-campus housing goals, and our academic buildings.

So we had a wonderful agreement, which continues to this day. If you will remember, they opposed not a single dormitory, not a single piece of student housing that we've put up, nor have they opposed the faculty housing. We gave them money for the traffic study. We didn't get what we wanted out of it, but we gave it anyhow. And we built the parking garage, and the parking garage has not been an issue since it was built. In fact, I now have letters on my desk on almost a monthly basis from students objecting to the fact that they're not allowed to use the parking garage. That was another compromise. The students didn't want us to build that parking garage. It was going to be ugly. It was going to be environmentally unsound. I sent them the pages from the 1988 EIR and everything else showing that parking structures are far more environmentally sound than spraying asphalt all over campus. We were going to build parking structures because there was tremendous agreement among environmentalists

that the dense garages were less environmentally damaging than the open asphalt parking lots.

Jarrell: Better to go up, instead of spreading out.

Greenwood: Yes. And ours doesn't even go above the tree line.¹⁶ Nonetheless, the students didn't want to pay for the parking garage. I, of course, knew, that we were going to need the parking garage for the faculty and staff parking as we were putting in the new buildings near there and because we had to, temporarily at least, take out some surface parking. I said to the students, "Well, I think it's a terribly bad precedent, and I'm sure that your successors are going to live to regret it, but if you want, we will excuse you from paying for this parking garage. We will not change your rates to pay for this parking garage, but you may not park in it. You will not be able to park in this parking garage." "Oh, that's great! We won this battle. We don't have to pay for that parking garage!" I said, "However, you do understand that when we deck the East Remote Lot, which is mostly a student parking lot, we will have to apportion the cost accordingly." "Oh great!" That's what we want." Of course now, those students are gone. The new students are here, and they say it's unfair. "You're violating my rights not to allow me to have the opportunity to park in that parking garage." We have held firm on it, because the faculty and the staff need the parking, and the students can park in the remote lot and take the shuttle. There's really no reason why they can't do that.

¹⁶ For more on the design and building of this parking garage see Irene Reti, Interviewer and Editor, *Growth and Stewardship: Frank Zwart's Four Decades at UC Santa Cruz*, (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2011). <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/ucsc/growth-and-stewardship-frank-zwarts-four-decades-at-uc-santa-cruz>

Jarrell: Right. Just for the record, this is the big parking garage, the first of its kind at UCSC. It's near Science Hill.

Greenwood: It's right across from Kresge, at the corner of Meyer and McLaughlin.

Jarrell: Something that is important to remember is that the original projections were that this campus was going to have 27,500 students, and then that was submerged for many years, because during the 1970s there were truncations here at the campus. Now, I noticed in the paper, last week, that there's a new goal.

Greenwood: A working number.

Jarrell: A working number of approximately 20,000.

Greenwood: 21,000.

Jarrell: 21,000. That would be gently built at the rate of about four hundred.

Greenwood: Two percent a year.

Jarrell: Two percent a year.

Greenwood: Or less.

Jarrell: I think it's very interesting because there's certainly going to be a lot of controversy about that, but the original idea was that this was going to be a large, undergraduate-based research university.

Greenwood: Right, a large research university, with graduate and professional programs and an undergraduate focus.

Jarrell: How was this figure arrived at? I know there was a campus committee—

Greenwood: They're still working on the number. But the current working number of 21,000 by 2020, would be about half the growth that we've had since the last plan. The last plan was finalized in 1988, and it ran until 2005. It was about a 4 percent growth a year. Basically we've been on that plan. We dipped a little in the early 1990s, and then when we recovered we basically got right on the plan. The university's done nothing to change the rate of growth that it planned for. This is in contrast to other agencies around the general region, where growth has exceeded planning. We haven't done anything differently. In some ways, you could say we are responsible stewards. If we agree to a number, that's the number we stick with. We haven't tried to change it. But it is almost 2005, so now it's time to say, Okay, what would be next? What that number gets us is about 15 percent graduate students across our programs, over a period of close to fifteen years now. It also would probably get us a second professional school—this could be allied health, or business and commerce. It allows the existing research programs to build out, while maintaining a pretty steady but slower growth of undergraduates. The composition, that is the dominant student body, is still undergraduate. UCSC would still be about 15 percent graduate students, which by national standards is still pretty low.

Expanding Graduate Programs

Jarrell: I'm not familiar with the ratios of undergraduate to graduate students.

Greenwood: Stanford's is approximately 50:50. Most of the private research institutions are about 50 to 50 percent graduate / professional students. Some of the big publics—Michigan, and I think University of Virginia, Berkeley, UCLA—are about 25 or 30 percent graduate students. UC San Diego is about 14, 15 percent graduate students right now, and that's where we'd like to be.

The problem if you don't have enough graduate students, is that you're not providing the unique role that the University of California serves, which is to provide the research-ready students for the future. That's why we're different from CSUs [California State University system], because we do research and because we train advanced students. The undergraduate student body is educated by CSU, as well as by us. We think we do it especially well, and we give undergraduate students more opportunities to engage in interesting research. In research universities, typically, students are taught by the people who are writing the textbooks, instead of being taught by the people teaching the textbooks. It's an important difference in approach, in my view.

But, if you don't have a pretty healthy cadre of graduate students, first of all, you have trouble getting high-quality faculty members to come, because they aren't going to come if they cannot engage with very bright young people who are going to become the advanced scholars in the field. That's a real attraction for most bright faculty members. They like teaching undergraduate students, but

they want students who are studying with them at the highest levels as well. That's important. So, I think that this university has got to get up above 10 percent graduate students. It's really bad for us to be so low.

The other thing is that undergraduates make decisions about whether they want to pursue advanced careers based, at least in part, on their interaction with graduate students, as well as faculty members. And in a science laboratory, about which I know more than I do about how it's done in history, for example, there's always a structure. There's the professor, and there are sometimes postdocs, and graduate students, and undergraduate students. It's a vertically integrated team. The undergraduates, and the graduate students, the postdocs, the professor, all become, in many ways, a kind of family. They all help each other. Certainly when I was going through it, I learned a lot from the graduate students. When I was working as a technician, and then when I was an undergraduate student, graduate students were always sitting around at midnight teaching undergraduates how to do something, how to interpret their data. So you need that, or you can't create the intense activity that characterizes intellectual thought. Now, in the humanities and social sciences sometimes it's a little more distancing. That is, people work in the library, and they have conversations and interactions in seminars with their professors. They don't spend eight hours a day, seven days a week with them, which certainly is possible when you are a graduate student. And sometimes it's more like twelve or fifteen hours a day.

Jarrell: This is very interesting in terms of understanding the whole rationale for an increase in the graduate population here, and also the obligation of this campus to take on its fair share of undergraduate students.

State Demographics and Campus Growth

Greenwood: The arguments for increasing the size of the campus focus on three concerns. One, the demographics of the state, and the pressures on the University of California to take qualified students, which we believe will not let up until at least 2012, if then. UCSC will have to take a portion of those undergraduate students. Irvine, Riverside, some of the other growing campuses—they took a thousand students or more a year during these last eight years. I moderated that at UCSC, and kept it pretty close to four to six hundred, no more than that. For two reasons. One, I thought we could build housing fast enough to be able to accommodate that level of growth and not put too much pressure on housing in the city. And second, I thought we could hire the faculty reasonably fast enough to handle the growth.

It was a compromise. Other chancellors and their campuses saw the opportunity to grab the base of funds associated with getting new students, and they went up as high as they could conceivably go. That was not politically possible here in Santa Cruz, so we didn't do it. Now, the campus may live to regret that. Because as the funds get cut back, the more funding you got in the last eight years the less difficult it's going to be to cut back. So maybe I should have been more aggressive. I don't know. But it was as aggressive as I thought was politically possible and continue to maintain reasonable relations with the city.

We are in an interesting situation right now. Six years ago the university was hearing from town constituents: "We've got all these students and they're taking up all the housing and working people can't find rental units," etc. And we now are facing the very real prospect that housing in town will be cheaper than it is on the campus. There are apartments and units available in town, and we may have some difficulty keeping our dormitories as full as we would like to keep them. So these things come in cycles. For the last two years, maybe even the last three years, I have gotten not one complaint from the city council over our students taking up housing that's needed for other people who work in town. So it's changed.

I think any chancellor has to know what the "levers" are. You have to know what gets the city upset. Obviously, part of it is housing and traffic pressures. The traffic pressures have not lessened. But one of the things we did was to get very factual. We started looking at all the traffic data, and looking at who was going where in town. At the most impacted intersections in town, the traffic is not coming from the university. It's coming down Highway One. It's coming into town. We know which intersections are the ones that cause the gridlock downtown, and we know when we're responsible for it and when we're not. We are responsible for it some of the time. I'm not saying we're not. We're certainly responsible for the traffic on High Street and Bay Street most of the time. But the real difficulties in traffic coming through downtown Santa Cruz, etc., is most often not caused by UCSC.

We just educated ourselves. Then we were able to sit down with the city and say, "Let's get real about this. What can we do?" There are some things that we haven't done and can do and probably will do. We haven't tried staggering work hours the way we probably could if we wanted to even out the traffic patterns. We could and probably will change the array of classroom hours. We've been quietly working on that.

Jarrell: I've never thought of that as a mitigating—

Greenwood: We've allowed a certain amount of faculty preference to drive when classes are taught, and where they're taught, which is most unusual. In most large universities there's a scheduling pattern and the experts figure out how to best use the buildings—large classes, small classes, one side of the campus, the other side of the campus. Basically, if you're a professor you're told your class is scheduled for ten o'clock on Monday, Wednesday, Friday, and that's when you teach it. You don't say, "Oh, no. I only teach on Tuesdays and Thursdays and my preference is two o'clock in the afternoon." As you get larger, campus-wide scheduling becomes important. We've now developed the tools that will allow us to quickly analyze how many students should be on campus at any given time of day, where they are supposed to be on the campus, and which faculty members are going to be on campus and where. Once we've figured that out, if we've got some particularly destructive pattern like classes letting out at precisely the same time that most people are leaving work, then we change it.

Jarrell: Then you're going to have your gridlock. But I'd never thought of this aspect of organizing the campus schedule in terms of how it impinges on the traffic flow in the community.

Greenwood: I think that's why we've had more successful relations with the city, because we've talked about these things. We've said, okay, what's the problem? The problem is that other people who work in town cannot get where they need to go between four-thirty and six o'clock in the evening. Okay, what portion of that is really related to UCSC, as opposed to other organizations or from folks commuting from over the hill? For example, if we were to structure it so the students couldn't move their cars back on campus until seven-thirty, would that help or not? If we structured it so that we didn't have any classes that let out between five and six? Students are either on campus before four and they don't leave till after six. What if we structured our class hours so we have some earlier morning classes or later evening classes? What if we never have more than three of certain types of large classes at any given period of time? There are lots of options that would mitigate the issues. We have been willing to talk with the city regarding such practical issues.

The city's big concern, the city's big need right now, is a tax base. They've raised the issue of whether our students should be paying utility taxes? Well, maybe they should. I don't have an opinion on that. Of course, it won't matter what my opinion is in another couple of days (because of my move to UCOP), but I don't have a strong opinion on that, and I was willing to discuss it. Once it becomes clear that you are not opposed to exploring whether or not it would be possible

to say, "Well, there's no reason I can think of why students using telephones ought not to be paying the taxes that everybody else pays for telephones. So charge them. That's going to help you a little." We're always talking about TOT, transient occupancy tax and whether or not people who are on campus for conferences ought to be paying that, et cetera, et cetera. You have to understand what they need, and then you have to figure out how to work with the city to get them some of what they need.

Some of it we do with straight payments. We're paying for part of the water system. We are the best water users in the county. We're using only 5 more percent more water today than we were when we had five thousand fewer students. Why is nobody else in the city held to these standards? Why is it that there are no meters on city houses? Why is it that there's no penalty for using more than your fair share of water anyplace else in the city? We're not water hogs. We're perfectly willing to do every conceivable thing we can. We're using waterless urinals in the new engineering building.

Jarrell: I've never heard of that. Waterless urinals.

Greenwood: It's reflecting a new technology.

Jarrell: Really.

Greenwood: We're willing to do anything that's reasonable. We're willing to be a demonstration site for other projects. We're dealing with the city regarding the Texas Instruments property right now, and the Long Marine Lab property. The city needs a site for a desalination plant. It probably won't get built for fifteen

years, but they need a site and we'd like to find a way to figure this out with the city.

I was just talking to an established real estate agent in town. She handles a lot of the high-end properties. I was just talking to her the other night at the gourmet dinner for the Long Marine Lab. One thing she said was that even she, in her business, is still surprised at how house values are going up in the Santa Cruz region and how many people are still coming over here to buy a second house, a vacation house. When that happens, these folks either don't participate in the local politics, or they bring a different mindset to the local politics, neither of which makes the city council people too comfortable.

Then you've got the problem of losing twelve hundred reasonably high paying technology jobs from the westside of the city. Those jobs are unlikely to come back. So, in a way, the best hope for building reasonably well-paid jobs that will stay in the city or county is the university. I think building the argument that we are a stable, not likely to outsource overseas, source of employment for people who will, in fact stay in the area and will participate in the community is an argument that people have understood by now. Also, if our research opportunities, our programs with engineering and social sciences and the physical sciences, et cetera, continue to grow, we will create new jobs, and those jobs will replace the jobs on the westside. We've already replaced about 750 of the 1200 jobs just with developments thus far. While we might lose some of the state-supported jobs in this retrenchment that the state's going through right

now, we won't lose these other jobs. There's always some chance; people lose their grants. But you know, somebody loses one, somebody gets one.

Jarrell: It seems like your experience in the White House would have prepared you well for the highly politicized nature of Santa Cruz politics and dealing with campus growth and town-gown relations.

Greenwood: I think it did. I was fortunate when I came here that two really good politicians were in place. Sam Farr—his family and he have long been friends of the campus, and he's a very solid congressman and cares a great deal about the district and the campus. He was a great political mentor to me. He really helped me understand the history of people and the history of some of the controversies that of course I walked right into. And, at the time, Fred Keeley was our assemblyman. I think Santa Cruz has been fortunate because Fred was a really good assemblyman; Bruce McPherson was an excellent state senator; and John Laird has continued. So we've been lucky. You don't always get such really good, really intelligent, thoughtful politicians. I was fortunate in that Fred Keeley was the assemblyman, and so therefore he was the ranking local Democrat. And Democratic politics, as you know, pretty much dominate with respect to the city, if not the whole district, at least the city. So he helped me understand the history of the players, and basically gave me some good advice about how I might be able to diffuse some anxieties and concerns, and I certainly valued his advice.

I wouldn't have known to ask for it, if I hadn't spent the time in Washington. The University of California is, and continues to be, way more reactive than proactive. So I think I would have only been given advice about how to deal with

our local political folks once I had a problem. The advantage of being in Washington was that I knew how important it was going to be to be able to get involved in the local politics early. That meant being able to negotiate both sides of the aisle. So while we have a dominantly progressive, Democratically dominated local political environment, we do have a pretty solid set of Republican constituencies, fairly moderate, actually. And we have this very interesting senator, who is a Republican, and has been the Republican state officeholder. I liked Bruce a lot, and I was able to build a good relationship with the business community. That's a difficult bridge here, because they just have not done it well in the past. And in some ways the university is the best bridge that you have, but a shaky one to begin with— (laughs)

So the couple of years I had in Washington gave me the ability to recognize: First of all, don't make a mistake by wearing your politics on your sleeve when you come to town. Listen. Get political advice from both sides of the aisle, or the middle of the aisle, or from all constituencies. Try to understand what the root causes of the problems are. And then try to work to resolve them.

I'll give you an example. It is not the city's fault that we have some of the differences of opinion that we have. But it's also not the university's fault. At the time, the city of Santa Cruz wanted to compete for a campus of the great University of California, the tax situation was different. They had different sources of revenue. Proposition 13 hadn't passed. Their projections of what they would be able to offer in the way of enticements to keep the university—access to the campus's roads, infrastructure—were probably accurate, had that income

stream continued to be on an ascending curve. But then it stopped. So the city doesn't have a lot of options for where they get their revenue, other than taxes or fees. And the campus is not a philanthropic organization. We're not a foundation to provide funding to the city to get some very important things done, even if we think they're the right things to do.

So one of the things that I tried to get started when I was here (and I worked with John Laird on this), was to try to get the whole University of California to consider working with a group, particularly those campuses that exist in smaller cities, where their impact is felt more intensely, and also where the city and the university have a mutual dependency that's different than if you're a campus in Los Angeles, or even a large city. So from my time in the White House I learned to think of things in some political terms, and therefore I think probably didn't overreact to some early negative comments by the city. When I was working with Emily Reilly and a couple of the other mayors that I found (except when we were in a political environment where it was important for them to play to their constituency), we were able to have a straightforward conversation about the mess we were all in, and how were we going to try to dig our way out of it. So that was good. I think you have to learn the history. If you don't know the history of the tax base in California, then you don't understand why it is that smaller cities that have universities are trying to extract more from them.

Jarrell: Right. And all of that is very well documented, going back to the early sixties and what promises were made.

Greenwood: Yes, it's interesting to go through those archival materials and realize that there were things said; there were promises made. And there's no point in us rehearsing those promises, because we wouldn't be able to keep them if we were on the other side either. So it's a question of how do you carve out the new river? How do we get the new direction here to make it work together? I don't think anybody has come up with a good solution to that right now, and the budget process in the state of California does not really lend itself to long-term reflection.

UCSC School of Engineering

Reti: Today is June 21, 2005, and I am here with M.R.C. Greenwood in her office in Oakland at the University of California, Office of the President (UCOP). We're continuing the interviews that Randall Jarrell did in March of 2004, shortly before you left UCSC. So today, let's start by talking about the circumstances around the establishment of the first professional school at UCSC, in engineering, which was a very long battle that had been going on long before you came.

Greenwood: Right. The history of the engineering school at Santa Cruz is very interesting, and it's long. A school of engineering was actually approved for the campus at the time the campus was established in 1965. And, in fact, there was a vote by the Regents to establish a school of engineering. A dean of engineering had been hired, Francis Clauser. He came from Johns Hopkins University. He was hired to implement the school of engineering, to come and build a school of engineering. And then Fred Terman, a very well-known professor at Stanford, extremely well known nationally, wrote the Terman Report, saying that the

world didn't need any more engineering schools, and California in particular, didn't need one. "We are overproducing engineers." And it basically killed the advancement of the engineering program at Santa Cruz, as I understand it.

I suspect, and I actually know from reading some of the other oral histories, that it's a little more complicated than that, because there were also budgetary issues and other things. But the Applied Sciences building was built for engineering of that period. And that building was then put to other uses. The engineering program was eviscerated, except for two programs in computer science and computer science engineering, one of which had been information science, and had been in the humanities. The divisions weren't exactly the same then. But computer science started there. So for a long time, there were just two quite good programs that were producing some computer engineers and computer scientists.

Before I arrived, during Karl Pister's time (and of course he was the very famous dean of engineering from Berkeley), a committee had been put together by Pister, headed by Eugene Switkes, that presented the case for moving forward with a school of engineering. And it was probably the first decision that I had input into, actually before I was chancellor, because this had been approved and was moving forward to the Office of the President, and as Karl Pister was leaving it moved up to the Office of the President for presidential concurrence. President Atkinson called me at that point and said, "Did I know about the proposal?" I said, "Yes, I had been informed about it in my briefings to become chancellor." "And was I in favor of it? Was I ready to move forward with it?" Of course, I had

some trepidation, because I already knew enough about Santa Cruz to know that there was at least some opposition to the introduction of engineering, and that moving it was probably going to require some energy and some talent. I also, however, recognized that if I were to hesitate it probably would have been very difficult to implement it two or three years later.

Reti: Why?

Greenwood: Well, something like that gets the momentum and it gets moving, and then if you end up stalling it for a couple of years, people start thinking about other things they'd like to see the university do. Then you lose the impact of the faculty committee's report and it can get effectively stalled. I had read the report, and I thought they made a very compelling case. At the time, of course, there was no question that California needed more engineers, and that Santa Cruz was capable of producing them. We had quite a number of students who were transferring out of Santa Cruz to go someplace where they could get engineering degrees in something other than computer science. So we knew that we had a student base here.

Also, if you read the description of the original University of California at Santa Cruz, clearly the original founders saw the University of California at Santa Cruz as a research university, with a variety of professional schools. The colleges were going to be the way of organizing undergraduate education, but it was going to be a full-spectrum university, and not a large, liberal arts college with a variety of divisions. So I knew that it would be very important to the future balance of the institution. And although I would like to say that I understood at the time how

important it would be to our fundraising, and how important it would be to recognition outside of the immediate Santa Cruz, tri-county area, I don't think I completely understood that. But it certainly turned out to be the case.

So I said, "Yes, of course," to the president. "I think it's very important, and furthermore we should move as quickly as possible." And like all good chancellors, I asked, "And what can you do to help me, Mr. President, while we are doing this?" (laughs) So the decision was made.

And then it was very interesting, because in fact, the school had already been approved by the Regents decades ago. So technically we didn't have to take it back to the Regents, but because it was a momentous decision, we ended up taking it back.

So we established the school. We had a benefactor, as you know, in the wings, Jack Baskin, who was interested in starting the school. He had indicated an interest in being the benefactor for the school of engineering. I went to talk with him. I was a brand-new, naive chancellor. I went over and I just said, "Mr. Baskin, I think it's really important that we launch this school. We need your support. You've helped us so much, and I know this is what you see as your legacy." And Peggy, his wife, Peggy Downes Baskin said to him, "Jack, this is an opportunity for a legacy." And we were able to announce that we had the gift at my inauguration, which was really nice. That was in May of the following year.

Then, having gotten the engineering school off the ground, it became clear to the faculty and also, I think, to the university and particularly to the Silicon Valley

folks that we were serious. I started talking about how we were going to be graduating as many undergraduate engineers as Stanford in a relatively short period of time, all of which has turned out to be true. That we would be hiring first-rate faculty, UC-quality faculty, only in the really high tech moving fields. We weren't going to be burdened with outdated departments. Some of the engineering schools that have such departments have no way of getting rid of them, and those faculty are still quite powerful professors, and so they continue to influence the direction of the curriculum.

I talked with the deans of engineering at Berkeley and Stanford and Michigan and a couple of other places, and they all said to me, "You've got the best opportunity of anybody in the country, even though I'm sure you're starting it on a shoestring. But you can build a 21st century engineering school, instead of trying to reshape a 20th century engineering school. You've got some real opportunities here."

And that was the approach we took. We took the approach that we wanted to make it an engineering school that would focus on what California and the nation needed for the future. So we focused on the infotech, nanotech, and biotech areas, and the engineering prospects there. As well, some mechanical engineering and some information systems engineering were planned along with program/project management. These are things that make a vital and vibrant, current engineering school. And then we took advantage of every possible opportunity we could to be in a position to make linkages with the California Institutes for Science and Innovation. Even though we couldn't host one, because

we had no way of raising a three-to-one match for a billion dollars, or a hundred million dollars, UCSC still got a piece of the action in two of them.

We had Pat Mantey as the founding dean. That was a little interesting as well. Because Pat, who had been sort of the surrogate father of engineering, a dean of engineering, had done a fabulous job, great guy, had really done a terrific job for us. We needed a founding dean, and at the time Pat said, "I'll do it, but I'll only do it for a couple of years." And we made an agreement with the Academic Senate that we would waive a national recruitment initially, because we wanted somebody who had been involved to help us get it organized, but then we would do a national recruitment.

And, of course, when the time came to do the national recruitment, Pat had gotten rather fond of the job. The faculty that he had known and hired in computer science, and computer science and engineering, were very fond of him. We did have a national competition. And although Pat did very well, we hired Steve Kang, who had headed one of the top electrical engineering programs in the country, with a department that was bigger than our whole school will probably ever be, and who had raised millions and millions of dollars, and who had a perspective on this that I thought was rather outstanding. In my perspective, Pat's initiating the school and getting it going was critically important, and then Steve coming and bringing a new perspective was a new maturation. And I am sure there will be additional stages, because now the faculty has more than doubled. I think they are almost at 1500 students. I think it was 1100 when I left. I don't know what it is today. So they've already met most

of the goals that we had set for them. And they've brought in some truly spectacular faculty who will bring a lot of luster to the campus, I'm sure.

Reti: Fantastic.

Greenwood: Yes, now you have an engineer as chancellor, Denice Denton.

Reti: That's right.

Greenwood: It's going to be interesting to see how that goes. But I do think starting the engineering school was a very important event. Having an engineering school attracted a whole group of students to the campus that were just not looking at us earlier, because we didn't have those programs. So it brought a whole new set of students to us. It made us visible in a whole variety of arenas where we hadn't been previously noticed. Parents, particularly some parents of first generation students, took us more seriously than before. Not that we weren't taken seriously. But there was quite a large group of people, and especially a lot of new immigrant students who weren't looking at us seriously because we didn't have engineering. Of course the economics program also built business programs, one of which is joint with the engineering school. So I think we really enlarged our offerings in a set of areas that attracted new students.

And then another amusing story about engineering that I could tell you, is the erection of the new building that just opened. That was very interesting, because our next engineering building was on the list of capital projects for the system. And during Governor Gray Davis's time there was some one-time money that was made available to accelerate capital projects. We had an opportunity to get

on the revenue bond that would accelerate this project. But we were going to have to move like we had never moved before on a building. I had to convince people up here, my predecessor and Dick Atkinson, that we could deliver a building in time to get on this revenue bond. And they were extremely skeptical because of all of the difficulties in the past at Santa Cruz in getting through the EIR process. They said, "There's no way Santa Cruz can do this."

Reti: How long did you have? A couple of years—

Greenwood: Oh, maybe eight months to get finished with the planning project, not the building.

Reti: That's really fast.

Greenwood: But we had decided to go ahead with the building. We had hired an architect. We were in the design phase. The faculty committee had been formed. In fact, some of our own folks had said, "Well, they're probably right. We probably can't do it." And I found out that some in UCSC had effectively told the Office of the President that, "Okay, you're right. We'll back off." I said, "What? We're not backing off with this building." "Well, Chancellor, we're not sure." I said, "We're going to meet these deadlines." And Tom Vani [Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services] said, "Boy, it's going to be tough. It's going to be tough to meet these deadlines." I said, "Tough is not a problem. Impossible you need to tell me about." So we tussled over whether it was tough or impossible. And so I finally said, "I want to do this." I called the president, and I said, "Look. We want to stay on this. If we meet the deadlines, if we get to

the right Regents meetings, if we're ready to go to the public works board on time, we can make it. We want you to keep us on. If you want to put a back-up project in that you would advance if we fail, go ahead, I understand, but we want to be on this bond."¹⁷

So I went over and I talked to the dean of engineering and he said, "We can do this. We can do this." So I went over to the faculty committee, which was meeting with the architects. It was pretty unusual for me to show up at such a meeting. I walked in and I said, "Okay. I have something to talk to you about, and this is a make or break meeting. Here's the situation. Either we make these deadlines, in which case we can be on the revenue bond and we can get the building two years early, or we don't make these deadlines, and we have to wait to see if the voters pass the next bond. And if they don't pass the next bond, it could be as long as four years. So I want to try to get this building done. But let me tell you what it means. It means we design the building fast. We don't make changes. We don't whine about having to work in the evenings or on weekends. We meet the deadlines. And the committee has to be committed to doing this. We have to say once we've made decisions we're not taking them back. We're not going to go through the process that we do with a lot of buildings, where first it's this and then it's that, and no, I really meant this, and no, I want that. And the costs escalate and the project takes longer." Thank goodness I was dealing with engineers, because they understand that. Darrell Long was the chair of the building committee. I just said, "Darrell, people have to be willing to live

¹⁷ See Frank Zwart's oral history for more on the planning and building of the Baskin Engineering Building. Op. Cit.

with the decisions we make, and we have to make them on time. And if we don't, well then we still have a building but we just don't get it for a couple of years." So they did it. They met every benchmark.

While I was chancellor, we actually had a pretty good relationship with the city most of the time. There were a couple of episodes. But one of the things that came out of the parking garage episode was that we got an agreement with the city that they would not oppose our on campus housing or our academic buildings. So we weren't having the kind of huge battles over buildings that had been had in the past. We went through the entire process with the public hearings. But actually, we would get maybe four or five folks who would show up at these meetings with questions and issues, and we'd answer them all and deal with it. But I didn't have any reason to think that this particular building was going to trip off a major demonstration of any kind.

Reti: A big, politicized process.

Greenwood: Yes. And the most dangerous part of it was when we cut down the necessary trees around that area, which we did in August. But once that process got finished, we got the building. It's really a lovely building. It's a lovely building and Mr. Baskin gave some additional money for an auditorium. So I feel that the eight years that I was there as chancellor, we really did get this school on a firm footing. How far it walks and what it does now, will be a challenge for the next chancellor, and those to come.

Reti: Right. But it's absolutely poised to be successful, and tied in with this whole region.

Greenwood: Yes, it's very important. Now Santa Cruz is seen as a serious recruiting ground for the innovative businesses in the Silicon Valley area, and our students are getting good jobs, and good opportunities, and I think that's important.

The Silicon Valley Center

Reti: That brings me to my next topic, which is the Silicon Valley Center, the partnership with NASA. Would you talk about that, please?

Greenwood: Sure. Any reasonable assessment of the anti-growth politics of the city of Santa Cruz and the general area, and the Tidal Wave II and the demographics of the state of California, suggest that there's going to be a collision course over growth. The campus can get only so big in Santa Cruz. From very early on, I recognized that we had to have a more regional approach, and we had to be willing to at least entertain the idea that we would have hubs, that there would be part of the University of California at Santa Cruz that would be physically elsewhere. Silicon Valley was an obvious opportunity, because that's where a lot of the demand for our students would be. It's also where a lot of the opportunities to form both philanthropic and business relations were. And it's also one of the most vibrant, interesting, exciting economies in the world, both from the actual business side, and from studying the new labor movement, studying the interesting social sciences, and even the revitalization of the

humanities, and how the humanities interpret technology. And really, it's a great laboratory. It's a terrific laboratory.

And at some point in the first year or so that I was there, I was visited by Bill Berry, who was at that point, I think, the deputy director at NASA-Ames. I had known Bill from my days in Washington, D.C. as the associate director for science. He came to talk to me about the fact that NASA-Ames was thinking about developing a large project outside of their fence, and that they wanted it to be a research park. They wanted a lead academic institution. Did I have any interest in talking about this? I knew from previous experience in Washington that there had been an effort once before to privatize Ames, and that the University of California had been approached to take it over, and that the package and the terms at the time were not attractive to the then-occupants of this office [UCOP] and elsewhere. But I also understood that if UCSC could form a Silicon Valley Center over there and bring our programs over the hill, and do a number of things, such as establish a really robust relationship with the community colleges, so that we had in-place opportunities for transfer, if we used technology well, and if we built a school of commerce and innovation there, that we would have something that should have been done years and years ago.

But at the time, and it's still true, we were serving something like 50,000 students with our University Extension program over there. There's a *huge* program over there. So there clearly was a need for what the University of California and the University of California at Santa Cruz had to offer over there. We were just not

doing it in a core way. We were doing it in ancillary ways. And so I began the process of trying to discuss with people that we should start thinking about this.

Bill Berry had raised the issue of whether or not we were interested in a partnership. I had clearly begun to recognize that if Santa Cruz was going to have to accommodate more students and we were going to have to plan and not get pigeon-holed as an institution that couldn't grow, that we were going to have to have some alternatives. The two alternatives were over the hill in Silicon Valley and down in Monterey, where we had the Fort Ord property and the opportunity to develop facilities in Fort Ord. I had always thought that the way to do that would be to have a regional collaboration with CSU Monterey Bay as it developed in the Fort Ord area, around research opportunities and businesses.

The Fort Ord property got very exciting for a short time when it looked like the Cisco Systems Corporation was going to develop Coyote Valley. As controversial as that was, had that happened, we would have been sitting in a very nice position to have economic development opportunities, research facilities, or spin-off facilities in the 1500-acres that we had at Fort Ord. Because it would be close enough to Coyote Valley to be a possible strategic location for developing some new businesses. And in that area, Seaside and Marina, they're very anxious to have an economic development plan that brings in high-quality, well-paying jobs. With the base being closed, they are very dependent on tourism and on fairly low-paying service jobs. So this was a real opportunity for them. I also thought at the time, and still do, that eventually we will need some of the space down there to build housing. That the housing market in the Santa Cruz area is

getting so expensive. The Fort Ord property is zoned for housing. There's no reason why it couldn't eventually be of some value in that arena. So I was sort of thinking of a smaller, but regionally very important economic development opportunity in the Monterey area, and potentially, at least one professional school and maybe a series of undergraduate, graduate programs across the hill.

So some of that happened. The way it actualized itself is that we did acquire a building over on the NASA-Ames campus. One of my main objectives as chancellor was to advance the institution's standing nationally. And particularly, I wanted to see it prepare for entry into the AAU [Association of American Universities] universities. Not because being part of the AAU universities is so important, but because the benchmarks that are used to get in to AAU are probably benchmarks you want to meet as an institution anyhow, high quality programs and nationally ranked.

The university had been looking for a vice chancellor for research. The committee surfaced, and we had the opportunity to interview and attract Bob [Robert C.] Miller, who really had done some spectacular programs at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver and at the University of Washington. He was one of the main engineers of the extremely successful research park at UBC and he had run significant innovation efforts at the University of Washington, both institutions with big programs and lots of experience. So we were very fortunate that he was ready to try something new, that he was ready to try a start-up instead of guiding a major ship. So he came and I said, "Look. We have to double

our research budget. And we need to establish something at Ames that is of significance to the university and to the campus.”

That’s when we started negotiating for the University Affiliated Research Center, which is a 330 million dollar contract. At the time, it was the largest competitively awarded proposal that the University of California, not just Santa Cruz, but the University of California had ever had. So that’s changed the profile, and it’s brought some cash to the campus to use for other purposes. It was an objective that was accomplished. The physical facility over there is being used more and more, as I understand it. There was a proposal to try to do an intersegmental set of facilities. That may still get realized in the next capital issue, but I don’t know.

Reti: What does “intersegmental” mean?

Greenwood: Well, working with both CSU and the community colleges to build some educational facilities, classrooms and offices, maybe even laboratories, that could be jointly used. It would be quite an interesting, successful experiment to have classrooms used in a shared facility.

I think building the center out is still a real challenge for the new chancellor. There’s a really strong research hold now with the University Affiliated Research Center (UARC). Santa Cruz is certainly much better recognized in the valley than it ever was before. So that’s where it sits. We have good research connections, some physical facilities, a proposal for a school of commerce, so the future will tell. Of course, subsequently we had budget problems, so when that happens

everything slows down, and that's what's happened, basically. It's there, just like the engineering school. It's incubated. There's a framework there. If somebody wants to revive it as times get a little better, or as circumstances change, I think it may in fact turn out to be one of the greatest assets that Santa Cruz has.

Interdisciplinary Research

Reti: Yes. Other research centers were developed at UCSC during your time period. There is quite a list: Center for Adaptive Optics, STEPS [Science, Technology, Engineering, Policy and Society], Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community, Center for Global and International Regional Studies, Institute for Advanced Feminist Research, Center for Ocean Health. Please talk about those institutes and the vision for them as a whole.

Greenwood: Well, one of the things that I noticed when I came to Santa Cruz, having been in a variety of institutions—I think probably in my earlier sessions [with Jarrell] we talked about how I did my undergraduate education at a very small place, had gone to a very selective place for graduate school, then been in a medical school, gone back to a smaller place, then gone to UC Davis, which is a large, research-intensive campus, then gone back East to Washington, D.C., and then back to Davis briefly, and then on to Santa Cruz.

One of the things that I really noticed when I came to Santa Cruz was that we weren't very good at larger collaborative, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary programs. We had some very successful faculty members, but we, unlike other campuses, did not have a lot of ORUs or MRUs, [Organized Research Units or

Multi-Campus Research Units] and the trend for doing research in the country and globally right now is problem-oriented. It's around problems, projects, and programs, and not around disciplines and departments. And we were just not doing this. We didn't have big grants going in for centers. We didn't think that way. The deans weren't collaborating with each other. It just wasn't happening. And that's where most of the money for research was at the time, whether it was in the humanities, or social sciences, or in the sciences.

Reti: That's so interesting, because we had a history of interdisciplinary commitment, but not in research.

Greenwood: In curriculum. But we weren't doing the research. And we weren't pulling together really powerful groups of people to go out after major program project grants or centers. Before I came, Sandra Faber had given me an earful over the fact that UC Santa Cruz should have competed for (maybe once did compete for) a science and technology center at NSF (National Science Foundation). They hadn't gotten enough administrative support, and they didn't get it. She really thought I should look into that. She knew I knew these things from having spent the years in Washington. I understood the science centers from my experience on the National Science Board. In my first year at UCSC, I was appointed by President Clinton to the National Science Board, which was a six-year appointment. It actually created a little stir in town because it requires a security clearance, and in the process (this is just an aside), but in the process of doing that, it started a rumor that I was already looking for another job. All it was was this simple clearance so that I could get a presidential appointment to

this committee. So anyway, I knew a bit about what was necessary to be successful in a science and technology center. And our astronomy and astrophysics program is probably the best-known and one of the strongest in the country.

So I took it upon myself to really encourage the astronomers to think about how the center worked. Then it became clear that it had to be a broader collaboration, and they got the creative ideas about adaptive optics that sounded really good to me. I encouraged them. I personally got involved in advising them from the perspective of somebody who knew what science and technology centers had to have in order to be successful. I took it on, and really worked on it, and became an active participant in helping them figure out what their strengths were, and how to make the best case. Nationally, there are often one hundred letters of intent, then narrowed down to twenty-some submitted full applications, and the NSF visited five, and the NSF was going to fund two or three. So I actually went to the NSF site visit on campus and spent the entire day, and some others could probably tell you the story, but we were able to make some commitments at the site visit that may have been critical in helping us win the competition.

STEPS and the Center for Ocean Health were faculty-led proposals stimulated by either Jim Gill, or Bob Miller, and Burney Le Boeuf, in terms of getting people together to talk about big ideas we might work on, and then go out and try to solicit various types of funding. The Center for Ocean Health successfully got the new facility. That was something I did actively participate in, trying to help get the additional funding from the Packard Foundation to build that facility.

Because when I first arrived, the folks had been working for a long time trying to get what is now the Seymour Marine Discovery Center and they needed the additional research facility (Center for Ocean Health).

Reti: I know. That was a long battle.

Greenwood: Oh, that was such a complex situation. When I arrived, we had a project. We had an architect. We had a little bit of money. Probably we were going to be able to raise the money for the Discovery Center. But we didn't own the land. The land was held by the holding company that owned the property formerly known as Terrace Point. And they were trying to use the university in their campaign to promote the development they wanted to put there.

Reti: Housing.

Greenwood: Yes, we had a little interesting confrontation in which, up until shortly before I was supposed to go in front of the microphone and introduce Jean-Michel Cousteau, they hadn't delivered the deed. And I said, "You said you were going to convey the deed. And you're going to do it, or I'm not going to do what I said I was going to do." So we ended up getting the deed to the property, and once that happened we were able to move ahead, and we got the lovely gift from Mr. Seymour. And that then helped Gary Griggs with the Packard Foundation, to solicit another major gift for the Center for Ocean Health. We

have great marine scientists and they put together an excellent program and we were able to sell it. They still need more money.¹⁸

STEPS came out of a very serious series of discussions about what the University of California at Santa Cruz could do that would be uniquely different and build on our strengths in this interdisciplinary area of science, technology, engineering, and policy. I think they made a very credible case. They still haven't gotten the big, big, big program grant or donation yet, but they've certainly pulled the sciences together and they're now doing some very good collaborative work. They've gotten money from NSF and other places, so I think it's doing very well.

The Center for Advanced Feminist Research. When I first came to UC Santa Cruz, one of the things I knew about it was that we had some of the best feminists in the country at Santa Cruz. But they were, by and large, not a terribly cohesive group. I thought, this is the best group of feminist researchers in the country. We live in a county where there are more women than men. This is a perfect opportunity to make a public interface. I kept pushing for that, some kind of a UC Santa Cruz study of the new American woman, or whatever. That never really happened. But what did come out of it was the Center for Advanced Feminist Research, which has catalyzed some really good people coming to the

¹⁸ For more on the development of the Center for Ocean Health and the Seymour Marine Discovery Center see Sarah Rabkin, Interviewer and Editor, *From the Ground Up: Gary Griggs as Researcher, Teacher, and Institution-Builder* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2012) <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/griggs>

campus and some good conferences. I think it's really in a leadership position nationally.¹⁹

Reti: It's very exciting. Helene Moglen is very dynamic.

Greenwood: She's doing a lot with it. I expect that will be one of the signature pieces of the campus. And I'm glad that I did my little bit to push it along, and even a little personal philanthropy here and there. I hear it's going well. I just haven't been back in a while. What are the other ones?

Reti: The Center for Global, International, and Regional Studies. And the Center for Justice, Tolerance, and Community.

Greenwood: Well, the Center for Justice, Tolerance, and Community was a really important thing to do. It was our post-Prop 209 way of trying to address, in a scholarly way, what Manuel Pastor called "Relative, Rigorous, and Real Research." And issues of real public concern. I hope that it gets the support that it needs, because it's really a very worthy project, and it was very important to the two new colleges.

Two New Colleges: Nine and Ten and Thoughts on the UCSC College System

Reti: Okay. So let's talk about the two new colleges.

Greenwood: The two new colleges. First, Colleges Nine and Ten had been proposed and they had essentially been affirmed. UCSC was prepared to build

¹⁹ For more on the Center for Advanced Feminist Research see Helene Moglen's oral history, *op. cit.*

them when Karl Pister was chancellor, and in fact, started building them. And apparently in his era, if you look back at his oral history, there was the “Elf Land” controversy. Well, when I got there the university had to back off of the project because of shortfall funding, and also the enrollment at UC Santa Cruz had taken a dip, and we weren’t sure that we could support the facility. We didn’t have the finances to support it. Of course, after I came, we really started getting hit hard with the increased enrollment pressure of Tidal Wave II, and it turned out that there were several millions of dollars sunk in the ground already. All the utility and water lines were in the ground and a lot of the leveling of the ground was already done. But then UCSC had not been able to move forward on the colleges.

So there were two issues. One was that we were going to need the housing. That was clear, because we were being asked to grow and take more students, so we were going to have to have the housing. And then there was the issue that we needed to develop the programs for the two colleges. Some of that had been worked out, but not thoroughly. So we had to do two things. One was to revitalize the programmatic planning for the two colleges, which we did by putting together faculty committees and deciding what the themes of the colleges would be, and Student Affairs and the dean of undergraduate affairs did their bit of figuring out what services were going to be in the colleges. Also the work of Deana Slater and a couple of others to be the lead Students Affairs officers in charge, etc., was critical.

Reti: Was that the *Report of the Advisory Group to the UCSC Colleges in 2000*?

Greenwood: Yes, that's right. But then we had the actual construction issues. And that resulted in us building the college backwards, because we had an approved design, and regental approval to build the apartments as part of the college. It isn't the way you would normally do it. But we had to move fairly quickly. Two things had to happen. One was, initially we had all of the infrastructure in, and we needed to do something about housing. My objective with the city was to try to be honorable and honest, and to at least try to stay even with our housing as we were dealing with growth. And we were basically able to do that.

One day Francisco Hernandez and Tom Vani came in and said, "We need 150 new beds, and we need them fast." We had started a program within the city, with the motels, the "Slug Partnership" program. It actually was a real boon to these hotel owners who had to let their staff go when they were off-season. That's when we needed the housing. We always needed the housing in the fall through the winter quarter. By the end of winter quarter, we usually had either students moving off campus, or they were on Education Abroad, or—

Our housing census always peaked in November and dropped by the end of March. We often had empty beds in April. You can't force the students to stay on campus any longer than they want. Some of them encourage their parents to pay for a housing contract while they go find some other place to live. So with the Slug Partnership we were able to provide to these hotel owners a way of providing housing for our students and keeping their staff employed from October to April. That program worked pretty well, but there was a limit to it.

And there was a limit to how many students were willing to live that way and to parents who liked it. We don't mind having juniors and seniors doing something like that, but we weren't so thrilled about having freshmen and sophomores living in motels.

So we did everything we could. We leased the Holiday Inn. Then it became clear that we still had to do something. We decided to go ahead with a project to buy "The Village," the temporary housing. It's not really temporary. I think I heard that one out of three houses in the United States today is built this way. So they're very sturdy buildings. Francisco said, "We've got all the infrastructure and we'll put them in. They'll be there for five years. By then we'll get ready to build College Nine and Ten."

So we did it, thinking the prefab housing would be there five years and it would give us plenty of time. Well, of course it wasn't, because the system moved up our enrollment targets very quickly. So we said, we've got to start *building* Nine and Ten. We had approval to build the apartments, so we redesigned the apartments. We had to go back for financing, because it was three times more expensive than it was when it was originally designed. So we did that. And then we designed and got approved the rest of the college complex, the main College Nine and then College Ten buildings.

And somewhere along the line, I don't remember all the details here, the issue of a faculty club came up again, the proverbial, "Where's the faculty club? Chancellor Sinsheimer set aside a million dollars two decades ago, and where's our faculty club?" So this came up. We even considered my moving out of

University House and finding something else in town, and turning University House into a faculty club.

Then we did some studies on what is happening to faculty clubs around the country. They're mostly having financial issues. They're being heavily subsidized because the faculty just don't eat there enough and spend enough to keep it going. So we had a committee, which I think George Brown headed up at one point, to look at ways we could do a faculty club. At one point we were thinking about using the Student Center, taking that over as a potential faculty club, and then the students went berserk on that one. Finally, (and I don't remember all the details here) but finally we hit on an idea, that actually was at least partly stimulated by my visiting the Covell Village Commons in UCLA, which is also a housing complex, but it holds a conference center. It's quite nice. I thought, if we could put another floor on the College Nine and Ten dining facility, we could have a University Club, a club for staff and faculty, for events and meetings. And the worst thing that could happen is that if it fails College Nine and Ten will have additional conference and classroom space. That's the worst that could happen, in the final analysis. The only problem with it is that parking is not a good situation.²⁰

Reti: That's true.

Greenwood: You have to park and walk, or park and shuttle. But you can't get everything.

²⁰ For more on the planning of College Nine and Ten and the University Center, see Frank Zwart's oral history, *op. cit.*

Reti: It's a beautiful space. I love going there.

Greenwood: It's gorgeous. I love it too. And we decided that we were going to push for that, because the campus had no place like that. Many events had to be held at the chancellor's house because there was no place else to hold the event. So *everything* got held there. And it was very expensive to do it that way. It certainly was hard on me. I mean, we had 8000, 9000 people through the house every year. Jeff and Jonathan sometimes had to manage ten to fifteen events a week. So when you hear these stories about how the carpeting had to be replaced, etc., that's why.

Reti: It was trampled to death.

Greenwood: Yes. People spill things. They step on things. We recarpet the student dormitories, I think, every three years. These are the costs of maintenance in high-traffic areas.

So I was grateful, because we were able to start doing some events at the new center. And we were able to provide a dining room that staff and others could go to, where we could have classy events. We could do our fundraising dinners there. It's one of my favorite spaces, and I'm very proud of the fact that I was able to make a little personal donation and that the foyer is named after my grandchildren. That was kind of fun.

And so College Nine and Ten got put in place. Then there were issues over what would be the programs. That's when it became important to locate the Center for Justice, Tolerance, and Community in one of those colleges, and for it to have

some fellowships for students who were involved in those colleges. So far as I can tell it's quite successful, especially given that we've had a lot of budget constrictions.

I just loved opening two new colleges. It was such a wonderful experience. And Clark Kerr—before he died he came to visit the campus. The emeriti had invited him to talk. So I asked him, "Would you like to go see the new colleges?" He said, "Oh—" I said, "Come on, Clark. Let me take you up and show you what we're doing." College Nine was there. The buildings were there. It was coming together. College Ten was still rising. The dining hall was beginning to look like a real dining hall. But it was still clearly a construction site. College Nine and Ten got their academic buildings first, Social Sciences I and II. Then it got its apartments. And then it got its heart. (laughs) It was kind of a crazy way to build it, but it worked. It got done.

So I took him up, and there was some kind of a backhoe or something, and we got out of the car and we sort of walked in between the colleges. And these tears formed in his eyes. He said, "You know, you're still pioneering." I said, "Yes, we still are. We are still building a story, and UC Santa Cruz is an extraordinary institution. It's unlike most public universities. And that's at least, in part, your doing." Sure, we haven't kept the image, all of the pieces that Dean McHenry imagined, but some very critical core components which make us distinctly different are still here, and one of them is the colleges. So he was pleased.

Reti: That's very touching.

Greenwood: Yes, it was. It was very touching.

Reti: To be able to maintain that vision which was so unique, but to be innovative, too.

Greenwood: Yes. Well, one of the things I said when I was at Santa Cruz was that you have to respect your roots. But you can't be afraid to flower. And you can't be afraid that the plant will look a little different as it grows.

Reti: It has to. Forty years later, it has to.

Greenwood: If somebody had been willing to provide enough money to keep a ten-to-one faculty-student ratio, we probably could have maintained some of the things we did in the first ten years. But nobody is going to give that to a public university today, and you just have to be the best you can be, and still be distinctive. And be proud of *that*. And don't worry about the fact that, gee, it would have been great if we could have had everything that we had forty years ago. We've got some things we didn't have forty years ago, like a fabulous research program.

Reti: Which we absolutely need to be part of the University of California.

Greenwood: Yes, and a new engineering school, and two new colleges. The only thing that disappointed me about the opening of the two new colleges was that it should have been even more of a national event. I mean, who has opened two new undergraduate colleges in the 21st century? Well, maybe now UC Merced.

Reti: But outside of that. Why don't you think it was newsworthy?

Greenwood: To be honest with you, I don't think the UC system knows how to play that up, as a system. So the campuses have to do it themselves and we're in a fairly small media market. So I think, as much as anything, that's the reason.

Reti: Yes. Now, in relation to the colleges, there was also this proposal for "One CAO [College Administrative Officer], Two Colleges," having closer ties between the academic divisions and the colleges. Was this all part of that period?

Greenwood: Well, no, I think that sort of evolved. I think as we got more and more into academic planning, we realized how constrained our resources were going to be. And also something that was, and I think still is a big issue for Santa Cruz—the core courses and the undergraduate advising of the colleges were becoming increasingly disconnected from the full-time, ladder-line faculty. We were getting into a situation where the part-time faculty and some well-qualified instructional faculty were basically handling the first year or so of the curriculum. The advising in the colleges was not well connected with the major advising. The divisions were beginning to divorce themselves from undergraduate education, particularly at the general education level. That's a real problem. When the faculty get in the colleges they love it. But you've got to find a way to get them into the colleges. So a lot of things were discussed. One was more of an alliance, so that a dean of a division would feel that they also had responsibility for the success of the colleges, so that they would put their best faculty forward as provosts, and they would be interested in the quality of education. And we might even set up some successful internal competition over whose programs were most interesting, or most attractive.

The other thing was to put research opportunities in the colleges. CJTC was a good example of that. Get it in the colleges. I wanted the Institute for Advanced Feminist Research to be in one, too, so that the students are there and see it on a day-to-day basis.

You can offer extra things in the colleges, some speakers. CJTC, for example, ran a couple of dynamite seminar series. The one I remember was the Palestinian-Israeli dialogue. They were one of the sponsors of that. You do that in the colleges, instead of over in some other hall someplace. You begin an intellectual dialogue in the colleges, not just in the core course, but with some more faculty members. You do things—and Marty Chemers had really good ideas about this—you make research money available, and some of it is for undergraduates to do research out of those centers. So you are constantly keeping at least a moderately sized group of students actively involved with faculty members in research, so that students are always engaged in the institutions. Because the colleges really were devolving into Student Affairs, a co-curricular environment, and a core course that some thought had not been reviewed in a very long time, and I agreed with that. It had become one of the third rails of politics at UCSC.

Reti: Absolutely. It had become symbolic as the last vestige of the college system at UCSC.

Greenwood: Well, it symbolized that one was either for or against the colleges. That is not a very productive discussion. Because the colleges as they currently exist are not the colleges Dean McHenry imagined. He would have been horrified that the core courses were being taught primarily by faculty who didn't

have permanent status at the institution. He would not have been happy about that. And on the other hand, without divisional buy-in to the colleges, some of your most vital faculty were unwilling to participate because they didn't see it as a priority for their division. So the idea was to try to repair that with some experiments.

And that's why College Nine and Ten being associated with the Social Sciences Division was an experiment. It was a successful experiment when I left. I don't know whether it still is or not. The provost there reported to Marty Chemers. So he was both an associate dean of social sciences and the provost. I thought it was looking like it was a better arrangement than it was before. We were beginning to get higher-quality applications and interest in becoming provost, which had really dropped to the point where we were begging people to do it.

I think that was a very important discussion. It still needs to be had. It's not quite finished. You know, what can we *really* do with these colleges? And there's a huge backlog, which I didn't realize but I learned about as time went by, a very large backlog of senate regulations that have to do with colleges' authorities and responsibilities. They haven't been reviewed in years, and by and large it's policy on the books that's neither gone or applied. Someday it's going to come back and haunt the institution, I'm sure. So there was a lot of discussion that needed to be done. And we started it.

Reti: I think the question has always been: how do you reward faculty through the tenure process for being involved in the colleges?

Greenwood: Well, you reward them in the same way for any other kind of academic involvement, advising, any of the sorts of things they do. You just make it clear that it's important. That's why the divisional connection could be very important. Because then your dean is going to say something about the role that you played in helping to develop the curriculum for the freshmen, or an important course you taught, or the fact that you've got a group of those students involved in your research. You can't do that if the person who is doing all that coursework doesn't really report to anybody.

Reti: Absolutely. That was exactly the problem.

Greenwood: Yes, and it's also hard to raise money for the colleges when it's not clear to people what the connection with the curricular material is. You can raise money for them as great co-curricular environments, and great places for students, and good experiences. But it would be good if you had solid academic and research programs, beyond the core course, that sustained them. That's where we were headed. Didn't get all the way there, but we made some progress, at least made people talk about the colleges again, in a non-confrontational way. There certainly were people who felt we were trying to undermine the colleges. That was not what we were trying to do. I was trying to strengthen the colleges. I came from teaching in a small liberal arts college, where I really understood that environment, and understood why one needs ladder-line faculty in the colleges talking to students in their freshman year about their majors.

Narrative Evaluation System

Reti: Can we talk about the Narrative Evaluation System, and the decision to go to a letter grade system at UC Santa Cruz?

Greenwood: Oh sure. What would you like to know about it?

Reti: In fall 2001, letter grades became mandatory in undergraduate courses. I know that there was a lot of controversy about that issue.

Greenwood: Well, this was actually placed right where it should be, with the faculty. I think if you look back, I assiduously stayed away from saying what my own viewpoint was on this.

Reti: Yes, it's true that when I was doing research for this interview I couldn't find anything about your viewpoint.

Greenwood: No, you wouldn't have found anything about my viewpoint, because my attitude was that I was proud of the faculty for taking on their responsibilities. They *are* responsible for the evaluation of students, and for setting the standards, and for deciding what to do. I would never have stimulated this discussion, even though I did, in fact, have deep reservations about the trouble that our Narrative Evaluation System was probably going to eventually put us in. We were in the situation where we had narrative evaluations, but when students needed grades we translated those narrative evaluations into grades. And sooner or later somebody was going to translate some faculty member's narrative evaluation into a grade that the faculty member

didn't agree with. There was going to be an issue over: how do we do this? I saw it as a potential problem. As the classes got bigger and the population got bigger, how you do narrative evaluations that are meaningful in large classes?

And the other thing that was absolutely clear at the time was that we had numerous delinquent faculty members. I had letters on my desk every year from parents saying, "It's six months after the end of the term and my son/daughter does not have narrative evaluations. How are they supposed to know whether or not they are ready for the next class?" All of these are important issues. And the senate, by and large, was not really willing to take aggressive enforcement activity, although we did start doing things like posting lists of people who had more than x numbers of outstanding evaluations. Some faculty will act on that, some ignore it.

So the whole issue of what is the best evaluation system for students came up. Of course, the battle was cast as: for or against narrative evaluations. In fact, it was really not negative on the narrative evaluations. It was insisting on grades as well. Now, some will say, and it may turn out, that it will be the demise of the Narrative Evaluation System. While I was still there, that wasn't true. Students were getting both. And we were getting touted nationally as having one of the most serious and effective student evaluation systems in the country. I still think it's true that even if you have a class of 300 students and you are using a matrix to do the evaluation, where you are basically going into some of the software programs where you can give a student in certain areas, at least some information, it's still better than getting just an A, or a B, or a C. You know you

got the A because the professor was really impressed with your lab performance, or this or that, or everything was very good. But it's better.

Reti: It's more information.

Greenwood: It's much more information. So my attitude toward it was, this is a faculty issue. I'm not going to take sides on this. I will say that I think that narrative evaluations are performance evaluations, and if we had said that early on it might have been easier for people to understand what we were doing, instead of, "Well, we don't give grades." If we had called them performance evaluations that would have been much easier for people to understand than narrative evaluations, which is a very—

Reti: Right, what does that even mean?

Greenwood: If you don't know education-ese, you wouldn't even be able to guess. But 'performance evaluation' you would understand, because if you work at a job, you can—

Reti: It's a business term.

Greenwood: It's a business term and people get it. They understand that their sons and daughters are getting a performance evaluation. There were issues related to some students having difficulty with graduate schools. There really wasn't much evidence. By and large, our students do about as well as anybody else getting into graduate schools, and better than some getting into medical schools, etc. So I wasn't convinced on that ground. I was convinced that there

were certain scholarships and fellowships that if you don't have a GPA you're just not eligible for. And those were the areas where we were trying to be helpful to our students, and we were basically giving them a GPA.

So the faculty fought it out. I basically watched with some detached amusement. My own personal view, but I never did express this at the time, is that there is value to both. And that if you could sustain grades and narratives, you would, in fact, be a leader nationally. Sustaining the narrative evaluations in certain areas, for example, arts and humanities, probably would be a sane thing to do, probably more meaningful. But it's probably not so meaningful in engineering and the sciences. People aren't going to read it. They want to know, did you make an A or a B? So I thought it was an interesting battle. I wasn't surprised how it came out. But I didn't give the faculty any help on that one at all. I let them have to deal with the students. And as you know, the students had very strong opinions, and they locked the faculty out of the Academic Senate.

Reti: They did?

Greenwood: The faculty was about to have the Academic Senate meeting, and the students locked us out. It canceled the senate meeting. On the one hand, I had folks yelling in one ear, "Arrest these students. How dare they do this? You have to take some action, Chancellor. This is a violation of our academic freedom. You need to be decisive here!" On the other hand, I have others saying [calm voice], "Well now, the students have certainly let us know how they feel. We just need to move the senate meeting, and next time we need to find a way to be sure that they can't lock us out."

So I've got this going in this ear, and that going in the other ear, and people just screaming at each other. Of course, some of the students and faculty were yelling at each other fairly loudly, too. In any case, we didn't have a senate meeting. Then it had to be moved, and it was moved to another facility, where we were able to ensure that we could keep the doors open, and that people could get in the building. The faculty voted to make the grades mandatory. Very interestingly, that particular year there was lots of brouhaha. A little bit the next year. I have heard or seen virtually nothing since then.

Reti: About the narrative evaluations.

Greenwood: Yes.

Reti: No, it really hasn't been an issue.

Greenwood: And the alumni haven't made an issue of it. I don't know what the current situation with the narratives is, whether or not people are getting them in, or whether there's been a drop off and no enforcement. I just don't know. But I co-taught a class for the Chancellor's Internship Program for seven of the eight years that I was there, and we had to do all the narrative evaluations. So I did them all, along with grades.

That was a historically significant moment, I think, for those who have followed the history of that issue at Santa Cruz.

Reti: Oh, yes.

Greenwood: I don't doubt for a second, though, that it made us more attractive to lot of low-income and first generation kids. Those families understand grades. They don't understand anything else. They want their kids to go someplace where they can say what they did in what they consider to be normal terms. When Santa Cruz was originally founded, to be honest with you, the first several classes were full of a lot of very smart, pretty middle-class kids, many of them looking for a counterculture experience. And some of the faculty were, too.

Student Activism

Reti: What was your general approach to student activism?

Greenwood: Talk to them. My general approach to student activism is: *I was one of those!* (laughter) If they actually knew much about early activism, they would be a lot worse to deal with. Because some of the stuff we did was much worse than anything they ever did to me. But my general attitude towards student activism is that these are often some of the students who are going to be very important alumni. Not all. But many of them. Because they're the students that care. They're the students that really care about issues. You run into some sour apples in any group of people, who just generally hate authority, and it doesn't matter what you say, or how you say it, or whether you're right or wrong. You're the enemy, and you will be trashed. But by and large, I found that student activists were usually very interesting students. They cared about issues. They were informed on issues. They wanted to talk, and they wanted to be taken seriously. My general attitude toward student activism was to take them seriously. So I took them seriously. I would show up where they didn't expect

me, and sit down and talk to them. One of the approaches that I took was to try to de-demonize myself by basically being accessible and talking to students, and letting them know that I actually cared about what they were interested in, and that there were some issues I could solve, and some I couldn't.

For example, the night that Proposition 209 passed I spent the night at Oakes College with the students, watching the election returns, talking about what we could and couldn't do. When it was clear they were going to demonstrate, I did everything I could to find out how and why and where, so that we could handle it. We did handle it pretty well. I never had to arrest a student for activism or demonstrations, not once in the eight years I was there. There were students arrested, but mostly by the police for doing something illegal, not because they were demonstrating. Now, there have been some arrested since then, and there were some arrested before. But I always tried to deal with it.

I remember the first time the protestors were going to close the campus. I think it was during the Proposition 209 election. I was talking with the Student Affairs staff and they were saying, "They're going to close the campus. What are we going to do?" And I said, "Well, what time are they going to start?" They said, "Six o'clock." I said, "Fine. We'll be at the bottom of the hill with donuts and coffee. These kids are really hurting. This is something that really matters to them. So we're going to go down there. We're going to be with them, and we're going to feed them, and we're going to talk to them, and we're going to try to persuade them to keep our entrances open enough that I don't have to take an action." And that's what we did. That worked. At least that time it worked.

I've always enjoyed students. I was a student activist when I was young. I was a very active student activist.

Reti: In what kinds of movements?

Greenwood: Oh. The anti-Vietnam war. I went on the peace marches and I did lots of things on the campus that I was on.

Reti: Was that Vassar?

Greenwood: Yes, Vassar, and then also when I was in the city. I was at Rockefeller, but I participated in some things at Columbia and NYU. And some groups that were—

Reti: Oh, okay. I get the picture. (laughs)

Greenwood: So what else is on your list?

Graduate Students at UCSC

Reti: The graduate college. I know it's a little jump backwards. You said that was one of your disappointments.

Greenwood: It was one of my disappointments, yes. I really thought that since Santa Cruz is focused on colleges, a graduate college could be very positive. And one of things the graduate students told me when I first got there, and I'm sure it's still true, is that they don't have an identity. They come in and all the forms at UCSC say, "Check your college." Cowell, whatever. Many of them felt like they were sort of an appendage to a department. We have many student services, but

none of them were focused on graduate students. So I mentioned that there are places around the country where there is a graduate college. All the graduate students belong to the graduate college. And the graduate college has programs. It has resources. We need more housing anyhow, so why don't we build a graduate college, and have a focus there, and make the provost of the graduate college the dean of graduate education or graduate studies. And basically give our graduate students a feeling of community, and a feeling of place, and a sense of importance that they don't feel right now. Because Santa Cruz's graduate population is still small.²¹

Reti: I just finished graduate school here. I really experienced that isolation.

Greenwood: What program?

Reti: History.

Greenwood: History, yes. So I still think it's a great concept, and I was more than prepared to implement it virtually, to basically just declare that we're forming a graduate college, all the graduate students will be part of it, and there will be programs. My idea was just try it. And then if you can get the physical embodiment, fine, if the money comes along. Then you get the graduate students involved in planning what they would like to see. There's a very good proposal for a graduate college. And it should be implemented. Or at least it should be thought about, because I think any institution that decides that they can have a coherent set of services and programs for graduate students has some value

²¹ In 2005, UCSC had 1338 graduate students out of a total student enrollment of 14,495. See <http://planning.ucsc.edu/irps/historicalData/HeadcountEnrollmentHistory.pdf>

added. What do I mean by value added? Well, for example, it would be very useful for some of our graduate students to have easy access to certificates in a business area, to certificates in instructional technology, to certificates in advanced college teaching. There are lots of things that no department would ever offer.

Reti: Right. Which would be a really strong, practical component of a graduate education.

Greenwood: Yes, programs that you could electively take, and which would prepare you for alternate careers. If you wanted, for example, to become a faculty member in a comprehensive university like CSU, or a community college, or a four-year institution, these programs would be advantages for you to have. You might get lucky and be really great at instructional technology, and you might also be a graduate student in a department where if they can get a Powerpoint presentation together it's a big deal. And you're going to be applying for jobs where one of the questions they're going to ask you is, "How are you going to use instructional technology?" and you don't actually have a clue.

I also thought that we could use our graduate college to focus on summer session, because in summer session graduate students can be the instructor of record. So we could have developed a program where, instead of it being—our summer session doesn't have as many ladder-line faculty and courses are taught by graduate students—that you turned it into an opportunity for advanced graduate students to have a course of their own, develop their own curriculum, have a few mentor faculty members who are paid to be there in the summer time

and who are not only teaching a course, but mentoring. And do the things you would want to do to build a teaching portfolio for graduate students. And give them the supplementary income. You could pay them better under those circumstances. I thought, especially for the students in the arts and humanities and social sciences, it might be a very helpful thing. Because if you could pay students more in the summer, then maybe they could take more time off when they are trying to write their dissertation or do their final research.

Reti: Oh, yes. That would be fantastic.

Greenwood: I still think something needs to be done to really make graduate education at Santa Cruz vital, and make those students feel that they're as important, or maybe even more important in some ways, than the large numbers of undergraduates, as much as I love them. It needs to be a serious part of the way Santa Cruz looks to the outside. And a college is perfect, since we have colleges for everything else. So why not a graduate college? The graduate students really wanted it. Now, I don't know. Maybe Chancellor Denice Denton will be able to make it happen. Or something that's her version.

Reti: Why didn't it happen while you were at UCSC?

Greenwood: Well, I think a combination of reasons. First of all, we didn't have a strong graduate dean. When I first got there we had a part-time graduate dean. Jim Gill was sort of doing both research and graduate dean. And then we appointed Frank Talamantes, and he, unfortunately, although a wonderful human being, was not able to get the support. The faculty were only moderately

interested. He was never able to really get the program rolling. Then, because of the budget crisis, we had to administratively recombine graduate studies and research. So the graduate college effort never had the leadership that it needed. It didn't have a champion. None of these things ever happen if you don't have a champion, and it didn't. The graduate students wanted more. Katie Flint, a graduate student, really stuck with the development of the Graduate Commons, and got it built when she was a graduate student. I don't know how many years of her graduate degree it cost her, but she put her heart and soul into that, and that wouldn't be there today if it hadn't been for Katie, who worked her heart out on that. She's an astrophysics graduate student, too. And she is doing very well. She worked to get a place for graduate students, small, but there.²² But to do a graduate college would have required, not just student and administrative support, but faculty support.

Reti: Yes, it is really good that the Graduate Commons is there.

Greenwood: So I don't know. I think it just didn't happen because there were too many things on the agenda. Didn't really have a champion. We needed a good, strong graduate dean who wanted to rally the graduate students and work the faculty members, and figure out how to do it without making the deans feel like we were stepping on their turf, or the undergraduates feel like we were doing too much for graduate students. It just needed something more than I alone was able to give it. So I was disappointed. If I had stayed for a couple of more years I probably would have made that one of my top priorities.

²² For more on the building of the Graduate Student Commons see Frank Zwart's oral history, *op. cit.*

Key Staff Appointments

Reti: Let's talk about some of your key appointments, and also which staff were particularly helpful to you during your time at UCSC.

Greenwood: Well, let's start with the close-in chancellor's office staff question first. Of course, it really is true—it takes a village to staff a chancellor. It really does. And when you talk about staff, there are staff in so many units that individually helped me in various cases. But the one I would talk about first would be Judi Hance [now Tessier]. Truthfully, I think that Judi Hance should be given a great deal of credit for my successes as chancellor (I wouldn't blame her for my failures), because when I arrived as chancellor—actually, even before I arrived as chancellor, Judi started mentoring me, breaking in the chancellor, teaching me about the mores of the University of California at Santa Cruz.

Reti: She had been here under Chancellor Pister.

Greenwood: I was her third chancellor. She had worked for Robert Stevens at the end of his term. She worked for Karl Pister the entire time. And she worked for me the entire time that I was chancellor. She had worked for the University of California at Santa Cruz since she was eighteen years old, except for a short break, I think after a divorce or something, where she worked at Spanish Bay for a year, or maybe two. And she, of course, had done everything from the steno pool when she started, to managing the psychology department, to being the chancellor's executive assistant. No one really understands what that job means and how important it is that the person in that job knows what they're doing,

because they are really the access point for the chancellor. They are the one who has to have the guts to walk in and say to the chancellor, "I'm really sorry. But you have to take this other appointment." Or, "Don't do this. Don't see this person without talking to so-and-so." They see your unguarded moments and must be totally confidential.

She was also very good at enforcing process, not allowing end-runs into me, without people having done what they were supposed to do before they came in to see me. But on top of all that, she was really a colleague, and now that I'm not chancellor any more, we're friends, as well. I could say to her, "Well, how do we decide who puts the flag at half mast?" She always knew the answers to these questions. And she had a set of skills that you don't find anymore. Judi took dictation, which turned out to be an extraordinary, valuable skill sometimes because she could get in the car with me and we could get a lot done on the way to an appointment. She was indefatigable. She kept my hours. She was often there when I got there in the morning and she was usually leaving after me at night. It's amazing what she knew, and what she knew about how to find out who knew what.

I found her probably to be a critically important direct staff person, although there were other people in the Office of the Chancellor, other staff members who were very good, and certainly did things directly for me. For example, Leslie Sunell, who was the assistant chancellor, had worked for me at UC Davis. We had an open search that, after looking at several very good candidates, unanimously recommended her. I might have chosen her anyhow, since I had

had the additional experience of having worked with her at Davis, and knew how professional she was. As the assistant chancellor, she had specific responsibilities, but that's the person who has to be there to do things when things get tough, when you've got to figure out how you're going to deal with a complicated faculty issue, or there's a whistleblower complaint, or there's something that needs to be handled very confidentially but well. She was exceptionally competent and critically important.

There were two other special assistants who were invaluable. One was Joyce Justus. Joyce is a long-term UC veteran who began her administrative career as a faculty assistant to Dick Atkinson at UCSD. She worked for years at UCOP and then came to work in the White House as assistant director of social sciences, when I was associate director. When she returned to California, she agreed to work with me on intersegmental relations and diversity. She accomplished much for UCSC and I treasured her advice. Another was Karen Kovacs (now North) who came to work for me on national policy issues. I was elected as AAAS [American Association for the Advancement of Science] president and had other national roles, and she had worked as an AAAS fellow in the White House. She did a superb job of keeping me current, moving projects, and coauthoring several well-received policy pieces.

And there was Lynda Rannals, who was on the front desk most of the time that I was chancellor. Lynda played a very important role in the office because she's a very upbeat person. She was always very good with whatever came in the door. And you never know—chancellor's offices, dean's offices, for that matter, can be

dangerous places. People do come in very angry. And they can and sometimes do really bizarre things. That did not happen when I was chancellor. We did have an episode when I was at UC Davis that was alarming. Not in my office, but it had happened on the campus. We had to go through the whole drill of getting our staff to understand the real danger signs and having a gate that locked so that people couldn't get back into the office without pushing a button. Unfortunately, this has only gotten worse nationally—

So anyhow, Judi was perfect for me. Leslie Sunell had a wonderful combination of having a PhD from UC Irvine, having had the experience of being an assistant dean at UC Davis, had a lot of ombudsperson skills, and had done some amazing things. She also had had experience in her position in Hawaii of running an archival system, and building one. So she understood records, the importance of moving into technology and records. On top of all that, she had a really good grasp of how faculty behaved, both well and badly, and how to handle senate issues. She was extremely valuable to me.

Then of course there were members of the Student Affairs staff whom I really came to depend on. I got to know Gesna Clarke pretty well when we were doing the United Way campaign. And gosh. (sigh) Lots of folks.

Reti: I know it's impossible to talk about everybody.

Greenwood: It is. Let me just say that I think I had a really good relationship with staff, even though there were union issues of various and sundry kinds. Any time I would do the brown bag lunches with the staff, which basically were

sort of an open grilling session, most of the time I would get at least a dozen or so little emails back from staff saying that they were very pleased that I was willing to openly answer questions, and they didn't want me to be embarrassed, and they didn't want me to stop having them. I always felt really good about that. In addition to the sort of: push the button and you get fifty union letters saying, "Why aren't you bargaining in good faith?" The orchestrated stuff that is now part of Labor Relations. Not that I don't think that there are real issues, but there's a certain kind of email that you get which is not very flattering, that you get about fifty exact duplicates of whenever there's a critical point in the negotiation. But even with that, I would run into people who had sent me one of those letters and they would say, "I hope you're not mad at me for sending that letter." I would say, "No, you have a right to express your opinion and I'm doing the best I can. It may not be good enough for you, but I'm trying to do the best I can here." And they would be good about it.

Maybe that's enough about staff. The other was critical appointments.

Reti: Deans and vice chancellors.

Greenwood: Well, as you probably know, or certainly as was the case, UC Santa Cruz had a reputation for being a "difficult to govern campus."

Reti: Yes, I certainly know that.

Greenwood: It had a reputation for that, and almost every chancellor who followed Dean McHenry had some vote of no-confidence either threatened or done. Karl Pister had some issues. But it was actually Michael Tanner that the

senate at that point was actively engaged in trying to unseat when I arrived. But it never happened. I worked very well with Michael. He did a huge amount to help me understand the institution and the history of various issues. A very dedicated man. He really cared about the institution. And in fact, as we worked together situations got lots better. And then, I think it was two years later when he said, "You know, I've been doing this job or some configuration of it for ten years. I need a break. I think you're well enough launched, and I'm ready to do something different. So you need to search for an executive vice chancellor."

I decided at that point that we needed to recruit an external executive vice chancellor, that one of the issues with Santa Cruz was that it was in its adolescence and it was sort of stuck there. We needed to bring in somebody who had been in a bigger institution, who knew what was possible, and who didn't have any preconceived notions of how you could get something done at Santa Cruz. I realized that was also dangerous because there is always the possibility when you bring in somebody from the outside that they don't know the culture and it's a terrible disaster.

We had several very good candidates. They were all outside of UC Santa Cruz. A couple of the top ones were from significant universities outside of the state. We ended up with the committee unanimously endorsing John Simpson from the University of Washington. I was excited to get John, because John had been a very successful dean of arts and sciences at Washington, and he had built a lot in the humanities, even though he himself is an experimental psychologist. He was classified as a social scientist, with his appointment in psychology at Santa Cruz,

but he was really a neuroscientist. He and I had known each other vaguely from our earlier research work, had met a few times, and I visited his laboratory when I was on sabbatical in 1982 at the University of Washington. I didn't know him very well, but I knew him enough to know how well he was respected. I thought he was a very attractive candidate, and that with his experience of being the dean of arts and sciences, which was one and a half times the size of the entire university at Santa Cruz, he would understand the faculty mores. And he had what I would call very good faculty talent taste. He was a stickler for the quality of the work that the faculty was doing. He read every file. He really was good at that.

And he also, I thought, would professionalize the office of executive vice chancellor. The office had had a kind of motley history. People had turned over in that position very rapidly. It wasn't a position, I think, that the faculty respected. I think that they thought it was one they could get rid of if they wanted to. So I wanted a strong executive vice chancellor, somebody who is able to handle the budget, and who the deans are reporting to, and who can really build a sense of: "*We are* a first-rate research university. Our faculty are as good as anybody else's, and we're building this institution and its reputation so that we will soon be selective, as well as very excellent."

It was very clear to me that we were getting more and more popular, and that if we just said the true things and presented ourselves well we would progress. I said I felt a little bit like Will Rogers. You know that old line of Will Rogers? "Everybody thinks that I did something. I actually just came into town and told

the truth. (laughs) And just told it over and over again and finally people began to believe it." The truth was that they had in the midst of their regional parochial conflicts one of the best universities in the country, and it was time that they started recognizing that, and that our faculty stacked up against Berkeley, or UCLA, or anyplace else! By any measure you want to measure them by: their publications, their national reputation, prizes. They're great faculty.

And John had the same attitude. He had very carefully looked over our faculty before he took the job. He said, "We have a great faculty, and we have the opportunity to do something that very few institutions can do. We're growing, and we have the opportunity to hire more really great young faculty." So that's what he put a lot of his energy into, was being sure that the deans understood that he was watching, that they needed to really push their departments to hire the best candidates they could get, instead of the one they were the most comfortable with. Of course, we paid a lot of attention to diversity. John, I think, was the first one to refuse an appointment, to just turn down somebody because he looked at the search and said, "You had an opportunity to look at women and minorities and you didn't, and you're going to have to go back and do this search over again." It infuriated a particular department, but they didn't make that mistake again, and very few other units did either. I was enthusiastic about him because I thought he had a certain professional talent.

Nothing obviously gets to John personally. He doesn't wear his feelings on his sleeve at all. It was very hard for some of the more difficult faculty critics to get John's ire up. It just didn't happen. So he did a very good job. Obviously he was

ready to move on after five years of doing that. He's now president of SUNY Buffalo, apparently having a good time. But he left, I think, a good legacy. And he molded a position that's very attractive. I am sure that if the new chancellor now advertises this in a national search, that it will be seen as one of the most attractive EVC positions in the country. And at this point, with some of the faculty we've hired and some of the deans, some of the experience that's been had there, it may in fact turn out to be that we have the depth in the university now.

Then there were the deans. Those appointments were very important. The two appointments in the deanships that we made were the dean of engineering and the dean of humanities. The latter is a troubled position. It continues to be a position where it's really hard to get a dean that gets enough traction with the faculty that they stay for very long. This is also a national problem. Deans of humanities turn over very fast, and I don't know whether it's just that the content of the humanities area is such that the faculty can never agree on what makes a good dean. Some think this. Some think that. There's always some kind of turmoil.

Wlad Godzich is without a doubt one of the best scholars in the humanities internationally. He had some great ideas on how to move the humanities forward. But he did get crosswise with his management style and the faculty. So he ended up serving the five-year term but no more. Now I guess Gary Lease is back as interim dean. I don't know how long that will last but, however long it lasts, he's got the experience. But he also has people who have strong feelings

about him, not all positive. I've had positive experiences with Gary, but I think it will be the case that they will do an open search for that position at some point.

And then Ed Houghton, who was the dean of the arts, is an amazing man. He spent ten years of his life getting the new music building built. It had been his baby, and he was very excited about that. Ed is amazingly conscious of the new relationship between the arts and technology, and did a lot as dean to encourage that, and there is an evolving minor in engineering for the arts.

Reti: And the new digital arts program.

Greenwood: Yes. I think he made some good hires in that area. I thought he was a very solid dean. My guess is that this will be his last term. He was a good solid, intellectual, steady dean.

Dave Kliger, who was the dean of the sciences, is very well liked by his faculty. People are very loyal to him. They consider him extremely fair. I thought he was basically a very fair guy. Dave just had no clear interest in active fundraising, and in really big ideas that might transform the sciences. I think that Dave did a great job, but UCSC might have been better served by having a new dean with new energy, who understood that the sciences were the area in which you could raise the most money and, "Come on buddy. Let's do it, because we need it." So that would be the only place that I would fault him. But I didn't choose him. I think he might have even been there before Karl Pister. He's been there a long time.

Reti: Yes.

Greenwood: He's steady and sure, which is a good thing. But this is a growing institution with aspirations to grasp every possible opportunity. Leslie told me the other day that more than 50 percent of the faculty that are at UCSC today were hired while I was chancellor. So there's a whole new era coming. You have to grasp that and move it forward. That's the legacy that the new chancellor has. She has a young faculty and the opportunity to hire some more, because there are backlogged positions. So at some point the institution will be more than three-quarters faculty members who have been hired since 1996.

Reti: Well, you had a whole generation of people who came at the beginning and then they reached retirement age.

Greenwood: Yes. And then there was another bulge that's just about ready to retire. That's why we were able to make some senior hires. In the engineering school, in particular, we needed some experienced people. We didn't want to start everything with assistant professors.

Reti: That's how things started during the early years of UCSC, for the most part. But you don't need to do that again.

Greenwood: Well, you want to hire a lot of young people because you want them to build their careers. On the other hand, if you are trying to start a new department, in the sciences at least, you need to bring in somebody who's got an established reputation, who will attract other faculty members of that caliber to want to be faculty members at Santa Cruz, and who will also bring in research

money, because it's expensive to do research in anything these days, but particularly in some of those areas.

The vice chancellors. Francisco Hernandez, whom I think is one of the best vice chancellors of student affairs in the entire system, is brilliant. He's a scholar, for one thing. He's a Stanford PhD in education. He reads the literature; he writes professionally. He has an instructor position in the Department of Education. He really taught me a lot about how Latino politics play out, and what I needed to know, and where I needed to think about critical issues. We made significant progress in some areas, and the UCCP [University of California College Prep] program that he developed, which is taking advanced placement courses and SAT prep, etc. to all fifty-eight counties—was one of the most brilliant moves that could have been made in the wake of Proposition 209. Talk about leveling the playing ground. That's actually doing something about it, instead of complaining about it, just actually doing something about it. I was proud to have him as vice chancellor and learned to respect him. Francisco also worked directly with Lynda Goff, the undergraduate dean, on improving undergraduate life, advising, and recruiting. They were an excellent duo.

Tom Vani was hired just before I came. Karl was in the process of hiring him, and I did have the opportunity to interview him before he was hired. But he was hired by Karl. Tom and I hit it off right away, and Tom and Francisco knew each other from Berkeley. They had been there during the murders in the fraternity house, the killings, and the Oakland Fire in 1991 and numerous other challenges. They were an interesting team because they knew what it was like to have a

university under attack, in this case by fire, or something else. They knew what that was like. They were real professionals about disaster preparation, because they'd been through it. They'd lived through it. So they knew how to handle things. Tom is an incredibly loyal vice chancellor. He's a very thoughtful and very business-oriented guy. He really reads the literature and he understands business organizations. He and I used to joke that he had a one-line job description, which was: "keep the chancellor out of jail." (laughs) He was really good at that. But the two of them were an unbeatable combination because they knew everything I didn't know, and everything John didn't know. I don't think it would have been possible to have a stronger early vice-chancellor team than Tom, and Francisco, and John.

And then, as I think I said earlier, when we were able to unexpectedly hire Bob Miller as the vice chancellor for research. Many colleagues remarked, "Oh, my goodness. How did she pull that off? How did John pull that off?" We had strong team then.

And then Ron Suduiko came in as the vice chancellor for university relations and development. I think we've more than tripled the amount of money we were raising. I was very proud of what we were doing. That effort is still a little unstable. I think Ron did a good job, but he wasn't quite as much a part of the team as I would have liked to see. That may be partly location. He wasn't physically located in the chancellor's suite in McHenry Library, so you know how that is. You don't see each other in the hall, so you forget to tell somebody something and they're left out of the loop. But I think he was a very good

appointment. He had been working for Chuck [Charles M.] Vest at MIT, and the university was looking for a vice chancellor for university relations, and I happened to talk to Chuck at a professional meeting. He said, "You know, I think you ought to consider Ron Suduiko. I think he might be willing to make a move to the West Coast." A personal set of circumstances, as well as the opportunity, made the West Coast look attractive to him. So we were able to get him.

At UCOP, I was told Santa Cruz had the reputation of having one of the best leadership teams in the system. That is evidenced by the fact that we did more than a half a billion dollars of construction, hired 50 percent of the faculty, did the things that are on the list that you've looked at. Those things got done not because of me. They got done because we had a great team and people did their jobs. The faculty senate at Santa Cruz, as all good senates, always has issues and questions, but by and large, they were pretty cooperative in helping us, too. I was proud of that, as well.

As I was in the final few years, our WASC [Western Association of Schools and Colleges] accreditation visit approached. This was a critical accreditation visit and an opportunity for the university to shine. I worked with the accrediting agency to ensure that we would have a strong, nationally respected team leader. From my point of view, this was an opportunity for internal reflection, data gathering, and national recognition, not just a perfunctory exercise. With Jim Duchestadt (former president of the University of Michigan) as the team leader, we would be really examined. John Simpson appointed Lynda Goff to be the WASC accreditation liaison. I was sure she would do a good job and I was

pleased that Jim told me later how much he had learned about UCSC, how many assets he now knew we had. He also remarked that Goff had done one of the best jobs he had ever seen.

The Council of UC Chancellors

Reti: Tell me about your relationships with the other UC chancellors.

Greenwood: Oh, I had very good relationships with them. I think I've read this in all the oral histories and what my predecessors have said is all true—one of the great things about being a chancellor in the UC system is the colleagues that you have. I really liked all of the chancellors that I served with.

I had an interesting set of experiences, which might be worth recalling in the oral history. And that is that when I arrived at my first chancellors meeting (COC) there was another female chancellor. It was Laurel Wilkening. But virtually within months of my arrival, she announced that she was stepping down the following year. So the first year I was chancellor, Laurel was there, Chang-Lin Tien was there, Henry Yang, and Haile DeBas were there, and I was there. So there were five of us who represented diversity, if you will, out of the then-nine chancellors. It was San Francisco, Irvine, Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara, and Berkeley. Then a series of sad events took Chang-Lin away from us. Laurel resigned. Haile didn't stay to be permanent chancellor. He was only there for a year. The next year I was the only female chancellor. I was the only female, and Henry was the only minority. There's a different dynamic under those circumstances.

Laurel had said to me. "You wait. You're going to miss me when I'm gone." I said, "I miss you already, Laurel. So don't tell me I'll miss you when you're gone." She said, "Well. It will be different. You'll see." She said this because she had been the only woman chancellor for a year as well. And then Carol Tomlinson-Keasey was hired and France [Córdova] was hired as chancellor, and the composition changed. Right now, at the University of California, I'm the provost and we have three female chancellors. And now our first African American chancellor. The composition changes, and that makes the personal dynamics different.

But while I was chancellor, I never had anything bad to say about any of my chancellor friends. I never had bad interactions. Bob Dynes and I were made chancellors on the same day in the same Regents meeting—at San Diego and I at Santa Cruz. We had an affinity for each other, probably a little bit because of the kind of science background we have. Even though I'm not a physicist, I learned a lot about the physical sciences in Washington, D.C. I sometimes called Bob or Larry Vanderhoef when I had issues. Somebody would say, "Well, we can't do that." And I'd say, "I think San Diego did it, so if San Diego did it, why can't we do this?" I'd call Bob and say, "Bob, am I wrong? Did you not do this?" And he'd say, "Oh, no. We did this." "Well, how did you do this?" He'd say, "Well, did it this way." So we would talk back and forth. And he called me a couple of times about political environments. I called Larry about some other issues.

Before every Regents meeting the chancellors would have a dinner, the night before, which Karl Pister used to call the group therapy session for chancellors. It

is true, because chancelloring, while it's exciting and there's so much that you get to do and think about that's mind-expanding, it's also lonely. Because many of the issues that deeply trouble you, including the behavior of faculty members or others that you consider puzzling, impossible, or even unethical, you can't talk about it to anybody else. Maybe your spouse, if you've got one. But you just can't talk about it. You can't talk about to deans or anybody else. You really have to struggle with it alone. Or if you're having one of those moments of self-doubt—am I really doing the right thing?—there's just nobody to talk to, sometimes. The chancellors' groups were always a good thing because then you could say, "You wouldn't believe what I'm putting up with." And they'd say, "Oh, yes I would. Let me tell you about what happened to me last week." So it was good that way. And also to share the successes. We enjoyed each other's accomplishments. That was very positive. That continues.

I had a very good relationship with Dick Atkinson, the systemwide president. Dick's philosophy seemed to be: hire the best people you can find for the job and get out of their way. I think maybe three times in the entire time I was chancellor did he call me. Three times in eight years did he call me to tell me something, or give me some advice. I called him on occasion, and the chancellors wrote an annual report. I had an annual formal visitation with Dick. His office said they were going to lock the door because every time I went in I came out with something. They said, "Dick never says no to MRC." I said, "Well, MRC has figured out exactly what she really has to have, and I don't make any bones about it and Dick usually listens to it and I sometimes get it." There were enough

times when UCSC did not get things to compensate. I felt I had a really good relationship with him. I had a lot of respect for him and I think he respected me as well. So that was very positive. And I got to know some of the vice presidents up here that I'm now working with, which was important in my consideration to do this job.

Budgetary Challenges at the University of California

Reti: Okay, let's move on to budgetary challenges that were going on during your period as chancellor, which were reflected in tuition increases and layoffs and other things.

Greenwood: Well, it's no secret that higher education in California goes through boom-bust cycles. It just happens. It's been happening for at least three decadal cycles. I still joke about when I came to California in 1989 to work for Ted Hullar at UC Davis, I had to make a decision to take the job in a very narrow time frame because I had effectively started to negotiate closing terms on a different job. And when this one came up, I realized I really wanted to take this job, and so I had to do something I really didn't want to do. I had to get out of the other job and get into this one. So we didn't have time to get all the details about the office arrangements and any of those details completely under control. And we didn't really come to a lot of agreement on new budget issues. And Ted said to me, "Well, MRC you don't need to worry about it. I'm honest. I treat people fairly. You're going to get your cut of the budget." And, as I used to say, "That sentence was correct. It's just that the problem was the accent was on the wrong word. I did get my *cut* (laughs) of the budget." The first thing I had to do as graduate

dean was cut my budget by nearly 30 percent. Over a period of time, I had to lay off a substantial number of staff, and retrain some others, and move them into whole new levels of responsibilities that they hadn't been in before, because there were fewer of them.

We went through some really good years when I was chancellor. The institution was growing. Part of that was, of course, we were accommodating new students. We were able to hire new faculty. We hired a lot of new staff. One of the things that I think is underappreciated at Santa Cruz, is that even when we had the big budget cuts just recently, of 2000, 2001, 2003, where we had to lay people off in various operations—and of course we got especially hard hit in student preparation, because that was a targeted budget cut of the state—but there were remarkably few people who actually lost their employment with the university. Part of the reason was that we were hiring all these good faculty and they were succeeding at getting grants and things like that. So we were expanding other programs. We did lose people off of state funds that we were able to rehire on other funds. Now, people might prefer to be on 19900 money, because it sounds on the surface like it's more stable money. Lately it hasn't been any more stable than grant-funded projects, or other things. That was always an issue. You'd say, "Well, we're going to have to cut this budget by 15 percent or 20 percent. And that means laying off people."

We worked very hard to do the most compassionate programs. So when we got into layoffs we always did a campus-only hiring program unless there was a really good exception. We really pushed the START program so that if people

wanted to back off a little on the time they were spending we could garner those savings. We did stick to "hiring your own" if possible. And we actively searched for ways to move people off of one set of work into another set. That obviously doesn't work if you've got an IT job and the person you're laying off is a plumber. But, by and large, when I looked at the numbers, the actual number of people who really could not work for the university in any capacity anymore was relatively low. Not that it wasn't demoralizing and difficult and stressful, but we didn't have to lose too many people. That was always a difficult thing, because we did not want to be penalized for doing better at generating non-state jobs. When you're saying you're cutting x number of jobs, we need to say how many state-supported jobs we have lost. That may not be the same as the number of people we have lost. But in order to stress what the state's doing to us, we need to say we've lost x number of jobs. Now, if those people have been moved over to a non-state supported position, that's only because we're doing a good job of creating new jobs and new opportunities in some other arena. The first thing I always thought about when we had to lay off was the people. How are we going to do this? How are we going to figure out how we're going to consolidate, how we're going to move people around?

And then the last couple of years before I left we brought in consultants to try to think through our business practices and see where we could save money, see how we could really get improved IT. In fact, Santa Cruz and UCLA are now seen as the two campuses that did the best job and are doing the best job in realigning information technology. Sometimes you need outside help to see that,

because nobody inside wants to change. Everybody wants their own system and thinks their own way is the right way. That includes the chancellor, who always likes the Mac and doesn't want to move on to any other machine.

Reti: (laughs) I'm a Mac girl myself.

Greenwood: So the layoffs were always hard, and the budget cuts were always difficult. When you have to take money out of a budget, it's not pleasant. Nobody likes to do it. It's always more fun to be growing and to have more money coming in.

We also tried—and the senate was cooperative—we tried to build a reserve. There was no reserve to speak of when I became chancellor. I mean, not even a large single digit budget line. And you really ought to keep 10 percent of your operating budget as your reserve. And we didn't have that, because it had been spent down so badly in the previous downturn.

Reti: In the early 1990s.

Greenwood: Karl Pister had to put a lot of money into financial aid because the enrollment was dipping and it was thought that it was because we didn't have competitive financial aid, so much of the money in reserve went to the students for financial aid. When we had to cut, we tried to cut where it would hurt the least, to think about the people involved, and to get some efficiencies out of it. And the last time around, the cuts were big enough that it required some transformation. I don't know what the current status is, but we were making good progress when I left.

Reflections on the Master Plan for Higher Education in California

Reti: And of course the other area that was really affected by budgetary challenges was tuition increases for the students.

Greenwood: This is the dilemma that all public universities are facing right now. There is a disinvestment by most states in higher education. When that happens, you have two choices to make. One choice is that you just degrade the quality. You don't raise the tuition. You just say, "Well, we're going to do less with less." So your classes get bigger. You offer less of them. People can't get through in four and a half years. And pretty soon the faculty wakes up to the fact that they have a heavier teaching load than the kinds of institutions they want to be in. So when the next phone call comes they start thinking about leaving.

And as our current UC President says, and he's right, once you go over that cliff, you're over it. It's very hard to get back up on it. So you have to constantly say, we've got to maintain the quality. And if we have to maintain the quality, what does that mean? Well, one of the things it functionally means is that we have to have a higher tuition and higher aid. The discounted price for students who are in the bottom third of financial need, for most of them it's essentially transparent. They might be working a couple of hours more but their financial aid package is covered. They're still not paying that much more. It's really the middle-class families and the graduate students who are getting hurt, because there is not enough financial support there. We're probably about to change that with graduate students.

But the reality is that we were a very low-cost institution. And if the state had the political will to honor the original Master Plan, that would be great. But it didn't. The legislature and the governor are certainly not going to give us more and they will probably give us less. And they are looking for efficiency. So the theme I think you'll hear for the next couple of years, is we will be consolidating purchasing. We will be doing some things that will cut our costs. Those actions have unintended costs, and some of them will be local. Some of the local businesses that have been a cottage industry for the campuses will probably not be able to keep up with the competitive price pressure. And that's a situation you really don't want to be in. On the other hand, how do you justify to the state that you're prepared to pay more for supplies? We just did a little experiment around here at UCOP. We saved several hundred thousand dollars just by having a purchasing contract with Office Max. Now, it doesn't make the local store down on the corner very happy, but it's saving us money and it means we can save another job or two here. That matters.

Reti: One of the statements you made in your last email to the campus was, "Whether California will honor the promises of the internationally revered Master Plan for Higher Education is a question we must face." Is that what you were just referring to in terms of political will?

Greenwood: Well, it's why I took this job. I mean, the reason I took the UC Provost job, left the beautiful environs of Santa Cruz and a job I knew how to do with people I loved working with, was because Bob Dynes persuaded me that that was what's at stake. That if we don't try to rearticulate that, and find

supporters for it, and figure a way to do it, we are probably going to lose it. We're seeing all kinds of incursions in the intent and execution of the Master Plan. An example is that CSU is trying to get the doctoral degree. And they may be successful. And if they do, then we'll be competing with CSU for research support, etc., in certain areas.

Reti: That's a huge change.

Greenwood: Yes. It's not just whether or not it's access for the undergraduates. There are two kinds of attacks on the Master Plan right now. One is the fiscal attack. One of the original tenets was to make higher education as inexpensive as possible, and that it is a public good for states to subsidize higher education to ensure that they have an educated citizenry, so they can be economically competitive, create wealth in the state, and make it possible to have a good life in California. That was the enlightened view of the late 1960s and 1970s, when the Master Plan was really coming into its early stage of fruition. People believed that an educated populace was in the state's best interest. That's changed over the last decade or so, maybe as a consequence of the "Me-Too" generation. Now, it goes: people are going to make more if they get an education, so it's a personal good, not a public good.

Reti: Oh, this is a matter of investment.

Greenwood: Yes.

Reti: They should be paying for it themselves.

Greenwood: One contention is that they should be paying for it themselves, or they should be paying for a larger portion of it themselves, because they're actually going to make more money. Now, one of UC's Nobel Laureates just recently wrote a paper showing that the amount the state gets back for the investment that they make in an undergraduate or graduate degree, in taxes that that individual pays above and beyond what they would pay if they had only a high school education, is way more than the dollars that the state invested. You have to look at investing in higher education as a wealth-creating strategy. That may be a little crass for some academics. But it's really true.

It's also true that if we don't educate this next generation with the same enthusiasm that we did earlier beneficiaries of the Master Plan, we will regret it. It bothers me a great deal that we supported the Master Plan when the major beneficiaries of the Master Plan were traditional Caucasian students, even though many of them were the first in their families to go to college. California public higher education has always been an entry route for people who didn't come from an educated family. But now, when we're facing demographics that are substantially different, we don't have the same commitment. I think it will be fatal for the state if it persists to its logical, obvious outcome, which is that the university will be a pretty expensive place to attend, even though we may have very good financial aid. It will not be seen as within the grasp of a significant part of this new demographic. And I think in the final analysis that will be very hard on the university because we will be seen as not serving the population that

the populace legislature cares about. So I am concerned about whether or not the Master Plan will survive.

And the other thing that complicates the issues is term limits. Because term limits mean that there's nobody in the legislature that cares about anything longer than six or eight years. There just isn't anybody. These are long-term, twenty, twenty-five year out serious issues for the state. I run into people all the time who say, "Oh, the Master Plan is forty-five years old. What does it mean to us today? We should be doing what is important today, and UC should do this, and CSU should do that, and if CSU wants to compete with UC, why not?" It's very different because the underlying value that higher education is a public good is disappearing from the lexicon.

So right now I think we are in a very threatened and imperiled condition with respect to it. Some prominent folks criticize, "Well, the Master Plan is meaningless. It was done in the sixties. Who cares about what was done in the sixties?" The fact that it has served us well, and we have the strongest research university in the world, should count for validation of the plan. Many of the people in the legislature just don't think that way. Either they are thinking about, "Well, why doesn't the university take more undergraduates? I want to see my sons and daughters and nieces and nephews be able to get in. So what's so sacred about 12.5 percent? Let them take the top 30." Without an understanding that unless they are prepared to fund us phenomenally well and build significantly more campuses, we can't do the job we're doing today.

I don't know how that's going to come out. But it is the reason I decided that, after eight years of serving as a chancellor, I could spend a few more years before the time for me to hang up my saddle comes along, and see what I could do to really make a difference for the whole university. Time will tell.

Reti: Do you think that UC is becoming a quasi-public institution, due to the higher reliance on private donations?

Greenwood: A lot of people think that the public universities are becoming more private. What they don't realize is that the private universities are also becoming a little more public. They're very dependent on public policy for financial aid and tax-exempt bond status. All kinds of IRS and other federal policies influence how well they do. And also how well they do with their endowment. If the federal government decides they're going to change the gift rules, for example, it always has a huge effect on the private universities, sometimes positive, sometimes negative.

But the gap between the privates and the public is exacerbated by three things. One is the disinvestment in higher education by most states. The second is the fact that the privates aren't growing and the publics, at least in California, Florida, and Texas are growing, and have a lot of demographic pressure, so they have to expand at the same time that they are not getting more money. We still get money with every new student we take. We can argue whether it's enough or not enough, but it's more per student than some other states get.

And then the third thing that is changing are the real issues around graduate international students, the visa issues that have been imposed, the fact that international students are a lot more expensive for our faculty to support, especially if they're having to support them on their own resources and research funds. The best of the international students are going to the privates now.

Those three things are pushing a wedge between the publics and the privates. One of the things that I do, in addition to being provost, is chair the division of policy and global affairs at the National Academy of Sciences. So I've been pushing for a couple of years now that the academy needs to do a study of the national interest. The reason why the nation should be interested in the fate of the public research universities, is because they are, by and large, where the international and national strength of the nation comes from. The privates are very good, but they will never serve enough people to really be the core of our intellectual brain trust. Important, very important. But they are not the only factor here. And if the publics really become very different from the privates, even the best publics, then we will have trouble with international competition. We may already be having trouble with our national brain trust. Of the 114,000 doctoral degrees that were given in the world (I think it was last year. It might have been the year before because the data lags), only 39,000 of them were given in the United States. It used to be that we were two to one, or three to one over any other large area like Europe or Asia. That line was crossed over about seven or eight years ago. And now, with the birth of all of these Pacific universities that have modeled themselves after the University of California—

There's a lot more going on. Students don't have to leave their countries and come to the United States to get a good degree. Maybe to get a great one they still do. But to get a good one they don't have to. They have opportunities in their own country.

Reti: Is there anything else you want to say about UCSC, from your vantage point now of having been gone for a little more than a year?

Greenwood: Well, it's a very strong institution. As I said, I think it's got a spectacular faculty. And if the faculty will work with administration, assert themselves intellectually, and develop the programs they're capable of, it will be unbeatable. At least in certain areas it will be fabulous. There are real strengths in every division. We've got great strengths in the humanities, the social sciences, the arts, engineering, and the physical and life sciences. I guess my only concern is whether they will be able to move fast enough when the money starts to come back again, because it will. We're in a new cycle. The money will start to come back again.

One of the things I learned early, and one of the things that I think helped me when I was chancellor, was that you have to be ready for the next wave. And if you wait until the next wave is forming to get ready, then by the time you get things organized it's already crashed on the shore. You might be into the next trough. So it's always a good idea to be constantly thinking, constantly planning. It's more important to plan when things are in a depression, than it is when things are on an upswing. Because when things are in a depression, you can really see what's core. Whether you like it or not, you can really see what's

important to do. And then you can be ready with programs, if you will, already on the table, when the money starts to come back. And you can get in there. UCSC got a couple of buildings because we were ready. A number of people around the system were just saying, "Well, there's no point in doing all this planning. There isn't any money."

Reti: Like when you were talking about building the engineering building.

Greenwood: Yes. There wasn't any money. And I said, "No. No. No. We need to be ready to pounce. We need to have the idea when the money comes. Not the idea the year after the money comes." I pushed a number of deans and faculty with new programs that were being initiated at the private foundation or federal level because one of the lessons I learned from my other experiences is that if you can get in on a first round you have much higher probability of being funded. Most organizations can't get organized that fast, so nimbleness and the ability to push and move and be the first one in the door of a new foundation is key. That's when you get an opportunity. If you wait two rounds, then you have to compete against more established organizations who have a horde of people and an office to do nothing but try to put these proposals together. If you get out one round ahead of them you have a shot at getting the money. After that, they've got well-oiled machines, and they've set their priorities, and they know what they're going to do, and then competing against them gets much more difficult.

Reti: Yesterday we were talking about the strengths in the sciences at UCSC, and you mentioned that there were a couple of programs in the humanities that you also thought were really strong. Can I ask you which ones?

Greenwood: Well obviously, I think the feminist studies program is very strong. And the history of consciousness program has a long history.²³ I think linguistics is a fabulous department, and if they don't lose any more people they will continue to be really first-rate. I've always had a fondness for the American studies program. I think it still has some building to do. I think history is a good program. I think they haven't thought through some areas of history they probably ought to at Santa Cruz. But they haven't had as many vacancies as some departments, either. But the ones in the humanities that stack up really well are, of course, history of consciousness, because it's a very competitive program, although they don't have the best succession plan yet. There's a group of faculty that are the same age, and they need to think about that. And then, as I said, I think linguistics is a terrific program. They've trained some great graduate students, and they've had some really terrific faculty, both the ones that are still there and the ones who have come and gone. It's not a bad thing for a department to have a reputation of attracting really good people. And then if they get picked off by other excellent institutions, that's not really a failure of the department. It's a loss, but it's not necessarily a failure.

Reti: Yes, it says a lot about the quality of the people you've hired.

²³ The Regional History Project has conducted three oral histories which cover the history of the History of Consciousness Department. See Cameron Vanderscoff, Interviewer and Editor, *James Clifford: Tradition and Transformation at UC Santa Cruz*, (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2013) <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/clifford>; Irene Reti, Interviewer and Editor, *Edges and Ecotones: Donna Haraway's Worlds at UCSC* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2007) <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/haraway>; and Cameron Vanderscoff, Interviewer and Editor, *Hayden White: Frontiers of Consciousness at UCSC*, (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2013). <http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/hayden-white-frontiers-of-consciousness-at-ucsc>

Greenwood: Yes, exactly. I would be unhappy, but I would understand it if a faculty member left us to go, as one did, to Princeton, because we couldn't match the offer. We just couldn't match the offer and subsidies that Princeton was prepared to offer. If we lost them to Kansas or Ohio State, then I was not very happy. I can understand why people would make a decision to go certain other kinds of places, especially if the offer was extremely attractive, the way some universities can when they really want to get somebody. Some institutions only make a couple of hires a year, so they'll put all their eggs in one basket, and they'll do things we can't do in a public institution. Those would always break my heart a little bit. But amazingly enough, we always got somebody good to replace them. People still want to come to the University of California, even though our salaries are lagging, even though our start-ups are not as high as many other places, even though the cost of living is much more than what you have to pay in the Midwest and on the East Coast. People still come, and they survive.

I was trying very hard when I was at UCSC to both accommodate the continuing slow growth restraint that the campus was going to have as it faced its future, and to find ways to give release valves so that the campus would not get locked in to a small, less than fully fleshed out research university that could not grow, and couldn't change, and therefore was going to struggle constantly. That's why I was trying to craft a situation where we could grow relatively modestly at UC Santa Cruz, but we could develop professional schools, in Silicon Valley, if necessary. Obviously, for a lot of reasons, I would have preferred to develop

them here. But I didn't want to leave the campus to be a large liberal arts undergraduate institution, with 10 percent graduate students, and only one professional school, and no opportunities to expand because of the controlled growth environment. I saw the opportunities both in Fort Ord in Monterey and over the hill as our major possibilities.

And somehow, it's important to frame that, because even now, with the debates over the Long Range Development Plan [of 2005], I think that argument has gotten lost again. It's become very much about the city of Santa Cruz and the campus of Santa Cruz, and not about the University of California at Santa Cruz and the options it has for the long-term, meaning twenty-five or thirty years down the road.

I wanted, in this oral history, to try to capture some of the imagination that went into trying to figure out—if you're going to be forever constrained, what are the institution's further options? Do you simply accept that fate, knowing then that the other campuses will go marching down other paths and they'll have a different life and this one will be really, perhaps good at what it does, but it won't be doing much else? My personal view was we would start losing faculty when that happened, when people really began to understand that there were going to be no new professional schools, there was not going to be any real growth in graduate education, that our building program had come to a standstill because our student population was not changing. When that began to dawn on people, we'd start losing people and it would take us a decade or more to catch up.

Reti: And we'd be in a steady-state situation.

Greenwood: Yes. There are some people who think they'd like that, but there's no funding mechanism currently in the University of California, and there never has been one, that would allow Santa Cruz to be different.

Reti: That's been the contradiction from the beginning of the campus's history.

Greenwood: The only other option would be if we found a very generous donor who wanted, effectively, to name the campus and provide a really serious major endowment for us that would allow us to have funds to work with, like a private institution. I haven't seen that happen yet. I'm sure any chancellor would welcome someone walking in the door and saying, "How about if I gave you a billion dollars." (laughs)

Reti: Well, that would have enormous implications for a public university.

Greenwood: Some public institutions are becoming, effectively, private institutions, with respect to their financing. This is a critical time in the University of California's history, how UC Santa Cruz fares depends on the state, the economy, and frankly the creativity of its faculty and administration. I wish them well—Fiat Lux!