

Lawrence
Leadership *in* Higher Education

Views from the Presidency

Leadership *in* Higher Education

Robert M. Berdahl
Myles Brand
Molly Corbett Broad
John T. Casteen III
Mary Sue Coleman
Norman C. Francis

Nils Hasselmo
Shirley Ann Jackson
Shirley Strum Kenny
William English Kirwan
Charles M. Vest
David Ward

Francis L. Lawrence



transaction

Lawrence Leadershipⁱⁿ Higher Education

"Leadership in Higher Education: Views from the Presidency offers a provocative look at the challenges facing university leaders as we begin the twenty-first century. The highest standards of excellence and integrity are the motivating drive for all aspects of our best universities, as evident in this collection of candid and insightful interviews. With his vision and rich experience, Fran Lawrence has conceived a thought-provoking volume that is an important addition to the literature in higher education."**—Henry T. Yang, chancellor, University of California, Santa Barbara**

"Fran Lawrence is a highly respected and well connected leader of American higher education. The candor he elicits in the interviews with university presidents contained in this book is remarkable. His own insights reflect a wealth of experience and deeply held values. Rarely have the practical experiences of so many leaders and leadership theory been so thoughtfully blended. This book is a must read for both aspiring and serving college and university presidents."**—David Hardesty, president, West Virginia University**

"Leadership in Higher Education: Views from the Presidency by Fran Lawrence is not just a book for academics: it's for anyone interested in leadership in complex organizations. It will be especially helpful to anyone who wants to learn how to inspire and motivate very bright, creative, self-directed people, no easy task as many business leaders have learned. The stories of thirteen leaders of some of America's best universities offer excellent models for the management of knowledge workers, a whole new area of business skill with many difficult passages and dangerous pitfalls for the traditional CEO."

—David Stern, commissioner of the National Basketball Association (NBA)

"These conversations open a fascinating perspective on the backgrounds and characters of several highly regarded university presidents. The interviews give a good sense of their disparate approaches to the job and the challenges they faced—both challenges that were common to almost everyone and those that were distinctive in each case. The book demonstrates that a variety of strategies can lead to success in these complex and demanding jobs, and also sheds light on more general issues of leadership in higher education."

—Nannerl O. Keohane, president emerita, Duke University

ISBN 0-7658-0328-3

90000 >

EAN



ISBN: 0-7658-0328-3



LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Views from the Presidency

Francis L. Lawrence

In this collection of interviews, presidents and chancellors of some of America's most respected universities candidly reflect on their experiences during the decade leading up to the twenty-first century and immediately following it. This was a time of change and uncertainty, when opportunities for achievement and potential for failure made their role uncommonly challenging, and success called for considerable determination, integrity, foresight, skill, and courage.

The American higher education system, often characterized as the best in the world, is distinguished for its scholarship as well as its accessibility. Its indispensable role as an engine for individual and societal economic advancement has made universities the targets of media interest, critical examination, and political manipulation. Higher education has become the passport to the American dream, and the percentage of those going to college has increased, challenging individual institutions and systems to accommodate growing numbers of aspiring students while searching for solutions to problems of inadequate college preparation and inadequate financial assistance for low-income students. Despite their increasing importance to the nation, the region, and their communities, public and private universities have seen states reduce their support to their state systems of higher education, shifting the responsibility to individuals and institutions.

Leadership in Higher Education traces the careers of thirteen women and men who have presided over a total of twenty universities or university systems and three national organizations of higher education: Robert Berdahl, Myles Brand, Molly

(Continued on back flap)

(Continued from front flap)

Corbett Broad, John T. Casteen III, Mary Sue Coleman, Norman C. Francis, Nils Hasselmo, Shirley Ann Jackson, Shirley Strum Kenny, William English Kirwan, Francis L. Lawrence, Charles M. Vest, and David Ward.

About the Author

Francis L. Lawrence, president emeritus of Rutgers University, conducted and compiled these interviews. He is currently a University Professor teaching leadership classes in the university's New Brunswick School of Communication, Information, and Library Studies and its Camden Honors Program. He is the author and editor of works of literary criticism and, recently, of articles on topics in higher education.



Library of Congress: 2006040362
Printed in the U.S.A.
Jacket design by Ellen F. Kane
www.transactionpub.com

Copyright © 2006 by Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publisher. All inquiries should be addressed to Transaction Publishers, Rutgers—The State University, 35 Berrue Circle, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854-8042. www.transactionpub.com

This book is printed on acid-free paper that meets the American National Standard for Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 2006040362

ISBN: 0-7658-0328-3 (cloth); 1-4128-0590-2 (paper)

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lawrence, Francis L.

Leadership in higher education : views from the presidency / Francis L. Lawrence.

p. cm.

ISBN: 0-7658-0328-3 (case alk. paper)—ISBN: 1-4128-0590-2 (pbk. alk. paper)

1. College presidents—United States. 2. Universities and colleges—United States—Administration. I. Title.

LB2341.L247 2006
378.1'110973—dc22

2006040362

Myles Brand

Myles Brand is the president of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, a post he assumed on January 1, 2003. He is the first university president to serve in that role.

Born May 17, 1942, Brand attended Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and graduated in 1964 with a bachelor's degree in philosophy, then went on to earn his Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Rochester in 1967. His professional background includes service as provost and vice president for academic affairs at Ohio State University, president of the University of Oregon (1989-1994), and president of Indiana University (1994-2002). At the University of Oregon, he alleviated a funding crisis by making selective cut-backs based on faculty recommendations. His recruitment of out-of-state students established a new source of revenue, increased program quality, and positioned the institution as a national university. At Indiana University under his administration research funding tripled, leadership in fields such as biomedicine improved, the endowment increased sixfold, substantial capital improvements were made, the university took a greater role in state economic development, the School of Informatics was founded, and the university's hospitals were combined with a private institution to create a new private hospital system named Clarion. Throughout his administrative career, he continued to teach and do research in philosophy.

On the national level, Brand has served as chair of the board of directors of the Association of American Universities (AAU) in 1999-2000, a member of the executive committee of the American Council on Education (1994-97), and a member of the board of directors of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (1995-1998). He was also a member of the board of the umbrella organization of Internet2, the University Corporation for Advanced Internet Development.

At the NCAA, Brand has implemented a Division I athletics reform agenda that is designed to improve the pre-college preparation of student athletes and keep them on the path to progress toward a degree. In addition, the NCAA has established standards for student athlete graduation rates and penalties for institutions that fail to meet those standards.

Francis Lawrence: Myles, could we begin by talking about your background, the people in your life who influenced you, and the personal traits that have contributed to your development as a leader?

Myles Brand: I was born in Brooklyn, New York and had a very ordinary education in the public schools there and on Long Island, where my family moved when I was a teenager. I enjoyed school, but my high school years were spent looking forward to a more challenging time in college. Since my parents were pragmatic people and brought me up in a vocationally oriented atmosphere, I started out at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in engineering and spent two years in that curriculum. Then I encountered a teacher who literally changed my life by opening up possibilities that I didn't know existed. He was a philosophy faculty member named Robert Whalen (long deceased now). He was not a particularly high-level researcher, but he knew the history of philosophy and he introduced me to a world of abstract ideas that just thrilled me and excited me to a degree I had never experienced. He gathered around him a small group of students and, remarkably, three of us became professional philosophers. That was a turning point in my life. It has stuck with me because it made me realize how important teachers are and what faculty members can accomplish in working with young people. So I ended by earning my bachelor's degree in philosophy. Then, having picked up the habit of hard work, I finished my Ph.D. at the University of Rochester in about two and a half years.

Among the personal attributes that contributed to my success, people would probably point out my willingness to work hard, as well as to listen to people and take their concerns into consideration, the ability to put matters in context, to see the bigger picture, look beyond the moment, and take personal responsibility.

FL: What were the challenges that the University of Oregon faced when you became president?

MB: It was at a time when it looked as though Oregon's economy was really booming. They were moving into the early stages of information technology (IT) development and the state had good tax revenues, so it looked like the challenge was to build a good Association of American Universities research university into an even better one. There had been some conflict between the former president and the governor; but when someone new comes in, you get the benefit of the doubt, so that didn't prove to be a problem. Things looked bright for about a year and a half.

FL: Then there were some issues, weren't there?

MB: After about a year and a half, there was a property tax revolt of major proportions and the state passed Measure 5, which was comparable to California's Prop 13. The income tax was already regressive and people felt that they were really paying the maximum amount they could be expected to pay in state taxes. There is no sales tax in Oregon. In effect, the people of Oregon made the decision that they didn't want to support certain services,

like higher education, at the level they had been funding them. In a three-year period, we lost about 75 percent of our state funding.

Those were extraordinarily difficult times. We formed a blue ribbon committee of faculty and administrators to make recommendations on what should be done. My only advice to the committee was not to cut across the board because that would degrade the institution to an intolerable level, since it had not been well funded even before this drastic budget reduction. Naturally, they gave me a menu of choices, since no committee wants to take direct responsibility for cuts. I understood that I had to make the final decisions. I worried a lot about it and then I made what I considered to be the best possible choices. Oregon operates in a town hall meeting environment with no faculty senate, so to announce the cuts we reserved the largest space on campus: still it was overflowing. I told the assembly that we would close a college, the college of physical education, which housed a number of programs, including geriatrics. I also closed all of the Ph.D. programs in education except special education and cut back on arts and sciences, but the major thrust was closing the college. A thousand people were going to be put out of work and a large number of degree programs reduced or closed. The dean of the college of physical education, whom everyone knew was dying of cancer, stood and made the case for his unit, telling his colleagues that though it was his college that was being closed today, their college could be next. I had to reply that this was the decision; it was what we had to do to preserve the institution. That was a tough time and a depressing year followed it.

We lost several thousand students when we made the original cutbacks. One day before Measure 5 was to be enacted, in a meeting with students who were very upset because we had cancelled a Grateful Dead concert, I told them that the concert ought to be the least of their worries because Measure 5 was going to affect their tuition drastically: it might even double. I was wrong about that: it tripled.

Then, over the next year, a solution emerged that I was able to develop. As the state reduced the budget to a single digit percentage of expenditures, we began to operate as if we were a private institution, recruiting out-of-state students. Frankly, that was the key that turned the situation around. What we did was to turn the University of Oregon into what was essentially a semi-private institution. Within two years not only did the enrollment come back up, but the quality of the programs improved. Students were wearing tee shirts that said "The University of California at Eugene Oregon." It was a difficult time, but when I left the institution I was able to go feeling that we had not only turned around the problem but positioned the institution so that it would be better in the future. Of course that doesn't mean that everyone liked what I did: the departments that were cut were unhappy and some of the students graduating from programs that were closed refused to shake my hand at graduation, but the most important fact is that what we did was a success, not merely in terms of rescuing but improving the institution during hard times.

FL: That is a remarkable example of leadership in a difficult situation. You made the hard choices because you had to do the right thing for the institution. Certainly you paid a price as the focus of the pain and anger of the people who were adversely affected by the cuts, but in the end, you were able to see that you had made the right choices for the university. Indiana, with its eight campuses and nearly 100,000 students, presented new challenges. What were the major issues you needed to tackle when you assumed that presidency?

MB: Indiana was, as Midwestern Big Ten universities tend to be, on much firmer ground. The people of the state of Indiana were committed to the success of Indiana University and, along with Purdue, it is regarded as one of the jeweled crowns of the state. The great challenge was the complexity of the institution. It wasn't a single campus but eight, including a medical school, and the most serious problem was how to resist the normal academic desire for so much autonomy that the institution spins apart. How do you sustain the unity, purpose, and identity of a single institution that complex? It's not a system in the way that California and New York have state university systems, and it's not a major campus with some small regional campuses like the University of Michigan. In addition, the complexity and size of the Indianapolis campus, combined with the medical school, made it a serious competitor with the more traditional Big Ten campus in Bloomington. The challenge was to make all of these units work together.

FL: What effects did the role and demands of each of these leadership posts have on your family life?

MB: I think that you identify with the university—you become the university—when you are the president. Not only do you internalize the values of the institution, but the successes and failures of the institution are yours personally. You take on the role of being the institution. That happens whether you like it or not and my philosophy has always been not only to accept it but to embrace it. These presidencies are not jobs. They are lives. The institution becomes your life. I never thought I was off. I'm a bit of a workaholic, but when I got finished with the dinner meetings about seven or nine o'clock at night, I'd start on my paperwork and I would do the paperwork until I fell asleep at 11:30 or so and then be up for my breakfast meeting to start all over again, seven days a week. To my great benefit, my wife Peg understands this as well. She's a faculty member but, within the context of her own academic work, she was willing to devote the time necessary to be very supportive and she understood what was required. It's all consuming and there were some family stresses, but probably not more than one would find at any other high-level job.

FL: What did each of your internal constituencies—governing boards, faculty, students, staff, and administrators—expect of you at each of your presidencies?

MB: All of the multiple constituencies, internal and external have their own different interests, and they don't always coincide. I always thought that

it was extremely important to work well with the university's board. In public universities, board members are chosen not necessarily because of their leadership potential for the institution, but rather because of their connections with the political party in power or the governor. Sometimes they're chosen because they have been critical of the university and they have their own agendas. I felt that communication with the members of the board was critical and I worked hard at it. Before our monthly board meeting, I would call every board member and spend enough time on the phone with each of them to make sure not only that they understood the issues coming up, but understood them in relation to their specific concern. I would also visit them once or twice a year in their own offices. I would listen very carefully to what they had to say. That doesn't mean that I always agreed with every board member, but they knew that I was listening and when we disagreed, I acknowledged that. My relationship with the board was always good, and that's not always true for presidents in public universities.

The faculty have different interests, and their interests vary according to their academic disciplines. At Indiana, I saw that they were in the Stone Age in terms of information technology. I think that it is impossible to be a successful major research university today unless you have a leadership role in IT, so I conducted an international search, hired a very strong chief information officer, and we undertook a strategic plan in IT. We were able to move into the top institutions in the area of information technology in a short period of time.

A great many faculty members were excited about that, but not all of my friends in the humanities were. Some humanists thought that we were neglecting the traditional studies, even though that was where I came from and where I taught every year at both of my presidencies. I tried to support my faculty colleagues in the humanities by addressing their needs, for example, by providing research funding when various foundations stopped supporting humanities research. That helped, but still they thought that their interests were not well served.

Faculty politics, independent of discipline, is always very interesting. On one hand, faculty are creative and ground-breaking in their fields. On the other hand, they're very conservative in protection of their individual rights and prestige. That is independent of their political views, conservative or liberal.

FL: Would you like to say anything about what students expected of you?

MB: With a hundred thousand students at Indiana University, it was hard to know very many of them personally. I tried. I met with student groups, such as the student newspaper staff. I became friends with those I got to know in the student leadership, but it was very difficult to become familiar with individuals in the general student body. I think that's one of the difficulties of the presidency of these very large institutions.

FL: I experienced the same frustrations. I could get to know the student leaders and I went to the dormitories every year for fireside chats, but my best

efforts were just a drop in the bucket so far as getting to know a student body of some 52,000 was concerned.

MB: I did continue to keep clearly in mind that one of the key purposes of the university is the education of undergraduates. That's a principle drawn from my own undergraduate experience.

FL: What did you feel you owed to all of these constituencies? What did you feel that you needed to do in response to their needs and demands?

MB: My philosophy of leadership is based on my perception that, to oversimplify considerably, there are at the extremes two kinds of presidential leadership. The first type is interested in communication and good feelings. They're not necessarily decision makers. They're very personable. Warm and fuzzy is the term that comes to mind. When there is a hard decision to make, they tend to postpone it or get someone else to do it for them. The second type is more focused on future directions. Of course, these are extremes. Real presidents fall somewhere on the continuum between the two end points. I feel very uncomfortable with the first type of leadership. Having identified with the institution, I have always wanted it to get better and I'll make the hard decisions. I will take personal responsibility for my decision and, if it's a tough one, even though I've consulted widely, I don't blame it on the people I consulted. I'll take the heat for any decision I make. I have a responsibility to the institution's constituents to act in the best interest of the whole university. My obligations to faculty members and other constituents were to support them in their academic efforts and to make the institution as a whole a better institution.

FL: What do you feel was your greatest challenge as a leader?

MB: The crisis in funding at the University of Oregon. I was pleased and proud that it turned out in the end as I had hoped and predicted it would. That was very hard, but another difficult time was at Indiana with athletics. That is a situation I cannot discuss because of pending litigation.

FL: Let's talk a little about organizational structure. How have you recruited and structured your leadership team in each institution?

MB: Some people come into a presidential position, listen carefully to the board, and say that we have to clean house and start all over again. I have never accepted that. There has always been some initial turnover of people who weren't working at a high level of performance, folks who retired early but were still in office, but it was usually very few. By and large, the people I found in place at my presidencies were very good. They were a high level team that just needed to be reoriented and had the ability, as good professionals, to be flexible, open, and change their loyalties. I never worried about the restructuring as much as I did about being sure we had the right people in the right positions. I tend to assimilate myself to the structure that exists rather than make massive changes.

FL: What was the highest-level position on each of the several campuses of Indiana University?

MB: Each campus has a chancellor. On the two larger campuses, Bloomington and Indianapolis, the chancellor is like a provost with additional powers to look after student affairs, for example. Other functions were carried out by my leadership team of vice presidents. My leadership team and I couldn't get around to every campus, so we depended upon the chancellors of the six smaller campuses to do the vast majority of the work, including community relations. Any time that external constituents were involved, particularly governmental constituents, I worked together with all the chancellors. I told them that sending separate individual messages to legislators was a hanging offense and that we had to stay together as a team, even if the budget favored one campus over another. As a result, I never had any issues on this score.

FL: What are the some of the specific qualities that you look for in the people that you choose to work with and depend upon?

MB: The most important attribute is how smart they are. I want to work with smart people, people who get it, who don't have to be told twice. I want to work with people who are self-starters, who can initiate action. We agree upon the goals that we need to accomplish. I don't micro-manage. I want them to keep me up to date on what they're doing, but I expect them to work through it. I want people who understand loyalty—not in the sense of concealing wrongdoing, if there is any—but loyalty to the team and the university. They must have the ability to work together and feel good about each other. They don't have to go off and party together; they don't have to be the best of friends on Saturday night; but they have to be a good working team, mutually supportive of each other, self starters and again, very smart.

FL: I know that in each post you've been expected to spend a lot of time away from the university. As a president you are the chief representative of the university to the alumni and the public and the primary person who solicits major gifts. In each of these posts, have you had someone in your administration who stood in for you, handling the day-to-day work of the university while you were gone?

MB: No. The fact is that in this day and age, you can always be in contact through Blackberries, telephones, and other communication devices. Fortunately I don't have to lug around my laptop anymore.

FL: I want to talk a little bit about the vision. How did you formulate a vision for the future at each of the institutions that you served?

MB: Visions can't be imported. They have to be homegrown. I always found that it took about a year, one cycle, to really understand the depth and the subtlety of an institution. Even though in some ways public research universities may look alike, there are very important, subtle differences in terms of their traditions and their aspirations, as well as their strengths and weaknesses. I always spent the first year going through a planning process. It was good for the institutions to have that exercise in self-reflection, but it was

essential for me in order to understand what each institution was about. Once I understood what its aspirations were and what was possible in terms of its strengths, then I would let a vision emerge. I would constantly test and retest that vision. I'm a philosopher and philosophy is mostly done through dialectic debate, so I would formulate a position that I thought might work and I would go into a group to try it out. I wanted people to argue with me. Could I defend this position? Did this make sense? Did they have objections? That's the process. It just takes some time and you have to be patient with it. But at the end of the process, there emerges a future vision of the institution that is consistent with and indeed underlies what its members want it to become but is more than they are currently able to reach. The vision of the future has to be a stretch, something more than they had in their minds when they started.

Let me go back to information technology for an example. Even though we started from nowhere, the vision was to make Indiana University a leader in information technology in absolute terms nationally and internationally. We had the wherewithal to do it, but the university was not organized to accomplish it. When I said that, people didn't have a clue what I was talking about and weren't willing to accept it, but we accomplished what we set out to do. I'll give you another example, this one in the area of fund raising. Indiana University was at the bottom of the Big Ten in numbers of chairs and professorships. I worked with the foundation board (which as you know is different from the governance board in public institutions) and said that we were going to have a campaign and when we finish this campaign, we'll be number one in the Big Ten in chairs and professorships. They thought I was from Mars. The fact of the matter is that we did it and we had an extraordinarily successful campaign. That was what we needed at the institution, that was what the people wanted, but they were not willing to say that was where we were going. They needed someone to stand up and say that this is our goal, we're going to focus on it, we're going to put our energy, our people on it and we'll get it done. That's what it took. Of course everyone was happy when it was accomplished, but they didn't believe it was possible when we started.

FL: What strategies did you use to communicate and create buy-in to the vision by the academic community, as well as the external constituencies, such as alumni and friends?

MB: I tried grassroots planning in the first year. I would meet with departments and colleges, cross sections of faculty, and department heads. I never got complete buy-in from any group of faculty. Their interests are more focused in their disciplines. I think campus politics plays a part there too. I did get more buy-in than when I started and I got enough buy-in to get it done, but there were always those who were skeptical and some who were cynical. In this day and age, if you let that control your actions as president, you're not going to get anything done.

FL: You mention the sometimes narrow disciplinary focus of faculty scholars. Do you foresee that one day departmental barriers will be broken down and we will manage our faculty in a different kind of structure?

MB: I don't believe so, because, given all the increased communication opportunities, faculty members no longer identify with the institution, at least faculty in big research universities. They identify with people in their subdiscipline on a national and international basis. They don't talk to the people in the same department down the hall. They talk to people half way across the country and that is their support group, not their local colleagues. The barriers are no longer local, institutional barriers that you have a hope of breaking down by bringing people together at your house for dinner. You can't do that any more because the identification of faculty members is in a much more dispersed fashion and doesn't rely upon institutional connections. At least in the foreseeable future, I don't think we'll break down those barriers.

FL: You are probably right about the fact that faculty find their colleagues and support groups in their highly specialized subdisciplines, which are national and international in scope. As you know, that was true in research universities even before we had a greatly expanded communication network. But in some cases you do see people bringing together disparate disciplines to focus on a problem. A Rutgers neuroscience faculty member came in and immediately started working with people in computer science, anthropology, and other areas on a multifaceted problem so, all of a sudden, a cluster of people who would never have spoken to each other were working together on key projects. He explained that he was a scientist, but many large problems require bringing in other disciplines in an effort to reach a solution. Of course many of our interdisciplinary research and teaching centers and institutes are set up to serve just that purpose.

MB: We are seeing the growth of disciplines in a much more rapid fashion than we've ever seen before. People from certain fields are coming together to create new disciplines. They may not be long-lived, but those multi-disciplinary attempts or the invention of new disciplines, once they get a foothold, begin to look at relationships across campuses, across states, across countries, and they too then become insular. It's exciting for that period of time when new constellations are coming together, but as soon as they form and are productive, they're not going to be unique. There will be similar constellations across the country and those will become the lines of communication among faculty.

FL: How have you strategized translating your understanding of each university together with the external realities into a long-range plan for change and improvement?

MB: I believe in grassroots planning. I think you have to go through data gathering and then it falls to leadership groups to figure out the future focus. You start very early getting a fix on it, scanning the institution to pick out the

strengths and weaknesses, trying to be as factual as possible, and often involving external consultants to give some validity to the claims and simultaneously working to create the long range, global vision. Then, in planning, you bring the two things together. I think that's a healthy exercise. Probably presidents have an opportunity to do it once during their tenure unless they happen to be there for twenty years. Then they have to reinvent themselves and the institution. But, as you know, most of these presidencies last five to ten years, so you only have one opportunity to do long-range planning, and it's best to do that early in your presidency.

FL: How did you link the changes you wanted to make to the financial budgeting process of each institution?

MB: You always have to make clear that it's the plan that drives the budget, not the other way around. But the fact of the matter is that there are so many fixed costs at these universities and so many reasonably good directions you don't want to pull back from, that your flexibility is within a 5 to 10 percent level. It's within that 5 to 10 percent margin that you can make changes. I always found that the best way to promote the goals of the plan is to identify new revenue sources, and use those to provide incentives for the plan. As I mentioned in the case of private fund raising for endowed chairs and professorships, you can provide them to the areas you want to develop. We went out and raised external funds rather than trying to reallocate. I think you can do that to motivate the changes and once you get that momentum going, then you can begin to shift budgets around. But even if you're successful, the redistribution will be just five to ten percent.

FL: How have you gotten faculty on board and enthusiastic about changes?

MB: I haven't always been able to do that. I think there are some faculty who are open to change and looking for new ways, so of course you work with them. Then there's a good middle group who see not merely that the money is there, but there's some intellectual excitement and new opportunities. What you've drawn out in the plan is actually their tacit aspirations. But there will be some faculty members who are either so focused on their own narrow work or their own personal lives that you're not going to bring them along, and then there are always the cynics. If we wait to see if we can get eighty or ninety percent of the faculty headed in the same direction, I think that we'll never get anything done. At the same time you can't have a successful plan with just ten or twenty percent of the faculty behind you. You have to have a good critical mass.

FL: Making change often is not synonymous with making friends. Can you describe one or more critical incidents, how they arose and how you dealt with them?

MB: For the most part, in Oregon or elsewhere, in the other hard decisions that I had to make there was reasonable acceptance. But I have learned how not to take personally the concerns and sometimes the statements of those virulently opposed to decisions I have taken for the good of the institution.

FL: In instances like the Oregon situation in which you took actions that displeased many people, what was the media reaction? How did they deal with the issue? Were you a villain or were you a hero?

MB: Externally I got credit for doing the hard work. While Measure 5 was being debated, I was very vocal. Interestingly, Oregon has a law that prohibits the heads of agencies, and that includes the presidents of the universities, from speaking about any issue pending before the state legislature. Obviously I was on a stump to try as best I could to prevent this measure from passing. I and other opponents of the measure failed in that, but even so I would give speeches in which I would tell people that you must understand that I can't say anything about this, but if I were to say something.... I filled the newspapers with op-eds. At the board level, the chancellor level, the legislative and the gubernatorial level, I think there was appreciation that I was willing to make the hard decisions. The newspapers sometimes were interesting. They wanted to know how many people were going to be fired, the names of everyone, and when. I said that these were personnel issues and we weren't going to talk to them about it. There was a little conflict with the newspapers, but by and large, the external reception of this rather hard-nosed approach, combined with a plan for the future, was well received.

FL: Let's go on to monitoring progress and celebrating success. What methods did you use to assess the outcomes of your initiatives at each of the institutions?

MB: At Indiana, we set specific goals and we measured ourselves against peers. We did not use *U.S. News and World Report* and other such measures, but we looked more carefully, for example, at the amount of private funds we raised each year, at the standing of our information technology among peers, at the number of faculty members who won awards, and the placement of our graduating students. We looked at a number of concrete measures, set up specific goals, and met them.

Of course in regard to any of these goals, there can be conflicting opinions. For example, Indiana is a rather homogenous state and seven of the eight Indiana University campuses draw students almost exclusively inside the state. However the Bloomington Campus has an opportunity to recruit nationally and internationally, which gave us a real opportunity to increase the diversity of the campus, thereby providing a better education for all the students. That caused us to measure our admissions criteria in ways other than simply SAT scores. Some faculty members wanted to measure principally in terms of SAT scores. I have always thought that greater diversity creates a better environment for all students and that diversity is a positive measure. So there can be disagreement about whether you are making progress based on disagreement about the metrics, but, for the most part, we had clear metrics.

FL: What importance did you place on the roles of the University of Oregon and Indiana University in their communities?

MB: In the case of Oregon, particularly given the financial situation, we were mostly inwardly directed, but in the early 1990s we did some external outreach and started a research park. At Indiana University, I made it a major initiative, part of our strategic plan, that we would be engaged with our communities and the state. It seems to me that for public universities, the most important variable in their success is not the president or even the governor; it's the economy of the state. A public university engaged in the economy of the state will create a greater partnership with elected officials and business leaders as well as helping itself.

I worked very hard in Indiana to improve the economy of the state and made it a major issue, particularly my last few years there. Indiana had a Rust Belt economy, a basic manufacturing economy that needed to change dramatically. In one instance, we needed some start-up funding for transferring research activity to the private sector and for some partnerships between university faculty and the private sector. I went to the lieutenant governor who was the head of the department of commerce and told him that we needed a research fund of about \$25 million a year, a relatively small amount compared to our neighboring states. He turned ashen. I went around the entire state and hired a couple of people to help me to connect with various constituencies. I talked to every Rotary Club, talked to all of the fraternal organizations, the Lions, the Elks, and so on, had articles in all the newspapers, got the professional associations and the business community on board, had industrial leaders testifying before the state senate and so on. We got the funding we needed from the state. That was a breakthrough. It seemed to me that Indiana University had a real opportunity in the biomedical fields. It has the only medical school in the state and that offered us a leadership opportunity to change the economy. The school of medicine faculty were good researchers; they were also entrepreneurial and they were open to this approach. So I went to the Lilly Endowment, which is Indianapolis based, and asked them for very significant dollars. It turned out that over a several year period they gave us almost \$250 million. The Lilly Endowment had rarely given money to public universities and had never provided funds for life sciences and medical studies, but they gained trust in us and made a major investment. Right now the state is entering a new economic era with an interest primarily in biomedical research, some information technology as well, and, with Purdue, in advanced manufacturing. I think the state's economy is turning around. The universities, and Indiana University in particular, have gotten very significant credit for that.

I saw my role at IU differently than I did my role at Oregon. In Indiana, the need to engage the university in the future of the state was primary, so I spent a lot of time with business leaders as well as elected officials. You've got to adjust yourself to the situation. In Oregon, that wasn't the right approach. In Indiana, it was the required approach, so we made it part of our strategic plan. When I started to do that, shortly after I arrived at Indiana and before the

economy really went into the tank, people on campus didn't understand what I was talking about, but over time, they embraced it. We created a new college called the School of Informatics. We expected about 150 majors in the first couple of years. In the first year we had 1,200 majors. There was enormous capital investment by the state in new university research facilities. That had never happened before; they had never supported research facilities. It was a dramatic turnaround in the relationship and partnership with the state because the times and the environment demanded it, not for some abstract reason.

FL: What did the alumni expect of you?

MB: It's interesting. Indiana has a basketball team that does well. Some—perhaps many—alumni were more interested in this than in our intellectual accomplishments, so part of my job was to present the intellectual strengths of undergraduate education and research. Towards the end of my tenure there, alumni were much more alert and supportive of our engagement activities with the state.

FL: What part of your work have you enjoyed most?

MB: That's a hard question. I think the part I enjoyed most was working with the leadership team in formulating our goals and working together to get it done. It made me feel good to be part of a team aimed in the same direction, working hard, and being able to enjoy some of the successes. I probably enjoyed that more than the point when the final success was reached, when we met our metrics, when we became first in the number of chairs and professorships. That was nice and got a lot of notice but the fact of the matter I think is that I just enjoyed working with these people towards a common goal.

FL: How many chairs did you have and what was the level at which they were funded?

MB: We started with under a hundred and within five years we had 350 to 400, funded at approximately one to one and a half million each.

FL: Every leader experiences planned and unplanned events that escalate into time-consuming crises. Among the most common are fiscal challenges or contract negotiations and PR challenges that crop up unexpectedly. Do you have any crisis management stories that you would like to share, other than the funding crisis in Oregon?

MB: When *Time* magazine named Indiana University as the number one undergraduate institution in the country among public universities, we were very proud of that and it was quite unexpected. They just sent teams to each of the leading campuses. We weren't able to prompt it, it just occurred. Of course after we were so designated we put it on billboards—I mean that literally—and it was a big boost. Apparently that had caught the eye of the *Princeton Review* (which has no connection with Princeton University) and the *Princeton Review* then labeled us the leading party school in the country the following year. The way they undertake their research is by standing outside of bars on

Friday and Saturday nights (I'm not making this up) and interviewing students who leave the bars about whether or not they had a good time. We had gotten a lot of publicity from the *Time* magazine report and we got a lot of publicity from the *Princeton Review* party school designation. Once we were labeled a party school, we had additional notice. *Girls Gone Wild* came to campus to film our coeds and bars, then a California pornography company came into one of our dorms uninvited, and possibly illegally, to do some filming with actresses and volunteer male students, so it was a crisis of some proportions. TV shock commentators took up the criticism. We went from being able to boast that we had the greatest undergraduate program to dealing with all of these bottom feeders who came in and tried to take advantage of the publicity they could generate. We had a crisis management team and I had on staff a person who was a media chief of staff, so we did as much as we could to answer things directly and, when necessary, put the president up front. I think we handled it as well as we could, but these crisis management situations become very time consuming.

FL: Just one more set of questions before we get into the National Intercollegiate Athletic Association. Is there anything more that you want to say about how you would define leadership? You gave two excellent examples of your own leadership.

MB: I think leadership consists of the ability to see ahead and put things in global context, to identify with the aspirations and the values of the institution, to take personal responsibility, and, frankly, to work hard.

FL: What are the most important qualities of the university president today?

MB: I think you have to understand the context in which you're working and realize that various constituencies or individuals will press you for this or that, but that you have to make the right decisions, not the politically expedient ones. Don't be deterred by the negative comments of those whose positions you did not adopt. There are some presidents who have been in office for a long time in various institutions who were beloved by their institutions and have managed to make few decisions during their tenure. I would expect that the campus has good feelings about them, but I wouldn't consider them strong leaders. It isn't necessary to have conflict to be a leader but it does come sometimes with the position. I think you have to be willing to take strong positions when you understand that it definitely benefits the entire institution.

FL: How have the role and demands of the presidency changed over the past few decades in response to the following factors, first the disinvestment of the states in public higher education?

MB: It has made presidents much more committed to finding other sources of funds and in some, though not all cases, has caused them to redistribute funds on campus. It has made the job much more externally directed than it has been in the past. The bad news is that that's a trend that has not abated.

FL: The second factor is the technological revolution.

MB: I think it's changed the way the presidency is conducted. The technological revolution now allows you to be in communication all the time. It increases your workload dramatically. It gives you more opportunity to understand the detail, but it is enormously time consuming.

FL: The third factor is the growing role of private support and commercial application in university research.

MB: I think the intersection between universities and the state or community in all research institutions is now such that the boundaries between what is the university and what is not the university have been blurred, even broken down. I personally think that that's good. Some would like to keep the ivy-covered walls between the university and the external community. I think that in the future, we're going to see a greater blurring of those boundaries. I think it's healthy from the university's point of view, as we become more engaged in the rest of the world's activities and local activities, and it's of great benefit to those who help to support the institution, particularly the taxpayers.

FL: And the last factor is the increasingly strident demands of students and politicians for high quality and accountability in both expenditures and results.

MB: I think we're all accountable in much more explicit ways that we have been in the past. Rather than resist that, it's always been my view that what presidents have to do is make sure you use the right metrics and then be held accountable to it, not just you personally, but the institution. That is a change that puts more pressure on the office and the institution, but I think it's a healthy change.

FL: Presidencies were once measured in decades but now are more typically limited to terms of four or five years. Do you believe that the changes in the role have brought that about or are there other reasons for this accelerated rate of attrition?

MB: Let me tell you a story. William Bryan was the president of Indiana University for almost forty years, starting before the turn of the twentieth century. This is what his day consisted of. After rising and having breakfast, at about 9:30, he would take his horse and buggy and he would drive over to the other part of the campus where his office was. He'd hold meetings from about 10:00 to 12:00, no more than ten minutes a meeting, and then he would go home for lunch. He would spend the rest of the day in his home office with handwritten correspondence or writing lectures and papers. He had built into his contract that there would be no social events. No president has that luxury today.

FL: No one could survive.

MB: It would be a short tenure. The time demands, the pressures for decisions, the dealing with far more vociferous constituency groups make that impossible. The job has changed dramatically.

FL: How would you characterize your leadership style?

MB: I think I'm aggressive. People sometimes think that when I try out an idea, I'm really settled in it. They don't understand the dialectic. I want to put things out tentatively, get feedback and understand all of the points of view, so the dialectic is very important to me. I'm value oriented. I'm a long-range thinker. My strength lies in thinking of strategic context and global positioning of the institution as opposed to details. I'm not a particularly warm and fuzzy guy and that may grate on some people but that's something I've learned about myself and I'm no longer upset about it. I'm a strategic thinker. I'm demanding and sometimes impatient with those who just don't get it.

FL: What do you feel have been the most critical capital investments made under your leadership at each university?

MB: I think that at IU, we made very significant investments in research facilities and laboratories, both in the medical school—often in partnership with the private sector—and on the Bloomington Campus. At one point we had, proportionally, the most construction in the history of the institution. We made several billion dollars worth of capital investment during my tenure. It was quite a remarkable transition once we got the state to understand the importance of research facilities, especially laboratories, and facilities in the performing arts. So that turned out to be an important part of our goal. Here the public institutions do have one advantage over the privates. That is, when the times are good, when the economy is strong, you can convince the legislature to make investments of a capital nature. After all they don't pay for it now. They may bond it for the next thirty years, but they're feeling good about the budget and they will undertake those obligations. So I think IU has been advantaged in that regard.

FL: What do you believe is the most significant legacy that you left to the University of Oregon?

MB: My legacy is probably the repositioning and rethinking of what it needed to do to succeed, that it needed to reach out beyond its borders in terms of attracting non-resident students. It needed a different kind of budgetary approach than the traditional one that the system imposed. It needed to be a national university and I think that came out as a realization in the process of solving the budget cutback problems.

FL: Why did you leave Oregon to accept Indiana?

MB: I felt I couldn't leave Oregon until we were well on the way to solving the budgetary problems. Then there was this wonderful opportunity to go to a major Midwestern public university. I've always believed that the heart of public education in America is in the Big Ten group. There are wonderful public universities elsewhere of very high stature, from the University of Washington and Cal Berkeley on the West Coast to Rutgers and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill on the East Coast, but the heart of public education always seemed to me to be in the Big Ten institutions and when I had an

opportunity to play a leadership role in one of those institutions, I decided to move on.

FL: What do you see as your most important legacy to Indiana University?

MB: I think Indiana has made some dramatic improvements in several areas. It's so big and complex I can't say that there's one legacy. The research funding tripled. The endowment I think has increased sixfold. The quality of the students is high, the capital improvements are substantial, the role in state economic development has increased dramatically, so there's a whole bunch of metrics that have improved.

FL: Certainly the university has improved in regard to its technology infrastructure.

MB: The university has improved its technology, its engagement with the state, and its leadership in certain fields, such as biomedicine. The hospitals associated with the medical school were facing some very serious financial problems about six or seven years ago and I led an effort to consolidate those hospitals with a private institution, Methodist Hospital, to create a new hospital system named Clarion. That was the largest privatization ever undertaken in the state. I can't overestimate how important the medical school is. Particularly during that transition, the medical school took up a quarter of my time, and I don't think you're going to see any great public universities in the future unless they have research-oriented medical schools. Over 50 percent of the research funding now comes through NIH and there's going to be a differentiation between those that can really engage wholly in the life sciences and those that cannot. I would say that generally the institution is much better positioned for the future than it was in the past. It's ready for the rest of the twenty-first century.

FL: How did you make your decision to leave Indiana University to head the NCAA?

MB: Life's an adventure and, if you allow me, I have a chunk theory of careers. My chunk theory is that about every five years, plus or minus a year, you have to ask yourself and your family if you want another chunk. You could say yes, that's great we'll do another chunk here, but if you say I've done as much as I can here and maybe we should look elsewhere, that's fine, but I think you need to have that assessment. After five years with Oregon, we sat down, asked ourselves if we wanted another chunk, and thought that we'd see what opportunities came up. At Indiana, I was in my second chunk. After the first five years we decided that we'd like to go again. I was already beginning to think about whether or not I wanted to do a third chunk when I was contacted by the NCAA. I was thinking of another university or more likely a third chunk at IU, so I threw out the initial inquiry. My wife said, "Wait a second, why don't you look at this?" We did. It was fortuitous and unplanned, but that's why I feel that life is an adventure. You have to be willing to take

interesting opportunities when they arrive and take the risks that come with them.

FL: What advice would you give to new presidents?

MB: Even if you come from the institution, you still have to take a year to listen and learn. Don't jump to conclusions. Really try to absorb the aspirations and traditions and subtleties of the institution. So don't act too quickly, don't go in and fire the senior staff, don't go in and say you've got a plan that you're going to impose upon the institution. Don't make quick decisions on the people who work for you or with you. Give it time; be patient.

FL: Is there anything that you would choose to tackle first?

MB: In each institution, there are a few little things that are very annoying. For example, it may be that people are just not happy with the janitorial service, or the staff salaries may be incredibly low. There will be some little things that really don't fall into a large-scale plan. You can go fix those immediately. Take care of the odds and ends, but don't put yourself in a position that would force you to foreclose any major new directions.

FL: What is the most critical skill or set of skills that presidents will need in order to succeed in the future and how do those differ from the skills needed in the past?

MB: I think the job is so complex, particularly at the large research universities, public or private, that you have to know how to keep many things in the air at the same time rather than doing them sequentially. You must be capable of focusing on a wide range of issues simultaneously. I think that in the past, there was far less need for crisis management, far less necessity for working with the media: you could take your time and do things as they came up. You don't have that luxury anymore.

FL: What has been at the core of your work in higher education?

MB: It's all about the students. It's all about the future. It's all about others. Work in higher education is altruistic, when it's done well. It's about the students getting a good education in the way that my undergraduate teacher, Robert Whalen, taught me the virtues and values of intellectual thought. In the large public universities, it's also about the people in the state. It's about the next generation—and it's about social change: these institutions are the instruments of social change.

FL: What are the underlying purposes that you have worked to accomplish?

MB: My purposes have been to leave the institution better than I found it; to reposition the institution so that it is a positive force, particularly in the state, but also nationally and internationally; and to make the institution a valued part not just of the intellectual climate but the social and cultural climate.

FL: Let's move on now to national policy: the NCAA. All of the presidents I know have found that, in recent years, higher education has become the focus

of intense public interest, with all that entails, both good and bad. Of course college athletics has always been a focus of public interest, to the extent that politicians have sometimes tried to exert influence over it. What has been your experience as president of the NCAA? How has media and political attention helped or hurt you and the organization and your attempts to get your agenda before the public for a full and accurate hearing?

MB: One of the differences between being a university president and being president of the NCAA is the amount of media attention and visibility. Certainly a president, especially a public university president, gets a lot of media attention within the state and he or she is subject to newspaper and TV interest all the time. But it shifted to a national forum when I became associated with the NCAA. I don't seek it and sometimes it's not helpful but there is no avoiding the media attention. I have some very good help at the NCAA. I work with superb people and to the best of our ability we try together to manage it so that our message gets out in the best way possible. But media attention comes with the office and that's been a learning experience.

Let me turn to politics, because I think it really opens up a much deeper and important question. What I think we're beginning to see on a national basis is an attempt to federalize universities. One of the key strengths of American higher education is the diversity of the kinds of institutions and the autonomy that they have held from the state and federal government. That is under attack. We see attempts in the Congress to regulate tuition, for example, as well as to influence research much more than in the past, and to control policy through student financial aid. All of these are wedge issues to get the federal government into higher education. Potentially the biggest wedge issue is athletics. The NCAA has been involved in more and more congressional hearings. Some of it is just because certain elected officials would like to get re-elected and they can help make their case back home by showing that they're standing up for their school, no matter what violations the institution committed. But it's also true that, at least covertly, people feel that if you can get into intercollegiate athletics at the federal level, then you can use it as a wedge issue to get into all of higher education at the federal level. I would not be surprised to see an increase in federal pressure.

My own experience with intervention in either athletics or academics at the state level has been minimal. As a university president I did see a few local legislators on the far right side of the political spectrum who wanted to close down the Kinsey Institute in Indiana University or who made anti-gay statements, but they were just making points at home. None of it was very threatening and I never experienced a gubernatorial intervention. Some politicians suffer from the desire to show that they are arguing in favor of their constituents and for a particular coach or a particular team against the school administration. We've seen that on a number of occasions, but I don't think it has increased, and I believe that a good president can deal with it. I think the federal trend is much more important.

FL: You hit the ground running at the NCAA. You were able, on coming in, to take off on the basis of your January 2001 speech to the National Press Club on "Academics First: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics." As you know, the NCAA was already in the process of formulating and trying to bring to its board of directors a full program of academic reforms to increase the entrance requirements for student athletes, to strengthen progress toward degree requirements, lay down guidelines for more accurate graduation rate collection, and formulate graduation rate expectations, with penalties for failing to achieve them. Your coming coincided so beautifully with the reform movement that there was real hope that we would be able to get these things done. Nevertheless, in talking to some of our colleagues, I have found great skepticism among leaders in higher education about our ability to take control and clear up problems in recruiting, admissions, retention, graduation, student athlete conduct, and in the funding of athletics including the huge escalation in college coaching salaries, football and basketball in particular. One leader's opinion was that the only way out of the recurring scandal would be for the professional teams to institute farm teams, especially in basketball and football, in order to develop the talents of young people who really have no interest in higher education but are forced into it in order to prepare for professional careers. Do you think that farm systems in those sports would be a good idea and would relieve the universities of some of the pressures associated with athletics today?

MB: I think if you started minor leagues in the key sports that generate all the revenue, basketball and football, you would destroy college sports as we know it. I think that is throwing up your hands and saying it doesn't work. Once you rent out the stadiums, license the logos and start to pay the players, the fan interest will disappear. You can fill a stadium with a hundred and five thousand people because students are playing for Michigan or Ohio State. You can't fill the stands with some minor league club that has no relationship between the players and the institution at all. Minor league clubs tend to lose money and fail: college sports as we know it would simply go away.

FL: What would happen to the other sports?

MB: You would have no money to support them. As you well know, the way it works is that there is a redistribution of funds. College basketball and football subsidize all the other sports. In these very difficult financial times, universities would have to put in an enormous amount of money to support the non-revenue sports, given the loss of revenue that would occur if basketball and football moved to a farm team system. College sports as we know it would disappear.

FL: Returning to the earlier subject of academic reform, perhaps you could talk a little bit about what you feel will happen as a result of the measures now being enacted by the NCAA.

MB: The two primary problems facing college sports today are the needs first for academic reform, and second for fiscal responsibility. The need for

academic reform began to be discussed in earnest about a decade or more ago, in the first Knight Commission Report, issued in 1991. Many good people worked on it. In response to the latest Knight Commission Report, the NCAA put together a very strong committee of presidents, which you chaired, and the Group of Six athletic conferences put together a group of presidents on which I served from the very beginning. All that good work was going on in advance of my taking over at the NCAA. Some very strong and appropriate legislative changes were put in place. I was able to bring that to fruition.

I think that we have passed all the legislation we need to meet the academic reform goals that were set out, standing on the shoulders of others in doing this. We do have to implement these measures, but I think for all intents and purposes, we have finished this academic reform cycle: we got it done.

In many ways, as important as academic reform is, it is the easier of the two problems to solve. The tougher problem is fiscal responsibility. The cost of athletics operating budgets, the cost of facilities for athletics, and, most importantly, the autonomy that athletic departments have with respect to the rest of the institution raise the risk of scandals and frauds. How do we deal with the whole complex set of issues?

Here the NCAA's hands are not as free as in the case of academic reform. We cannot pass any national legislation to change the fiscal situation because of anti-trust laws. The only way we're going to solve this problem is if institution by institution takes responsibility for managing their affairs in a better way. In particular the presidents, who are the most important players, are going to have to step up and take full control on their campuses and reintegrate athletic programs into the academic missions of the institutions. We're at the very beginning of that. We're not even at the stage where we were when the first Knight Commission Report came out. This is going to be a very hard second step for us to take because the presidents, who must be in control for this to be successful, are under enormous pressure, not just from boosters and others, but from their boards. Those factors constitute a tough set of problems that make fiscal responsibility a very difficult issue to resolve. But I think the academic reform movement has really come to fruition and I couldn't be more pleased about that.

FL: Those who were closely connected with it, as you and I both were, felt very good about it. My worry is that there may be presidents and universities in the country that haven't taken the time to understand and plan for the implementation of the reforms. Is it possible for the NCAA to find ways to communicate directly with the presidents in order to ensure the success of the reforms?

MB: I think that most presidents actually do understand it, certainly those in Division I. I meet with presidents of each conference as much as I can. There's a good understanding of what needs to be done. Some are not entirely happy with the current approach. It's a small minority, but some are not pleased

that we're raising the standards. You also have some critics who think that the problems can't be solved, but I think a very large majority of presidents are fully on board, and that goes for Division II as well. Division III, on its own, has gone through a very dramatic reform effort, particularly at the last NCAA convention, and those presidents are also well informed. So I think that the presidents do understand and I think that, through the legislation, the NCAA has sufficient authority to enforce these standards. I'm optimistic that we'll get all of that done.

FL: You've clearly been on the side of the angels in your championship of Title IX and the strong stand that you've taken on the need to improve hiring practices and increase the numbers of African-American and Hispanic coaches in all sports. Have you seen any results from your advocacy and from your other efforts to identify and train more candidates?

MB: In Title IX, we've seen a very important victory. If you believe, as I do, that intercollegiate athletic participation in college sports has educational developmental value, if you believe that education involves more than just textbooks and lectures but also character building and goal-setting, and that intercollegiate athletics plays a role in that development, then why would you offer those opportunities to men and not women? The fact of the matter is that Title IX gives educational opportunities as well as athletic opportunities to women and that's critically important. When Secretary of Education Paige, under the White House's direction, reexamined Title IX recently, there was great concern that they would overturn Title IX. The fact of the matter is it was reaffirmed and even strengthened. So I consider that a victory.

FL: That was a very significant victory.

MB: With respect to hiring of coaches, coaches of color in particular, we have two issues. One is the issue of having a search process that allows the best talent to rise to the top and the second is making sure that assistant coaches are prepared to move into leadership roles. I think we've made progress on both of those. The NCAA has started what we call Coaches' Academies to ensure that promising young coaches of color will have an opportunity. We're starting a new one this year for women coaches. One of the problems we've had is that it used to be that the majority of the people who coached women's teams were women. Now a large majority of those who coach women's teams are men, so some of our best women coaches haven't had the opportunities they need. We'll also begin to look at that. The numbers have changed modestly, but I think the effort is in place now to see some changes in the next few years.

FL: Speaking of coaches, we pick up the newspaper almost daily and find that we have coaches who have gotten off the straight and narrow in one way or another. Of course that reflects badly on all of the programs including the 99 percent that are playing strictly by the book. Is there anything that can be done about that?

MB: I think that the athletic directors play a critical role. As you integrate athletics back into the mainstream of the institution, the athletic directors become much more important and become, as it were, key administrators within the institution rather than administrators simply running an auxiliary enterprise. They have the responsibility of working with the coaches. We expect these coaches to do three things. First, we expect them to have competitive teams. Winning comes with the territory. Second, we expect them to respect the academic mission of the institution as, for example, measured by graduation rates. Third, we expect them to represent the institution well. Going to a strip bar in a very visible way is not representing the institution well. In the past, coaches were able to do some of these things, live normal lives, if you like, but that's no longer true because the market has driven up the coaches' salaries, with about two dozen of them earning seven figures a year. It has reflected upon the behavior of all the coaches. Coaches in major programs are now under the same scrutiny as high elected officials. It comes with the territory, even if they're not one of the two dozen making those large salaries, so they have to understand the level of scrutiny, the level of visibility that they have, and what they need to do to represent the institution well. The AD plays a key role in that.

FL: You mentioned in one of your earlier comments about athletics the problems that can be connected with the active involvement of board members. What can be done to educate boards about the potential danger in which they put the institution by yielding to the temptation of being closely connected with the athletic director and encouraging the athletic director to move in certain directions?

MB: The Association of Governing Boards (AGB) came out with a white paper recently in which they made an important statement on that topic. They said the policy of overseeing athletics is the proper role for governing board members just as they oversee every other part of the university, but the administration and management of athletic departments, including hiring and firing coaches, is entirely in the hands of the president. That is a very important principle to the extent that, if that principle is ignored, the institution is placed at great risk and the president is placed at enormous risk. If someone gets fired, it's not the board members; it's the president. There is temptation, and even precedent in the traditions of some institutions, for some board members to be directly and actively engaged in the hiring and firing of coaches in the athletic program. There are some institutions that still have a separate 501C3 for the athletic department. The president has no real control over it. We've got to be able to move to a situation in which the presidents are in charge in athletics and the board members understand that. No one person may be able to create that change. It is going to take an agreement, a movement—and the NCAA may be able to play a role here—that helps people better understand what is the proper administration of athletics. I consider that an insidious problem on some campuses.

FL: I was pleased to see that you had directed committees to use a "student athlete first" or "kindler, gentler" approach in regard to academic waivers and eligibility appeals. I'm sure that its implementation is not without controversy. How is it working out?

MB: I think it's working out very well. We're not all the way there, but we're getting there. The key idea is that the students come first. The only reason we have intercollegiate athletics is because of the students. Unfortunately, even though our policies and our large book of rules said that students come first, our practices had been that competitive equity took precedence, particularly in the NCAA membership committees. I've tried to reinsert that key understanding that the students come first. It took some work to do it with the staff because they had been focused on the issue that if it looked like there was competitive advantage, even if the student was inadvertently harmed, we would take action. Now if the student is inadvertently harmed because of a situation or because of the rule, we give the student the benefit of the doubt. Minor changes in competitive equity frankly didn't matter much and it didn't affect every case, but it does affect some. Certainly the principle that the student comes first changes the attitude, the way we look at each case. Some of our membership committees are still getting comfortable with it, and we'll have to make some legislative changes. Change comes hard. Coaches and others in the athletic programs are very competitive people and they focus on what happens in the competition, but I think we're moving in the right direction.

FL: What do you see as the major issues on the horizon for the NCAA and its members?

MB: I think the major issues are implementing the academic reforms that have been passed and then beginning to address fiscal responsibility and the integration of athletics into the academic mission of the institution. The only way you're going to be able to control cost in athletic departments is if the decision-making process for athletics is just the same as the decision-making process for the school of business and for liberal arts and sciences.

FL: I know that you've asked Reverend Edward Malloy to head a task force to analyze the results of the NCAA gambling study and make recommendations. What do you think will be the major issues of the next ten years for the organization?

MB: I think that issues like gambling and alcohol abuse or drug abuse and scandals are issues that are very visible and noisy, but not deep. We're never going to solve them completely, given human nature. We can make progress, but look outside of athletics. We have all the laws in the world about violence, felonies, and so on, but people still commit the crimes. Having rules and enforcing them is not enough to stop everyone from committing crimes, but I think that we can make some progress. I think that we can make sure that students understand at a very early age that participation in athletics is compatible with and mutually supportive of their education. Many students un-

derstand that, but in certain sports, men's basketball in particular, that understanding is not complete. Implementing the new academic standards and rules which we put in place is a long-term matter; the other mission we need to accomplish is fiscal responsibility and the integration of missions. We're at the very beginning of that. As I mentioned, that is a bear. It is going to be a very tough problem to solve. If we can do that over the next decade, implement sound athletic academic standards and arrive at integration of missions and fiscal responsibility, I'll wave the flag and say we have reached a major accomplishment.

FL: There are just a few issue-oriented questions on which I'd like to get your opinion. One is in regard to funding. As states reduce their funding of higher education and state legislatures and governors try to cap tuition, how can institutions resolve their budget problems and continue to build both access and excellence?

MB: It is important for institutions to become very mission directed, not try to be all things to all people and for presidents particularly not to fall into the trap of always trying to move to the so-called next level. Understand what your mission is and succeed in that area. Even for research universities, I think one has to choose very carefully what areas to emphasize, not to starve the others, but to decide where the investments should be made. My prediction is that, over the next decade or two, we will see greater mission differentiation among types of institutions as well as among research institutions themselves. The ambitions of the faculty are broad, deep, and all encompassing. You know you've got a good institution if the ambitions outstrip the resources, but the fact is some decisions must be made and focus is going to have to be greater. I think we'll have to accommodate ourselves to more restrictive budgets than we have in the past. There are some opportunities for private fundraising and there are certainly opportunities for engagement with the private sector, but they're limited. For public universities, the major source of resources is tuition, which is not going to go up as fast as it has in the past and state funding, which is limited. We are just going to have to learn to be more focused in what we do.

FL: Is it the responsibility of our state institutions to solve the problem of access?

MB: It depends on which state institution you're talking about. I think if you look within a state as a whole, taking all the public institutions in the state, the answer is yes. But if you're looking at a research campus, it's not necessarily good for the research campus to solve the problem of access because what you want to do is to create a very high level intellectual environment. You want access across gender and across different population groups, African Americans, Asian Americans, and so on, but you don't want access in terms of those who are just barely able to go to college. Other institutions in the state need to be more focused on diversity. So in terms of the system within a state, the answer is yes, but you have to differentiate between institutions.

FL: Do you think then, having said this, that partnerships between state universities and community colleges can offer at least a partial solution to this?

MB: Perhaps, but I have some serious concerns. It depends on what a community college is. In some instances, a community college is a competitor of research campuses or other four-year institutions, where the community college sees itself as offering the first two years of a four-year education. The way you operate a public university is through cross-subsidization. Freshmen and sophomores tend to subsidize juniors and seniors and everyone subsidizes the graduate students. The most productive course in the university is always Psych 101 because that's where you gain the greatest revenue, which is then used to cross-subsidize the classics department. So if the community college perceives itself as two years of college, then what you're doing is taking the revenue sources for cross-subsidization out of the control of the institution and the problems we talked about before, the lack of state support becomes exacerbated in the extreme. If the community college, on the other hand, sees itself mostly in terms of workforce development activity, as many of them do today, then I think it is complementary. I think that the statistic is that a quarter to a third of the enrolled members of a community college have baccalaureate degrees. They are not there to get their first degree or their first two years of college; they're really there for improving their careers or switching careers. If that's the case, then the community college can be supportive of the economic development activities in the state and can remove some of that burden from the four-year state institutions.

FL: Getting back to the question of access. Is there any realistic hope that the states and the federal government will take on more of this responsibility of providing students from low-income families access to quality education?

MB: They can do that through improved need-based grants, Pell Grants in particular. We've been moving away from that direction. It may take a new approach by this administration or the next administration in order to go back to greater emphasis on need-based grants. The institutions themselves and the states have been moving away from need-based grants. Take the Hope Scholarship Fund in Georgia, which is a superb idea, except that it tends to support those who succeed well in high school and those tend to be upper middle class. The greatest correlation between SAT scores is with zip codes, a socioeconomic surrogate metric, so it depends on where you went to high school and what your high school experience was whether or not you're going to get a Hope Scholarship.

FL: It also produces serious budget problems for the state.

MB: In Georgia, they started to finance the merit grant programs by using gaming money, but they have outstripped gaming money at this point. Institutions too are moving more towards merit-based scholarships and away from need-based scholarships. I understand that we certainly want to have some

merit-based scholarships. Athletic scholarships are merit based. But unless we put more funds into need-based scholarships, access problems will increase. I think it is possible to make some headway in the financial aid issues at the federal level, but it will need a change in the direction of federal policy.

FL: You've had the opportunity to work with more than one governing board. It might be helpful to the readers of this book if you could outline what you feel are the important characteristics of good governing boards and what are the problems one can encounter in dealing with governing boards.

MB: Good governing boards have good communications with the president and understand that the president was hired to set the direction and to administer the institution. A good governing board provides good leadership in policy, advocates for the institution, and avoids letting end runs take place around the president and the administration. I think I've been very fortunate in both Oregon and Indiana to have outstanding boards. In general, I would think that one of the most significant problems facing the presidents of public universities is the quality of boards. It's incumbent on governors and state legislatures, if the governing board members are appointed through them, to make sure that the people who are appointed to these boards have the experience to do a good job. It's important to have some members who have large business experience, given the complexity of the universities, people who are not only good friends of the institution because they're alumni or donors, but are committed to the future of higher education.

FL: In the past few years, there have been several instances in which the governor of a state has gotten directly involved with policy issues or even personnel decisions in the state's flagship institutions or the system. Do you think this is a trend about which we should be concerned?

MB: I don't think it's a trend. I think it depends upon the individual governor. I didn't personally experience any of those problems and most governors understand that a certain level of autonomy is necessary for higher education. It's always important for the president of a major public research university to have a good working relationship with the governor. That can prevent some of the problems. In the extreme case, and sometimes it happens, the president has to say no. You can't keep your job at any cost. There are certain points of principle and situations where one has to recognize that it is time to go back to teaching. You can't stay in the job if the governor or someone else is leading the institution in a path that's detrimental to its future.

FL: How important do you think it is for presidents and chancellors to participate in national associations and join in the work of discussing and formulating solutions to current problems?

MB: I'm highly in favor of it and I have found that there were very few presidential meetings I attended—whether it was the Association of American Universities, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, or the American Council on Education—where I didn't learn some-

thing. That was always my criterion of whether these meetings were worth my time: did I learn something? I'm not so focused on my own accomplishments that I won't borrow a good idea, wherever it comes from. I have imported and made workable within the context of the university many ideas that I've gotten through those meetings. There's a secondary effect too, that never should be underestimated and that is that presidents are really alone. They have a few people in their higher-level administration teams they can talk to and who will say no to them about certain issues. But it helps a lot. I think, to spend some time, even if it's only a couple of weekends a year, with people who are in similar situations, who are facing similar personal issues, such as the impact of time on family, and to be able to talk to them and get to know them. So I have always found that secondary effect important as well.

FL: I agree with you. I've felt that I learned something at all of the meetings I attended and colleagues are always willing to give you an honest response. Now you've mentioned undergraduate education, but I'd like to give you an opportunity to add something if you wish. Your institutions responded very clearly to the criticism of research universities not caring about undergraduate teaching. Certainly being cited by *Time* magazine for the quality of Indiana University's undergraduate education was a clear sign that your university was doing wonderful things.

MB: It's all about the students. These institutions are very complex. The good ones will have ground-breaking research and creative activity in the arts, discover new drugs in the medical school, will be engaged with their states and help the economy and the cultural life of the state, but if they're not doing their job very well in undergraduate education, they're a failure. Undergraduate education only took up 20-25 percent of my time among all the things I had to do as a president, but that was a very important 20-25 percent. And of course it's quite possible to do it well at a research university. Just as some people are better at research, others are better at teaching and you have to be able to differentiate the workloads to some extent along those lines. I think that we'll see more and more people working with undergraduates who are on long term teaching contracts as opposed to the normal tenure track that requires research as well as teaching, but you've got to design the institution and make understood through rewards and praise the importance of undergraduate education.

FL: In regard to affirmative action, aside from the admissions issues, how have you managed to diversify your campus in terms of faculties, administrators, and staff?

MB: Well I think in attracting high level administrators, the president can do a great deal. It becomes a matter of what you bring to the table when you hire a high-level administrator, whether it's a dean or a vice president. One can have a clear and open search and aggressively seek out outstanding people, maybe take some risks if necessary in terms of someone not having all of the

prior experience possible, as long as they have the natural abilities. You can do that on the administrative side and, on the faculty side, I think that programs that provide incentives and encouragement through resource allocation work.

FL: Yes, money talks in higher education as it does in other fields. The last question is about the future. What do you see as the strongest forces driving the need for change in higher education over the next ten to twenty years?

MB: I think the economy is going to drive it. It has become clear to everyone that one needs a college education to succeed. I think the reaction to the federal government in terms of its intervention into the traditional autonomy of institutions is going to be a factor. I think that, given the pressure from economic concerns and fiscal constraints, conditions are going to favor those institutions that become more focused in their efforts. Those institutions that understand the need to break the boundaries between the university and its community, its state and corporate America will be most successful. That's going to be very hard to manage. There's a great tendency, certainly among some folk on the faculty, to be rather inward looking and there are dangers in terms of crossing the line into non-academic partnerships. They have to be managed very carefully. But those institutions that can see their way through it are going to be most successful. There are some who think that what you should really do is to build the walls higher and stronger. I believe that's an error. The institutions that oversee those changes in ways that are protective of the intellectual honesty and freedom of the institution while contributing to the general well being of the rest of the state and the nation are going to be the most successful ones.

FL: What do you think are the most important changes that are going to take place?

MB: Because of the changes in the demography of the country, we are going to see a greater number of ethnic minorities engaged in undergraduate education. We want to make sure that there are adequate faculty role models and administrators to support that. I think fiscal constraints will be prominent in the foreseeable future. I think there will be great exciting opportunities in research, especially biomedical research, and those institutions with research capabilities will prosper. What I call the Ponce de Leon effect is in action, namely that those who make governmental decisions about supporting research would like to live forever, or at least have their families live forever, so the biomedical revolution is good for another decade or two.

FL: And finally what would higher education leaders need to do or do more of in the future to help their institutions succeed, given the changing environment?

MB: I think they're going to have to be leaders, not just in their institutions, but on a broader set of issues. They're going to have to stand up more in corporate circles, in community circles, and on the state level. We're starting

to see that more and more. There was a time when presidents were very inward looking because that's what their institutions asked them to do, but I think we're seeing more and more presidential leadership on a broader scale, addressing social issues and addressing the economic issues. I think that's what it's going to take to be a leader among presidents.