

University of Connecticut
ORAL HISTORY OFFICE
U-1132
WHETTEN GRADUATE CENTER
438 WHITNEY AVENUE EXTENSION
STORRS, CT 06269-1132
860-486-4578/5245 (Tel.)
860-486-4582 (Fax)
Bruce.Stave@UConn.edu

Interviewee Permission Form

I do hereby give as an unrestricted gift to the University of Connecticut Oral History Office for scholarly and educational uses the Director of the Office shall determine, including the use on the world wide web, the recorded interviews and transcripts thereof recorded on 7/30/02; 8/8/02; 5/13/05; 6/13/05; 6/19/05; 11/2/07; 4/12/07 I also transfer to the Office and the University of Connecticut legal title and all literary rights including copyright. This gift does not preclude any use I may want to make of the information in the recordings and/or transcripts myself.

Bruce Stave
Signature of Interviewer

9/2/10
Date

Signature of Interviewer

Date

Philip Austin
Signature of Interviewee

PHILIP AUSTIN
Name of Interviewee (Please print)

25 Cassandra Blvd W, CT 06107
Address

(860) 313-0857
Phone

Philip.Austin@UConn.edu
E-mail address

Interview with President Philip E. Austin, the University of Connecticut, by Bruce M. Stave, for the University of Connecticut History and the UConn Center for Oral History, July 30, 2002.

STAVE: I'd like to begin with where and when you were born.

AUSTIN: Fargo, North Dakota, March 25, 1942.

BS: Can you talk a little bit about your early life? What was it like? What did your parents do?

PA: My father was a farmer and investor and landlord, and my mother was trained as a nurse. I was the older of two boys, and she did not work after I was born. I think it was a rather normal mid-western childhood of that era. The Ozzy and Harriet business -- much more simple, of course, than today -- both geographically more simple, and as a result of changing times. But I remember a rather pleasing childhood -- public education throughout public schools. All of my college and employment has been in public universities except one teaching stint at George Washington University. So, I come by this land grand philosophy almost by osmosis. I really do believe in it.

BS: In terms of your schooling, you say you went to public school. What kinds of subjects were you interested in when you were in, say, secondary school, and such?

PA: Geography, I remember enjoying. Geometry. I was on the school newspaper and took journalism each of the four years in high school, I recall. I think those are probably the standouts at the time. Social science was always of some interest to me. The complexity of interactions -- governmental, political, economic, religious and otherwise. But I don't recall having an intense interest in economics until maybe my junior year in college.

BS: Where did you go to college?

PA: I did my undergraduate work at North Dakota State University; I received a Bachelor's and Masters in Agricultural Economics, and then moved on to Michigan State, and on the way to a PhD, picked up an M.A. I had incurred an ROTC obligation, and was hopeful that the Vietnam War would be over, but it wasn't so I spent a year in Washington and a year in Saigon as an Army Captain, and returned and worked at the Office of Management and Budget in the Director's Office as an economist for three years. I moved to HEW for three years, taught at George Washington for a year, where I had done adjunct teaching at night during my HEW experience. And then moved to New York City to become Provost at Baruch for six years, President of Colorado State for six years, Chancellor of the [unclear] system for seven years and I've now been here six years.

BS: Let's go back to college for a moment. You went to school in North Dakota?

PA: Yes.

BS: Did you think of ever going anyplace else? Why did you decide to go there?

PA: My father had died, and there were business interests and other obligations and I just thought that I should probably stay around until things had become stabilized. And it was very convenient. It was only fifteen minutes to the University. I didn't live at home, but I was able to get home in case my presence could be helpful. It suited my purposes. I had aspirations that were higher -- largely -- you know, the

grass is always greener type of thing. And also, I was aware that North Dakota State was not ranked. However good it was, it had the connotation of being lesser than, say, the Big Ten. I had thought about going to the University of Minnesota, which was a big school that was only about three hours away. But I guess I took the convenient way out. I believe that I received a good education. I didn't think about it then, but I frequently tell people -- have told people here, in Alabama and in Colorado -- when parents want their youngster to go to Stamford or Harvard, and they ask me, "Well, will she get a good education here? She wants to come." And I said, "The fact of the matter is, this is a very good university. It may not have the name recognition and magnetism of a Duke or a UCLA, but it is in a category where if a young person applies himself or herself, he or she can get every good opportunity that you can anywhere else. I didn't think that through when I was going to school. But in retrospect, I think the place served me well and I appreciate the opportunity that I got.

BS: Did you study economics there?

PA: Yes.

BS: What got you interested in economics?

PA: I suppose, on reflection, it was -- as is frequently the case -- two or three professors who got me interested. I liked them as instructors. I went back a second time because I enjoyed the experience from the first class. And all of a sudden, I found myself being drawn inexorably down a path that I didn't fully understand at the time, but I

enjoyed the classes, I enjoyed the content. And I enjoyed the attention that the professors -- two of the professors, at least -- gave me great personal attention, dedicated time to answering my not-always-thought-out questions. And that just caused me to embrace a field in which I had something of an interest in any event. But I suspect I could as easily have wound up in psychology or another social science for the reasons I mentioned earlier.

BS: What kinds of extra-curricular activities did you engage in at the college?

PA: I was in the band. I played intramural basketball, but not any intercollegiate sports. I belonged to a social fraternity. As I mentioned earlier, I took ROTC as an option to being drafted, quite frankly. And in that regard, there was a -- I've even forgotten the name of it now -- but there was quasi-military club made up of individuals who were in the Air Force and Army ROTC, and I became its President -- the Association of the United States Army -- AUSA. And it turned out there that that was really more of a social gathering point than a military -- quasi-military organization. I can't think of much else.

BS: You went on to Michigan State.

PA: Yes.

BS: And why Michigan State?

PA: I received a scholarship and at that time, Michigan State had substantial strength in micro-economic theory and industrial organization, which were interests of mine. The department was

chaired by a person of some note -- Bob Lanzellotti, who had made a name for himself in industrial organization. Walter Adams was there in industrial organization. Harry Trebing had a center for the study of regulated monopolies. And it had a group of recently produced Milton Friedman accolades, who had the rigor of the University of Chicago economics training, but not the ideological irrelevancy of it. And I had an advisor in North Dakota who was aware of that and helped me sort out four or five institutions I should apply to and pursue, and Michigan State very quickly gave me an assistantship and scholarship -- bird in the hand.

BS: And what did you specialize in -- what aspect of economics?

PA: Micro-economics, industrial organization and the economics of under-developed countries were three of my areas. And then, it turned out that in no way was I thinking that this would lead me into what later became my career. But one of the sources of my assistantship was administered through the School of Education, and I got involved -- got interested in work that Howard Bowen was then working on in the economics of education and value of human capital and the rate of return not only to individuals of varying levels of educational attainment, but of the economies, and the role of the education and the rate of economic expansion. And that caused me to take some courses in economics of education. The practical impact of that was that I had two members of the Economics faculty, a member of the Ag-Economics faculty, Les Manderscheid, who was an econometrician, and a member of the Education faculty who constituted my Advisory

Committee.

BS: Was there any one individual who really influenced you at that time, in terms of education?

PA: Well, Walter Adams was the household name in economics, and I think he was -- he was not the most respected among the new breed of micro-theorists. He was an old-school, "break-em-up" economist. But he certainly was the individual who was best known in the field. He was a gruff old bastard. But he was always particularly respectful of people who chose to engage him and disagree with him, and I frequently did. And I always found him to be respectful and willing to take the time to talk. And so, he certainly was something of a role model. He was not my mentor. Well, to the extent professors are mentors at the graduate level -- they all were. But I have very fond memories of interacting with him. Les Manderscheid, who was the man in Agricultural Economics, and quite a -- he was a leader in econometrics at the time. He always took a special interest in my welfare and my development, and would nudge me into courses that he thought would fill up my education better. All of those judgments are so subjective. But in retrospect, I owe him much, and I'm grateful to him. I'd say he probably was among the most influential. The Chairman of my Committee was the former Chairman of the Economics Department. He actually ran the Department. He was Deputy Chair during the period. That was John Henderson. And there were many others. A young Turk from Chicago named Tom Saving, who was there during this period. He and another man wrote a book

on monetary theory that received much attention. He subsequently moved on. I think they've been at Texas A&M for the last thirty years. I've lost touch with him. You know how separable all these relationships are.

BS: Yes.

PA: You get a quilt that you did not intend to weave. [laughs]

BS: What year did you finish [unclear]?

PA: 1969.

BS: And Vietnam was [unclear] and you had your ROTC obligation.

PA: Right.

BS: So, you went to Washington first? What happened? Can you talk about that process?

PA: Well, I had a two year obligation, and my first year -- my first assignment was to an organization called Combat Developments Command, which was in the Department of the Army Headquarters. We had offices at Eisenhower Avenue, down in Alexandria and at the Pentagon. My boss was a two-star general, who hated his assignment because he had been the senior American military officer in Korea, ready to get his third star. You know, you don't get stars by pushing paper in Washington unless you're Colin Powell. In those days, you had to be in command.

BS: Who is this man?

PA: General Leahy. Oz Leahy. Great guy. Wonderful man. But unfortunately, when they were in Seoul, his wife contracted cancer,

and he had to send her back to Walter Reed. He came back with her and they gave him this assignment. He wanted to be over killing Koreans, not there pushing a bunch of PhD colonels and a bunch of PhD lieutenants who didn't want to be in the Army in the first place! [laughs] But he was always very good to me. I appreciated the time I spent working for him. But then, it turned out that during that period, the war was not winding down. It is clear now, as you read the hypocrisy and the lies that McNamara and the others have been revealed as David Halberstam reported at the time. The evidence is there. And so, they were developing alternative programs that would allow retreat with minimal dignity. And General Abrams, who, by then had assumed command, was quite upset because the Counselor for Economics at the Embassy was making all the decisions. There were three major programs. The Public Law 480 Program that provided for the importation of wheat -- American wheat -- to augment the rice supplies from the Mekong Delta. The Piaster Purchase Program that had the effect of establishing the currency. And there was the Commercial Import Program. Hundreds of millions of dollars that came in under these three programs -- two of which were Defense Department programs, and General Abrams felt, "Here I am, responsible, and I have no Economic Advisors. I have no idea what's going on, and I'm beholden to Ambassador Bunker and his Economic Advisor." I think the relationship between Bunker and Abrams was very good, but the general did not trust the economic advice that he was getting from the Embassy, and he wanted his own staff. So, with

the flick of a pen, there was created an office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Economic Affairs. And to head that office, they diverted a man who had been Dean of Social Science at West Point named Bill Watkin. He was a one-star general, and he was on his way, much to his delight, to become the Senior Core of Engineers Officer in Vietnam. He was to build bridges in Vietnam, receive his second star, and he would then return to be Chief of Engineers in Washington for his third star, which all of these guys dream of, you know? [laughs] Well, he's on the airplane on his way to Vietnam and they said, "Sorry, you're not going there. You're going to lead a bunch of PhD Captains at the Headquarters." So, once again, I'm working for a General who is frustrated and angry. He want to be out killing commies, and instead, he's got a bunch of PhDs sitting around doing Econometric analyses. [laughs] But in any event, he assembled a staff of -- I recall there were about fourteen of us. A couple of Majors and a Colonel -- to help him run us (the PhD Captains). But the rest of us were all between twenty-eight and thirty-two years old, recently minted PhDs. Hated being in Vietnam, or were a little bit afraid because the Viet Cong were blowing up buses. But in retrospect, it was one of the most educational and wonderful experiences of my life, in terms of growth and watching complex organizations move and so on. And, the memorable thing for me was that on three or four occasions, I was assigned to brief General Abrams on the movement of commodities from the South of Vietnam to where the people were fighting, up North, taking into account the weather, the availability of

commodities, the ability of Viet Cong in the South, Vietnam groups and the American troops to defend the railroad that followed the border of the South China Sea. It was just very good practical economics. And watching people perform in large and complex organizations. I also came to respect mightily General Abrams as a man who was, always a man of integrity. He was a tiny little guy -- tank man under Patton. He always had a cigar hanging out of his mouth. And the image that he sought to portray was one of tough talk and coarseness. In truth, the man had an elegant mind and was extremely intelligent. And a teddy bear. He was just a wonderfully compassionate and thoughtful guy.

BS: When you went to Vietnam, what was your initial feeling about it? That you had this assignment, you had to go there?

PA: First of all, I didn't like the war. And secondly, I quite candidly was worried. I mean, a number of -- not a large number, but I had four or five very close friends who were killed in Vietnam -- so, I was afraid. I didn't particularly want to be in the military. Though, as I said in retrospect, it was a very educational, mind-expanding experience for me.

BS: Did you have any family at the time?

PA: No.

BS: You were single?

PA: Yeah, I was single. We were married in 1977, and this would have been 1969-1971.

BS: So, what kind of offices did you have? Where were you based?

PA: In Vietnam?

BS: Yes.

PA: At MACV (Military Assistance Command, Vietnam) on Ton Son Hut Air Base, in Saigon. And we lived -- I think six former hotels during the French period that were taken over by the Americans, and converted to BOQs (Bachelor Officer Quarters). And we were transported back and forth by busses in the morning. Busses ran every hour. And there were fires shot in anger. They taught us during the nine-week glamour course on M16 rifles. And then, of course, the minute we got there, they issued us a 45 caliber pistol. [laughs]

BS: [laughs]

PA: I was more afraid of it than any of my potential targets! [laughs] And then, because they called me the choo-choo officer, I was doing this railroad stuff to get the food stuff up to the troops. The General always said, "You get out in the field and you observe. You've got to do more than just run these numbers." So, they put me on an Air America helicopter that ostensibly was civilian, and was not armed. But everybody knew that "them Air America guys were whacko." They were the former military people who, as I said, ostensibly did not have weapons. Everybody knew they had shotguns and pistols and everything right under their seats. And everybody knew they were nuts. And so, they sent me up with these guys, and I keep telling them, Get up. You don't have to fly at five hundred feet!" He said, "This is a lot more fun at five hundred feet." And, he said, "Besides, they've got rockets, and I can't go higher than three thousand feet and they can

get us there just as easily.” [laughs]

BS: [laughs]

PA: “Just get me home, Dear God!” But, as I say, those experiences are fun to laugh at after you’re home safely.

BS: So, you were there for one year?

PA: Well, it turns out I was there for ten months because they had too many Officers in Vietnam. And the deal with the administration was that they were going to downsize rather rapidly. And so, literally about three days before I was sent home, I learned that my name was in a file to be discharged. Just as I learned on short notice that I would be going to Vietnam rather than to the Middle East with General Leahy on the Washington Assignment.

BS: So, you came back after ten months -- and then what happened?

PA: Well, I was discharged from the Army. A person who I had known during the time in the Army, Bill Nishanen, had become Assistant Director of ONB for Policy Analysis. He was a PhD from Chicago in Economics. He had been the head of the Institute for Defense Analysis in Arlington, which is one of the lesser-known think-tanks. But it did good work in those days. And they had a contract with the office that I worked in Saigon. And they liked me and I liked them. We thought the same and we worked the same. And so, one of those guys put me in touch with this guy, who oversaw, again, a staff of ten PhDs. We were not budget examiners. We were analysts that provided the director with the alternative view. The examiners made sure the budget balanced and there was this view that -- as is the case

in every state, and we have it here -- that the state budget office is so negative, and all they will do is just cut where they can cut. That gives rise to [unclear] incentives, to spend money more rapidly and not be efficient, and not try new pilot projects, and so on. The intent, the philosophical foundation of this office, was that there'd be more analysis that would be longer term, rather than year-to-year budget balancing. I had federal credit programs as an assignment. And the federal government was, for our purposes, not than agency by agency - - but had functional assignments, pragmatic assignments. Therefore, I ended up with Fannie Mae and Ginny Mae and Freddie Mac. And about this time, the Republican Administration and the Democratic Control Congress reached an agreement on higher education that the administration wanted to move from institution aid to student aid, under the assumption you'll have a more efficient outcome if you allow students to note with their feed, rather than to subsidize the status quo by directing funds to institutions.

BS: This was the Nixon Administration?

PA: Yes. And the Democrats trade-off for that was that they wanted more money to go to education, and they agreed to move from institution aid to student aid if the administration would agree to vastly increase support for higher education. And both of those seemingly inconsistent objectives I could embrace. I believed in the view that the customer (student) ought to have options, and I believed that the federal government should support higher education as the social

equalizer and as the greatest potential for economic expansion of the good life. So, I really got into it. And it was during this period that Sally Mae was created. And there was a small problem. And that was that Region 10 in the then U.S. Office of Education had had some crooked people who were actually out inducing people to come in, fill out the paperwork saying, "We'll keep two thousand, you keep a thousand. Don't worry -- the federal government's never going to follow-up." So, effectively, they were advising people to treat loans as if they were grants. And what was noted by several different individuals in both Congress and Administration was that this would call into jeopardy -- this kind of fraud would call into jeopardy the whole Federal program. So, I worked in that area, did analyses of the student loan programs. It was during that period that the Pell Grants were begun. At that point they were called [unclear] Opportunity Grants. The college work-study program was dramatically expanded, and student loans were dramatically expanded. And that [unclear] of programs, I think, in that period were as important as higher education as was the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1963 or 1964, under President Johnson had for elementary and secondary education. So, it was an exciting time because I believed philosophically in the programs that I was working on. And that doesn't always happen in a big bureaucracy. George Schultz was Director of OMB when I was hired but then moved to become Secretary of the Treasury, as I recall. And [Caspar] Weinberg became Director. And then Weinberg moved to become Secretary of HEW -- after, I think, [Elliott] Richardson.

And Weinberg didn't take me over, but shortly after Weinberg took over, I moved to HEW and was offered the job Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Analysis at HEW. I spent the next three years there doing essentially the same kind of work, but for HEW rather than the budget office -- OMB. And then it was during that period of all the turmoil of Nixon, and Ford became President, and then Carter beat Ford. And Joe Califano was named Secretary. And they appointed a woman named Mary Berry as Assistant Secretary, who, to this day, remains a good friend. We gave her an honorary doctorate last year.

BS: She's historic?

PA: Yeah, she's historic. She's very smart -- very cerebral. And tough as hell. [laughs] There's intrinsic value for a good fight, from Mary's point of view. I respect her and I like her. At the time, it was Chancellor of the Boulder campus of the University of Colorado. She told Regents she wanted a one year leave of absence and she would return. Carter had announced a policy that appointees must make a four year commitment. He didn't want a revolving door. She made the commitment that she would stay for four years there. She forgot that when you're in Washington, it's a hell of a lot different world than the little isolated parochial places, and that inconsistency is quickly reported, and the people in Congress who were looking for an excuse to not confirm her, laid that out as she's a liar, she's a thief. So, they had a problem. And the [unclear] people called me and they had previously said that the sixty policy level people -- people who ran

HEW -- as is always the case in the change of party -- would be dismissed to make room for the Democrat appointees. But they knew that I had been a career civil servant, and they knew that I had neither Republican or Democratic credentials. I was registered Independent, and they knew that because of the Weinberg people, I was not required by the White House to sign a party pledge. And so, I did not constitute a threat. And they needed somebody to act as Assistant Secretary. So, they said, "If you will stay on as Active Assistant Secretary until we get this personnel issue clarified, we will arrange for another GS 16 job for you to return to." Well, I had already accepted the academic appointment at George Washington. So, I called the provost and explained my predicament and asked if I could be granted a delay from six months to a year. It turns out, it was only about six months. And it was an absolutely wonderful period because I was not a threat to anyone. I was not imposed on the Democrats by a Democratic White House with patronage appointments from Georgia or elsewhere. It turns out that Hale Champion and Ernie Boyer, who was the then-Commissioner were great partners, and Joe Califano and Mary Berry were great partners. And, to say the very least, Ernie Boyer and Hale Champion won the war. Because Califano couldn't care less about education. He was on heroin. His whole thing was the money and the political power and the prestige were in health and welfare, and he ignored education, which left Ernie Boyer and Hale Champion, who was the Under Secretary in charge. You know, I advised Mary, "Don't get into a war with Ernie because the Commissioner's got the dollars.

You're the policy-level person." Under that structure, the Assistant Secretary over-saw the activities of the Commissioner, the Director of NIE, the Director of NCES, which is the Statistical gathering enterprise and the Fund for the Improvement of both Secondary Education. The Commissioner ran ninety-nine percent of the money. The other three were important, but irrelevant to Washington insiders and bureaucrats and power manipulators. And so, it was the Commissioner to whom the Governors looked, the Mayors looked, the Superintendents looked, One Dupont Circle agencies looked, and the Congress looked. And Mary didn't play her cards the way she should have in my view. Though she's emerged and she has staying power. The Civil Rights Commission, God bless her! [laughs] I love watching her in battle.

BS: Is the appointment at George Washington -- what made you look at an academic [unclear]? What was that position?

PA: Well, if I had not gone in the Army, I suspect I would have sought, as did most of my contemporaries, an Assistant Professorship of Economics some place tracking for tenure. The people who majored in Economics at Michigan State and Michigan -- I didn't know too many at Wayne State. But really was a bifurcated track. You either did corporate finance with one of the big three auto makers at that time, or you went out to become an assistant professor and hoped for a professorship at a good school. And so, this was always in the back of

my mind. The government experience was just wonderfully expansive for me. It was a great time. It was an exciting time in Washington. But I saw too many old men (that is forty-five and fifty years old!) [laughs] who were ABDs or had PhDs, who arrived thirty years earlier to spend three or four years and here they were, pushing paper. So, I kind of vowed to myself, that in spite of the fact that I was having fun, I was not going to allow myself to be seduced into a federal career. I wanted to do other things. What I was appointed at George Washington to do was to teach one course a semester, and to be the head of an inter-disciplinary PhD program in public policy. I was the Chair of a Committee made up of professors from eight departments, including Political Science, Statistics, Economics, Education, etc. The idea was to come up with not an educational administration program, but a public policy program. The Dean at the graduate school at the time was a guy named Henry Solomon, who had formerly been a Chairman of Economics. He was committed to this program. I didn't have a big budget, but when I needed something done Henry knew how the place worked, he had the place wired. When I would run into a brick wall or I'd encounter a recalcitrant know-it-all, Henry advised me how to get around it. That was a good year, and I thought I'd be there for a while. I didn't think I'd stay there forever. But about six months into it, a guy with whom I went to Saudi Arabia and Iran -- Joel Segall called me from New York. He had been Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy. He held one of those chairs at University of Chicago Graduate School of Business. An absolutely

brilliant man and a great guy. He and I traveled to the Middle East two or three times. This was during the time of the oil crisis in the 1970s, and they were trying to get Middle Eastern money back to the United States. So, we were selling things like construction services to Middle Eastern countries. It started out with Saudi Arabia and Iran because that's where the money was. That's where the American revenues were going. But because of the Middle Eastern politics, we had to have the same type of mission to Israel, and then that made it necessary to go to Jordan. So, all of a sudden, Kissinger was running what they called his Joint Economic Cooperation Committee. That was the euphemism. What it really was was to get American bucks back by selling services to Saudi Arabia and Iran. Joel and I were responsible for the education and labor components. Bill Simon was the guy who led the efforts and typically involved maybe ten of us flying over and developing arrangements. After he left Federal service, Chancellor Kibbe -- Bob Kibbe named him President of Baruch College in New York. He called me and said, "How are you doing at George Washington." And I said, "I'm doing fine." I said, "How are you doing?" [laughs] He said, "I'm the token conservative of New York, and I don't like it!" Baruch is a great place. It's got that 42nd set of Street PhD programs that draw on faculty from Brooklyn, Queens, Hunter, and Baruch. There was one other I forget. But they had classy PhD programs. And concurrently, they were doing their city mission -- public school city mission -- which was the historic City College mission. Baruch was doing really very well. They had

open admissions, but they also had rigor. Anyway, he said, “This place is driving me nuts.” He said, “I want you to come up and help me.” And, of course, the force of his intellect and his stature had him being invited around the world to give papers and talks and going on Boards, and so on. So, to make a long story short, I left after only one year at GW, and went up to Baruch. And it was a wonderful experience.

BS: The position at Baruch was --?

PA: Provost. Provost and Professor of Economics. And Professor of Finance. I guess at Colorado State there were two departments that I was both Professor of Economics and Professor of Finance of two departments. I think at Baruch it was Professor of Economics and Finance in one department. But it was a great experience. And during all those years we didn't have children, and so Susan worked at Union Carbide. And we lived at 49th and 1st, and my office was at 23rd and Lex, and her office was at 47th and Park. So, we were just able to consume that city, and the nature of my boss' job was he was invited to a lot of plays and performances at the Met and the Metropolitan Museum and openings on Broadway. And much of that he -- he and his wife would go to as much as he could, and then he would just give me the unused tickets. So, we were able to do things that we couldn't have otherwise afforded. And it was just wonderful. I wish we could go back and replicate that life, but there's no way you can afford it on a working stiff salary, you know? [laughs]

BS: How many years were you at Baruch?

PA: From 1978 to December of 1983, I think, I was named President of Colorado State, and we actually moved there in March of 1984.

BS: What were the key issues at Baruch? What kinds of things did you do there? Aside from going to shows. [laughs]

PA: [laughs] That maybe happened six or seven times, but they were the memorable experiences. I was the Chief Academic Officer. And so, I oversaw the tenure, promotion, and appointments process. The allocation of the budget among academic departments. It was a rather simple structure. Baruch was known as the business school, but it also had a number of distinguished arts, humanities and social sciences departments. We were able to attract and retain distinguished faculty in these areas, among other reasons because they wanted to live in New York City. The History Department at Baruch had Ed Pessen, Clara Lovett, Randy Trumbauch, Dick Wade, Cynthia Whitaker and Myrna Chase.

[end of side one, tape one]

BS: So, you were saying that Clara Lovett was brought in as Provost.

PA: My Assistant Provost.

BS: Oh, Assistant Provost because you were Provost.

PA: The point I was making about Baruch was that even in Liberal Arts, for which it was not well known, you had History and several other distinguished departments. There were just pockets of just superior people that the good students could interact with.

BS: Yes. The issues.

PA: The issues were what you would expect in a city University of New York when the experiment of open admissions was -- is a matter of social equity. The thing to do, but it went over-board and the place -- the four good schools that had these wonderful reputations -- Brooklyn, Queens, Hunter and Baruch -- were in fear of having happen to them what happened to CCNY in the Bronx. And that's going from this reputation of just absolute excellence in public education to being inferior. And I'm told now that CCNY is coming back out of it and moving to its historic stature. That didn't happen at the other four places, and that was our constant challenge. To serve the contemporary groups of immigrants -- first generation college goers, while still enforcing some level of academic rigor.

BS: Yes.

PA: It's noble work. Those were some of the best years in education I had because it was a great challenge. Constantly under criticism. The Democrats and the Republicans were hypocrites. Pataki is now quite open in putting ideologues and right-wingers on the two Boards of Education -- SUNY and CUNY. But he's doing nothing different than Cuomo did. And it's remarkable that the SUNY and CUNY systems have remained as committed and successful in pursuing their public purpose, given the environment in which they work. I remember sitting at a Board meeting. [laughs] We were trying to get the old Metropolitan Tower on Park Avenue -- it was at that time that American Airlines was leaving the city and other confrontations were

leaving the city. There was a guy named David Margolies, who was a Baruch graduate and Chairman of Call Industries and was very close to Mayor Koch. And David Margolies was instrumental in exploring with the brass at Metropolitan Life, the notion of selling that beautiful building for a dollar to the city, so they could leave the city and avoid the taxes, and do all the things that American Airlines and Union Carbide and others were doing. Well, it didn't pan out, and it wasn't worth it to them. And when it finally got down to the wire, they were not going to -- if you lose the tax base of the income tax, you lose the tax base of that beautiful building, and so on. But we dreamed for a while. [laughs] In any event, I remember going to the Board of Higher Education meeting and this was -- I was not the one talking, but this was being described to the Board of Education, which is made up of -- as I recall -- each of the Borough Presidents had an appointment. The Governor had five appointments, as I recall. The Mayor had a couple of appointments. All of which had to be vetted through the Cardinal, the Black Bishop, the Chief Rabbi -- you know? [laughs] So, when you get this camel together under a tent, and you've got yourself an interesting challenge! There was a guy named Armand D'Angelo, who was the head of the union over in, I think, Queens. The proposition was that we were going to get this wonderful gift to the city. Shouldn't we all rejoice and share a glass of champagne? [laughs] He said, "We're not taking any gifts like that. We're going to build new things, and my people are going to have jobs to build it!" [laughs] That's what made America great, you know?

BS: [laughs]

PA: [laughs]

BS: That was New York -- high rent.

PA: Right. [laughs]

BS: Now, you left there for Colorado. How did that develop?

PA: I don't know. I got a letter saying that I'd been nominated. It was one of those rare things because most often, you go through the charade of agreeing to get somebody to nominate you, etc. That happened to be one where I was just nominated.

BS: Do you know who -- ultimately, did you find out who nominated you?

PA: Well, it turns out it was a professor who I had met at a conference. I didn't know him real well. We had a couple drinks together after a meeting. But he felt sure this was interesting stuff. On the one hand, I didn't want to leave the city. We loved it -- really. But life had become more of a challenge because Carbide had moved up to Danbury. And so, we bought a little weekend house up there. I mean, we were going apart. I would go spend the night up there, and the train -- I was having to live like most New Yorkers, and I didn't like it! [laughs] So, I sent in my credentials, and they informed me that I was down to a list of ten, and down to a list of four. And then they offered me the job.

BS: This is Colorado State?

PA: Yes.

BS: You went through a series of interviews, I assume.

PA: Yes. As I recall, I went through a screening telephone interview with

the Search Committee, and then I went out and spent three days -- excruciating days -- meeting virtually everyone that had ever passed through the gates of the State of Colorado, it seemed like. And then they offered me the job.

BS: This was Chancellor or President? What's the difference there?

PA: Well, the Board that oversaw Colorado State also oversaw the activities of the University of Southern Colorado in Pueblo and Fort Lewis College in Durango, the former being an amalgamation of this series of two-year courses [unclear]. Fort Lewis, on the other hand, was this wonderful little liberal arts college with only three or four thousand students.

PA: Durango is a lovely little cowboy town situated in -- the summers are as beautiful as the winters, and so on.

BS: Tamaron.

PA: Yeah, yeah. Tamaron and Telluride. And the colleges up on the bluff looking over all of this -- it's just wonderful. But in any event, I was named some time around December. I moved in March. And in that time I flew out three or four times, and I still remember one of the Board members was an officer of that architectural cash register -- it was United Banks of Colorado, that big, tall building that dominates the Denver skyline. They call it the cash register building. We were sitting up there in this dining room and the then-Chairman of the board and this woman who was an officer at that bank said, "Colorado higher education is getting ready for reorganization, and the University of Colorado Board has its four campuses under a President, and we're

fearful that if we're not organized similarly, the legislature could do great damage to us. And so, we're going to have a single officer responsible for Colorado State, USC and Fort Lewis. And each of them will have an administrative head. And we know we hired you to be President of CSU, but we're going to create a Chancellor's position, and you can choose which of those you want." [laughs] And I thought, "Wait a second. I signed on to become President. I'm not going to report to a bureaucrat. But I don't want to be the bureaucrat because I want to be on the campus. So, we've got a problem. And we're going to solve it before I move the first piece of furniture here." I suggested that I as President of CSU, can coordinate those other two places. I'll be the Chancellor and the President, and I'll be responsible for the activities of those other two Presidents. So, I'll be both." They said, "Okay, you can do it." [laughs] So, it turns out that we recruited within the next year the new Presidents of both Southern Colorado and Fort Lewis, who could deal in this new environment. Wonderful guys. They both were there for about ten years, and I think left with great respect. They did good work. And I appointed a Vice Chancellor for Finance and a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who coordinated the [unclear]. And that was the staff of the Chancellor's office. It was more of a ministerial, public affairs function. And most of my work was as President of CSU.

BS: I see. And this was 1984 to 1989?

PA: Right.

BS: What were the issues you were dealing with in Colorado? How

different did you find it from the New York system?

PA: Well, just the sociology of Colorado. Colorado is five different states, really. You have the inner city realities of Denver and Pueblo, with a lot of family problems, a lot of drug problems, a lot of people suffering, a lot of economic challenges, which gives rise to a Pat Schroeder or the very liberal congress- woman. You've got the Eastern Plains, so-called, which is East of Denver and East of I-25, which bifurcates that state. They belong in Kansas or some place. You have the Colorado Springs retired military, who are generally extremely conservative. You have Boulder, which is a world onto itself, with these drug heads and all of that. And then you've got Fort Collins, which is conservative but pragmatic.

BS: [laughs]

PA: Which answers the question -- when people say, "How can one state produce a Pat Schroeder and -- Tim Wirth from Boulder, who is a great guy, but he's very, very liberal. And a Bill Armstrong and Ken Kronier who are extremely right wing from Colorado Springs. And then Hank Brown, who was the Congressman from FL. Collins and later a U.S. Senator. And it is really that it's four or five quite different views of government. So, one great challenge there was to try to develop a consensus as to what the government can support, and get a strategic sense over where we wanted to go in five years, where we wanted these institutions to be in five years. What was very clear was, CSU was making great progress. It's like what happened at the University of Wisconsin. They created that crazy system, and it had the

effect of bringing down Madison. The rest all wanted to be the same and the faculty all wanted it, which is why I had problems here with these regional campuses.

BS: I was going to get to that.

PA: Gordon Gee was appointed President of CU, as I recall, within months of my having arrived. And you had CSU, CU and the Colorado School of Mines, which were research institutions in that state. And then you had the former teacher colleges and the community and technical colleges. And Colorado, as most states went through the naming of teachers colleges -- universities -- that had the effect of expanding the ranges of programs and diverting resources to programs of lesser quality. So, Gee and I got together with George Ansel, the President of the Colorado School of Mines. We agreed we could continue the traditional war among ourselves or we could develop a united front and come up with a plan as to what we can give the State of Colorado if we get certain increases of budget. It resonated, and it worked for two or three years. We had dramatic increases in budget. And, of course, we suffered the same resistance to change that you do every place. One of the big areas for change was in the School of Agriculture, where I tried to do what Dean Kerr has done here -- change the traditional crops and milking cows and all of that, into biotechnology, and science-based agriculture. And, of course, the farm bureau, as always, and the farmer's union, could be counted on to resist any change whatsoever. We had a very impressive College of Veterinary Medicine, which -- it was probably the best college at

Colorado State. It ranked with Cornell and UC Davis as being one of the top three in the country. I recently saw in The Chronicle of Higher Ed. that George Seidel was admitted to the National Academy. Those guys get their federal grants so they can travel to their meetings, and people in the arts and humanities feel left out. And so, we came up with -- I mean, these were the nuts and bolts, bread and butter issues. We came up with a policy of reallocating indirect costs, where the provost was responsible for assuring that there would be -- for high-performing, highly productive, both teaching and research people in areas for which there was not federal funding, where they would be rewarded for their work, even though they weren't bringing in dollars.

I mean, the more prices are different, the more they're the same.

BS: So, you stayed there until 1989?

PA: Right.

BS: And then you went to Alabama.

PA: Yes.

BS: Can you talk about that transition? How did that come about?

PA: I was called by the Chairman of the Board, who said they were searching for a Chancellor. And my name had come up on their radar screen because a headhunter had told them that I had had some success in inducing institutions to work together, and to share faculty, and to develop joint programs -- both research and instructional. And that was one of the things that my Board asked me to do, and we did have some success. There are always those faculty who want to do that, and then there are those who are going to resist it. We received many

headlines because nobody had enabled the faculty to do it before. And then, we had some good success in doing deals with Kodak of Colorado, Hewlett Packard, IBM in Boulder and Storage Technology. We would arrange to do on-site instruction at their plants, which was a profitable exercise. Primarily, it manifested through the School of Business and executive MBA programming, and also some Master's-level work in electrical engineering and mechanical engineering. But that got some headlines in the Denver Post and Rocky Mountain News about CSU being responsive to the intellectual needs of the economy. Apparently, that in one way or the other, was conveyed to the people in Alabama, where they had these three institutions that were components of a system. The institutions were the University of Alabama with excellent business, humanities and a few other programs and much mediocrity. UAH was a tiny little place -- I think four or five thousand students, but it was excellent. Dr. Von Braun -- so the story goes -- when he relocated the Marshall Space Center down there, did so if and only if the state would commit to providing a technological university right adjacent to the Marshall Space Center, which gave rise to an aerospace, high tech park. And the University was right there, so you had some of the best scientists in the world working there. We could recruit faculty from the around the world. Not to mention, having the government and aerospace scientists come in and do adjunct work. The excellence at the graduate level were technology and science areas. But they had the right philosophy of breadth in the undergraduate curriculum. So, you had all the arts and

humanities and social sciences -- natural sciences -- represented. And then you had UAB, which was a branch of Tuscaloosa, only twenty-five years before. When I arrived, the system had about \$1.3 billion in annual operating budgets, of which \$1 billion or \$900 million came from the UAB.

BS: That was the medical school?

PA: That was the medical school, by-and-large and it's just thriving. It's a wonderful experiment about the successful pursuit of academic excellence. The appointment of a few superior faculty and unleash them. And there were almost no state laws that interrupted their development. I believe it's the biggest single employer in the state, certainly in Birmingham. From my point of view, it's the enterprise of which the state ought to be most proud. It's the hospital that has overtaken Vanderbilt and the University of Florida UAB is widely recognized as the best hospital in the Southeast, and they've got eight or nine subspecialties that are regarded as the place to go if you have arthritis or cardiac transplantation or liver transplantation. UAB's the place to go -- not the others. And it's, I think, because there was a vision that was enunciated and recruited in superior faculty [unclear] and it's building on itself.

BS: Now, where were you located in Alabama? Where did you have offices and reside?

PA: All over. Too many. But the nature of the job was public representation, coordination of the Presidents, using universities to draw -- to capitalize on and exploit opportunities for economic

expansion. And therefore, I spent a good deal of time in Montgomery, where I had an office. The main office of the system and the old mansion in which we lived [contributed by a rich guy for the chancellor's residence] was in Tuscaloosa. But Birmingham is the biggest town, and Birmingham is where the money is. So, that's where we did fundraising and had social events. And so, they provided a condominium in Mountain Brook, which is a trendy, little yuppie section of town, just across the mountain, and I had an office at UAB. I didn't have an office at Huntsville, but they had a hotel on the campus, very much like ours here, and they had a little suite, and they called it the Chancellor's Suite. [laughs] So, whenever I would be up there or we would be up there for a social event, we'd always stay in the same set of rooms, and I could have a little working table, and people could come and visit me there for meetings. But most often, I would just use the President's conference room when I would go up there. But the fact is, I was all over. There was an attempt by the Board to take over higher education, and to split all higher education in the state with the Auburn Board. It's the same thing that I encountered in Colorado. The politicians deal with the lack of funding, lack of direction and lack of strategic vision state-wide is to take over turf and expand! [laughs] And so, we had all of the action except Auburn of any quality. There was a place called the University of South Alabama in Mobile. Mobile had a pretty good political base in the legislature and a lot of money in Mobile. The University of South Alabama which had a medical school was certainly not up to UAB standards, or

even UA standards. They were attempting to be all things to all people. Merging them into our system presented an opportunity to have representation in that part of the state. But it never happened. Our people -- a lot of the University of Alabama graduates down there wanted it to be done, but the people -- the local people -- wanted their independence, and they didn't want to be the fourth of four institutions in a system. And they were probably right.

BS: You were there until 1996?

PA: That's right.

BS: Then you get the call from UConn.

PA: Yes.

BS: What transpires there? Who were your contacts? How do you get in touch with UConn and how did they get in touch with you?

PA: The headhunter from Korn Ferry called and said, "Do you have an interest?" And I said, "No." I didn't know anything about UConn, they were treating us very, very well indeed in Alabama, and I just didn't particularly want to move. You were here and I wasn't, but as I understand it, that was a search that had many bumps, and ups and downs, and people agreeing to be candidates and that backing out, and people wanting to get their nose back in under the tent, and not being allowed back in by the committee, and so on. Later, Lew Rome called me and almost literally his words were, "We have a billion dollars, and we want you to come and spend it for us."

BS: [laughs]

PA: Now, I hadn't been told anything about the billion dollars before! And

so, we talked about it. And this man, Kunhle [John] called me again. Apparently, Lew told him that he had softened me up or something. And Kunhle called back and said, "Well, we can arrange for you to come up quietly in the dark of night and meet."

BS: Who was that?

PA: It was the headhunter who would have been engaged by the Board. And I remember coming and staying at the Goodwin Hotel for one night in anticipation of the meeting at the Hartford Club the next morning, and the driver was telling us that the Goodwin Hotel is the top drawer. If nothing comes of this, just being able to stay in the Goodwin Hotel will be worth the trip.

BS: [laughs]

PA: The tax driver who brought me in -- I said, "Tell me about the Goodwin Hotel." He said, "It's the best in the State of Connecticut. Long history, etc." And I got there, and they had me in a room that reeked of smoke -- second-hand smoke.

BS: Oh!

PA: The rug was thread-bare and the pillows stunk. The chair was thread-bare and the lighting was inadequate. I had a book I was trying to read and I couldn't! I thought, "What the hell have I gotten into here? Even my room isn't good enough to justify the trip!" The next morning it was cold as can be, and I was improperly dressed in my light top coat, when I walked to the Hartford Club, and it was surreal. I can remember Peter Halvorson sitting next to me. And David O'Leary (Governor's Chief of Staff) and all the politicians. The

Lieutenant Governor's staff. And sitting across from me were Lew Rome and Bill Berkley. And then, Willemina Price back in the corner. And Richard Bachou and this crowd. And I thought, "Where do you find the common denominator among this group?" Clearly Berkley and Rome were doing their deals and paying no attention to anyone else there.

BS: [laughs]

PA: Effectively, they offered me the job.

BS: Right then and there?

PA: But don't I have to go through some faculty interview or something, or give a presentation?" [unclear] I said, "Okay, well, it would be nice to see Storrs and my wife would probably like to take a look at the place, also." [laughs] So, they called Richard Bachou. I said, "If someone could get me to a rent-a-car place, I'll drive out. My plane doesn't leave until four-thirty or five." Richard Bachou called Don Hendredene, who was then the major of the UConn Police Department, and those two guys drove me out. We drove through Storrs. And all I remember is the South Campus had already been torn down in anticipation of Clinton's visit.

BS: Yes.

PA: But I saw the Towers (residence halls) there and I thought, "My God, this place looks like a war zone." Well, then, the next time I came back the towers project had been completed and during that visit I got to know Peter McFadden, and Peter seemed so sane and so decent and knowledgeable and intelligent. Kind of a very approachable guy.

BS: Was he Acting Provost at the time?

PA: No, he was Secretary of the Board.

BS: Oh, yes. That's right.

PA: And I thought somebody that seemed to experienced and sane must know how to bring some order out of this chaos and can help me understand. Well, on the Fourth of July weekend, friends of ours took the boys, and Susan and I flew up here [unclear] and stayed at Simon Konover's hotel out at the airport. And Peter came to pick us up the next morning, and gave us a tour throughout the campus, and we went over to the Health Center. It was more kind of psychological -- it satisfied the psychological appetite than really revealing anything. But I had looked at all the books and all the numbers, and thought it was a doable thing. And Berkley arranged -- the Berkleys and the Romes were at Berkley's place at Lake Placid for the Fourth of July weekend. So, on July 5th, we got on one of Berkley's little airplanes at Bradley and flew up to Lake Placid, where Berkley and Rome met us. Susan got to meet them. I got to meet their wives. And they got to see her. We spent maybe four very nice hours with them. And we flew back to the Sheraton, and as I recall, stayed over one more night and then flew back to Alabama commercially the next day. And then, within the next couple of weeks, they invited me back to meet with the whole Search Committee and members of the Board. I can remember Helverson and Jim Walker, who is a physician over at the Health Center -- great guy. I said to Jim, "You seem very normal, doctor.

But this process doesn't seem normal!" [laughs] And Jim said, "Oh, we don't do things the same way. But you can trust Lew. He's been a very, very good leader." You know, as a senior member of the medical faculty says that -- well, it turns out, the medical faculty is not the same as the philosophy faculty. [laughs] But I went through all of that interview and flew back home. I got in the car in Alabama and Lew called me and said, "You've got to come back. Your name is going to be leaked in the press tomorrow morning." I said, "How in the hell did that happen? You guaranteed me annuity and confidentiality?" Fortunately, I had told my Board Chairman in Alabama that I was coming up here, otherwise I would have been mortified. I was still embarrassed because I think you owe it to a Board or at least the Executive Committee to let it know. My Alabama Board Chair cut me some slack by allowing me to say to the full Board that I had informed him, which gave me a little bit of dancing room. But I don't know how it broke. There are those who tell me that Lew intentionally broke the story to tie my hands. I mean, it's like putting together a deal in the State Senate. [laughs] But it was the rocky way of getting here. And during that period, what they said to me was -- I mean, you know what the realities of life here were with Mark and Harry [Hartley] and Lew, and how that trio dealt and gave us the organization we have, and so on. But they said, "What we want is a President who is highly visible externally." And we would encourage you to live in Hartford rather than Storrs." Well, that resonated with us and that, of course -- I said, "Will that be an issue?"

They said, "Oh, no, no. It's not an issue." Of course, it was an issue for a period. But we got through it. It was a challenging transition. Well, I didn't know what I was saying. And so, that first year I slammed the Governor's office and the budget. That's what I had done all the time. It's not being critical or disrespectful. It's advocating for the institution I'm responsible for. Well, very clearly, there is still that large group out there, including the Governor, who thought we were still a state agency. And when he signed UConn 2000, he didn't realize what he was giving away, with respect to control of DHE, the Department of Public Works, of the state Budget Office. I mean, UConn had received vastly more independence. That's what I had come from, and that's what I thought I was operating. Had I known what the reaction was going to be, I'm not sure what I would have done. Had someone who was here for those twenty years become the President, I'm not sure that he or she would have -- it's just one of those kind of rare planets colliding type of things. But in retrospect, I think the Governor, who was not an advocate and was not very supportive -- and we probably got that first legislation because of [Tom] Ritter, in spite of the Governor -- I think the Governor now has -- unfortunately, in a period where there are no state resources, but I think he's become a real advocate, and I think he wants this to be his monument. And I'm taking him at his word.

BS: When you came, did you have much contact with Harry Hartley at all?

PA: Peter, who I've looked to for guidance on getting me through that transition --

BS: Peter McFadden?

PA: Yes. Well, Peter Haverson, also, but it was later. I mean, that was after we moved in here. As I recall, Peter was, at that point, Chairman of the Senate Executive Committee. And, you know, he was just kind of sober and talks in tongues, but he was very helpful to me. But during the transition itself, it was Peter McFadden. I can recall the night before -- we came up the day before the official Board meeting at the Law School, where they presented me and I made my comments, and the Board voted. Peter said, "You know, for the record, you ought to call Harry and just tell him you look forward to meeting him. And then in your remarks tomorrow you can say that you've been in contact with President Hartley." That was very good advice. And Harry has always been gracious. And I actually enjoy Harry -- watching him in action. [laughs] But in some respects, I guess we get along because we couldn't be more different in outlook. But I respect him and I like him. Then, after I was appointed but before we moved here, I visited maybe three times to meet people. And they put me up again over at the Sheraton, at the airport, and gave me what they called a suite.

[end of side two, tape one]

BS: You were saying?

PA: So, they put me up for a couple of days over at the Konover place, and they brought in the likes of Emmert and Cutler and Wilbur and Howard Cooper and Irene Conlan and Paul Shapiro. And Lew

Perkins. And in that group, Harry came and spent maybe an hour-and-a-half with me, and just gave me his perspective and it was very useful. And they all -- you know, you'd come in on these kinds of jobs were -- you have certain authority assumed, and then you earn the right to more authority or you lose the right to authority. And people -- you know people are gaming you, and people know you're gaming them. It's that little social dance you do in these positions, where your success and your real authority are yet to be determined by your behavior. So, everyone is playing the game. And it was in that context -- it was so interesting to hear a succession of very smart people assess each other. And you don't really know any of them!
[laughs]

BS: At that point and time, what did you see the key issues facing you?

PA: A Board that was dysfunctional. A Board, the members of which, thought it was absolutely appropriate to call a Dean and give him instruction. A Board Chairman who was [in retrospect, it was the right thing to do] comfortable directing the staff, "We've got the U.S. President coming. Tear down those historic dormitories, and have it done by the end of the week." And I understand that almost literally happened. Board members -- good people, like Jennifer Smith and Claire Leonardi, who were comfortable calling Bob Gray, and asking to have the UConn band appear at their high school. [laughs]

BS: [laughs]

PA: Or Claire Leonardi or John Downing, who, on the instruction of the Board Chair, would engage and make commitments on behalf of the

University for project labor agreements. A Board member -- so-called Vice Chair Bill Berkley, who is an extraordinarily bright man and tough, but he would float away for six months, not be seen, and then come back for three days when he had some time, and take over the negotiations on a football stadiums before the Board had even voted that we were going to go to Division I Football. It was just dysfunctional. So, I said after this happened a couple of times, I said, "Lew, I respect what you've done here. Clearly you love this place. But you've hired me to lead it and manage it, and I've got to be the responsible guy in the sandbox. It's my sandbox and I'm accountable to you." And to Lew's great credit, he agreed and immediately changed his behavior. But convincing a Board that had lost the knowledge of the difference between management and policy setting was a big challenge. Operating in a place that's got a billion dollars of state money coming in, at a time when the Governor -- you know, this whole culture change, where the Governor looked up on the President of UConn as being a co-equal to the Commissioner of Corrections or the Commissioner of Public Works. That just had to change. I really do not, in retrospect, blame the Governor and his people. That was the culture. Those were the expectations Ella Grasso and Bill O'Neill got to hire his cronies and put his cronies on the UConn budget -- why shouldn't I?

BS: [laughs]

PA: The Governor never said that, but that was the mentality. And it was an organization in which all of the above-mentioned agencies,

particularly the OTM and the Department of Public Works, resented corporate UConn. We designated. UConn 2000 decimated DPW. They lost three-quarters of their staff because there was no work for them. UConn and the casinos were the only significant construction going on. DPW is a small figure of its former self. There were underway dramatic change in the UConn Foundation. As you know, a formal fundraising office not only was not supported in the past, it was only the objections of some very powerful people that [Edward] Allenbee was even hired. And the increase in fundraising was dramatic. The people at CASE, which is their national association, told me that there is no place that even comes close to the rate of change at UConn.

BS: Was that happening prior to your coming?

PA: Oh, yes. Allenbee came and recently told me that a guy named Peter Drotch, who is from Boston, a UConn graduate -- and a handful of loyal alums, kept body and soul together when there was not professional leadership. And they recruited Allenby, over the objections of the administration. One area that has not been fixed yet, that I saw as a great challenge to begin with, was the research institutes that we have here, we must improve here also.

BS: You're talking about the private research --

PA: Well, the research administration. Yes. Not the graduate programs.

BS: The Research Foundation?

PA: That's right. The Environmental Research Institute, Material Science Institute, Biotechnology Institute and the Drug Design Institute, these

have become wholly owned subsidiaries appended to the University, and these people running their own little shops out there. Now, the problem is, in the sciences and engineering, those places have become the platforms on which -- again, some of our most productive faculty do their work. Apparently, we created these agencies which were kind of wholly owned subsidiaries, rather than fully integrated into the research and graduate education program. And then we wonder why we don't have the dollars to provide incentives to humanists and social scientists. Deans and Provosts don't have the dollars because they're all being kept on the outside. And also, you wonder what's happening to the size of the graduate programs.

BS: Did you see this at the beginning, or is this something that you came to subsequently?

PA: I saw it as being something I never encountered before, and so out of what I understand to be the organization of research universities -- public research universities in contemporary America. I do understand that some of the people I most admired were fully invested in these things, and therefore, any change and any improvement is going to be a longer term effort. Because you don't want to do anything that's going to reduce their productivity and the congenial environment that they have become used to working in. So, it's a more complicated challenge. But the good thing is, they're smart people. And they all understand that it's broke. "But how do we fix it?" is the question. And I'm hopeful that this new Vice Provost Janet Gregor will have a little more luck than Bob Smith! [laughs]

BS: Let me ask you a question. In the first letter to the University which you issued, which was in February 27, 1997, one of the things you talked about in there was the undergraduate experience. And you emphasized that -- you mentioned Susan Steele. What happened with that, in terms of the emphasis? Because I don't know if I read it correctly -- I may read it wrong -- it seems that over the past five years, there's been a movement away from that emphasis. Maybe I am reading it wrong.

PA: I think it's analogous to the apparent dichotomy between research and teaching -- there are those who, in my view, erroneously say, "Well, he's a good researcher implying he's not a teacher." In my experience, the people who are the best teachers, the most concerned about students, are also people who are productive in scholarly output. They enjoy doing what they're doing, and therefore, they're also active in the life of the University. I do not see teaching and research as competing activities. I have been told that this place -- and significant part because of the unattractive facilities, treated undergraduates in a disrespectful, uncongenial way. That they received good educations. But it happened in shabby buildings, where the whole attitude was that the professional staff were too busy to serve them adequately. And that that was exacerbating the difficulties in recruiting Connecticut youngsters. We had to come up with ways to make the undergraduate experience more attractive, more efficient, and cause them to understand that's why we are in business, and we understand it, and we want them to be successful, and we want them to enjoy their time

here. That gave rise to the undergraduate programs developed by Susan Steele. Some people suggested this represented a reduction in the commitment to research. And my reaction to both groups when they make that claim is that there are the so-called Big Ten schools, the so-called Pack Ten schools, that are pretty good places, that have good undergraduate experiences, and they also have faculty that are very productive among their peers in their disciplines across the country. We aspire to the pursuit of excellence in the graduate programs, but still being a place where the best Connecticut kids want to come for undergraduate programs. And therefore, I have been very supportive of the advising function. I've been very supportive of consolidating activities in Wilbur Cross, and renovating that place with that in mind, and making an attractive one-stop shopping destination. We are continuing the renovation of the old Business School building to have one-stop shopping in academic advisement and related programs. I think you have heard less about these programs lately because they are in place and the debate over their usefulness is over.

BS: In that first visit to the University, you talked about administrative organization. Was this on your chart from the beginning? As soon as you came here, did you think that you would be changing the organization?

PA: Yes. That it was "dysfunctional" is a euphemism. It's just a strange structure. But what was also clear to me was that the health center was -- with all academic health centers, particularly the public ones in the country -- was embarking on a very difficult journey. And also, that

Mark was doing an effective job as Chancellor, and had maybe shallow, but very broad support among faculty and leaders. I drew inferences based on conversations with the AUP Executive Committee and the Senate Executive Committee and Department Heads I knew, and Deans. And so, in that kind of a period, while I'm still leaning and developing allies among, particularly, the faculty, but also the administrative staff. 'Don't do something dumb,' and 'Don't do something without thinking it out,' and 'Don't announce something without some consultation and getting support for it.' So, I went slowly until this four million dollar issue arose, which --

BS: Did you expect that -- the four million dollar issue?

PA: Commitments were made three years ago without -- no one really knows what happened because you get different stories. But what Fred, who is my source on this, and who was in the middle of it then, I think he's probably right. That commitments were made to Deans with respect to new appointments that were not immediately communicated to the budget office. And it came to light when Maloney and DeTora, who are good people, heard from the Deans regarding what accounts new hires should be charged against, commitments were made without adequate resources being budgeted. I appointed Lori Aronson to fix the problem. She later reported that, "We've got about four million dollars of commitments beyond our capacity to pay." And that's when I said, "Well, this is not the final change, and I am not consulting anybody." Henceforth, the budget offices of both the Health Center and Storrs report into Aronson, who

reports to me. But allocative decisions among academic programs will be the prerogative of the two Chancellors after consulting with me. She will not make allocations between ecology and environmental biology and engineering. But she's going to make damn sure that commitments are not made beyond our ability to pay. And it's worked. The challenge at the Health Center was much greater, and the success we enjoyed was much greater because the external parameters, the external realities, just required us to go in with a meat hammer and fix it. Alas, we've taken forty-three million dollars out of the bottom line since 2000, and --

BS: At the Health Center?

PA: At the Health Center. And one hundred sixty positions. The national authorities are saying UConn is rather a model for the way in which -- our circumstances were such we had no choice. Mass General and Penn are booking two hundred million dollar losses. But they've got these massive foundations that they can use to plug their budgetary holes. They haven't fixed their problems. We didn't have a foundation to go to. And the faculty over there was -- I hear now out here people say, "Why can't you just do here what you did at the Health Center?" [laughs] And I say, "I don't think so!" [laughs] "That's not what you want." But there's more reorganization to come. And I think what we have to do is to streamline the administration of information technology, human resources, purchasing. There is much redundancy here. For example, each of the Deans has too many budget officers and information technology people. But the central

administration and information technology, for example here, does not currently have the capacity to perform adequately. And you can't take the positions away from the Deans until the central administration can perform. But I think a good deal of the efficiencies will be achieved maybe a couple years from now, when we can remove redundant positions. We can't afford it in the colleges and the big departments. But I think what we need is a senior person to pull all of that together, in the same way that Lori has pulled all of budgeting together, while leaving the academic prerogatives and the academic leadership and the two senior academic officers.

BS: Can you go back to Mark Emmert? You mentioned formerly [unclear]. What happened there? He was here and he left. What transpired?

PA: Specifically, and with respect to what generated the four million?

BS: Well, with that. And did that tie-in to his leaving, etc.?

PA: No. Mark was a very capable and very ambitious person, who I think had ambitions to move on to his own situation. And I think he would have done that regardless of -- in some respects -- I mean, my point here is not to point a finger at a particular individual. It is that a structure is flawed. And accountability and internal checks and balances were not there. And individuals who had ultimate responsibility did not have intermediate authority. And that always gives rise, whether it's research administration or budgetary. That gives rise to problems and surprises. And a place this big that has the ambitions this place has, has to minimize the possibility of surprises,

and try to have people communicate and be accountable. And what was clear there -- if what I have been told as an explanation -- I've talked to thirty people and I've talked to them repeatedly, and tried to develop a mosaic that is internally consistent and sensible. What it seems to be is that those who had the authority to communicate a commitment, did not have the responsibility to inform the Budget Office, and therefore, you had a communications breakdown. That has been removed with the realignment of Lori Aronson in that position. And there's a further thing. Wilbur [Jones], who is one of the most decent gentleman I have ever known -- and competent -- but he was a military man. And he believed in organization charts, and he acted in accordance with organization charts. And within the then dysfunctional organization chart -- he was some kind of financial advisor to the President up here, but was not in the chain of command. And therefore, he acted as a staff officer not a "line" decision maker. To say the least, Aronson is not encumbered by organization charts!

[laughs]

BS: [laughs] Maybe on that, we'll stop.

PA: Okay.

End of Interview

Interview with President Philip E. Austin, the University of Connecticut, by Bruce M. Stave, for the University of Connecticut History Project and the UConn Center for Oral History, August 8, 2002.

STAVE: If we could just begin, continuing where we left off last time. And using as a record, some of the letters that you've sent to the faculty over time, and the topics that were in them -- in the first one you included some statement about the West Hartford campus, and when you first came, what was happening with that. Could you talk a little about that, and maybe tie it in to the regional campuses, generally?

AUSTIN: Well, there were -- in my opinion -- unrealistic expectations as to what the University's presence could do for economic development. Everyone talked about economic development. And I believe that economists have about the link between human capital and economic expansion. But I think it's dangerous to look upon the presence of the University as a panacea for all social problems. People had in their common thinking -- the conventional was, I should say, that the Stamford experience could be replicated in Waterbury and in Hartford. That did not take into account the differential vitality and vibrancy of the Fairfield County economy relative to Hartford. With that as context, there were pressures from some significant people, including the Chairman of the Board and the Speaker of the House, whose support had been so responsible for so much of UConn's recent successes. Their view was that if we would vacate the West Hartford campus and relocate to Constitution Plaza, all of our troubles would be solved. That's an overstatement, but that was the political rhetoric. My view was that you don't fix it unless it's broke. The West Hartford

campus was moving along quite nicely. That the physical infrastructure was in dramatic need of some renovation and some cleaning up. But it was in a beautiful location. It was a congenial location. Parking for our students was free. It was easily accessible. And none of that existed in the Constitution Plaza space. It was very difficult to get to. Parking was extraordinarily expensive. Many of our students would probably just drop out, rather than go through the hassle of going to Constitution Plaza. And I thought it would be an enormous waste of money, without any discernable impact on economic development in Downtown Hartford. What Downtown Hartford needed then, and I believe needs now, are jobs and the presence of people who both work and live in the area, and will spend money on restaurants and other outlets. And so, we weren't going to do that. But I talked to the Board chair, the Speaker and other supporters of the proposal, and to their great credit, accepted my point of view, and so we removed that project from the UConn 2000 list.

BS: Now, was that done without much difficulty? Because I remember Lew Rome -- before you came -- taking some people around and showing them Constitution Plaza, and being very excited about it. So, how reluctant was he to shift ground?

PA: I think he was disappointed. And I think he was perhaps irritated with me. But he had told me that I should do what I thought was right. And I thought it was right for the reasons that I mentioned. And to their great credit, he and the other trustees, whom I talked with and gave them the rationale, accepted my point of view. Others of the

trustees had thought this was a bad idea throughout. So, it wasn't any great profile in courage. It was simply that a handful of well-placed people believed in their hearts, honestly, that it was a good thing. And then there were other substantial numbers of people who would have benefited greatly -- financially -- for this. So, in retrospect, about two years later as I recall, the Travelers organization offered us space on the first floor of the Education Center that [unclear] was building, from, as I recall, five to ten o'clock, five nights a week. And we now use that space for business programs as well as a few education and engineering programs. But the end result was about what I had thought would be the case. People who worked downtown would stop at five o'clock or six o'clock to take an occasional course. But the location was an impediment rather than an infraction.

BS: Were the regional campuses -- tri-campus initiative developed? Who initiated that? How did it come about, and how did it play out?

PA: Well, for starters, if I -- or probably you or most other people in education -- were asked to design Connecticut's public research university today, we would locate it in one location, somewhere around the intersection of 91 and 84. Connecticut is such a small state, access is very easy. But we don't have that luxury. We are victims of our history. We certainly wouldn't have -- in my opinion -- a location in Torrington, given what exists in Waterbury. I would make the argument that there is a strong argument for a location in Stamford. And there is strong academic and programmatic reasons for a location

at Avery Point. And perhaps in West Hartford, though my view is that probably what goes on in West Hartford, Waterbury and Torrington would more appropriately be overseen to the extent you would keep them going by Connecticut State University. Except for a few faculty in West Hartford, it's not a research university. It's unfair to impose the same expectations on those faculty as you do in Storrs, particularly in the sciences and engineering. We can't provide them with the infrastructure, the instrumentation and laboratory space. And even for those in the social sciences and arts and humanities, they don't have the library collections. And so, they have to come here. Which is not an insurmountable burden, a distraction. And it's a logistical cost that we're imposing on one set of faculty as opposed to the others. And we're theoretically holding them to the same standard of productivity. So, as I say, that seemed to me that public policy would be improved if we would have the Connecticut State University with its mission envision overseeing those places. That's not to be. When I suggested that we did not need to duplicate master's level work in business and engineering and urban studies that existed in Central Connecticut State University. I said I used the word 'duplicative.' That it would be duplicative because CSU was right there. And the head of the local Chamber of Commerce said, "To have duplication, Phil, you need to have [unclear], and we want UConn not Central." Now, that is a chauvinistic statement if it comes out of my mouth. But coming out of his mouth, it reflects reality and the marketplace. It was to us a cost. It was to us adding further excess capacity to the system in that part of

the state. But there were powerful people who made it very costly for us to not accept their invitation to the dance. And so, we went along with it. Once having made the commitment, I'm enthusiastically now trying to make it work. And quite honestly, part of my calculation in reluctantly but finally going along with the movement down to the center of town, rather than on the hill, was that without that kind of acquiescence, we wouldn't stand a chance to get an extension of UConn 2000. And I believe that particular movement helped us change attitudes in particularly the Governor's office, but also in the legislature, by politicians from that part of the state. I have no rationale for Torrington. I accept the existence of West Hartford for the reasons I mentioned, and I accept the existence of Waterbury for the reasons I mentioned. Plus, making UConn degrees easily available to people in that part of the state. There still is no reason for the Torrington location because they're so close to Waterbury, they could get their degrees there. But, as is the case with Army and Air Force bases, once they exist, it's hard to close.

BS: Now, you mentioned some powerful people. Implicitly, there may be some who come to mind. Can you elaborate a little? Who was really encouraging the Waterbury situation?

PA: Okay. Clearly the Governor. But equally clearly, a succession of State Senators and State Representatives, one of whom, Joan Hartley, chaired the Senate Appropriations Committee for Higher Education. That's not a voice to be eliminated. The head of Webster Bank, who was on the State Chamber of Commerce, and very helpful to us in

getting CBIA to put UConn and biotechnology and research universities as an agenda item that they would support. I'm talking about powerful people in that region of the state. Secondly, they pointed with some justification -- I'll be it parochial justification -- that they stood by and voted for a seventy million dollar expansion on the "Bloomie" site in Stamford, and they voted for a forty-five million dollar research and instructional site in Avery Point. And simple fairness and justice requires that you treat all taxpayers alike. And if you define the issue in that way, there's a rationale that it's consistent with better public policy setting than just geographic parochialism.

BS: What about the Director, who has been there? Did he play a major role in this? Was it Fran Brennan?

PA: I don't think he played a large role. The Directors of the campuses -- and then again, once you build a model on a flawed philosophy, as I mentioned earlier, then it's kind of unfair to be critical of individuals who occupy seats in the bureaucracy, and they have the apparent responsibility, but no authority. The faculty cared a little about what the campus directors think because the faculty's futures and success depend on the faculty and the department heads of their home departments. And so, they've got -- I think on those three campuses, they view the directors as custodians, whose job it is to make sure the buildings are heated and air conditioned and the lights are turned on and the doors are locked at night and unlocked in the morning. And they are the people who are blamed if their campuses don't get the additional bodies, don't get the additional sources. When, in point of

fact, that is a set of decisions that's made directly with the department heads and the Chancellor's office here, in Storrs. When construction began, Fran was very much one who would keep Fred Maryanski and Scott Brohinsky informed when potential trouble might arise. But the one Director who is quite different -- again, in part because the situation is different and the location is different and the potential is so much greater -- and she and her background just seemed fit for the job is Jackie Silverstein, down in Stamford. She is an academic who came up through the ranks in the traditional way. She was an administrator at St. John's. She's a legitimate, I think, biochemist. And she also has an engaging and charming personality that causes her to be able to work with the community. And what we had down there was -- when I arrived here -- a solid academic who was respected by the faculty, but he didn't go outside at all. So, all the businesses were upset. Then we got a man who was formerly the head of the Urban League, with no academic credentials, and the faculty disdained him, but he worked well with the community. They liked him and they knew him. This woman seems to have the respect of all parties. We have imposed on her some higher expectations than the other Directors.

BS: The same time that you were talking about these things, when you first started off, you were talking about external communications and public relations, and why this was significant for the University. What did you do about that? How did this develop?

PA: Keep talking. I want to frame your question.

BS: Well, I think that you were in the process of hiring a company to work

on public relations for the University. There was also a major change with the symbol of the University to the oak leaf.

PA: Yes. That was Margaret Brown. The firm's name was M. Brown. What I quickly picked up here -- from donors, from politicians and from business leaders -- was the arrogance of UConn. The invisibility of the University. I'd asked them to help us to support financially our academic programs. They'd say, "Why should we? We get nothing back." I said, "Come on! We're educating the leaders of the state." "No, you're not. The smart kids are leaving and not going to UConn." Now, much of that the faculty and the Board told me when I was being interviewed -- that the brain drain issue was something they'd like me to work on if I came here. But the intensity of it, and the recurring use of the word 'arrogance' -- UCONN as an entity off on its own was troubling. All of this led me to conclude that if we were to embark on a successful capital campaign, we are going to have any chance of not only extending for another ten years the Capital Building Program, but also getting past the fourth year we had to make some adjustments. You may recall at Year Four, there was to be an entire re-evaluation of the Ten Year Program, at which point it would be much easier just to terminate it. If we were to pass the Four Year Program, there would not be any further full scale reviews. Any further reductions would be the result of corruption or misconduct. Or lack of state resources. So, I thought, "We have to do something to demonstrate that this is an institution that has long been a good

institution in doing things.” Communicate to the public at large what it is this place has been doing, and that we are serious about fulfilling the expectations associated with the billion dollars. And much of this had been talked about prior to my arrival. I think my contribution probably was just to force the action rather than the talk. I, in the initial stages, was not one who pushed the change in the logo. Indeed, I had thought the Connecticut State Seal was not particularly attractive. It’s no more attractive or less attractive than any other State Seal, but it does -- in some respects -- address the very issue we’re trying to address here. That is, to force people to think of the University as part of Connecticut rather than separating us. A lot of people that I respected very much caused me to re-think that and say that what we need, also, is an identity and institutional homogeneity. One of the reasons people didn’t understand that UConn was doing all these things, and had been for a long time, is because -- for example, the signage at the Avery Point campus bore no relationship to the signage that the extension service used, which bore no relationship to the buildings in which our dental students at the Health Center performed their pro bono dental work in the inner cities, etc., etc., etc. So, two graduates -- Peter and Jan Good, who are nationally prominent design people -- both graduates of our design program in Fine Arts, and lead an extremely financially and professionally successful practice down in Essex -- volunteered their services. So, they went through a lot of stuff that they go through, and consulted different people about what the place meant to them, and having some historic significance and

tradition. And they came up with this oak leaf, which initially when I saw it, I was underwhelmed. Then they came with their full-fledged presentation and worked through what they had done with their focus groups of alumni and different constituent groups. By the end of the exercise, I thought, "Fine, let's just do it and be on with it." [laughs] You can study an issue to death. In retrospect, I think it has served us well. But we went through all of the pains that -- the least of the issues frequently are those that provoke the most concern.

BS: Yes.

PA: And on this one, we had one lady who really was -- I think she had mental problems. The librarian from Massachusetts, who came down wearing a sign. She never graduated from the University of Oak. [laughs] She graduated from the State University -- she started a petition. She came to basketball games and had people sign petitions that we had to remove the little red swatch on the athletic uniforms and buses -- it should be the blue and white. And another petition that would force us -- she took it to the State Capital and asked the legislature to force us to take the red line off the sign on the side of the UConn busses. [laughs] Well, how do you answer that except thank her for her interest and ignore her. But then, there were more middle-of-the-road pragmatic people who are intelligent people who have differences of opinion, and you try to listen to them and say, "Go ahead," and we went ahead.

BS: Okay. What do you think the effect has been now, a few years later?

PA: I think that symbol, right up to and including the Health Center, which

most people didn't know what that big building up on the hill was. And when we put some UConn signage up, people knew it was UConn. But now, across the big building, visible from about three miles out on 84 as you're going east, you see that logo. And frankly, I think that, in its immeasurable way, was probably a contributing factor to our being able to turn around the Health Center fortunes. And I think people can no longer say that UConn doesn't have a recognizable logo. I think elected leaders now understand that this is the statewide institution that in significant measure is going to determine the success or failure of this state economically. The provision of jobs, and therefore, the quality of life of their sons and daughters. And that this is something that you should not play around with. And so, I think it's probably been positive. That doesn't mean that that particular logo is the only one that would have worked. I think it's all taken together. I certainly think it's more interesting and more distinctive than retaining that which was initially my idea -- retaining what we had. Because that particular logo could have implied State Department of Transportation or the Department of Corrections. Another of the realities that I sought to change when I arrived six years ago was that the University no longer be viewed as a state agency with the President being viewed as a Commissioner. We still have the name 'Connecticut,' but it appears to be that we act much less like a government agency than apparently had been the case before.

BS: Now, we talked about communications and how this ties in. You mentioned Scott before. How did he become head of -- and why did

he become head of Communications or University Relations?

PA: The sequencing of all that, I don't precisely remember. But I think -- this was shortly before my arrival. Institutional advancement was created including a professional fundraising staff. And the Alumni Association and external relations, including government relations, were moved in under a Vice President. And the theory was that all external messages would be coordinated through that Vice President, and we would no longer be criticized for providing different numbers to the legislature, to having an internally consistent and cohesive message for different newspapers, and so on and so forth. Scott -- when I arrived here -- I think was just government relations and not the PR person.

BS: Yes.

PA: I've forgotten who was in PR.

BS: I'm not sure either.

PA: Well, it turned out that Scott -- in my opinion -- is just remarkably intelligent, remarkably engaging, remarkably knowledgeable and pragmatic, and can communicate very well because of his personality. And he was reasonably knowledgeable about the University. He informed me that he was burned out in the legislature, and just didn't want to do that anymore. And he would love to work for me, and would love to stay at the University, particularly if he could apply for the Public Relations job. If that weren't in the cards, would I just please tell him and not have him go through a full search. And he would quietly look for a job elsewhere that was out of government

affairs. He was just tired of spending all of that time in the legislature with all of the challenges. I was reluctant at first because I thought we might want to try not a full-time Public Relations staff, but a consultant on retainer, for which we could get more bang for the buck on periodic campaigns. Here's another case, where I think my initial instinct was wrong. And in retrospect, I think it was correct to slide Scott into the overall role. I think he's done a good job. But a couple of years later, when I was left with a vacancy on the Government Affairs Operation, I went back to Scott and I said, "I have to have you back at Government Affairs. I have missed you, and I want to ask you to consider again taking over government relations. We'll have a lower level person do the routine activities such as letter writing, drafting and responding to legislative inquiries. I was blessed with [Lori] Aronson's presence, who happened to be the Deputy at OTM before she came here. And she also -- because of other extensive government experience -- knew the government vocabulary, and knew the expectations of legislators. So, she could respond effectively to agency requests from OTM and DPW. And so, Scott being a loyal guy, again took responsibility for government affairs.

BS: Right.

PA: Scott went to some of Ed Allenby's staff meetings, but de factor, he reported to me from day one on Government Relations issues. The Alumni Association went through some very trying times. Older alumni were downright angry because they hadn't been [unclear] in

decades. Particularly those who lived elsewhere. Ed Allenby brought in a guy from the University of Michigan, who had been the Number Two guy at Michigan -- Bill Colburn -- who conceptually knew what to do. He was good. He had a good work ethic. He was an honorable man. He suffered from one major deficiency. And that is, he never was responsible for relations with a lay board. This caused him great problems with the Alumni Board. Fortunately, I had a couple of Alumni Board members who were very loyal alums, namely Louise Berry, Jim Abromitus, Roger Gelfenbein and Phil Barry. I sat down with them and said, "Look, I'm going to just cut-off this Alumni Association. They're being destructive rather than helpful. They think that they -- like many of the old-timers -- think that this institution is here to give them benefits, like free parking, cheap basketball tickets, etc., as approved to helping the University. My first loyalty, I said, is to the current students and the current faculty and staff. Not to people who've lived here for forty years, or to Alumni Association self-appointed leaders." And there was a little resistance at first. I said, "You give me the guidance. I'll take on the war if you're with me. They came along. Unfortunately, in fighting this war, they chewed up Bill Colburn and he left. And then we recruited a guy from UMass, who was a little more sensitive to decision-making in New England -- let's put it that way -- and the hundred-and-sixty-nine town mentality. And, to Bill Colburn's credit, I think if John Feudo had come first, he probably would have been chewed up, also. We consumed a lot of our time in kind of helping fight this battle, and to get good people to run

for the office -- for the Board of the Alumni Association. And within the last two years, much progress has been made. The Board of the Alumni Association is now made-up of people who understand their responsibilities. Through the AAUP and UCPEA, the Alumni Association and the Foundation, we have a very effective advocacy group that frankly, is helping us as we speak. I have, in the past year, visited the Bay Area Chapter in San Francisco. I regularly visit Washington and Miami, around the Georgetown and Miami basketball games. Around five years ago, we got maybe twenty-five to fifty people in Miami. This last time -- last year we had five hundred and fifty people come to our pre-game function. Most of them are retired people, wearing these ugly dog hats, and their blue and white uniforms! [laughs] And they have a couple of drinks, and they're excited about UCONN, and they went to buy UCONN paraphernalia, and they're registering. And they're getting their grandchildren to come here to apply. I think that the time has passed for -- the real value of Ed Allenby to this organization was the amount of money he brought in and has in the endowment. It's gone from the point, I think -- in 1995, the Foundation Endowment was kicking off, maybe, five million dollars. This past year twenty-one million dollars went into academic support. And what I'm hopeful for is to complete this three hundred million dollar capital campaign, and get the state matching that's already in place, and have maybe seven hundred million to a billion dollars. And when you talk about the money that that can kick-off primarily for endowed professorships, academic support and

student scholarships, that's when you can make a real difference. I am proposing to the Foundation Board and the Trustees is to the Vice Presidents abolish position, and to recruit a President of the Foundation to head an arm's length 501(c). Half of Allenby's payroll has been met by the state, and half by the Foundation. This has caused IRS questions every year. Whether or not this really was an arm's length organization. Just hire somebody to raise money and manage money and authorize the expenditure of money, reporting directly to me on day-to-day and month-to-month. Taking policy guidance from the Foundation Board. And then have Scott Brohinsky reporting directly to me as he has been. And have the Alumni Association report to him and to me.

BS: The whole institutional advancement situation, under Ed Allenby changed dramatically, in terms of professionalism of fundraising here. Could you talk a little about that? About what happened? And then very recently, last week's newspaper story broke about the troubles the Foundation is having in lay-off individuals -- this kind of thing.

PA: Yeah. It's the agony and the ecstasy. What as I think is common knowledge, that fundraising arm, that the direction of the Board, perhaps with the inappropriate intrusion of the Chairman of the Board over the objection of the then-President, a commitment to a professional staff development and professional staff growth occurred. Now, I don't like the fact that the President of the University's authority was usurped by the Chairman of the Board. [laughs] But on

that particular issue, I think the Chairman of the Board was right and the President of the University was wrong! [laughs] But Ed did -- what he did -- they had a dramatic increase in staff members. The original MOU called for about four million dollars of augmentation by the University to be dropped by a hundred thousand and two hundred thousand bucks a year over time. The original configuration was premised on self-support and independence to a far greater extent than almost at any other University I've ever seen. Thank heavens for the quick donations coming out. Ed got out and picked the low-lying fruit very quickly. They got a couple of very good staff members who knew how to train students to put on banks of telephones to solicit the five hundred to five thousand dollar range. And that brought in a lot of money. And then, God Bless them, there were the people like Harold Swenk and Ray Neog, who came in with -- and Gary Gladstein and Mark Shenkman -- who came in with substantial contributions. Well, when the market was going up, as it has for the last decade, that's fine. You can pay for the operating costs, and tax endowments to support the Foundation. But when the market loses twenty-five percent of its value, your endowment is under water. And you can't tax it because you have the standards of the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, CASE, the professional organization that sets up the industry standards for fiduciary responsibilities and restricted funds, and how much of the restricted funds can be taxed to support operations. And what was very clear was, about four months ago the Foundation Board came to me and

said, "We're supporting ourselves on reserves, and the reserves are being depleted. And until the stock market comes back, we're not going to be able to sustain this level of fundraising. We have to perform our fiduciary responsibility to prior donors." And so, where it's going to suffer is our going out and getting commitments for new dollars, and we think that would be a bad thing because we're all one university here, and we're a 501(c). We exist exclusively to support the University. And if we lose the momentum, we're going to lose the excitement of the volunteer people on the Board, and staff. And I said, "I understand. What's happened at that Foundation is one dramatic change in the last few years that is unarguable. And so, I don't want to lose the momentum, but for the same reasons that the Foundation is in trouble, so, also, is the University being challenged." They asked if we could augment the MOU, which, by that time, I think, had dropped to \$3.1 million of University money transferred per year. They asked if we could put in an additional three million dollars, and I said, "I just can't do that, politically." Internal politics, as well as external. Notwithstanding the fact that the legislature, by its actions, had demonstrated their support for fundraising by the matching grant program under UConn 2000. I said, "I'll tell you what. Rather than just losing" -- I think the \$3 million contemplated firing six people. I said, "We all have to tighten up. I'm going to recommend to the Board some management salary freezes. I'm going to recommend some tuition increases. We're going to look at workload for all of our employees. Everybody is going to have to be taxed and hurt a little bit.

And that includes that Foundation. So, look at a \$1.7 million transfer. And tell me how many jobs you can eliminate and cut your payroll.” Well, they came back proposing the elimination of twenty positions, which is about a twenty percent reduction. It just so happens they’re dropping from about ten million dollars to an eight million dollar operation. Some good people are no longer on the payroll. But we have to operate with a balanced budget, and that’s just the way life is. I believe that we can keep the momentum going. I believe we can continue to make the fundraising contacts, and that we’ll continue to get our commitments for the capital campaign -- even now -- are in line with the plan we had promulgated three years ago. The actual cash coming in has slowed down because people are waiting to pay off their commitments until their stocks come back. I am confident that we can discharge our fiduciary responsibilities to past donors. So, what we’ve done is tighten up. We’ve suffered reductions in our endowment to a lesser extent than many other comparable big research universities nationally.

[end of side one, tape one]

BS: Now, who is actually heading it now to replace Ed? You said you were going to bring it a different position, essentially. But right now -- today --?

PA: Well, the volunteer Chairman of the Board is Dennis McCarthy, who is a UConn graduate -- 1966, I think -- and former Number Three

person at Fidelity Investments, up in Boston. Until we recruit a new person to replace Ed, Mary Beth Amy, heads the management side, and Nevin Kessler, who heads the fundraising side, are reporting directly to me.

BS: I see. Has there been much reaction to the announcement -- the very recent announcement -- about the layoffs, and the fact that the endowment had gone down, rather than up, as everybody else's -- or most everybody else.

PA: No. As a matter of fact, I've been quite surprised at the kind of common knowledge and mature reaction to the combination of the economy and September 11th and its collective impact on the stock market. When you read five stories in every newspaper every day, it's hard to be surprised. Just as, I'm sure I'm going to propose some tuition increases. At the June Board meeting I tried to lay the groundwork for tuition increases, and point out the overall parameters of our situation. And the news story that appeared in the Hartford Courant the following morning -- rather than condemning us, compared us favorably to other institutions around the country. And the incoming President of the undergraduate student bodies said, "We don't want to have a [unclear] in quality, and if we have to pay a little more in tuition, that's what we ought to do."

BS: Yeah. Well, this, I guess, is happening nationally. I was just listening to public radio or one of the radio stations, and they had someone on from one of the national state university organizations talking about this progress.

PA: Yes.

BS: With respect to the football stadium and the upgrade to Division I -- could you talk a little bit about how this developed from the time that you came, and what your expectations were when you first came here?

PA: Well, I moved here from Alabama, so believe me -- I know the downside of it. [laughs] The enormous potential upside and the enormous potential downside of big-time football. And before that, I was in Colorado, where a struggling football team can find its place in life and be a persistent headache when you don't have the money to support the ways that it could be competitive. So, it was with great trepidation that I embarked upon that debate, with a couple of exceptions. The Board had already reached the conclusion that this was the way to go. As I read the faculty, there were large segments that were opposed to it, and there were large segments that were strongly in favor of it. And, as I came to know the data, neither segment really understand the true underlying analytics, and it quickly became athletics versus academics, just as [unclear] talks about research versus undergraduate education. I ultimately became persuaded that this is something we ought to do because I've regarded the men's and women's basketball successes here to be so critically important to helping us get the whole State of Connecticut excited about the University of Connecticut. That has nothing to do with the fundamental reason for our existence. But it's what the common

person away from the University gets excited about -- particularly the women's team, but also the men's team. And I thought the reality of UCONN as a national leader in Title 9 was highly significant. The correctness and the fairness of the Title IX is without question. And for an athletic program that has competed at the level that this University's had over the last decade -- the subsidy from state money is phenomenally small. They've become greatly self-sufficient. Now, there's been a cost to that. And that is, a lot of the old-timers who are used to paying three dollars to sit in the old auditorium to watch New Hampshire beat us sixty-to-nothing, are upset because tickets cost more. When they come up with a point system and people have to pay more to sit in less desirable seats to see this higher level of basketball, there are some angry long residents. On the other hand, that's what gives us the television revenues. That's what allows us to charge - rightly or wrongly -- for non-faculty, non-student tickets, twenty-eight dollars for men's basketball and seventeen for women's basketball, and still have a queue five miles long, waiting to buy tickets. And the associated advertising that goes with that is how you can have a self-sufficient program. That was almost a dream for me, to provide the athletic outlets and the excitement that is produced by it, in a way that's enormously self-sufficient, "Oh, could we just freeze this picture" that I inherited in 1996, and that three more times, we had a soccer championship, a women's championship, and a men's championship in basketball. If we could have just kept that, I would have said, "No way to football." I just knew football would cause

headaches. I didn't know how it would manifest itself. [laughs]

Because what our Commissioner of the Big East and Lew Perkins and other Presidents around the country told me, as they tutored me about the restructuring of the NCAA, that the NCAA is about to implode. That the big schools that make all the investments are being voted down by the little schools that have no programs. I'm not talking about the smaller, but still significant research universities. I'm talking about the three thousand student Liberal Arts schools that have the same vote at the table as UCLA. Well, UCLA and Berkeley are not only different schools academically, they play at a different level, and their issues are just quite different in fielding ninety-five scholarships, as opposed to a small Liberal Arts school. And given that restructuring, and given that the Big East would most likely break up in the next few years, and that what would likely happen is that Boston College, Georgetown, Syracuse, Rutgers, Notre Dame, Miami and West Virginia would go off and form their own league -- institutions that had all programs, including football. And that the colleges like Providence, Villanova, Seton Hall, and the smaller primarily parochial schools would go off on their own. And that the big schools in the first category would have access to television revenues, which would allow the continuation of self-sufficiency financially. A predictably logical home under that scenario because we didn't necessarily fit with small private Catholics, and we wouldn't be admitted to the large Catholics and publics because we didn't have football. And we could very easily be falling right back into playing Rhode Island and New

Hampshire, rather than the big, exciting teams that get us national exposure on television. So, for that reason, I went along with movement into Division IA, which required the construction within three or four years of at least a thirty-thousand-seat stadium to meet the conference and NCAA rules, which got us into a three-year dance with the State of Connecticut's legislature over the building first out here, of a stadium. And then Adriaen's Landing. And finally, now, in East Hartford, where it's taking shape.

BS: The development of the stadium -- for instance, not being on campus -- not being in Hartford, but being East Hartford -- can you talk a little bit about the site and what went on in that.

PA: My clear preference then and now was that it be on the campus. I've come from a mid-Western heritage, where [unclear] and Southern and Mountain states where football weekends are a time when alumni and other benefactors and supporters of the University gather at the institution and re-charge their excitement about the institution and their loyalty. I can remember at Michigan State, there used to be seminars that would be advertised six months in advance to alumni groups -- "Come back and hear Professor X, who will talk Friday afternoon from 3:00 to 5:00, cocktails at 6:00, banquet at such-and-such. Saturday morning we'll have a tailgate, and the game, and after the game do this or that. Stay in the University hotel. See your former professors. That was six weekends a year in East Lansing, Michigan. You couldn't walk because of so many people being there. That charges up the alumni, and that charges up the fundraising effort. And

that's what I hoped to begin here. It wasn't to be.

BS: So, what about the site in East Hartford?

PA: Well, first it was Adriaen's Landing.

BS: Right.

PA: And then it was sold as an economic development venture. I don't even remember what was written about it, but if I was quoted accurately, you never heard me say that this was an economic development vehicle for downtown Hartford. And I thought the Adriaen's Landing site was not the most desirable for parking reasons, for access reasons. I was never enthused about that. And I'm less enthused about East Hartford than I am about Storrs. But I think it's a better venue for us than Adriaen's Landing because of the location of Highways 2 and 84 and 91, and all of that, and the great open spaces surrounding the site and the parking availability. But we lose the excitement factor on the campus, where people will come and spend a couple of days. And frankly, I'm scared to death about -- no matter what rules we put out, kids are going to drink. And kids driving back and forth. The counter argument to that is, "Well, if they weren't going to a football game, they'd be going to something else, and they're going to be drinking there, too." Probably there is a certain amount of truth to that. But this is more of an organized University venture. But it was this or nothing. And so, I took this. The head bone's connected to the shoulder bone. Once you make the decision to save basketball, you've must have football, and to get football, you have to have a stadium, and to get a stadium, you have to have a

politically acceptable consensus as to where they're going to spend their ninety million bucks, one backs into East Hartford.

BS: How much of a role did Lew Perkins play in this?

PA: Significant. Lew is not unique, but he knows his job, and he does it very well. And by the time I arrived here, he was as politically connected, I believe, as anyone in the state. And many of the commitments to the stadium, from both Democrats and Republicans, I think, were to Lew personally. And I think part of that was that during the early stages of the UCONN 2000 deliberations, he said that this would go through easier if we differentiated at inter-collegiate athletics from UCONN 2000 [unclear] and academic program that can contain some intramural projects, but not inter-collegiate athletics. Lew was told to agree to it, but Lew could have winged, also, and gone behind the scenes. But what they knew was that throughout those early stages of UCONN 2000, there was no end run to get a football stadium concurrently. And many Republicans and Democrats made a commitment to Lew, which in my initial visits to legislators, they confirmed and they committed to me, that if we came to them for a stadium, they would be there for us because UCONN kept inter-collegiate athletics out of the first round of UCONN 2000. So, Lew's role and his activities before I arrived here were very important. And frankly, they continue to be. He has developed personal relationships in some very unlikely and unpredictable offices.

BS: Any special place?

PA: I think most of the leadership of the legislature and the Governor know

him and respect him. And they know him to be a guy who, when he makes a commitment, will stick with it. And he's now, far beyond his capital campaign goal for that department, including a practice facility. Because I said to him, "Lew, I will be with you for the stadium. "But on the practice facility and other stuff out there, you have to raise your own money." And he recently got a two-and-a-half million dollar contribution from Bob Burton. Just a week ago, he received a three-million dollar commitment from Mr. Fisk, who, I think, is a real estate developer over in Simsbury. So, he's doing his job. He's raising money. And we will be the better for it.

BS: You mentioned environmentalism. You mentioned Dave Ivry bonding with him over Horsebarn Hill. Can we talk about the Pfizer situation? About how that developed? Whose idea was it, essentially? Who generated the idea to have Pfizer set-up the center here for research, and can you elaborate on what happened?

PA: Well, I think that was a program that I think honestly came from the faculty. We have four or five faculty members in the School of Agriculture who have earned very substantial reputations in animal vaccine research. I think all of them -- certainly most of them were in the Department of [unclear] Biology. And their Department Head, with whom I interacted most was Herb Whitely, who has since moved on to the University of Illinois. Herb is a very solid, pragmatic man, as well as an extremely well-respected veterinarian, and he had personal relationships, as did three or four of his faculty with Pfizer scientists. And the prospect of them developing a research facility and locating it

here, I think, really did come up from the faculty. And it was quickly embraced by Kirk Kerr, as I recall, and Mark Emmert and Bob Smith. And they came to see me. And, at that point, the essential elements of the proposal were, "Would you agree to take to the Board if we put together this deal? A proposal that contemplates a thirty-nine million dollar research facility located some place over on the Ag Campus. It would be paid for by Pfizer." I've kind of forgotten now, but I think we would -- our faculty and students would have maybe a fourth of the building or a --

BS: Fifth.

PA: Twenty percent of the building for our purposes. We would manage the whole facility, and that Pfizer's vaccines would be tested. And I said, "If it is what it appears to be, obviously, I'll take that. If somebody else is underwriting the costs of the facility in which our faculty can get their research conducted, subsidized by somebody else and in which our students cannot only receive that training and education, but also have hands-up on employment following their experience here, it sounds to me like win/win." Well, they had gone out and fixed the proposal, I'll talk about it with the Board. And I brought it up with the Senate Executive Committee; in principle, everybody generally agreed with it. There were a couple on the Executive Committee who had the corporate relationship issues, which are legitimate issues. I'm not persuaded that in that case it violated anything, but I take that those reservations and concerns as concerns

that must be addressed. And as you would predict, the Board and Abromitis in his role as Commissioner of Economic Development, and the Governor's office were all very enthusiastic and supportive. Well, then it came out that Pfizer -- the first generation of the location of Horsebarn Hill caused many local people, and not just what I regard as the extreme people, who oppose anything we do. Many sensible people told me about the history of Horsebarn Hill, and grandchildren sliding down with sleds, and at night walking, and all that stuff. Which I respect. I might not do it myself, but there are certain traditions that have been around a long time, and you don't violate them if you can afford it. But we said, "How about over, across 195, on the former UCEPI site?" Wouldn't work because it was an all-or-nothing decision that it had to be in the School of Agriculture, so you'd have the geographically contiguous site, where our faculty would have five minute access, not the psychological resistance of the [unclear] by 195, having to get in the car, rather than just walk over, etc., etc., etc. So, it became an all-or-nothing issue. And then the question is, when you have this local opposition, we don't want to do it over there. Is there another place on that side of the road where we cannot violate the sensibilities of the middle-of-the-road people. It was just crazy! [laughs] We moved it down over, so you couldn't see it from the highway, or almost from the top of Horsebarn Hill. And Quentin Kessel had a historic family [unclear] over there someplace that he was concerned about. And so, if we could move it twenty yards over back, even further, there was some guy down that road who

is reputed to be like Peter Newcomer. This was not Peter, but a man who was reputed to have had a very large gun collection -- and he was heard to say in one of the town organizing meetings, "If they build it there, they're going to be able to see my gun collection in action!" or something [laughs]. So, we found what was thought to be the least undesirable of options. We had kind of the tacit approval of the Department of Environmental Protection. OPM had indicated that if we went through the Fonsi business, the finding no significant impact, that it would probably be approved. So, we went through a couple of public meetings. I said to the people around me -- and many of the local leaders -- throughout that whole period, there was no once that the City Council voted against the University. And even the Planning and Zoning Commission was not unanimously, but supportive of what we were trying to do. I mean, this notion of the town's elected establishment, and the town's citizenry -- opposed to that project was just a misnomer. But Peter Newcomer, God rest his soul, and his friend Ayla Kardestuncer, and Ruth McLaughlin -- and it's the same group we're hearing from up here, on Hilltop. And Jim Severson -- that crowd of maybe fifteen or twenty people who are repeatedly --

BS: Was Richard Sherman involved in that?

PA: Oh, always. Yes. Richard, though, is very Machiavellian. Richard's the brains behind the outfit, but you don't hear him talking. I'm told he just kind of sits on the periphery, pulling the strings. But they're a formidable group, because seemingly, they have nothing else to do. They have funding. They're intelligent. And they're incapable of

shame.

BS: [laughs]

PA: And you put this whole thing together, and you've got yourself -- well, what happened was they put out this picture, and they created the illusion that Pfizer was going to be built on top of Horsebarn Hill. And people would -- people in the street would say, "Phil, why don't you push it just so it's not on the crest. Why don't you put it down?" And I said, "You can't even see it from the road." So, that's not what they told them. That's not what the mailing said. And on two or three occasions during the process before Pfizer pulled the plug, I wondered if it wouldn't have been wiser just for us to pull the plug because I thought, "If we're alienating to the extent of the complaints that I'm hearing" -- but then I talked to other people who were also known as environmentalists who said, "No, where it is up there is fine." But that never got out in the papers." I mean, long-term citizens of Mansfield and Willimantic, who were generally supportive of what we were trying to do, were mute. This is frequently the case. And the letters to the editor and the news coverage was always covering the extreme crowd. And the perception was we were going to put a strip mall up on top of Horsebarn Hill. Well, Pfizer -- George Milne, who was the head of Pfizer Research -- called me just about three years ago now. It was in August, I think. And he said, "I've got bad news. I've talked to 42nd Street down in New York this morning, and we've got to pull the plug. We've got ten or twelve vaccines on the shelf.

And it's not that we doubt the commitment of the State or the University, but under Connecticut's Environmental Protection act, these people can keep us stalled in court for another two or three years. And in the meantime, our vaccines potentially [unclear] are sitting there on the shelf, untested." And I said, "I'm terribly disappointed, but I understand, and that's that." And I said, "I hope that we will be able to continue to have our faculty involved with your scientists, so the perception of Icon's faculty and Pfizer is not just an illusion, but it is a reality." And he said, "Absolutely." And they're now considering a big gift, and they're considering several different parts of the University, including the Health Center. Also this vaccine-testing group. They're also interested in Synthetic Chemistry. So, I mean, the Pfizer should be good citizens. What we heard later -- about six months later -- was that when they cut us off, it didn't have that much to do with us, though the local group made it easier. But within about a two-week period, they cut back on a hundred million dollars of capital projects, and the following week, another couple hundred million dollars of capital projects, because they saw their cash flow situation becoming worse, and so they just put the brakes on it. So, there is a question of, if we had been in the ground, and we'd been digging, would it have continued. But if we were just sequencing in a normal state of affairs without any community opposition, they might have pulled the plug anyway.

BS: What reaction did you get subsequent to the plug being pulled?

PA: Well, elation from the locals -- from some of the locals.

BS: Yes.

PA: Overwhelming letters from around the state, from the Governor, from Kevin Sullivan. I think -- as a matter of fact, it may have been in reaction -- I got a phone call from Kevin asking what has gone on? What can we do to make sure this never happens? And he was angry. I didn't realize he was that intensely involved. So, it was not a Republican/Democrat situation. It was, "This is our state university. One of the reasons we're investing in it is to keep the jobs here, and to keep industry here, so that we can keep our kids here. And you can't do that without jobs." And so, there was bipartisan support, and great anger from people from West Hartford and beyond. And I still get this when I give speeches around the state. Inevitably, there are twenty minutes of questions and answers afterwards. At least I can predict, there's a fifty/fifty chance that I'm going to get a question about how did the University lose Pfizer.

BS: With respect to these kinds of environmental issues and the opposition, there's also the issue of the barn, I think.

PA: The Fallwell Barn?

BS: Yes. And then there was the water question that came up recently in an article in the Hartford Courant. Are these the same people, or are they different people?

PA: Yes, a lot of them are. Rich Sherman's always there. Now, the barn, I think, is a modestly different group of people. A man named Bruce Borders, who frequently is not involved in these other issues. I think he's an honest man. And guys like Kevin Tubridy and Bob Gillard,

who owns these Willard Hardware Stores. I mean, these are not irresponsible people. They are thoughtful people. Many preservationists tell me that there's not a thing unique to that barn. That if you go forty miles out toward Putnam, you will see another twenty that have all the same characteristics. I don't know what makes a barn unique. But a lot of people who I respect in the University and out have said to me, "Tear down the sheep barn that's attached to it. Tear down everything else. But buy yourself some peace, and just restore the main barn and use it for something, whether it's an agricultural storage area, or an agricultural museum or a little coffee shop that's quaint for people coming back." But with the new biotechnology building, there's a chance that if we're fortunate to get one more building over there, we might have to relocate the ice cream tourist attraction. The Falwell Barn might be a more suitable place for the ice cream thing because people could get in and out as they leave town more easily. So, we agreed to the restoration of the Falwell Barn. To me, that's one of the things you do in a shared governance environment. You try to seek a consensus and to give a little bit to keep things going. But with that exception, I think it's accurate to say that on the different issues, another fifteen or twenty percent of people will come forward and join because they have a peculiar interest, whether it's Horsebarn Hill or Hillside, or whatever. But the core is always there.

BS: What about this water issue? How have you dealt with that? The article that appeared?

PA: There will appear, I'm told, a piece written by Ed Smith, who is a science teacher at E.O. Smith High School, who has scientific credentials. And even more significant than his degrees in science are that he's been on the Willimantic Water Commission for ten years or something. And he has taken this set of charges more personally than I have. I mean, he is angry and he has done things pro-actively. I said to him, "I'd like to have you as my guest at dinner or a basketball game, but I don't want to ruin this."

BS: [laughs]

PA: "You are independent. I have nothing to do with you. You don't report to me. Your wife's not on the payroll. And I haven't asked you to write a certain thing, and it's very important that I can honestly continue to say that, and that you say that." And he said, "I agree." He said, "I really think that the way UCONN is trying to act is appropriate." He said, "UCONN is my neighbor. I'm on the Willimantic Water Board, and they're accusing us of being irresponsible and not concerned about the water in Willimantic." He said, "I resent that personally." Hilltop is a different issue, but much of the concern about the other projects are from things that happened thirty and forty years ago. And when you spend a billion bucks to re-make a campus, you're going to dig some holes and you're going to find some stuff that nobody knew was there, rightly or wrongly. And that's what happened. In the case of the Hilltop issue, we had this so-called design build business, where we engaged a contractor-developer, specified the outcome, negotiated a price, and the low

bidder who was pre-qualified got the bid. In the community meetings which we promoted so concerned people could come, hear what we were planning, and offer their opinions. And if it didn't cost us a lot more, or it didn't do harm to the project, what I've said to [Dale] Dreyfus and [Vicki] Tripodey and [Larry] Schilling and all those, "If we can make some modifications to offend fewer people, and not violate our objective or our ability to deliver housing or whatever it is, then let's try to do it." Well, unfortunately, what they did was take a set of graphics, as I remember the history of this issue. They took a set of graphics, a couple of which did not have a so-called detention pond. The prose that described the pictures said that for a project of that size, in that particular location, there would have to be some kind of a detention area for the run-off. Otherwise, it would actually flood those houses down across Separatist Road, right off their foundations. We said that. We apparently showed, on the wall, pictures that did not have the detention ponds drawn in, number one. And number two, we talked about a buffer area. And the people across the street -- Mrs. Schwep and Mrs. Kenney and the former statistics professor lived down there.

BS: Uwe Koehn?

PA: Yes. His wife, and he, too -- I haven't talked to either of them. But they are absolutely certain that they were misled by the aforementioned group of people. That they knew all along we were going to have a detention pond, and whether it was in the prose or not,

it should have been in the picture. The question is, when do you schedule these public meetings? Do you wait until you've got a perfect project, and then have everybody oppose it? Or do you start early on, and not have a complete proposal. It was one for which I don't make excuses. I get angry about Pfizer, but I don't make excuses about Hilltop. I don't think anyone intentionally fumbled the ball, but the ball was fumbled. And so, my attitude has been, "I'm sorry. It was unintentional. We'll try to do better the next time, and we'll fix this problem." Interestingly, Art Rocque and Jane Stahl and the people at DEP, tell us that the plan that we have out there right now, including the trees that we re-planted, are adequate buffers in accordance with the initial plan. And that what we have meets DEP's requirements. Further, Bruce, you may want to talk to Tom Callahan, who can give you technical details -- if this is an issue that you wish to talk more about, get Tom. But the fact of the matter is, none of the water concerns -- I mean, I'm not a scientist, as you know, so I don't really know what I'm talking about. But one of the arguments was that chloroform came, or was found. Apparently, chloroform arises from fecal matter in water supply. Not from anything we did on Hilltop. But UConn's responsible for a raccoon getting in the old lady's well?!! The bucket -- the bottle of water -- that looks so awful in that news story -- the night before that picture was taken I'm told, they came in and cleaned out her well, which anyone who knows about wells, I'm told, knows it can't hold the sediment that's kicked up. So, it looks like hell. But that doesn't have any relationship to the quality

of the water! The guy who wrote that story is the current husband of the retired English professor --

BS: David Morse and Joan Hall.

PA: Yes. He was all upset about the run-off at the Unitarian Meeting Hall, down at the corner of Hunting Lodge and North Eagleville. That, apparently, was produced by work that had been done on the apartments over to the north of Hilltop, which are not University apartments. And who, by the way, is so intensely upset because he was a carpenter that built that Unitarian operation. There apparently was historically, a service station or dry cleaning establishment that's no longer in existence down in that area someplace. On one of those corners -- I'm thinking somewhere around the police station -- there was a service station.

BS: Yes, there was one across the street, where Subway is.

PA: One of the chemicals for which we are being blamed is nothing that was in our trash dump up there, but is consistent with kerosene and stuff that is produced by a service station. But my view is, once again, UCONN has been looked upon by these people who live around us as they have this public watering hole, and it's to be responsible, including providing them with our clean water. When nothing with the University has done has caused the condition about which they are complaining. We've attempted to be cooperative, including wherever there was even the thought of some of our actions might have been responsible, to offer water hook-ups. We have gone out of our way to the point that Art Rocque has been quite complimentary.

[end of side two, tape one]

BS: You were saying?

PA: I was saying that the Commissioner of Environmental Protection, Art Rocque, has been quite supportive and fair-minded, I think. We have applied for or cooperated with the Regional Environmental Protection Office in Boston to do a voluntary audit on our activities. And we're recruiting -- we're now down to two people who will serve as an Environmental Officer for all the University projects. The fact of the matter is, this group finds none of that to be acceptable because they don't trust DEA and they don't trust DEP. I think more than they trust us. So, there's a point at which one comes to the conclusion that nothing that can be done is going to be useful, to develop a more cooperative attitude and mutual respect. And so, I'm very close to getting to the point of saying, "Forget about the extremists. Deal with the middle-of-the-road people in the community who are concerned about the environment, as am I, those that don't see a problem under every rock."

BS: In light of this -- or maybe despite this -- how would you assess UConn's town gown relations, aside from these groups -- fringe groups or pressure groups or [unclear] groups, or whatever?

PA: Well, as I say, Town Council and the P&Z, to the best of my memory, have approved virtually everything -- every proposal we have had. And more important than what I think, in a public meeting at the

Alumni House for a group of town leaders that I attended, along with the other names that I gave you that do this kind of thing, that question arose. And Betsy Paterson was in the audience. Betsy said in her thirty years around here, town gown relations have never been more positive. And that the University has never made an attempt to reach out and try to communicate our priority to the extent that we've been doing the last few years. So, I am comfortable in my own mind, which may or may not have relevance to what the community people think. But that the Mayor would say that in a public meeting, has more meaning than anything I might think.

BS: Have you done anything specifically to institutionalize town gown relations?

PA: I, on a couple of occasions, have had little cocktail parties to which we invited the Town Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Administrators that make decisions that affect them quite a bit. We've attempted, through these community meetings, to allow not only the elected leadership, but also the town, to know what our plans are over the next year or two years. I have had Tom Callahan proactively be sure that the Mayor and Marty Berliner know what we're going to do in as much detail as they want before we do it.

BS: Marty Berliner is the City Manager?

PA: Yes. And things like in June, in each of the last few years, I've had a reception over at the house -- a picnic at the house -- for the state police to thank them for the efforts during Spring Weekend. And we've invited the Mayor and the City Manager and others -- the Police

Chief and the fire people from the community. And they always come, and they're always very congenial and supportive. So, you know, once again, the criticism and the complaints come from a small group of people. They have their right to their own opinion, but I'm not letting it bother me, as long as the elected office holders feel comfortable and that we're trying to give them an honest assessment of what we want to do, and get their support -- that's what I'm interested in.

BS: You mentioned Spring Weekend. I was going to get to that, and I'm glad you raised it. Can you talk a little bit about that, in terms of what you've tried to do as President to deal with it, and what it manifests, as far as the community is concerned.

PA: Well, what we have tried is a variety of strategic and tactical options. And I must say that the state police, the town, and virtually are involved have been enormously cooperative. Bill Rosen is now apparently making this a Town Council issue, which is an interesting alternative. And to what end, I'm not sure. There's no one who is more concerned or embarrassed about Spring Weekend than I am. But I am also mindful that if we said there will be no drinking, there will be no partying on that particular weekend -- not for a moment do I think anybody's going to listen to me or anyone else. It's just going to be that we'll have them all at some other location, and that would be one interesting way to wash our hands of the problem. Say, "Do what you want." And people are now suggesting this as an option because

we thought -- last year we've had carnivals during the day in the hopes that that would [unclear] the way of drinking of beer until later. The Police Chief has put out the so-called 'Jerk Letter.' If you don't act like a jerk, you won't be treated like a jerk, and you can legally have fun responsibly. But if you threaten other people or property, you're going to be treated like the thug that you are. The Student Government people tell me that that has had an effect -- obviously not enough effect -- but it has caused many people to stay home. The Athletic Department has directed their student athletes that they are not to be out or they'll lose their scholarships. We've done programming in this last year at Memorial Stadium, which was of interest. I think there were a couple thousand in Memorial Stadium and there were something like eight thousand over in X Lot. There are more people now who are saying, "Perhaps what you ought to do is just close down everything. Not allow any alternative events, including carnivals or concerts. Treat it like any other weekend for a couple of years. Force them to go cold turkey." But just get the word out, there's going to be no University programming, and they go to Carriage House and drink too much, there's going to be big trouble. They will deal with the University Police and/or the State Police -- whichever is appropriate. And that is almost seductively attractive. Except if there is a riot, and there are serious injuries, we will know that we -- by telling many thousands who might otherwise go to our programs that they're on their own, go on out and get hurt -- that's not an obvious thing to do. I take very little comfort from the fact that Penn State and the University

of Washington and Kansas State and Texas A&M, and all these other schools around the country are in situations that are as bad or worse than ours. Misery loves company, but at the end of the day, these are our students, this is our community, and we're trying to find a way that you can deal with reducing the influx of out-of-state people. I also take some comfort in the fact that the overwhelming majority of the people who are arrested are not our students, but it's still perceived to be a University-produced event. I haven't heard anything from national experts or projects at other comparable Universities, that in one way or another, we haven't discussed or tried here. I hope against hope that it's just a flash of the pan, and that it will go away, but it's here. And it's become an entitlement, a rite of passage of the kids in their own minds when they come as freshmen -- they've heard their older siblings tell them about what they did, and this is what you do in the spring of the year before you go home. And, of course, they are -- at that stage -- accidents will never happen and they're invulnerable.

BS: Did you have any experience with this at the other institutions?

PA: Not in Alabama. There was a Spring Weekend at Colorado State which -- Colorado State and UC Boulder -- which over a period -- I think the first three years I was there, it continually got worse. After three or four years, some windows and some stores downtown got broken. Again, done by people from Nebraska and Arizona, as I recall. Twenty-year-olds from Nebraska and Arizona. But it was at a CSU event. So, I met with the Chamber of Commerce and the Mayor and the City Council and the faculty leadership and the Committee of

the Trustees and I said, "Let us agree on a plan." I've had state police, I've had city police, I've had the Student Affairs Group, and we've tried the best we can. I told them I would like to have a consensus, and get the ideas on the table. And they said, "Let us just stop it. If you're going to stop it, stop it now. Would you do that?" I said, "I will if you guys are with me." I said, "There may be riots next year as a result of stopping it, but then it's not a University event. And they said, "Fine." And then we advertised that we actually bought space at the Chamber of Commerce, and the Mayor strongly came on commending the University, and so on. The difference between that and here is quite frankly, out there we had a very supportive organized political and business community speaking with the University in that paper. It wasn't a very good paper, but it was supportive of the University. There was a functioning town of a hundred and fifty thousand people. It had a City Center. It had a bustling chamber. It was a city with a University on the periphery. Here, the community is the University. And so, it's just quite a different exercise. But we may be in a position where we should try for a year. I'm going to take this up with the Senate Executive Committee this fall. I've already talked to the Board about it. And I intend to talk to the Governor. The State Police are indifferent. "Another weekend with over-time. Who cares what you do!" [laughs] I'm biting my fingernails for the month-and-a-half before the first Thursday night! [laughs]

BS: You mentioned this competing with the Health and Medical Schools. And from the outset, I think you have more than the usual connection

of a President, at least it seems to me, with the Health Center as a topic when you first came here.

PA: At UConn?

BS: At UConn -- yes.

PA: I think the way I'm operating now is more than normal involvement throughout the country, where the President's responsible. But the Board was quite clear to me when I was appointed -- "Two things we really want our President to do is to be more visible in the state, and to make the reality, not just the perception, of one University, including a much greater presence at the Health Center. We suggest that you work on issues like the brain drain and the regional campuses and the budget situation, and so on." But it was very clear that the whole notion of the disconnect -- even, I guess, when John DiBiaggio moved from Farmington to out here, he lost his connection to Farmington. His successor, Jim Mulvilhill had as much independence as Les Cutler did from Harry Hartley. And the Trustees really wanted that stopped. They wanted the President to be accountable for what goes on in both places. And they wanted, to the extent possible, something that I happen to believe in, and find a sensible prospect. And that is an institution in which faculty and students consider potential interactions across campuses to be natural and rewarded.

BS: Well, what about the finances of the place and the administration of the place - the Health Center? What were the problems that you faced when you came here, with respect to them?

PA: Well, it was out of control. But it was not at great variance with most American Medical Schools. There was the culture and the process of an organization predicated upon reimbursements, Medicare and insurance increasing in response to demand without limits seemingly. The reality of insurance premiums increasing about sixteen percent a year, over that mid-nineties period and that this would continue was believing in the tooth fairy. There was no incentive in American medicine, not just American Medical Schools, to cut costs. You made your money on the tests, so you over-prescribed tests. The rubber glove story told it all: "Of course, you throw away rubber gloves! We're not paying for it!" And that was the mentality. Well, then, the federal government took a hundred billion dollars out of Medicare, and that effected the GME and IME -- the Medical Education Reimbursements for interns and residents. And that took a whack out of academic health centers. And then the California Managed Care Ratios moved to the East Coast, and slowly took hold here. So, the way in which insurance companies reimbursed us caused increasing difficulty, and all the business about having to call and get permission before you can perform even a minimal procedure took hold, and in an increasing number of people belonged to Managed Care Organizations, and they had to go through screening. And we were blessed, in one sense, in Farmington because we did not have what I had, for example, in Alabama, at a hospital four times the size of [John] Dempsey Hospital, and with faculty that -- I think the last time we talked, UAB Medical Center had, by itself, a nine-hundred-and-

fifty million dollar budget. It was a massive, very good place. And maybe three hundred million dollars in federal -- NIH primarily -- federal support for their research activity. They were a spectacular faculty. Here, there was much less of the subspecialties. And there was much more family practice intern medicine, obstetrics and gynecology and gerontology. So, the very expensive, highly remunerated, very sexy surgeries were not done in large number. Most of that was done at Hartford Hospital and St. Francis. And so, there was much less to lose when the reimbursements got whacked by the federal government and by insurance companies. But we still had this hole. It was an interesting challenge because the docs were not unionized, and most everybody else was unionized. And that caused problems in terms of cutting the cost to balance the budget. We went public with the mess. There were those in elective office, in administration, the Office of Health Care Access and OPM that wanted to close John Dempsey Hospital. We fought that aggressively. And interestingly, we had both Democrats and Republicans in the legislature who killed that idea immediately because the unions. Everybody but the docs were unionized, and the unions with David McCloskey and others got in immediately on our side. And Melody Peters, and other -- David Pudlin and others -- immediately embraced our proposal to stay open. But also, the rich doctors who were not unionized and lived in the Avon Valley and Simsbury and in the Farmington Valley, represented by Republican Legislators, got to there Republican Legislators saying, "You will not close this hospital?" So,

we had this bipartisan support and the administration very quickly backed off. And then we had to a deal, and Mary Eberly and Toni Harp, who are the Co-Chairs of the Public Health Committee and very supportive of UCONN, generally. In fact, I saw Mary last night at a caucus. I called her yesterday to ask her if I could depend on her to aggressively lead the \$1.3 billion in additional state capital support and she committed. But the two of them we spent a lot of time with. And they helped us create a deal with Kevin Sullivan, George Jepson. And Cam Staples and Tom Gaffe Co-Chaired Education. And then Toni Harp and Mary Eberly. And then we did the same on the Republican side to get the minority leadership on those three Committees -- Education, Public Health and Appropriations. And we said, "We will take twenty million dollars out of the bottom line if you will give us twenty million dollars over two years, so that we can get through this period. Because we can't get through it without some immediate help." And, to their great credit, they tweaked us a little bit and to the Governor's great credit -- he turned around and embraced this and signed the bill. So, that was the structure of the deal that bought us time to make the changes to hold us together. How it was actually done was a combination of Dickens and Aronson. I can speak for admiration of Aronson's experience, her intellect, her work ethic, her effectiveness. Because she is perceived to be honest and wouldn't mislead people in the Legislature. I said to her, "I want you to go over, spend as much time as necessary, look at those books and shape up the budgets of the Health Center." I had previously appointed

Bruce Carlson to be the corporate relations guy, to try to do more deals like the Pfizer thing. Not necessarily do deals where they built buildings, but to get corporate support for faculty research efforts. Peter Deckers, when it was clear that we had to change administrative leaderships, I asked Peter Deckers if he would take over this responsibility. He agreed to do it but he said -- he was quite candid -- he said, "You know, the faculty does respect me. I've got credibility. I've been here a long time. But I'm not a manager. I'm a surgeon and I'm a faculty member. And my friends are all surgeons and faculty members." I don't know anything about budgets and management. So, you've got to help me assemble a team." And I said, "I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll put Bruce Carlson in as your special assistant, maybe for six months or a year to get us through this." This was about the time that the four million dollar problem came up down here. And I said, "We'll change Aronson's scope of responsibility immediately anyway. She's going to report to me directly. Not through you and the Chancellor in Storrs. But you don't have to worry. She's not going to be my spy. She'll be loyal to you." And Peter was sufficiently self-confident that none of this was a challenge to him. So, those two started immediately. Laurie then recruited a Chief Operations Officer for the departing person. And it was Susan Wetstone, who is an absolutely stunning person, who was formerly City Manager of New Haven. She knew the process, and she knew state law. And then she recruited Don Upton to replace Larry Wilderas -- the Budget Officer. She recruited Dan Upton from Hehmanen in

Philadelphia, who knew hospital finances. And with Peter's personality, we were just lucky. The risk we took paid off. Peter's engaging and overwhelming personality combined with Laurie's and Bruce's methodical and knowledgeable administration styles, the technical budgetary and management support of the other two, they made it work. And it's now -- knock on wood -- it's now in a position that I think will work.

BS: Why did Cutler have to leave? What was his --?

PA: There are no bad people in this scenario, including the budget man, and including others. Can I be candid with you?

BS: Yes.

PA: This is something I'll excise if you -- but Les probably shouldn't have been appointed. He was appointed over the objections of the faculty initially, by Lew Rome. I started befriending different faculty members over there, and would see the clinical heads -- about fifteen people that actually run the hospital and run the faculty practice. And they would increasingly say to me, "Now, Phil, you've got to spend more time here. You're the new face. You're the one who doesn't have a history. And you know we trust you effectively." I said, "Yeah, sure. But stick with Les. Just let's work with him." Well, it turns out, what Les did was go in his corner office and shut the door, and that was his way of leadership. I mean, it's a classic case. And you add to it that he was a dentist, in a place dominated by the Medical School. The physicians -- I mean, a PhD was better than a dentist to be your leader.

BS: [laughs]

PA: Because you knew you didn't know as much as -- I mean, all of that -- sociology and psychological complexity was foolish. And finally, three or four asked if they could have a drink with me at one of the homes over in Avon one night. I guess there were five of them and one of me. There were six of us. And we thought it would be about an hour. And we sat there from five-thirty until ten o'clock at night. They told me stories that in some respects were not a total surprise, but the intensity and the magnitude of the stories and their reinforcing it just led me to conclude that Les could not make it. And they also said that they were prepared to do a vote of no confidence, and get a little bit deeper, and it was eventually unanimous. That it was not the case as recently as a month before that, but as this financial pressure was starting to paint them into a corner, Les was not the guy who could get them out.

BS: Was Peter Deckers among these?

PA: No, no. And I think frankly that was by design because he would not then be accused of -- he denies it. But there was no one else that had Peter's personality. If it hadn't have been Peter, I would have had to go outside. So, I said, "I'll tell you what you can do to help me. Get all of the chairs together and invite me to a meeting." So, they invited me to a lunch and I said, "I'm not going to name names, but I've heard of great dissatisfaction and concern here. As long as a person is in a Chancellor's office and reporting to me, I'm going to be loyal to him

until the trigger is pulled. So, I am loyal to Les, and I'm not inviting you to stab him in the back. But I also can't turn a blind eye to reality. I would appreciate it if you would go around the table and tell me whether you support this man or you don't, and it will remain confidential. But I don't want to invite you in, one by one, and get rumors started that I'm trying to set him up. On the other hand, I don't want to ignore what the senior faculty members of this place think. And they went around the table, and a couple of them said -- and they were being sincere. They'd say, "Oh, this pains me so much because my kids played soccer with Les' kids, and they grew up together, etc., but he can't do the job, and I will vote no confidence." [laughs] And a couple of them said, "Well, I don't trust the son-of-a-bitch. I don't like the son-of-a-bitch, and I think you ought to fire him this afternoon!" [laughs] Claire Leonardi, at that point, shared the Health Affairs Committee, and Roger had recently become the Board Chair. And Abermitis and Len Jacobs were active on the Health Affairs Committee, and I got them together and I said, "This is what I'm hearing. Several of you have previously complained about Les and his leadership, or lack thereof. And I figure it's time to pull the trigger, but I don't want to do anything without your prior knowledge. What do you think?" And all five of them said, "We're with you. Do what you've got to do." So, I talked to Les and he was shocked. And he was very disappointed with me. He was very angry with me. Almost literally, within a month or six weeks, that place went from being like a funeral home to a sense of fear because they didn't know what was

happening. But the trust in their leader, Peter, was quickly obvious. He had several faculty meetings where the whole faculty would come in. Five-thirty they have their meetings, after everybody had done their evening rounds. And it was just somber. And Peter would say, "Our President's here. Talk." [laughs] So, I stood up and read the gospel according to John Rowland. And that is that we're broke. We've got twenty million bucks, and we've got to take out a hundred jobs, and we have to lose forty-three million dollars. And the bottom line over the next two years -- well, we're not going to make it. But the good news is that when they proposed closing Dempsey, it was shut off like that, which means that you are respectful, you have earned their respect over the last quarter century. And now here, and around the country, we have to tighten our belts. And you can choose to complain and cry, or you can get with us and try our new strategy. And they really reacted very positively. And I think they didn't quite understand what a President was because I'm told they'd never had one involved there before. But they knew they needed somebody who had a political team. I mean, the old mechanism was to not include Scott, and not tell Scott what was going on. And then, when they failed in the legislature, it was Scott's fault. Well, that shit is over, you know? [laughs] Don't play that game with me! And then, I would do my thing, and I think they thought I was serious and I was reasonably capable, and was being honest with them. And then their guy, who they implicitly trusted and loved -- Peter -- got up and did his thing. Of course, I was there maybe two days a week. Peter was there six

days a week. And he was -- you know, the nurses and the ladies who change the bedpans don't trust the guy in charge -- Peter. Because he's the Dean, and he's the guy who is doing all the cutting -- budget cutting.

BS: Right.

PA: Do you know Peter?

BS: Slightly.

PA: You know his magnetic personality?

BS: Yes.

PA: So, as groups, they despised the Dean. But as individuals, they loved Peter.

BS: [laughs]

PA: And that paradox, I think, is what nobody really understood. He was absolutely indispensable. And in the meantime, here's Lon and Bruce, doing their thing. And people getting upset with them, with their messages. But once again, they knew Lon could be trusted. She was wonderfully competent. And she was respected by me, by the Board and by the Legislature. And they better do business with her. So, you know, it was risky and it was an intense period. But so far, it's worked.

BS: That's what I was going to ask. It has been effective?

PA: Yes.

BS: Is it out of the woods?

PA: Well, it's out of the woods, but it's predicated on Medicare being reconciled, and it's predicated on a whole lot of assumptions,

nationally. Not things under our control. But no further cuts in Medicare. One would hope there would be fixings in Medicare. You know, we're all paying higher insurance rates, in everything from cars to health right now. And presumably, that's going to be -- that the provider is going to get higher levels of compensation, and that's going to be down to the hospital's benefit. And the way the financial triangle is set-up here and elsewhere -- in the old days, the hospital subsidized -- the hospital and practice plan subsidized medical education because the state paid for such a small amount of the total cost, and there is no such thing as meaningful tuition levels at medical schools. So, it was the profits in the hospitals and the medical physician practice that, because of the insurance thing and Medicare, the hospital was broke, and the physician practices were broke. Now, if Medicare changes and the others, that will provide the insurance policies to maintain the stabilization.

BS: In this process, is the Dental School part of this process? Were they at these meetings? Or is that a separate entity?

PA: Oh, no -- they were there.

BS: They were there?

PA: Yes. Ironically, the Dental School is a fraction of the size of the Medical School.

BS: Yes, I know.

PA: But the Dental School, for the past ten years, has been looked upon as one of the top two or three in the country. The Medical School is probably slightly above-average. It fields, I think, about a hundred and

fifty or something. The Medical School is about sixty-five or sixty.

BS: Wasn't it the smallest teaching hospital in the country?

PA: Yes. It was -- and then when I started using that Joel Levine, who is a gastroenterologist over there -- he said, "I read something the other night, Phil, that had another hospital -- a teaching hospital was at one-seventy-five. And at CON is two-twenty beds." So, I mean, I don't know. It's small.

BS: Yes.

PA: It's tiny.

BS: Now, is there any plan to change that? Or is that the way it is?

PA: To make it bigger?

BS: Yes.

PA: The Hartford area, including New Britain General, John Dempsey, St. Francis and Hartford, apply the California estimates. It has great over capacity. Maybe thirty to forty percent too many beds right now. You know, the out-patient procedures. And we, right now, are just starting a Surgery Center, down at the base of the hill.

BS: Right.

PA: And we're contemplating starting a surgery -- that is for obstetrics and gynecology. We're contemplating doing a deal with orthopedics associates, where we give them space down at the bottom of the hill, and they do most of their in-patient procedures up in our surgical suites in Dempsey. We do the managed care for the Department of Corrections right now. And we've got deals that we're talking about to spread more fixed costs, and maybe do more deals with other state

agencies and Long Lane, for troubled adolescents, and places like that.

And we have a deal going with our Psychiatric Department with the Institute of Living at Hartford Hospital.

BS: You mentioned size. I raised the issue of size, and you mentioned size.

The size of the University itself -- there is this move to expand the population here at Storrs, or maybe as a whole University.

PA: It's [unclear] University -- not here.

BS: Where would it be? And why would that be current? What's involved in that, and did you develop this notion, or did it come from [unclear]?

PA: No. "We" developed it in conjunction with and the approval of the Board. But it was kind of in place when I got here. We were at twenty-six thousand in recent years. We lost students and faculty. And we were growing back. But we lost fifty percent of our housing capacity when South Campus was demolished. It's much nicer, but it's only got seven hundred and seventy-five beds as opposed to fourteen hundred, or whatever. And so, we shouldn't grow too fast. But we had to get back to some kind of equilibrium. Twenty-five thousand by the Year 2005 seems to be a nice goal. And we had this conscious plan of trying to push the more marginal students who would have been shoe-ins a few years ago, to the regionals. The good news is that UCONN Storrs is hot. And everybody wants to come here. The bad news is, they all want to come here, and they won't go to the regionals. And if they can't get in here, their second choice is BC or BU, Syracuse or Rutgers. We're trying a few more inducements now. We think actually maybe Waterbury might be able

to retain some of those people. Stamford seems to be increasing. Avery Point's not going to increase greatly unless we provide housing because the under-graduates who might go there because of the Sound, need a place to live. And the Master's and PhD program in Marine Science and Marine Biology is -- those fifteen or twenty faculty members -- they're really spectacular. But it's not going to grow in terms of PhD numbers.

End of Interview

Interview with President Philip E. Austin, the University of Connecticut, by Bruce M. Stave, for the University of Connecticut History Project and the UConn Center for Oral History, August 9, 2002.

STAVE: This is the third session with President Austin. The first was conducted on July 30, 2002. The second was conducted on August 8, 2002. If we can start with a little bit of discussion of issues of diversity here. Particularly, there were some incidents on campus during your Presidency with graffiti, anti-gay, anti-semitic, anti-black graffiti. Can you talk a little about the atmosphere that you work in there, the kinds of pressures that you have, and the actions that you've taken? And we can move on from there.

AUSTIN: Yeah, we've done a number of things. The most pronounced or best publicized and most emotional reaction was homophobic chalk markings on the sidewalks around the so-called Rainbow Center. And what intensified the issue a couple days afterward is that some people alleged that they had seen members of that group actually doing the chalking themselves, to provoke the incident. Other people can say that, of course. I can't unless there's hard evidence. What we have attempted to do is increase funding for activities that, other things equal, lead to a more fair-minded, a more civilized organization with a sense of community in which people can argue and debate and raise their voices, but they can't do it in a way that uses individual attacks or attacks against groups as part of their strategic weaponry. We've supported activities as disparate as seeking simply to increase the minority representation in the community so that they are less the minority, and therefore, it's more difficult for ignorant people or biased

people -- whether it be racist, anti-semitic, homophobic -- whatever -- cannot engage in destructive behavior. I have been of the opinion that in most cases, these incidents have been the result of unknowing people who have been drinking too much, and they revert to adolescent, mindless statements. Whether it's students up in the Towers, either returning home, or coming down to Ted's Liquor Store to get more alcohol on a Friday or Saturday night, and they walk by the Hillel Center, and they destroy a sign, across the board to these types of incidents in front of the Rainbow Center. We have done such things as increase funding for the Cultural Centers, for the Institutes. We've increased funding for the Women's Center. We have commissioned a set of activities under the general [unclear] of a Committee for the Enhancement of Civility, led through Student Affairs. I mentioned earlier that we more aggressively recruited minority youngsters. And generally sought, in various ways, both by word and by bureaucratic response, sought to say that if caught individuals who engage in this behavior, which is absolutely contrary to the nature of the University, will be aggressively prosecuted to the limit of the law. In the case of the Hillel Center, I met with the rabbi, who is from the organization down in New Haven, and Debbie, who runs the Hillel Center. And what we ultimately agreed to do was to put in a University purchased sign that was of the type that was standard throughout the University -- it was metal and steel -- so more difficult to deface or to destroy. And my understanding is there hasn't been an incident of late. So, these are the normal ways of responding, but the common theme throughout all

of our responses is that this type of behavior is simply unacceptable. People will be made to pay if they're caught. And even if the motivation is -- as was the case ten years ago, as I'm told with the Asian students -- the result of drunken, inappropriate, immature behavior, they still will be made to pay the price, and we do not want people who do those things in this community. One other thing I do is re-issue annually or semi-annually, a President's statement on harassment and fairness. And one could say, "Well, that's just a bureaucratic exercise." But the lack of doing so would have been conspicuous by its absence. So, it's the full range of response.

BS: What about the pressures with respect to political correctness as opposed to academic freedom? How much do you feel that, and do these issues come up?

PA: Well, we had the one incident where the man took out the full-page ad at the back of a newspaper which was regarded to be racist. And I did take the position that that is very clearly academic freedom. And taking out ads that were clearly based on points of view that were internally consistent and legitimate albeit provocative. And in some cases, some people could regard it as disrespectful to a group, they still were issues presented in an appropriate way in a University.

BS: Is that the David Horowitz ad?

PA: Yes. I mean, I didn't agree with some of what was in there. But I thought much of it was a provocatively stated set of issues and ideas that were worthy of discussion.

BS: This is on the reparation of forced slavery, I think.

PA: Yes. I've forgotten what it was, Bruce. But there were ten or twelve points.

BS: Right.

PA: And a group of Black students were very, very angry and thought I was being irresponsible and aiding and abetting, and all of that. So, I asked Ron Taylor to organize a group of them, and I sat down and talked with them. I said that I didn't agree with them but what they ought to do is construct replies and write back, and if they were unable to get appropriate coverage in the same student newspaper, and they were required to take out an ad, as the Horowitz Group did, I would attempt to raise money to help pay for placing the response. But there's no way I was going to be critical of you, the student newspaper, or Horowitz. I was protecting the process because that's the essence of the University. Issues of that kind are, in my opinion, are appropriately characterized as academic freedom issues. Threatening behavior and causing people to be uncomfortable and unable to respond, do not come under academic freedom. One that was probably halfway in between was the students who occupied my office, over the wages of the janitorial people. And I went along with it, and I consulted with different groups to make sure I wasn't getting too far out in front, or that local customs and mores would not be offended by my interpretation of appropriate responses to academic freedom. We allowed those kids to stay in there for two or three days, make their point, and they got excitable and anxious after a couple of days, and they got penned in by their own action. And they started banging pots

and pans and becoming disruptive. And I told them about three o'clock one afternoon that I believed in academic freedom and that is why they were being allowed to do this. But that final exams began at eight o'clock the next morning. And if there were any disruption of final exams, they were going to be arrested and removed. And they left that night. So, there's academic freedom, and then there's subsets of academic freedom, and the ways to invoke it, to change behavior and ways to just protect it. I think it depends on the incident.

BS: What about the issue that they were raising -- is this the sweatshop issue?

PA: Well, it was under the general rubric of the sweatshop issue and our athletes wearing Nike uniforms and Rebok shoes and all that. But the immediate issue that they were making their demands over was whether we were paying a living wage to the Capital Cleaners. And the point was that -- I forget the numbers, but our relation with Capital Cleaners was in compliance with state law, which was fifty or seventy-five cents an hour less than comparable state employees were paid, and it was that disparity they were demanding we pay. In point of fact, we had already negotiated a contract with Capital Cleaners that the University would fund that disparity at the beginning of the next fiscal year. And so, what they were down to was fifty or seventy-five cents.

BS: And how did it end? Did it end up just with the budget, going as you planned?

PA: Yes, that was it -- yes.

BS: Back to diversity. You appointed an Associate Provost, Multi-Cultural

Affairs. Can you talk a little about the origins of that, and also the strategic plans that came out of it?

PA: There have been, as I recall before my arrival here -- or somewhere around when we were under that foolish initial organization chart, where I really didn't have much to do in the internal work of the University, and every third person in the University was a Vice Chancellor or Vice Provost or Assistant! [laughs] Each had a fancy title and questionable responsibility. In any event, there was provided for a position -- whatever we call Ron Taylor's position -- but it had, for budgetary reasons, not been filled. And that went on for one year, and then two years, and then three years, because we're in a perpetual budgetary crisis, and that happened to be one of the ways to meet the budget shortfall. It became clear that people who were concerned about our commitment to diversity -- if we're going to have it on the books, we either fund it or we take it off the books. Because at some point, it's just an embarrassment not to fill a vacancy and it sends a negative signal. Ron Taylor was a person who I inferred had earned broad-based respect throughout the academic community over the years, and also, for a variety of reasons, was respected and trusted in the minority community. And I thought he would be one who I could ask to kind of bridge the gaps, help me as emergencies and issues arose. And also, bring some order and consistency to a whole lot of expenditures for which I didn't think the University was getting much in return. And so, I asked the Chancellor to fill that position and do a search, and either put Ron Taylor in there or show me somebody who could do that job a

lot better than Ron. And because Ron had been around, and been an active participant in the community, and he was of minority status, there was probably no one who had those credentials right on line. And Ron accepted the appointment. And he has helped me in a number of ways. One, identifying some people who do some diversity training, which is kind of a political requirement. He completed that diversity report, some elements of which are foolish, but most of which, I think, is very good (a) because there are some substantive suggestions, many of which we have already implemented. But the very process -- engaging in the process of diversity [unclear] identifies it as a University priority which is being taken seriously. He also took responsibility for Office of Diversity and Equity where for a variety of reasons things were not working and we received much criticism from both internal and external sources i.e., academic department heads and the CHRO. Fortunately, Ron had had the current Director of the CHRO as a student, and therefore had credibility. So, I asked him to do some back channel communications with her, so she knew that the University was not consciously thumbing our nose at them. And then he and I went over to see her. That was an invaluable service that he performed, that you can never put in a position description. Ironically, the activation of the post may actually lead to some efficiencies budgetarily because we're squeezing some of the Directors and getting more out of the several units.

BS: Do you think there's been a change in, say, the academic side of the institutes? We're talking African-American studies and Asian-

American studies, Puerto-Rican studies.

PA: And Women's studies.

BS: And Women's studies.

PA: There's been not a discernable change that I'm aware of. I've asked Ron to work on it. But he had an agenda -- a backlog agenda -- on immediate issues of an administrative type that I suspect -- including arranging for the recruitment of a replacement for the diversity and equity position, including recruiting a person who would come in and effectively train our staff, rather than paying exorbitant fees for this diversity training and perpetuity, engage the services of a well-respected woman, who is effectively going to train the trainers, and we'll have our own internal repository, so that every department had -- academic and otherwise -- will at least be aware of the law, and be aware of the institutional mission, and so on. But I have asked him to look closer at every dollar he's got.

BS: Ron headed up the Committee that did the search for the Chancellor, and ultimately, John Petersen was appointed. Could you talk a little bit about that search, and the work with the Chancellor, etc.? In other words, leading up to the choice, and then what's transpired.

PA: Well, for the reasons regarding Ron's stature in the University community, plus the fact I wanted to send a message that it was an open search, and I would encourage minority and women to apply, I asked him to take this on. And he agreed. We were going after Cadillacs, and I think there was a view that the Provost of Berkeley or the University of Michigan would jump at the chance to come here and be

our Provost. And I was shocked [laughs] to learn that was not the case.

The search went well. Several strong people applied. And then we brought in three or four finalists. Three of them were really quite strong on paper. And a couple of them crashed and burned right out of the chute. One of them blew off questions, and it quickly became clear that this guy just wouldn't make it.

BS: There were questions in the campus newspaper, too, weren't there, about the search and about this particular candidate?

PA: I don't remember. There was a woman, I liked her, but it turned out that she also kind of blew people off. And then, another whole set of opposition to her came in from other groups. It turns out she was a very aggressive, open lesbian, and an open relationship that some people thought was inappropriate. And that was a very difficult one because that could not be the reason that she was eliminated. But from some very sensible people on the Search Committee and off -- apparently, she said things that were just totally inappropriate. And so, she was eliminated. And that got us down to Petersen and maybe one other. Some very strong people on paper, who I had known of were eliminated by the Search Committee and not invited in for interviews. And I pushed back. For example, a black woman who was President of one of the Cal State Universities -- her name was suggested to me and to Ron. And I asked him just to call her and answer her question. She asked if she could just meet with him and me and not with the Committee? No, well then she wouldn't be interested. So, I said, "Fine, cross her off." And then she would call back again. I mean, she

clearly wanted to be crowned without having to go through the [unclear]. Couldn't be done. She complicated things a little bit because she put the word out into the black system that UConn really didn't care about this. Well, thank God for Ron Taylor, being the Chairman of the Search Committee, because those kinds of charges could stick to a white guy and not to a black man with the standing he enjoyed. But it came down to John Petersen and a woman named Susan Henry. She was Dean of Science at Carnegie Mellon. Just an impeccable resume and an elegant mind, and a cultivated demeanor, and people were blown away by her. To the point that I invited her back personally for the third interview, I think, and I asked Greg Anderson to put together a group of people and her to take her to dinner, and try to induce her to come. And it turned out she had been offered the Deanship of Life Sciences and Agriculture, which is a significant position at Cornell. The deal that she thought she had been offered at Cornell was that she could bring along her three or four professorial colleagues from Carnegie who were on her Research Team with the grants. And they made those positions available and vacant for her. And they also would give her a couple of Assistant Deans who would really run the college, so she could spend at least fifty percent of her time as a bench scientist, and still be the nominal Dean. And so, she thought what she had -- the offer -- would allow her to retain her identity and her fulfillment as a scientist, but still do the strategic planning and priority setting, and have someone else count the paper clips and push the paper. What we offered her was a not comparable position by any means. Phil Yeagle

and Greg Anderson and their colleagues were wonderfully supportive in developing an offer package for her. I said, “The deal I’ll make you is you can spend as much time in your laboratory as you wish, but you’re responsible for leading and managing the academic enterprise.” She missed a couple of deadlines to respond to our offer. She said, “It’s taken so much time because I find the prospects at UCONN so exciting that I would like to come.” But, she said, “This whole process has taught me [unclear] really a scientist, and not an administrator. And I had thought I would like to be a Provost or a President, but I just can’t give up my science. And I know the UCONN job is a one hundred percent job. So, I’m going to Cornell.” And then the question was, “Do we go with John or not?” Because everybody else in the search people liked John. But everybody else in the search was just a different candidate than Susan. And my view was because there were kind of internal differences of opinion over Fred Maryanski, and it was causing some frustration on Fred’s part and anger on his wife’s part, and uncertainty among the staff and the Chancellor’s office. And some Deans were actually incapable of hiding their own ambition. They thought that they could do a much better job than Fred was doing, and all of this. I had great respect for Fred. People trusted him because he is an honest man, and he is a smart man. But he’s not forceful, and he doesn’t have the leadership ability to stand up in front of a crowd and do those types of things. And I thought that’s what we need. And there are so many speaking invitations and public [unclear] invitations that come into this place that no one person can handle them all. And I

thought we needed a Chancellor that would be comfortable going to talk to the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, and so on. That really is not Fred's strength. I thought to leave him in another year and extend the search was just not for the good of the institution. We had to get to work. So, we appointed John.

BS: Was there an opportunity to extend it another year? Had that been discussed?

PA: I talked about it with the Senate Executive Committee and with the Executive Committee of the Board, and said that unless they could come up with real strong reasons to the contrary, that my bias was to go forward and make the appointment. There was mixed support for John and little for Fred. I also talked with Ed Marth and Kevin Fahey and others and what I got was, "Phil, whatever you do, we'll support you. In the end, the overwhelming majority opinion was to go with Peterson or reopen the search.

BS: How have you seen it working out over the past -- what is it -- two years -- I guess?

PA: John has been good. He's smart and he's honest and he's tough. But he has some trouble with politically complex situations. I asked members of the Search Committee to call Deean Barbara Redwood from Wayne State who has previously been Dean of Nursing at UConn. I suggested that they say Phil thought you might be able to give us a better assessment of this guy." And she said, "Well, I'll tell you what. David Adamaty just left as President. And when he left, his Provost left and John Petersen is the consensus candidate of the Deans to be in

the internal candidate for Provost.” Well, what better recommendation from people who know administrators, that you can trust a guy, and he’s proven to exercise fair mind and judgment. So, I took that to be an extraordinarily strong recommendation from a person in whom I repose great trust. But John had more learning to do about central administration.

BS: Now, you mention talking to Ed Marth, who is Executive Director of the AAUP, and you said he was involved with [unclear]. Could you talk a little bit about your relationships with the unions at the University and the rollover that they have played in the time that you were here?

PA: Well, it’s really been a collegial relationship. And I can’t take credit for it because this had been established before I arrived. I’ll start with the non-professorial union. Kevin Fahey is the elected head and is a congenial, pale fellow, well met, intelligent man, who wants to be supportive of good relations with the University. And I think he understands that I want to be fair-minded and cooperative. We worked together well individually. He, unlike the AAUP, has an Executive Committee and a Board, some members of which do not share his views. In the case of the AAUP, people ought to be happy. [laughs] Eight or ten years now, five percent increases in the contracts. And so, our faculty is handsomely compensated relative to peers. And that has a lot to do with retaining and recruiting good faculty. Moreover, Ed Marth is just that type of person [unclear] well met, and he’s got that twinkle in his eye and he’s easy to deal with. I think he was skeptical about me for the first several months that I was here. But he has been

enormously helpful in avoiding taking faculty issues to arbitration or legal action. And I think Ed understands that I'm trying to be fair-minded, and that he can trust me. And he knows that if he tries to hammer me, it's not going to work. And I know if I try to hammer him, it's not going to work. He and I understand that. I have to take a broader University view, and he is responsible for his constituents, collectively and individually. And his constituents collectively are what we have to sell for the University, so they're among my most important constituents. But I have many others, as well. In that general context, a specific example might help to illustrate the relationship.

[end of side one, tape one]

BS: There is an unusual case that's gone on here of breaking tenure, of a professor in Physics, I believe. And it's well known because I was talking to a friend of mine over the weekend at NYU, and he was asking about this.

PA: Oh.

BS: What happened there, at least in a general sense? And how does this effect the University academic freedom, etc.

BS: Some other issues -- in the sciences, too -- you had problems during your administration with animal care. Could you discuss that a little bit?

PA: Yes. The best way to describe the overall situation is, I think we had seventy-eight different laboratory locations at which animal

experimentation occurred. The United States Department of Agriculture suggests that we should have or, at most, two. Our objective is to get the three. We've closed many of them. The policy here over the decades has been that if you can afford a cage and ten mice, you can set it up in your office or next door, and begin the research project. That's the luxury that the faculty in those areas had and they no longer have. We cannot afford, no matter how distinguished one professor might be, to throw into jeopardy the full research agenda at the University of Connecticut simply to continue past practice. The investigator from USDA who everyone, including the principal investigators in these labs, described as a "fair-minded man," not a "crazy control freak from the federal government," but a guy who knows his business, has been around a long time, and is trying to do the right thing. He is described to have said to a group of forty or fifty professors and administrators at one period, maybe three years ago, that, "The University of Connecticut is the absolutely most scandalously deficient University" he's ever seen, in terms of animal care. And a year later, he came back and said to a comparable group -- that there is no university in the country that's made more progress and has changed its attitude culturally, so dramatically, than the University of Connecticut." So, there's no question -- the place was a mess. We have set aside -- with UConn 2000 funds -- twenty million dollars to consolidate laboratories including, I think, one of the major facilities will be in the new pharm bio building. There's some irritation on the part of some faculty that they can't just keep their animal collections

next door. But not only were we far behind comparable Universities, the federal government is tightening up -- increasing accountability to ever heightened standards. The Health Center does have AALAC accreditation -- USDA accreditation. We do not in Storrs. And we must get it because not having that accreditation, I'm told, precludes us from applying for many different types of NIH, USDA and other grants, for which many of our faculty would be very competitive.

BS: What are some of the examples of the problems? What kind of problems arose?

PA: Well, there are some that I view as just foolish. The federal [unclear] who write the rule book put them in there, and it's not my prerogative to change them. Chipping paint, cows in a pasture without shade trees on a hot day. A repeat offense can occur if, in patho-biology there was paint chipping in the laboratory in Inspection One, and it's fixed. And six months later, there's paint chipping in a laboratory in Psychology. That's a repeat offense.

PA: Haring said that PETA has the University of Connecticut and its crosshairs; I've received maybe five hundred letters because the PETA group has targeted UConn and its members are active.

BS: The University was involved in the Anthrax square that occurred. Could you discuss that? How you found out about it, and what occurred?

PA: Well, I found out about it when I got a phone call saying the FBI had just put an orange ribbon about the Patho-Biology Building. [laughs] I said, "What's the FBI doing here, and where's Bob Hudd?" He said,

“Bob Hudd just found out about it, and he’s over there.” Apparently, some Anthrax was found in a laboratory that was overseen by the then-acting Chairman of the Department, who replaced Herb Whiteley, Herb Vankruiningen. I’m not sure that the full truth is out yet -- that the Anthrax was discovered. Professor Von Kruingen told a graduate student from some place in Eastern Europe or some place in the former Soviet Union who now lives in West Hartford, is a graduate student, but in Army ROTC at the University of Connecticut. He gets the highest praise from the Colonel of our ROTC unit as being a patriot and all of this. But the graduate student was allegedly instructed by the professor, when it was discovered that there was Anthrax in a refrigerator -- he was told by the professor to destroy it in approved [unclear]. The student, apparently, destroyed a couple, but took one vile and put it in a refrigerator in another laboratory. And that was later discovered. The word got to the FBI by someone who was afraid. The FBI descended on the campus, notified the police, and the police notified me. This coincided with the death of an elderly lady some place else in Connecticut, from anthrax. And, of course, it was right after September 11th, and there are those who said, “Prior to September 11th, nobody would have paid any attention.” The Dean of Agriculture here, who has administrative responsibility over this Department, was mortified. When he was a young professor at Texas A&M, he contracted anthrax. Kirk called and asked to see me and he said, “I’m sorry that this happened. I’ve got to tell you -- this is not dangerous stuff. This is in a mode or whatever it’s called that will not be a danger

to people.” He said, “I’ll go over and walk through that building unprotected and rub my hands up against it.” He said, “There’s no danger, but it’s a terrible PR mess. I know that.” Well, unfortunately, Kirk was interviewed by the Hartford Courant, and that attitude came out -- that this is no big thing, which deeply offended the investigation and press who were making it a big thing. Fortunately, we got through it. And whether or not those who say that the professor directed the guy to “Destroy this stuff,” and then winked at him and said, “But save one” is true or not, I don’t know. The administration instructed Frank Labato, our environmental officer, to conduct an inventory of every laboratory in the University to ensure that there were no more substances that were prohibited by the USDA. It took a month or so, and he brought in some people from Yale and from UMass -- the Bay State Medical Facility. I received a document certifying that every laboratory had been inspected, and I sent out the requisite statement to principal investigators and people saying, “We’ve got to take this seriously, and we’re going to comply with federal laws,” and all of this seemed to satisfy the FBI. I read in the paper only a couple of weeks ago that whereas they could have brought serious charges under this new Patriotic Act against our graduate student, what they had offered him was something that came to a plea bargain. He doesn’t agree he did fault, but he’s going to be in probation for eighteen months at which time this will be stripped from his record.

BS: He has accelerated rehabilitation?

PA: Something like that -- yes.

BS: Did you ever have the opportunity to meet him?

PA: No.

BS: Who actually dealt with him directly? Was it the Department? The police?

PA: The police. And, of course, his major professor. And I don't know whether the Dean was actively involved with the student or not. He was very quickly off the campus and unavailable, and he was dealing with the FBI.

BS: Okay. Another matter -- let's see. A different direction, but this has to do with the debate over the curriculum at the University and general education. Could you discuss your role in that, how you have seen it moving, and such?

PA: Well, slowly, and deliberately, appropriately. You know, how many angels dance on the head of a pin? Are we going to study the great scholarship of the Western European white men or are the women and the people of color and all these who are writing now going to find their way in the curriculum, too? And, by the way, you've got a hundred and twenty hours to do it, or a hundred and twenty-eight hours -- whatever. And to me, it comes down to is what constitutes a learned person. The very process probably produces value. When people wanted to talk to me about it, I talked at about the level of abstraction that I've just said to you. But I haven't become more deeply involved in the process than that. I really do believe that the content of the curriculum is a faculty prerogative, as long as it's doable within the resource limitations, and that it's consistent with the mission of the

University. What we're talking about here is what undergraduates will leave us with, and what they must have been exposed to, and then what in addition, it's nice to have been exposed to.

BS: How about another relatively current issue, the calendar of the University?

PA: My view is that they did a good analysis. They and we did not do a good political roll-up of the issue. My principle driver on that is I'd like to have it set-up so Spring Weekend occurs when it's colder outside. [laughs] But there is also the issue -- more seriously -- on when students have their free time, and when they can get out of here a little earlier, and have an extended summer, where they can get employment and do internships or whatever, and not have that big break between the semesters. The big down side, which frankly, I didn't even know was an issue is that some people -- in the sciences primarily -- sciences and engineering -- claim to use that inter-session. And it can be done only then because they're research is in areas where the climate will allow them to do their research only then. And that because of the funding cycles of federal funding agencies, they have to have that time right then to prepare their proposals to get in for the next cycle. It's all so complicated, and in many cases, even two people in the same department will argue differently. So, I guess what our plan is right now is that we're going to bring this up in September, and try to have a vote in October or November and get the issue resolved. I'm told that Peter Halverson and some of the members of the Committee thought that the administration and, perhaps I, had real strong convictions on

this, and that it had to do with one convocation and Spring Weekend and all. I don't necessarily see how one convocation is related to this particularly. But I do not have strongly held convictions, and whatever the community agrees on is going to be fine with me.

BS: The physical change of the campus now. As we talk, Legislature is debating the 21st Century UConn. This is in August. And there are budget problems. But I'd like to go back to the changes that came with UConn 2000, and the impact that that had on you when you first came here. I'd also like to touch on the Master Plan of the campus, and the physical change that's going on, including things like parking and also the new hotel on campus. So, that is the kind of question that we teach people in Oral History not to ask because it has too many parts.

[laughs]

PA: From what angle?

BS: Okay. First, what role did UConn 2000 have when you first came here?

PA: When I was brought out here to see the campus in July of 1996, the first buildings that I remember seeing were the Towers dormitories. And they were quite awful. Just unappealing to the newcomer.

BS: Right.

PA: What an awful statement. And then, when we arrived back here in September or thereabouts, the renovations had been completed, and I thought, "God, they're nicer than I remember." But what I think the master planning group and the consultants, the people from Ann Arbor and New Haven did by identifying five or six different features that

were imposed as common issues common parameters going forward on renovations or new construction was, for example, to specify that the pitch of the roofs would all be the same angle, that green would be the color, whether on a brick building or windows, as in the Chemistry Department. And in so far as possible, where appropriate, brick color would correspond to the old, historic buildings over around Gulley and Beech and Manchester, and so on. I've seen pictures of South Campus, and I've heard all the horror stories of how unattractive and students who really wanted to come to UConn because their parents had, would come out and they'd see the South Campus, and they wouldn't even go in the rest of the way -- they'd turn around and leave and say, "I'm not going to that school." Very clearly I think that the beauty of the campus right now is in significant measure what has allowed us to make the claims that we're making about the turn-around in recruiting successes, and all the valedictorians and salutatorians and all of that. It's being exacerbated by the economic situations. BU, BC, Rutgers and Syracuse are our most significant competitors. A State of Connecticut resident can come here and receive as good, if not better, education than at any of those places and at a third of the price. But if we didn't have the buildings, and they didn't see South Campus as where they could live, and the Chemistry Building they might not have come. It always worked inside, but it's now attractive. And the new Business School certainly is attractive. That Information Technology Building, between the Library and the Business School is going to be stunning. If we can get the Student Center done and give the kids

something to do, other than just go to a bar -- a theater, a food court, etc. -- we should simply keep getting more competitive and more attractive. So, the building program is not an end in and of itself. But it's an enabler to do what our mission is, and that's to provide high quality education to the very best students that we are able to attract.

BS: How about the development of the new hotel on campus? How do you see that?

PA: When I arrived I told several faculty and administrative leaders, we need a conference center. "I'm going to have a hotel before I die!" [laughs] And I hammered away and hammered away, and we had issues with the Planning & Zoning Commission. Without the capacity to showcase the quality of our faculty and programs, we could not exploit our potential. I also feared, because of the Pfizer situation, we might have scared away other private investors. But fortunately, Bob Friedman stayed the course, and he has given us what we had hoped for. I think the public areas on the first floor are what they ought to be at a public University. They're not elegant and they're not excessive, but they're attractive and they're efficient. Bob Friedman calls me maybe once every three or four months. I'm hopeful that he can follow his business plan, and he'll be in a position to add another set-up to expand to another fifty rooms. Business seems to be going well for him. But what it's doing is allowing us to attract even more conferences. Sally Reis brought in yet another one for young problem solvers this summer, in addition to their confrature. Janine Caira had the fifty or sixty tapeworm specialists. [laughs]

BS: [laughs]

PA: But people can come here and they've got a place to stay. And that just wasn't the case. I mean, to go down to this Quality Inn or whatever it is, halfway between here and Willimantic is not a suitable alternative.

BS: How about the parking situation on campus? There was a time when parking was not charged on campus -- now it is. What, in fact, does this change add? The garages and this type of thing?

PA: I've been surprised at how few complaints we've received about parking. And I attribute a lot of the smoothness of the bumpy ride to Karla Fox, who has been here a long time. Karla's paid her dues on the AAUP Board and on the Executive Committee Board, and on most circles that I know of, she's trusted. She's known to be of the place, not a passing administrator who doesn't really care, doesn't know the history of the place, and so on and so forth. I just asked her early on, "Take this on." Once you decide that the philosophical basis of your buildings and grounds plan is going to be a pedestrian campus, and there are not going to be cars down the middle. The rest flows from the policy. But the point is, the pedestrian center of the campus with a cross that the center point of which -- the meeting point of which -- would be just about the library. Once you come to that, there aren't going to be any cars driven in very many places within North Eagleville, South Eagleville, Gulley and 195. Then you need peripheral parking and additional bus service, all of which must be funded. That meant promulgating an overall traffic system that would be self-

supporting including enough to generate the revenues to get the busses going from the new parking lots on the periphery, and the two ramps on the immediate corners of the campus. And frankly, you're going from nothing to a hundred bucks to three hundred bucks, to the case now -- where I park, I pay, I think, six hundred and fifty bucks. For somebody who spent twenty years here and could just drive in and get in at the right time and get a spot twenty feet from the building -- you have to pay three or four hundred bucks for the privilege of parking ten minutes away rather than three minutes a way. But people seemed -- you know, there was all the grousing that you and I talked about six years ago. But people -- if they weren't grousing about that, they'd be grousing about something else. That was something that was a dramatic change in their lives. And frankly, I was very pleased at the way in which people saw that as a necessary component to a massive change, but a change that contemplated a quantum improvement in the quality of the buildings in which they did their work.

BS: Just a couple of more questions to finish up. One thing -- we talked about parking and physical change. What about the issue of safety on campus? This comes up on occasion? How have you dealt with this?

PA: Well, it had come up on a couple of occasions. My view is -- my perception is -- and professionals have told me that serious safety concerns are probably less of an issue here than most comparable institutions. And by that I do not mean inner city -- big city -- metropolitan institutions. I'm talking about rural. And I think that's for a variety of reasons. The nature of our clientele doesn't really

regard violence as an option. Now, from time to time we have non students from New London and other places who apparently in the last year, until we closed them down, saw Husky Blues as a suitable place to transfer drugs and acquire drugs. And so, Naval people would come up, and they held a different set of customs and [unclear] than our normal students. And, from time to time, also motivated by drugs apparently, gang members from Hartford and New Haven would find their way to the campus. And they did engage in behavior that was just outrageously unacceptable. We're concerned because we do have implicit in our contract with parents that this is a safe environment for their youngsters to study in a place that except when acts of God occur, they're going to be safe. All of that notwithstanding, we have spent a lot of money to install these blue lights to create the aura of safety, and also to suggest to students where the safe paths are to go to and from destinations. That's number one. Number two, I think we are blessed with a remarkably effective police force. They are well trained as university police. They are remarkably student friendly. They understand that more restraint is necessary in a University community than in a police force generally, but still they must be prepared for those occasions when people do bad things to each other. What I have learned from talking with them is they even have a strategy for parking their vehicles where they're obvious to more people. And then they're out on their feet, so it would appear that there's greater police presence than is really the case. Now, having said all this, I certainly don't want ever to sweep under the carpet the fact that we've had incidents where a

carload of thugs from Hartford drive up to I-95 and North Eagleville, jump out, assault a guy, take his wallet, and they're gone. Fortunately in that case, the kid got the license number, called the cops and they apprehended them at the town strip mall down there before 84. The first year I got here, there were allegations of rape up around the Hilltop Apartments. We fanned out around the residence and told the young women, "For heaven sakes, stay away from there. Don't go there." And it turned out, as I recall -- the inference that the police drew was that in one case, we actually had a retraction from the young woman who they thought was seeking attention, and she reported this and it didn't really happen. And in another two cases, they were convinced that it really did happen, and we never caught the perpetrators. So, I don't mean to be declaring victory at all. But I think we've taken the steps that must be taken, that we qualify as a prudent response to the safety not only of our students, but of the members of this community. To go much further would probably be a misallocation of money. To do much less would not be sufficient.

BS: Just a couple of wrap-up questions. You've been here for six years now?

PA: Yes.

BS: What would you think is your greatest contribution in those six years? And what would you like your contribution to be once you've left UConn?

PA: I have known this to be a very good place for a very long time, and it's obviously a good academic institution right now, which I believe was

not fully recognized before, say, 1994 or 1995. I hope people will conclude that during the time I was responsible, the institution became better academically and was so recognized nationally. My initial concern was that we spend the billion dollars in a way that supports this objective. Also, that the construction projects he managed in a competent and efficient way, unlike when DPW was doing it. I think we've been successful in that regard. I couldn't believe the disrespect that state bureaucrats and state legislators had for UConn. They wanted their basketball teams, and they wanted us to be better than Yale. But yet, they wanted to treat us as a state agency. And a good part of my first year here was to, in a non-arrogant way, try to persuade them, "You can't have it both ways. You really must release the institution. You must let us act like a research institution. You must let us set tuition by ourselves. You must let us raise the privately donated money without the fear that you're going to supplant, rather than supplement that, with your state appropriation." And I think we've been successful in doing that. There is no way that we're going to be as good as we can be without this University getting into the mainstream of American public universities with respect to private philanthropic support. I am confident that we will successfully conclude the three hundred million dollar campaign, no matter how bad the economy becomes. We're more than two-thirds of the way there already, and we have another two years left in our time period. And if the economy comes back, it's possible we can push that up to four hundred and fifty million, which means we'll be at six hundred and fifty to seven hundred million. And

then, if the economy really does come back, perhaps in the next three years, we can raise another three hundred million. And that really will be meaningful financial augmentation to the state support and the tuition support and the federal support. And I think the last is just our national campaign in recruiting, to improve the perception of UConn nationally of our undergraduate programs and selected graduate programs. We could double the number of out-of-state students who qualify tomorrow if we wanted to. But we can't. We don't have the faculty resources, and we don't have the housing availability. I learned this afternoon that we have two hundred and fifty more students than we had accounted for because the summer melt was smaller than our historical experience. That's just wonderful news! But we need the classes for them, which means we're going to have to come up now with probably another half a million dollars of adjunct money, and we're going to have to triple rooms again. The final thing that I hoped I would be able to do is take a long-shot and try to get the extension for another ten years of the building program so that the whole campus would be upgraded over a twenty-year period. Monteith and Arjona are buildings that probably eighty percent are undergraduates go through in the first couple years, and they're dreadful. And Torrey Life Sciences is not completed; it's so bad that I think we'll just tear it down and replace it. There's still a lot to be done on this campus. And the regional campuses -- West Hartford needs work -- and we have to finish Avery Point. The facilities are the building blocks of what help you attract superior faculty and superior students. Scholarships for the

students, along with high quality programs, that is to say high quality faculty. And that means good pay, good laboratory space for the scientists, good collections in the library, etc. And an appropriately distributed mix of distinguished professorships to bring everybody together. Its financial resources and an attractive physical plant and support of alumni that help you get to that point. So, it's all of those building blocks that, if successfully pursued, I hope will say, "Well, when he was here, the place was made better."

BS: When you first came here, you expressed concern -- I think the first letter you wrote to faculty in February of 1997 -- about the NRC ratings. Has this changed much? We may not have other ratings -- I'm not quite sure. But what's your feeling about that?

PA: I think -- as you know, those are every ten year ratings.

BS: Yes, right.

PA: And so, we've probably got another four or five years before we do it again. We have made changes in the way we report that will make us look better. For example, the last time around, in the biological sciences, which -- at the University of Connecticut are very good. But we've got three departments here. One at Avery Point. A big one at the Health Center. And we report them as five different departments. That ought to be one department. But cellular molecular here is very good. Cellular molecular, combined with what's at the Health Center would be a spectacular department. Ecology and evolutionary biology and PMB combined with marine sciences at Avery Point is dramatic. Engineering -- several of the engineering department -- electrical,

computer science -- combined with what's now down at the Stamford campus would be an excellent faculty and [unclear]. But what we've also done is make budgetary decisions, for example, that two areas of priority are genetic biotechnology, and fuel cells. Now, that was easy to do because we already had substantial endowments of faculty who were awfully good. And in the case of fuel cells, for example, Connecticut Innovations, Inc. came in and gave us, I think, eleven million dollars over a period of three years to endow professorships, primarily in engineering. Combined with a whole lot of corporate support, it makes it something of a no-brainer. And you can attract even more high quality professors. Similarly, Rutgers, along with several other institutions, was trying to steal Jerry Yang. But Rutgers was the one that made a real serious effort to take him away. I think there were eight or ten faculty positions and vacant positions they were going to give him for his laboratory -- a whole lot of space -- and we were not in a position to do that. Well, what we did was commit space in the new biotechnology building for his laboratories. And then reallocated a couple faculty positions within the College of Agriculture and a couple centrally provided, so he's got five more positions that can support the work of that laboratory. And that's going to have a dramatic impact with our funding levels. The awareness of the faculty within your departments with peers nationally and internationally, and publication, quite independent of financials. Those two enterprises alone should cause great improvements in areas that are hot, and we're doing it with other people's money.

BS: That's always good. [laughs] Is there anything that I haven't asked you that I should have?

PA: I am surprised that you -- particularly you -- didn't probe a little bit on why I'm so hot on corporate university relationships.

BS: Well, why don't you tell me?

PA: Because I think they're necessary. Public universities particularly, but also private, simply do not have the resources to pursue meaningful excellence without outside support. As I recall, when you and I discussed this one afternoon, your concern, which I thought was appropriate, was that corporate money can prevent incentives and sometimes cause behaviors that are not dishonest, but not at the highest level of professional requirements." And I certainly believe that's a threat. I also believe, though, that in those disciplines, the incentive to get a federal grant from NIH renewed can also lead to painting the backs of mice, and so what I have always thought is that you have to proceed from the starting point that your tenured faculty are people of integrity and ethical. And when it's demonstrated that that's not the case, you hammer them real hard so that those who are honest, get the message that their honesty pays off. And then you have research protocols that are unequivocal and specify what behaviors are not acceptable. For example, holding back research results in anything but a timely way for the purpose of producing a profit is not acceptable. Also, the research protocols and the scientific methods to be approved by the principle investigator, not by the corporate funder or the government. And if you've those agreements and you can abide by

them and you can enforce them, the source of the monies becomes irrelevant. That said I wouldn't want to take tobacco money or Saddam Hussein's money right now, but those reservations arise from political correctness and the image that would be sent rather than concerns regarding political correctness.

BS: Was it with Pfizer or something? I'm not quite sure.

PA: I'm not sure, Bruce. No, I think it had to do -- it may have arisen from Pfizer. But you took the conversation over to a whole movement toward corporate relationships.

BS: Well, the corporatization of the University -- that's an issue that I think manifests itself in a variety of ways because --

PA: Right.

BS: Is there anything else you want to say?

PA: No. Not so much in connection with this interview. I vaguely remember the Senate Executive Committee or something and you brought that up and I said, "I hope we can talk about this further some time," and that was --

End of Interview

Interview with President Philip E. Austin, the University of Connecticut, by Bruce M. Stave, for the University of Connecticut History Project and the UConn Center for Oral History, May 13, 2003.

STAVE: When we talked last time -- last summer -- UConn 21st Century was still not yet passed. Since that time, it has been. Can you discuss a little bit about this -- about what went into the final success of that?

AUSTIN : Well, it's one of those instances where I believed what I heard the political leaders say. They saw the first five years of UConn 2000 -- or six years -- as being one of the best investments the state had made. They saw good buildings were being built here. They saw that the brain drain that was much talked about in 1995 and 1996 had, in fact, been stopped. And I think people became aware that what we had been saying was true. And that is, that the quality of the academic programming at UConn had been good for a long, long time. But when you put faculty and students in decrepit buildings that were not only inefficient and uncomfortable and aesthetically distasteful, but in some cases dangerous, that people who have options will exercise those options. And so, I think a number of political leaders who, in the first round, went along reluctantly with the approval. The second round they actually took the lead and wanted to be something that looked good, and that the change at UConn and the higher profile of students and greater diversification did, in fact, keep a lot of very bright kids in the state, and therefore, this was an investment that was paying off. And all of the other activities like leveraging state dollars, and getting two dollars in private donations for each dollar -- people saw it was working. Leading up to the passage of the first billion

dollars -- people thought that the set aside of twenty million dollars for matching money probably would not be successful over a five year period. And in point of fact, it was matched in eighteen months. Again, which just demonstrated that there were private philanthropists out there, some of whom never went to UConn, but who were successful in business in the State of Connecticut and they felt an obligation to support public education, but wouldn't do it when there wasn't pride that is produced in the first instance, or arises from a good faculty in a good physical plant. And when they see the commitment of the state, they, too, will come forth as happens at private schools around the country. People want to be associated with a winner. When the ball starts rolling down the hill, it goes faster and becomes bigger. And I think that's largely what happened. I was enormously pleased with the vote counts. The votes were overwhelmingly positive in the state house, which is, as I recall, something like a hundred and ten, four and twenty-five against. And then, the State Senate was thirty-four to two. The Bridgeport Delegation accounted for a good number of the twenty votes in the House in opposition. And in the Senate, State Senator Albert Penn from Bridgeport voted against it. And all of those votes -- they had said publicly were against the Governor, not against UConn because the Governor was withholding any capita. Money for the City of Bridgeport until they resolved the Mayor's legal problems. And then, in the Senate, the other was our good friend Edith Prague, who is opposed to everything. So, the overwhelming support by the political leaders and by the corporate

lenders and people who control or own wealth for the University was a source of great satisfaction.

BS: When we were talking -- I'm not sure you were so certain at that time that it was going to pass. There was some uncertainty. What do you think was the fact that put it over the top? Was it wanting to get on a winning side thing?

PA: Well, throughout the session, the people who know about politics more than I want to know -- told me throughout not to worry. That the votes were there. But I was aware of the economic challenges the state was beginning to face. I was aware that in order to actually have this thing be implemented would require withdrawal of support for a lot of other institutions in the same session that UConn had approved \$1.3 billion - - many millions of dollars were withdrawn -- previously approved were withdrawn from Connecticut State University.

BS: For bonding?

PA: For bonding. And that what we're seeing now is that cities and towns and public elementary and secondary schools are being deferred. So, it was -- while people were saying, "Don't be a worry wort," I was looking at the numbers and saying, "How can the politician embrace one great, big project for one University to the exclusion, almost, of everything else?" But in the end, they did it. And I think again, it's because this state's economic future and therefore, the quality of life, is going to be determined by the quality of the public research university, period. The community and technical schools certainly will produce technicians if the necessary condition of a highly educated

workforce will help retain existing industry, and successfully recruit new industry. And that's what's going to give people jobs, keep the bright kids in the state. That's going to determine the tax base. And that's going to determine the quality of life. And in my view, it all begins and ends with the University of Connecticut, because we are the only public research university in town. Yale is obviously one of the bet Universities in the world, but it attracts the best students from around the world, and in large numbers. When they graduate, they go to Hong Kong or Singapore or London or New York to seek their fortunes. In very large numbers, they're not going to stay. And so, I think that message -- perhaps because ten years earlier the insurance companies and the manufacturing companies in very large numbers, were shipping away their jobs to New York and to the Pacific Rim respectively. And they were worried that things could still get worse. And I think that helped. I think they were was a great pride that was developing in the University. I don't put much stock in this U.S. News and World Report business, but legislators do, parents do, high school students do. And therefore, we pay attention to it. And I think that helped subliminally reinforce the enthusiasm. And then, it goes without saying that the men's and women's basketball teams, even for people who never came near one of our campuses, were made to feel like members of the extended family. And so, those constituents created the context in which politicians say 'eye' or 'nay,' and they overwhelmingly said 'eye.'

BS: What was the role of the Governor?

PA: I was not here for the first round, but I'm told that he was -- in the first round reluctantly brought to the table to sign the legislation. In the second round, quite honestly, it would not have happened without him. I went to him maybe four or five months before the legislative session began, and asked if he'd be willing to consider an extension, that this was such a successful program, and that we wouldn't be where we were, had he not signed the initial legislation. We would be halfway there if we stop after ten years. Consider this to be a completion of work that you began, that you enabled us to go out and be competitive, and do this for Connecticut, and be remembered for this. Presumably you'll have one more term in office, and this should be testimony for something very tangible which you left behind -- a source of great pride for you, and the people will remember you this way. The fact is, there were several people who were skeptical because of the perception that UConn was taking everything. And even some of our supporters said that, "Your priorities are wrong. You should be going after more operating dollars and not bonding dollars." And my position was you look at the numbers -- the state was obviously sinking into a situation where operating renewables weren't good. And if we could get this commitment, it would put us in a position of predictability out thirteen years. There were three years left in UConn 2000, and ten years through 2015. First of all, our physical plant requirements could be addressed substantially more -- really not completed, but substantially better. And secondly, out of the \$1.3 billion, I think \$400 million is in telecommunications, technology and

deferred maintenance. Those are monies that really do mimic operating dollars. So, there's \$400 million of what would have had to have come from our budget in any event. So, it's very satisfying.

BS: Now, the fact that the Governor was very positive toward UConn in his election campaign.

PA: Yes, he was.

BS: What do you think this reflected? And did you have any interaction on that?

PA: Well, I think he saw the numbers. I think he saw what the private sector was doing in terms of contributions. I think he was proud of the change in perception of UConn -- not necessarily the reality, but the perception. And the whole notion that the calls he was getting now were not -- at that point, the calls he was getting at that point had gone from, "The buildings are so awful," and, "My kid is sick because the dormitory room is leaking cold air in the winter," and, "My kid can't study in the summer because it's so hot and humid -- it's not air conditioned." Calls changed from that kind of generally negative to, "I'm angry because my kid can't get into UConn anymore. What's going on here?" I think it got his attention. And he, by that time, had appointed the majority of the trustees, and I think he was getting back new information from his trustees that said, "You know, this UConn place really is better than people had given it credit for, and has been a long time." And now there's the enthusiasm. I am told -- well, first of all, he was never reticent to be critical, even when I was in the room, in the first couple of years. But I'm told that in the last four years even

when I wasn't in the room, he was saying awfully good things about UConn. So, I take his positive words as an honest change in opinion, and that he wants to leave this as a legacy.

BS: Were there any trustees who were particularly close to him that would sort of be his liaison to you?

PA: I don't think you could describe any of them as being particularly close. But people that he appointed for the first time include Roger Gelfenlien, of course, who was Chairman of the Board. Mike Cicchetti, with whom he is quite close. Jim Abromaitis, who is a rather well-known former UConn athlete, and a childhood playmate of the Governor, and one of his Commissioners. Mike Martinez, who is a small businessman, was his appointee. David O'Leary, who was his former Chief of Staff. And then he reappointed a number of people. For example, [Richard] Treibek and [William] Berkley, [Claire] Leonardi and the daughter of the late, great John Bailey, Louise Bailey, was reappointed by him.

BS: With this view that -- this very positive view of the University -- the budget of the University has been adversely effected -- the operating budget had been adversely effected during the academic -- this academic year.

PA: Yes.

BS: Could you talk a little bit about that? What's happened and what the response is?

PA: The state is broke. Like forty-six other states, Connecticut -- in my opinion, I thought at the time -- but certainly in retrospect, I think it

was a serious mistake to lower the tax rates that required such a fight to implement around the turn of the decade. But the national economy was such we would have faced challenge in any event. We continue to face a billion dollar deficit in the next fiscal year. And until the elected leadership comes up with some compromise [unclear] solution of concessions, tax increases and programmatic reductions -- until that's fixed at the very macro level, institutions like ours are going to continue to suffer budget reductions. I take modest satisfaction in the fact that, as reported in The Hartford Courant at the time, the reductions imposed on UConn were less than the other units of higher education. And higher education received smaller cuts than the rest of state government. So, as I say, it's nice to know you're liked. It would be nicer to know you're liked when the state has money to distribute in response to that emotion! [laughs]

BS: There have been actually several cuts along the line.

PA: Yes.

BS: Back in the Fall, and then again the Spring, I guess.

PA: Right.

BS: How is the University dealing with this? What decisions have you had to make?

PA: Well, we have frozen recruitments and appointments across the board, and then have selectively in priority areas, and after careful analysis, authorized appointments of new position. It's not good long-term academic policy. We've accommodated enrollment increases overwhelmingly with adjuncts. And, as I say, that can teach the

courses -- get the courses taught -- and in some cases, good experienced adjuncts do as well as or better than full-time faculty. But to have a University -- a research University -- worthy of the name, you need the commitment to scholarly output, and you need dedicated people who are going to be around for advising and service work and committee work, and so on. And that has been one way which is less easy to see on a day-to-day basis if you're an outsider. But it certainly has the effect of inhibiting quality enhancement, and exploiting our full potential. But in a way, the way we dealt with it, is by reducing expenditures, taking out the bottom line. I inherited a set of union relationships that were just wonderful. I don't take credit for them, but I've done everything I can to nurture them and maintain good relationships, and the two major campus-based unions came forward with a proposal to accept a wage freeze for one year -- delay it for a year. And the administration -- everybody earning more than seventy-five thousand dollars in the administration -- had their salaries frozen for the first nine months of the current year, and we adjusted for the last quarter for the rate, and paid out for one quarter, and then the next year everyone will be frozen. And the students had imposed on them a mid-year tuition increase this year, and roughly eight-and-a-half percent in each of the next two years, with almost a twenty-five percent increase over a two-and-a-half year period, which has allowed us to keep body and soul together during this period of challenge. And we only hope that the economy will come back because this economy - - the Connecticut revenue stream -- is disproportionately dependent on

capital gains tax. And if all the wealthy people in Farmington and Avon and Simsbury and Fairfield County are not experiencing capital gains, the state's not experiencing revenue increases, indeed, the contrary, if and when they sell stocks, they're experiencing capital losses which reduces the state's losses. So, what we have to hope for is that there will be a rather rapid turn-around in the economy.

Unfortunately, this morning we saw another six hundred jobs at The Hartford are going to be lost. The bad news is, we're not out of this, and it's not obvious how long it will take to get out of it. The good news is that relative to most other states, our pain is much less severe, and so, while we're having all these operating budget challenges, we're still able to recruit people from UCLA and the University of Washington and Berkeley and Duke because publics and privates around the country are suffering terribly.

BS: Part of the parcel of this, in terms of assisting the University, were the union contracts. Could you explain how that came about actually? The process of this change that went about with the unions to accept a wage freeze?

PA: Well, it started with Ed Martha, with whom I had been in constant contact. Because the AAUP and UP and the Alumni Association and our 501© UConn Foundation had formed several years ago a so-called Advocates Group, that advocated on behalf of the University's budget request. People outside don't understand that there's not the adversarial relationship that is often [unclear] by the word 'union.' And, as I understand it, [unclear] it's more of a professional

association. And most often, we are on the same side of the war, fighting the battle with people outside. And so, it was in that spirit that Ed came to me and said, "What would you think of . . . ?" And obviously, I liked it very much. And the quid for the quo is that there would not be budget-related layoffs. I'm deeply grateful for his willingness first, and then the Executive Board's, and then the faculty at large in their vote supported the freeze. I'm deeply grateful for the action they took. But they also averted layoffs. And that was easy for me to agree to because we retained the ability to make layoffs that would arise from problematic shifts. And the fact is that the number of the faculty members is roughly the same as it had been ten years before. And we had increased approaching three thousand more students. So, there was no way that we would be laying off faculty in big numbers. After this was announced, Ed took his hits and see back the labor coalition and elsewhere, that he had, over a period of several weeks, tried to get them to move in the same direction. And their attitude was one of inflexibility and intransigence and fighting. And again, because of the long history of collegial relationships, it was -- what I want to believe is that the faculty and the staff and the administration all had kind of a higher calling, and there was concern about progress at the University, and not just individual paychecks. They care about the institution as an entity. It's not just another job as the Department of Motor Vehicles, and so on. The political issue in UCPEA was a little bit more complicated than AAUP because the memberships is more heterogeneous. And further, they, along with

our union at the Health Center -- the United Health Workers UHP --
the United Health Professionals --

BS: Not the faculty?

PA: Not the faculty.

BS: Okay.

PA: Both of those units report in through the same umbrella unit. So, that complicated the UCPEA decision. But they did it. And again, I meant what I said when I made the public report on this, that it's gratifying to see members of faculty and staff and administration suffer a little bit of pain on behalf of the Institution allowing the momentum of the institution at large to continue, rather than just the selfish adherence to contractual rights. And they were contractual rights. They negotiated in good faith, and they were owed the money, and they deferred gratification, which pleases me mightily.

BS: So, the UCPEA agreement came after.

PA: Yes.

BS: Several weeks after the AAUP.

PA: Right.

BS: Was there much tension there originally when AAUP signed off and they hadn't yet? Do you know what the dynamics there were?

PA: I think the view of some of the leadership of UCPEA was they would like to do it, but because of the more complicated set of relationships, both within and outside the University, a little more political legwork had to be done before they'd get to the point where it could pass. To their great credit, I think the two people who led to a vote that I think

was seven-to-one in favor of it, was Kevin Fahey, who is the elected President, and Kathy Sanner, who does their negotiating. And so, in a group which has really quite highly paid members, but also many who are compensated at a much lower level, they did an excellent job.

BS: Now, how do you think the state's early retirement program will play out, with respect to the budget? And at the University -- what do you think will happen with that?

PA: At this stage, no one knows. I don't think the Governor or Senator Sullivan or Speaker Lyons knows. There is a history of relationships among the handful of decision-makers that is unfortunate. And that includes Jerry Brown, who is the head of the AFL-CIO, and the Governor, that I'm told --

BS: [unclear]

PA: Isn't that AFL-CIO?

BS: Yes. Well, it's not the whole thing. It's 1199.

PA: 1199. That's right. The nursing homes and people like that.

BS: Yes.

PA: Apparently, two years ago, when the nursing home reimbursement challenges arose, both the state administration and the union administration engaged in acrimonious attacks, and that sullied the relationship, and so they began this set of negotiations with great mistrust and great anger. And it just didn't give rise to the kind of -- 'the state's got a problem, let's sit down at the table and try to reach a consensus.' And we're still there. And if we don't get a result, we could suffer more cuts. There's just a series of decisions that have to

be made by people outside the University before we know the impact - the inside view of the University. For example, of the dollars that go into say, a retiring professor's annual compensation, the State can make the claim, as they have done, that they're going to recapture a number of those dollars. Well, we've heard seventy-five or eighty percent over time. Unfortunately, it's gone from eighty percent, and it's dropped to seventy-five for so-called 'essential' employees. And then, non-essential employees, we've been told or we've heard speculation, could -- institutions might recapture only thirty to thirty-five percent. Our problem at UConn is rather unique because I would argue all of our employees are essential, given that we house seventy percent of our students, which is not the case at state universities or the Comm-Techs which house very few. We have to feed them, we have to entertain them, we have to protect them with fire and police force. We have to keep the place clean. And that requires personnel on duty twenty-four hours a day, in addition to teaching. And, as I pointed out earlier, we have about the same number of faculty we had ten years ago. And we have about three thousand more students. Now, admittedly, during that period, students enrollments took a dive and faculty stayed about the same. So, what goes around comes around. But we are at the point now where we cannot add anymore students, and we can't just continue to depend on adjuncts. And so, it's the case that I found myself last year making on the bonding side. It's a painfully similar message this year on the operating side. If you want this moment of magic to prevail for the next couple of decades, don't

let us down now, for in the total scheme of things, relatively few dollars, we will continue to deliver.

BS: Okay. Now, to do that, there's been a long-range planning effort, or an academic plan task force that's been set-up. And part of that, I think, ties into use of facilities on campus. How does this play out? With the change that will occur -- is it in consequence of losing staff and faculty from early retirement because advance figures, like a hundred and two staff, and they've mentioned eleven faculty. But obviously, that was not accurate. Maybe it was accurate for the time, but the numbers are much higher than that, I think, with the faculty.

PA: Oh, yes. There's something in excess of eight hundred individuals -- faculty and staff -- who are eligible. In the historic experience here, the last three early retirements produced something around forty-five percent of eligible faculty and staff. And conventional wisdom has it that a number of people have delayed early retirement -- have delayed retirement after they were eligible in order to get the three extra points, or whatever advantage they would have gotten. So, our fear is that the participation rate by eligibles could be much higher than forty-five percent. Which, depending upon how much the state attempts to recapture, will determine what our situation is going forward.

BS: So, that makes long range planning a little difficult in the sense. But what's happening with this academic plan task force thing?

PA: Well, Dick Brown and Karla Fox were asked to lead a group of individuals from across the campus to develop an academic road map that would determine at the undergraduate level what breadth really

means, and what we need to have -- what we need in terms of academic coverage, disciplinary coverage, to be worthy of the main university. And which small number of graduate programs and doctoral programs and research agendas will receive investment, so that we can aspire to among the most distinguished programs in the country. And while no one -- or at least I -- do not believe that they can come up with specific programs, and how many dollars they can get, the process is intended to invite a consensus building discussion among any segment of the University which wants to participate in developing an academic point of view that will be broadly embraced, and will be the basis for budgetary decision-making on an annual basis. And these processes, in my experience, have intrinsic value to the mere process is more important than the document that might be produced by the process. I'm very pleased with the way it's progressing. Dick Brown is very much an intellectual, who has the humanities viewpoint, and Karla is one who is very pragmatic, and knows how to drive around curves and confront barriers without just smashing the whole car. And I think the two of them are providing good leadership, and if it can be done, those two could do it better than most. They've had a couple of meetings with the Board of Trustees, and you always get the predictable reaction from a lay board on this issue or any other issue. My view is to sit respectfully and listen to their point of view, and take into account and reflect those things that make sense, and do your best effort, and bring it back once again with them. I think if they understand that they've been listened to, and their

points of view are considered and implemented or appropriate, they'll be happy to embrace the report later.

BS: Are there any directions that you think things are moving in, in terms of where priorities will be in the next ten or fifteen years?

PA: I frankly do not see dramatic changes. There are seven or eight departments in the college liberal arts and sciences that have been highly ranked, highly regarded for a long time, and student demand remains high in those departments. In part because of external realities. And in part, because of our educational requirements in the curriculum. So, obviously, we would continue those. There have been some new areas identified in the last three or four years, like regenerative biology and fuel cell technology. And in those cases, for example, they meet the three tests that I try to impose. One is demand. And the demand is most certainly the empire of students. One is faculty strength. And in fuel cells, throughout the school of engineering and in the department of physics and in the department of chemistry, we have great faculty strength that's relevant to doing the research and graduate level instruction. The third is available external support. For example, Connecticut Innovations, Inc. gave us, I think, four million dollars to establish three [unclear] professorships in fuel cell technology. And the State of Connecticut is supportive, and United Technology gave us four million dollars. Fuel cells is a very important component of their business plan over the next twenty years. We can't produce enough Masters and Ph.D. students to satisfy the demand of the industry. So, it meets all of those tests. And then, there

are second and third order benefits. For example, we have a chemistry professor named Steve Suib who, over the past decade or so, has collaborated with a Japanese scholar/entrepreneur. Steve and this man have co-authored many papers. I'm an economist. I don't know what technically I'm talking about here, but the technology has to do, in part, with the production of a more pure form of oxygen. Well, it so happens -- I'm told one of the big technical areas to the broad application of fuel cells is the inadequate supply of pure oxygen. This man from Japan is in the final stages of completing a contract with us that would contemplate a \$4 million gift with a \$2 million state match. So, there's yet another \$6 million which is separate from, but entirely related, scientifically, and organizationally to the fuel cell project initiative. So, some of those are targets of opportunity when funding arises. But we cannot pursue them if we don't have the faculty talent endowment. Of course, in the case of biology, we made a substantial commitment because we had a professor, Jerry Yang, who was the lead principle investigator. I think it was Maryland, Vanderbilt and Rutgers were attempting to recruit him. And we countered to keep this man because he not only paid for himself. He paid for all those around him. And brought great distinction to the University in an area of biological sciences in which we have strength. So, we made a commitment for five additional faculty lines in that area. And the beauty of it is in that particular set of disciplines, federal funding is available. We incurred the start-up costs, but as long as federal priorities remain as they are, they underwrite operating costs in the

future. And another nice thing is that we're now not dependent for one of our priority areas on the existence and retention of one professor. We now have five additional tenure professors, any one of whom -- well, three of whom -- could take over leadership adventure. So, the road map that this faculty committee comes up with will provide general directions, but will still have targets of opportunity that will determine the steeples of excellence. And from my point of view, we cannot afford in our current configuration and our current funding realities, a program of whatever quality that stands alone and doesn't interact in an interdisciplinary way with other related disciplines, such as the chemistry, chemical engineering, engineering, and so on.

BS: One of the initiatives that's going on is the human rights initiative. How does that fit in to all of this?

PA: The same situation. We have enormous expertise -- faculty expertise - - that pre-existed the opportunity with the ANC, Native American initiatives.

BS: The Dodd Center?

PA: The Dodd Center -- came to life, and as I understand it, because of the elder Senator Dodd's involvement with the trials at Nuremberg. The initial intellectual areas were Judaic and Holocaust studies. But the view was that eventually, we would get into the broader and human rights, and what common themes there may be about the practice of evil against humanity in different parts of the world in different stages in history. And coincidentally, a couple of years ago, we recruited a new Law Dean who is quite a superior academic leader, and a good

fundraiser. But she also is the world's expert in Native American law.
[end of side one]

BS: You were talking about the Dean of the Law School.

PA: Yes. And she had been involved in the development of a compendium of Native American law. And those connections caused her to be -- those pre-existing connections to her arrival in Connecticut caused her to be trusted by the leaders of the two major tribes in Connecticut, which put us in a position to facilitate a visit by her and a visit to one of the tribes and made a proposal for the endowment of a \$2.5 million chair in Indian Law, which I believe is going to be backed upon favorably. And then, finally, under the general rubric of human rights is the African National Congress Venture, which arose initially, as I understand it, because of the relationship -- one of our history associate professors to some people in Africa and the United Nations and so on. We had, at UConn, a strength in oral history, and degree programs and strength in archival activities. And all of that -- because of our land grant status -- it's relationship building comes rather naturally to at least some elements of our faculty. And so, that allowed us to pursue a sister institution relationship with the University of Fort Hill, and also to compete successfully for US AID funding, which President Bush, I'm told, has now cut out of the federal budget, prospectively. And that to get something, I think, on the order of \$1 million from the Mellon Foundation to do that oral history and archival work. So, the point of the tale is that the existing strength of the faculty and the institution of the Dodd Center, with its areas of

emphasis, allowed the enhancement of a relationship with the Indian Tribes. And, I guess, the bottom line message in each is different, but there are common themes that draw them together under the [unclear] of human rights.

BS: What about the Gladstein Professor -- who would chair?

PA: The same point. We have a member of the foundation, Board of Directors, Garry Gladstein, who is a UConn graduate. And in the last five years, became reconnected with the University -- a very successful man who is a generous person, as well. It so happens that he made his fortune with the Soros Organization. And therefore, had all these international contacts. Like Mr. Soros, over the decades, he developed an interest in human rights and the alleviation of suffering. When we talked to him about his participation in the Capital Campaign, he said that human rights was generally an area in which he wished to at least initially direct his philanthropy, and the human rights chair. And in addition to the chair, there was a previously funded lectureship series. So, it's one of those situations where when there's minimum critical mass, it becomes not just a target of opportunity, but rather a magnet. That if it's a sufficiently distinguished set of programs, then it's easier to recruit distinguished faculty. It's easier to solicit philanthropic support. And I think we should still be very skeptical before we begin programs that fit under the general title of human rights because the venture will be known for the weakest of the programs. And you want only high quality programs.

BS: Speaking of human rights, the University has -- like many universities

-- this past spring, run into the issue of the war in Iraq. Can you talk about some of the things that happened on campus, with respect to that?

PA: Well, I was frankly very pleased with the student and faculty response. You knew from the 1960s that were so divisive for reasons that were different than Vietnam, but still the connection between protection of the American people from terrorists like Al Queda and Saddam Hussein and Iraq, whose dots were not very tightly connected in many people's minds. And I thought, "Oh, let the debate begin, and let's even encourage the debate on the campus, but don't let the violence like the 1960s begin." And fortunately, we seem to have gotten through the whole thing. Except for a couple of [unclear]. A group of students set-up a little tent city, and during the awful Spring Weekend, a couple of people who had been drinking too much did some destruction to the tents. But the UConn Police were out the first few nights after the tents were erected, and many people expected us to try to discourage the people who were in the tents, when our real view was exactly the opposite. We wanted to make sure that people who might have disagreed with them knew they would be arrested and prosecuted if they didn't allow these kids to express their points of view. And in that regard, I put out a couple of e-mails encouraging faculty to -- in disciplines where it was appropriate, and where they sensed student interests, to organize [unclear] or panel discussions about the war from economic, political, ethical, sociological standpoint. And Mark Boyer in Political Science and Mohammed

Hussain in Accounting led a group that didn't control but coordinated what was going on. I think it was student interest seemed to be sincere and deep, and the discussions produced light and not all smoke. I think what could have been most a unfortunate set of incidents turned out to be an educational activity.

BS: Now, a number of people from the University -- either students or staff were called up.

PA: Yes.

BS: How does the University deal with that? What's done for these people?

PA: In a word, the University's response is flexible. We attempt to ensure that people who have to leave and have no choice in the matter can come back and pick up where they left off, and are not penalized financially or academically. We urge the Deans to urge the Professors to cut a wide swath for the people if they left in midterm, that they can have their record cleared and start over again just to accommodate individual needs. To recognize that this is not something resulting from laxity or inappropriate behavior. They were serving the country, frequently against their own will. And we should not make it more difficult for them.

BS: You mentioned Spring Weekend. I'd like to get your assessment of that, and also connected to the committee that you set-up on substance abuse earlier in the year.

PA: Yes.

BS: What they reported, and how this plays out.

PA: Well, they're separate but related ventures. My concern about alcohol consumption in a [unclear] is that. We have on this campus and every campus in every city and hamlet in the country hard drugs being sold and used. But that's not the most significant problem. The real problem is that at UConn and most other universities, were going through a period when all together too many of our undergraduates begin consuming alcohol in excess on Thursday night. It goes through Sunday night. And this year, thank heavens, we have avoided death. But last year, we had just a horrendous couple of deaths that were associated or allegedly arose while -- well, one case, a Kappa Sigma kid got drunk and put a girl in his car and killed a young pharmacy student, which is tragic. And so, I asked a group of faculty and students and staff, including a couple from the Health Center, who have expertise in alcoholism and addictive behavior generally to address the issue. Don't reinvent the intellectual wheel. Don't contribute to your discipline, but sit down and [unclear] wisdom you've gained based on your experience, including two or three of our contemporary students, who have been busted, but still remain students in good standing, tell us what can we do to reduce the level of inappropriate alcohol consumption? And they came up with a whole range of suggestions which, frankly, as a report taken collectively, were uncommonly useful. Most often that kind of study group is less relevant and less pragmatic than this one happened to be. And I triggered a lot of that to the Chairman, who is a thirty-year UConn native, John DeWolfe, in Engineering. He's very pragmatic. He's

sensitive. He's knowledgeable, and he oversaw a good free-flowing set of discussions, I was told, by several people on the committee. But he knew how to keep them within previously set parameters. And I'm hopeful that this is going to have a positive effect next year, as we try to make some changes in the way we organize ourselves. Some of our activities that range from notifying parents after the first infraction, to more aggressive enforcement of current student code, to encouraging Deans and Departments Heads to have not only classes, but tests on Fridays and Mondays to discourage excessive consumption on Thursday nights, to the provision of more workout space, like Greer Auditorium. To make possibly using what used to be Husky Blues, over in the little strip mall we currently own as a space to put on programming activities that are not based on alcohol. Alcohol consumption is kind of the organizing principle. So, that's for the school year, generally. And the place where it's carried to the extreme, of course, is Spring Weekend. We have, in the last four or five years been lucky. In 1998, we had just a serious, serious set of problems and issues. Still, when twelve thousand people assemble on your campus, and they drink too much for six or seven hours, there are going to be behaviors that are always on the edge of disaster. And it's little comfort to me that of the eighty arrests or whatever, this year only seven were UConn students. Because from a public relations point of view, it's our party. And so, what to do about it? Some say, "Just close it down." Well, what does that mean, close it down?" It's a public university. It's public land. There are public roads coming

here. Where do you close it down? Do you put a fence around the campus? [laughs] "Don't do any programming? Don't allow them to have a concert?" From my point of view, that keeps them for at least three or four hours, from drinking. So, at eleven o'clock, when they do go back to the parking lot, they have consumed less, and they've had a chance to entertain themselves through a concert, rather than alcohol. And what would be the impact if we said, "We're going to arrest anybody who is in the parking lot, and that there will be no organized activities -- planned activities?" Well, the police and the psychologists and the student affairs Division tell me what we'll do is just drive them off campus because they're going to party -- become a [unclear] now -- and they're going to drink. And then we will be responsible for students at two in the morning, driving back to the campus, dead drunk, and we'll lose them that way. So, we have consulted around the country. Penn State has had its serious problems in this regard. The University of Oklahoma, Michigan, Michigan State -- Ohio State has had serious problems, and various sundry others. And as close as we've been able to find out, nobody knows any more than we do about how you address binge drinking and what has become a tradition weekend in the spring of the year, just before finals when they leave each other for the summer months. We'll continue to work on it, but it is my assessment that the general programmatic approach that we've been taking is about as appropriate to the circumstance we find in Storrs, Connecticut, on that weekend each year. It's possible, given that extreme movements in either direction

can make things worse, rather than better. But I find the weekend to be a source of great embarrassment, a source of great worry and frustration and anxiety in the months and weeks leading up to it. And the fact that there have not been the kids dangling from the trees, and the cars overturned, and the burning couches -- every television station and the front pages of the newspapers -- doesn't make me feel that much better. We still have a problem.

BS: Regrettably, the television did give it a lot of coverage, even without that.

PA: I don't know if you noticed, but they've been using a 1998 tape, and they did it again this year.

BS: I did notice that. The Committee on Substance Abuse -- will their suggestions be implemented?

PA: Yes. We went through the lists I guess the week before last -- or *the* list the week before last, just so we understood what the second and third implications of implementation would be. It's rather straightforward. For example, the one regarding parental notification after the first infraction. The Buckley Amendment of 1972 or whenever it was, does not preclude that. But the University Administration in the mid-1970s made the decision that parents would not be notified when students were expelled or disciplined or didn't pay, unless certain conditions had been met, like a sign-off on the bottom of a sheet that said the parents would be notified. Well, to have a change on this one variable is a dramatic change. And we should just give students enough time -- get it in our descriptive

brochures or application forms and others and our Student Discipline Code, so no one can say, "Well, you didn't tell us this was going to happen." In the case of more spot checks, we learned from our police that when our police put up these impromptu road stops, it costs about five thousand dollars a night. Well, how many do you do, and what do you budget for them? And can you encourage the state police to do them up 195 and 44, as well as us doing it on the periphery of the campus? So, mind you, we're fined twenty-five thousand dollars, and have five of them in the fall of the year when students get back, so they know that we mean business, and maybe starting a couple of weeks before Spring Weekend, so once again, you reinforce the message. But some of them will take time, but there's no recommendation that at this point, that I find not implementable. And that is, I suppose, not unrelated to the fact that John DeWolfe and two or three of his colleagues checked with me throughout the process, and they made modifications. So, it was a good job.

BS: Okay. How about something that I think occurred last year. That was dealing with diversity on the tail of the Associate Provost for Multi-Cultural Affairs and the strategic plan on that. What's happened to that in the intervening year or so?

PA: We did implement diversity training. And I believe that -- I forget what the numbers are, but a substantial number of the administrative staff -- virtually all the senior administrative staff. And that includes Deans and Department Heads, both academic and non-academic, have gone through a three-hour diversity training workshop. And at some

places those training exercises can be so pedantic and lacking in substance, and vacuous that they're just meaningless. This is not the case here. Ron Taylor recruited and hired a young woman from The Hartford, to be our new Director of Office Diversity. She's a lawyer. Very smart, and very effective. Because rather than perceive herself as a regulator, which people in that kind of office frequently do, and therefore, psychologically shut-out by every manager in the organization. She's naturally vivacious and smiley and she knows how to help people. So, she can come and say, "I'm from the government. I'm here to help you," and after ten minutes with her, you believe her. And so, also, with a young man that Ron recruited from Michigan State -- Damon who is uncommonly substantive. He has the same effect. He's very smiley and nice and friendly. He can sell things, but he's got something to sell. So, the whole philosophy of the Office of Diversity and Equity has changed. And I think department heads who, in the past, simply didn't understand or didn't know how to do it, now go to this woman and man with increased frequency.

BS: Her name?

PA: Dana McGee.

BS: Dana McGee?

PA: Yes. And the man's name is Damon Williams. He's a Ph.D. She's a lawyer. So, those were two of the significant things we had projected that as new leaderships for the Office of Diversity and Equity and training workshops. Diversification was training for -- I hope

ultimately, everybody here.

BS: I've seen announcements on UConn Forum that they've canceled a number of these workshops. Any reason for that, to your knowledge?

PA: I'm not sure, except possibly -- I ask you to get this confirmed with Ron -- a woman consultant who they had engaged to oversee them, by comparison to these two young people was a disappointment? So, Ron canceled her contract, and I think is now trying to arrange it so that these two in-house people will actually run it themselves.

BS: The Daily Campus has had a committee set-up to look into its affairs. Could you elaborate on that?

PA: Yes. The Student Life Committee, headed by Louise Bailey, appointed a four-person committee shared by Angela Roya, and including Chris Hattaye, who is a student trustee and former head of the Student Government, and Phil Barry, who is a former City Council member here, and an alumni trustee. And then a third person -- or a fourth person. I've forgotten now. And the reason for this was there were allegations of bills not being paid in a timely way, or not at all. There were allegations regarding favoritism in assignments, and the stuff that you frequently hear. The reason I was delighted when I heard that committee had put the working group together was because it's one of those cases where the Board of Trustees is the entity that has legal liability and legal responsibility, but over the decades, it had allowed the student newspaper to float away, and there was really no oversight by a non-student. It's own Advisory Board had kind of dissipated in disgust. And we just need a set of procedures that are

going to be enforced, and it's got to be run like a business from the business side. And, of course, students inside the paper are alleging that this is an attempt to wrest editorial control and censorship, and so on. Nothing could be further from the truth. What I would hope is that by having a little bit more financial accountability, we could also get a little bit more reporting rigor. And a little more professionalism, and give the faculty and the journalism department and communications department a bit more involved. They more or less I'm told just walked away from it entirely. A reporter from the Journal Inquirer, who is one of the best reporters, I think, in the state, of political affairs, walked away in disgust.

BS: Who is that? Keith Phoneuf?

PA: Yes.

BS: Was he on the committee?

PA: He was on the Advisory Board to the student newspaper. Much of this is just human emotion -- particularly human emotion from human relationships from the student adolescent point of view. And I've talked to students who've come to see me from all different sides. But the notion of favoritism and stacking and editorial boards and stacking committees to make assignments and all -- that's what happens! The New York Times gets caught every once in a while.

BS: Yes, it does.

PA: It's an interesting process.

BS: On athletics, they're completing the building of the football stadium at Rensselaer Field in East Hartford. But an issue has arisen with the Big

East. Could you explain what that issue is, and what is happening now, and how you're trying to deal with this, and how the Athletic Department is trying to deal with it?

PA: Yes. Should I repeat what I said to you at the outset?

BS: Yes.

PA: When I arrived at UConn in 1996, the then-Chairman of the Board said to me, "You can still stop the movement to Division IA Football, but it will probably be costly, from a political point of view, and you've got to do it reasonably quickly because the train is out of the station, and it's moving slowly, awaiting your arrival. So that I would urge you to get up to speed quickly."

BS: Was that Lew Rome?

PA: Lew Rome -- yes. And so, I undertook to have conversations with several people, both here -- primarily Lou Perkins -- but also Commissioner Mike Taughese of the Big East. And then others who were not involved with our parochial issue here, but who knew NCAA and college athletics, who had taught me in other places, like Alabama and Colorado. And an old friend from Michigan State, who I had known. And they all reported the same set of relationships, that the NCAA was precariously balanced, that it was about to implode, that football was becoming ever greater as a revenue source, and even successful basketball would -- in the future -- they thought, have trouble standing on its own financially. And that the situation at UConn, which I found to be about the best possible, was but a snapshot in time, and could not prevail over the intermediate and

longer term. That is to say, have a women's basketball program that supports itself budgetarily, and a men's basketball program through television revenues and ticket sales and so on, that can support itself and the other twenty-two intercollegiate sports because of the phenomenon of football -- being like a vacuum cleaner, you need the football in order to get the television contracts as an augment to basketball. And that therefore, a conference like the Big East Conference was an anomaly that could not long prevail. Seven or eight of the schools had the full range of sports. And then you had great strength in schools like Providence and Seton Hall and Georgetown and UConn, that did not have division. Providence, and I forget the others.

BS: Georgetown, Seton Hall, St. Johns?

PA: St. Johns. And what would likely happen over a relatively short period of time is that because of this bifurcation, the football schools would probably go off and form their own conference. The Catholic schools -- smaller Catholic schools -- would probably go off and form their own conference, with a couple being added -- and UConn would be left with no obvious place to go. Or at least not a place as good as the Big East Conference. And so, I reluctantly went along with movement to Division IA. What has happened recently is -- well, what's happened over the last three years -- is this tenuous equilibrium that my advisors told me about has been happening most recently with the Atlantic Coast Conference attempting to pick off the University of Miami, and some say Boston College and Syracuse, to join their

conference for exactly the reasons that these people have told me. Some of the Atlantic Coast Conference don't want this to happen, and we don't know yet just what the final solution is going to be. But what is pretty clear is that now, in retrospect, with all of the anxiety and all of the irritation that these kinds of uncertainties promote, I think we're lucky that we have football, or we would be now be wondering how we're going to put together a basketball agenda that has so electrified the state, and so put UConn on at least the sports fans map around the country. And heaven knows, we would lose that sparkle and that sizzle if we went back to losing to New Hampshire and Rhode Island, as opposed to Miami and Georgetown and Notre Dame.

BS: But no one is talking about UConn moving into football in terms of the movement there -- UConn being taken into one of these leagues. At least the newspapers don't seem to recount that. So, now that we've upgraded -- we're going to have a stadium -- what happens to us if this move goes? And have you spoken to the Presidents of the other institutions?

PA: Oh, yes. Well, first of all, they're all being coy. Because just as I am doing, you repeat the holy grail and the conventional wisdom to them, but you have two or three plans in reserve just in case the coalition breaks apart. My concern with the University of Miami is not that that President and that administration is doing what it can do to maximize revenues to underwrite the program, so that in that case, she can make the claim that they're not invading resources that can be used for the academic program. It's rather that the athletic program is as self-

sufficient as possible.

BS: That's Donna Shalala?

PA: Yes, Donna Shalala. So, I mean, you can bet that if we had an opportunity by realignment to put UConn in another conference that would net us ten million dollars more a year, I would be out there talking about it. The difficulty here is that as recently as a year or so ago, they gave the Presidents of the Big East -- Miami gave the Presidents of the Big East complete assurance that they were done talking to the ACC, and that for the foreseeable future -- and I remember the use of the word 'foreseeable' -- for the foreseeable future, they would not engage in anymore discussions, or even return phone calls. I remember 'foreseeable' because I said, "What does 'foreseeable' mean?" And the response was, "Well, for at least four or five years." That might last for three or four months.

BS: [laughs]

PA: I am confident that UConn will be able to find a suitable home. I think one of the reasons that one of our names is -- I know that one of the reasons that our name is not mentioned prominently, but everybody has us on their quiet list, is because they're uncertain about whether or not our football successes of this past year were a flash in the pan, or whether it really means that we're going to improve as we should. But no one will dispute the value of a UConn -- particularly women's team and men's basketball team. And also men's soccer, women's field hockey. We have a remarkably clean program. It's had no serious NCAA violations. It's largely financially self-sufficient. And the

coaches have me persuaded that they are honestly concerned about the students as student athletes. It's kind of, more or less, a President's dream, where we exist right now. As I said, if we could have frozen this snapshot, and keep this as our perpetual condition I would be delighted. But it was not meant to be.

BS: Is there anything that you would want to add?

PA: I think we've covered it all, Bruce.

BS: We've covered a lot. Okay. Well, I thank you again.

PA: Thank you. If more happens, or something breaks, I'll be happy to come back and talk again.

BS: Yes. This I would appreciate.

End of Interview

Interview with University of Connecticut President, Philip Austin, for the UConn Oral History Project, Center for Oral History, by Bruce M. Stave, June 3, 2005.

STAVE: Okay, as I just mentioned, we last spoke on May 13th of 2003 and we were talking about the situation with the Big East. You were in the middle of it at that time. It hadn't been resolved at all. I think you were making some comments about the President of the University of Miami. [chuckles] Could you elaborate on what did transpire finally with that and how it transpired?

AUSTIN: Well, it has—it has not yet reached final resolution, but we're at what I would call a penultimate stage, and we are in a much stronger position as a Conference and as a University of Connecticut than I would ever have predicted in 2003. We have now, as a result of the departure of Miami, Boston College and Virginia Tech, added Marquette, DePaul, Cincinnati, Louisville and South Florida, and those who know more about these things than I, say that this is, without question—[phone rings] [tape off/on]

BS: Okay. So you were saying that it turned out—

PA: It turns out that with respect to basketball, I'm told by knowledgeable people, much more so than I, that it's the strongest NCAA Basketball Conference in history and that in the case of football there is no denying that having lost Miami, most significantly, and Virginia Tech, that the strength of the Football Conference has been lessened. But I'm told that Cincinnati and South Florida, interestingly, are both very strong additions and it's interesting that the progress that we made last year and going to a

bowl game in the first year of full Division One play, suggests that Randy Edsall has, with recruiting and red-shirting and coaching and hard work, has contributed mightily to the strength of football in the Big East more than I would have expected. Syracuse is now having challenges, but they have replaced a coach. Pittsburgh is regaining strength and West Virginia has been strong.

It is the case that for the next two years the Big East will have a Bowl Championship Series place and if we meet the criteria and we progress as we have, we will have an assured BCS position going forward. The BCS is important, not only for our kids to play and our fans to cheer, that is where the money to support the whole thing is and to keep intercollegiate athletics self-sufficient. It's the Bowl Championship Series that has the television revenues that go back to the Conference and are distributed to the institutions. That is why we can cite the statistic that ten years ago, in terms of University money, there was roughly four million dollars on a seven million dollar athletic department budget. We now have a forty-five million dollar budget and something like seven and a half million comes through the University. The overwhelming majority of that goes to intramurals and the pursuit of Title IX equity. That simply could not have happened without the ticket policy, which has provoked some reaction and the television revenues and the advertising. So at this point, we do have a largely self-sufficient winning set of promos that are clean from an NCAA point of view. [BMS sneezing]

BS: Excuse me.

PA: Sure, and that's the objective to maintain. I was very worried about that two years ago.

BS: Well, how did this actually play out? What happened with lawsuits and changes in personnel, such as the Athletic Director and this kind of thing?

PA: Well, our Attorney General took a personal interest in this. The former Governor took a personal interest in this, and I must say they were both very supportive, but they got out a little ahead of us from the point of view of lawsuits. As I recall, the University of Pittsburgh retained outside counsel first and was willing to go it alone, but under the general rubric 'there's strength in numbers,' they persuaded the other three of us, West Virginia, UConn and Rutgers to join in an overall suit, which we did.

In retrospect—initially, I was concerned that the Connecticut Attorney General would grandstand, but in retrospect, he was a wonderful partner, provided good advice. One of the Associate Attorneys General effectively signed on and participated in most of the discussions with us. I had been aware that Lew Perkins had been pursued by Kansas University, but I think it was the Thursday the Governor—the then Governor, the Attorney General and I had a press conference, at which we announced what we were doing, and Mr. Perkins stood right with us saying he was ready for battle, and rolled up his sleeves. The following Sunday, about four in the afternoon, he called me and said he had accepted an appointment at Kansas University. So I hung up the phone thinking that I'm not competent to do these athletic things. I can't help without a competent Director. So I called Jeff Hathaway,

who had two years earlier gone to Colorado State and I told him that Lew was leaving and I said, “I need help and I need it immediately. Will you come back, work for me?” and he said, “Yes.” He said, “I’ll come back quickly.” He said, “I’ll come back this week,” and I said, “How about coming back tomorrow and getting in the saddle and just project the image of stability, as well as the reality of stability?” He did and we announced his appointment concurrent, to the hour, with Lew Perkins’ announcement of appointment at Kansas.

I knew there was going to be some eyebrows raised for having done this without a search and the conventional thing, but I thought this and another vice president about the same time I appointed without a search and decided I just had to take the irritation, if not anger in some circles for having vacated a search when we require a national search. Fortunately, most of the campus leaders said they were supportive. In the one case, the view of some groups was the President has the right to select those two or three vice presidents without a search except the academic affairs, the academic officers. In the case of the Athletic Director, it’s just different and there were extenuating circumstances at the time.

It was as if not a beat was missed and frankly, in some of the—I’d like to go off the record on this comment, but it is the case that whereas Mr. Perkins, who had a peculiar set of personality characteristics that created the package, along with his size, may have been necessary to transform a small program into a large program and the ticket policy and the politics of getting a football

stadium built and all of that, and raising money, it was the case that almost concurrent with his departure, this big time had changed from requiring a scalpel rather than a sledge hammer. Jeffrey Hathaway has the competence and the diligence and the tenacity of Perkins and the judgment, but he's also much more diplomatic and respectful of differing views and he seemed to me, and I think he's proven in retrospect, to be the right man at the right time.

So all in all, I would say my conclusion is we have fared much better now than I could have predicted two years ago, but every day there continue to be challenges. There are issues. Salaries are determined by the external marketplace, but they're in my opinion, very high. Ticket prices for sporting events, which are required to cause the programs to be self-sufficient, are too high, but it is also the case that successful and wealthy supporters, while I might wish that they would contribute to the School of Business or the School of Fine Arts or the School of Medicine or Liberal Arts, many of them chose, as ___ the two gifts totally five million for an indoor practice facility. They chose to do that and so wealthy people, through their contributions, are subsidizing athletics. We don't have the capacity to accommodate the demand for either basketball program and of much surprise to me, last year we sold out the football stadium. First year in Division One. So it's all in all on net, even with the challenges, it's been a pretty successful story.

BM: Okay, we'll get back to some of this athletic stuff when we come up to recent times, but another point, going back to this period, was the change in administrative structure. You alluded to hiring a vice

president without a search. Could you talk about this structure was changed and what happened there?

PA: Well, it was changed because the prior structure was dysfunctional and it—

BM: Could you just say what the prior structure was.

PA: The prior structure had been promulgated maybe in 1993 or '94—before I got here, but it was only a couple of years before I arrived. It had—I'm told by those who were here at the time, and so I have a mosaic in my mind, but I don't have personal observation, that the change was to accommodate the personality and work appetites of the then President and the then Chairman of the Board. The Chairman of the Board was very activist, very involved in decision making, and the then President was not as involved. What this did was create two Chancellors, one at the Health Center and one at Storrs and a President who was much more of a PR officer and an external officer, at which he was very good. It therefore also allowed a very active Board Chair, who had become more involved to fill a void.

BM: This is Harry Hartley and Lew Rome.

PA: Lew Rome. What was clear to me after a few years—well, when the then Chancellor Mark Emmert left to go to Louisiana, what was clear to me was that commitments had been made that left the University with a four million dollar deficit, resulting in commitments for which there were not sufficient checks and balances. So I went to the Board and said, "You know, this isn't working. I'm the President and I feel accountable, but I don't have the authority because the finance officers all report into two

Chancellors.” I had a wonderful man as Vice President named Wilbur Jones, who was a retired military officer and believed that you look at organization charts and he did not have a chain of command relationship with those people. Therefore, he didn’t get involved in the budgets, those checks and balances, and defined his position exclusively to be—almost a treasurer position—to oversee the issuing of bonds, and that was a very important job in those days and he did it very well because it was when we were issuing on average a hundred million dollars a year of bonds. He had very good relationships with the State Treasurer. Everything was fine, but when he left and the Vice President for Institutional Advancement left, I said to the Board, “Now is the time we have to do this. I simply have to have accountability. I need a chief operating officer, as well as a chief financial officer, and budgets cannot be approved until they’re approved by those two people.” So Provosts can talk to Deans and Department Heads all they want, but a commitment is not a commitment until it’s signed off by a central finance officer.

I knew conceptually that that was important and would give me more comfort that the institution was being served in a prudent and cost efficient way, but that change also revealed that there was more trouble in paradise than I had even suspected at that point. It resulted in certain process and reporting difficulties that have received much press. We’ve had a lot investigations and reviews. I don’t believe there was any fraud. I don’t think anyone personally benefited or gained, and frankly, most of the changes that are called cost overruns, would have been approved, had they

simply been brought to the central administration. But two people named Dale Dreyfuss and Larry Schilling, and I'd prefer Dreyfuss's name not be mentioned right now because it's not final, who were smart and hardworking good employees, but they simply did not report things to their supervisors that should have been and that gave rise to, for example, a Student Center additional cost of fifteen million dollars. Now, nine plus million of that was from an error that the project manager made. She, in a timely way, reported it to Schilling. Schilling did not report it to his supervisor, so his supervisor says, and most certainly his supervisor did not report it to the Vice President.

BS: His supervisor would have been?

PA: Dreyfuss.

BS: Dreyfuss.

PA: Schilling says he did report it. Dreyfuss said he didn't. The problem was that, had we known that, I most certainly would have gotten to the bottom of it and then reported it to the Board and asked for approval to move from net square feet to gross square feet, to which you assign a dollar value. Then the price of steel because China is now—in this building boom, the price of steel has gone through the roof and as is the case frequently in Connecticut, there's more ledge than your borings suggest and so there was a fifteen million dollar expenditure greater than we had anticipated. But I'm sure the Board would have approved those changes.

So also a couple of years before UConn 2000 was approved, Physiology and Neurobiology was moved over across 195 in a remodeled building. I wasn't here and it's not my place to be

critical of my predecessors, but it's hard to imagine why that was built over there when we have three biology departments. There is much joint research activity. There's much joint teaching activity and exchange of resources, and it just seems to be irrational in retrospect. When we were constructing the Physiology and Neurobiology Building and the—or the Bio Physics Building, excuse me, and the Pharm Bio Building, the prospect of moving the Physiology and Neurobiology group back to this side of the campus became ever more compelling. About that time what was clear, as the Master Plan was evolving was that the new Pharmacy Building was just too big for the site of the old Pharmacy Building. Secondly, there were some recruiting problems in the new Pharm-D program, and it wasn't all clear they were going to be successful at the time and therefore might not need all the space.

So our solution to that was to redesign the Pharmacy Building and call it a Pharm Bio Building and put it over immediately contiguous to the other biology buildings, so that if pharmacy tanked or was greatly reduced, those laboratories could be productively used and not just sit idle and therefore a waste of money. Almost concurrently it was decided, well, we could solve the PNB problem by adding another floor, five or six more laboratories and faculty offices to the Pharm Bio Building, and that added five or six million dollars to that building. I would have been proud to take that proposal to the Trustees and explain why we wanted to do it. That it was not a mistake. It was a conscious academic decision to make academic programming more efficient.

The problem was that they didn't report it to us and all of a sudden we find these issues and change orders were required.

A similar issue regarding the President's house. The Board approved a four hundred sixty thousand dollar project. I could have built an awfully nice house for four hundred thousand dollars, but that old building is on the National Historical Register and so it could not be torn down. They had budgeted fifty thousand dollars to remove lead, mold and asbestos. It turns out the place was loaded with it and the bill for the outside consultant to remove it was two hundred thousand, rather than fifty thousand. More ledge, steel and all of that, and when they attempted to replace a leaking roof on the sunroom, they took the old roof off and discovered that the walls were rotten from water leaking for fifty years and the walls imploded. So that's another hundred. So all of a sudden you're at a million bucks and, you know, that's politically sensitive because it's the President's house. I voted with my feet eight years before by not living in it and would love to have replaced it with a one-story ranch where you could do a lot more efficient entertaining, but that was not in the cards. My personal situation changed and it was just sensible to move into the house. Now, all of that could have been explained to the Board. My embarrassment was that the Trustees didn't know and I didn't know because the same group was doing it.

So, in a sense, my action of changing the organization chart and appointing a woman in whom I reposed full confidence, caused very quickly for these problems to be identified and she fixed them.

BS: Were the problems identified first, or the issue of code violations came out with Hilltop and some of the other places. Were these issues identified before that, do you know?

PA: It all happened about the same time because she imposed procedures that didn't allow sloppy behavior.

BS: This is Linda Flaherty.

PA: Linda Flaherty-Goldsmith. The Hilltop situation arose because—the procedures were in place. We had carbon monoxide monitoring and in two of the units there were elevated levels of carbon monoxide detected. Still, one of our distinguished chemistry professors, Bob Birge, who happens to be a friend of mine, I called and asked if that were a dangerous level and he said, “In homes, if you had fifteen or twenty times that amount, you wouldn't worry about it. But carbon monoxide is something you don't want in residence halls.”

Well, in addressing the carbon monoxide level, the outside consultants we brought in—we brought in the State Fire Marshal immediately, and they declared the place safe for occupancy. Then we brought in outside consultants to look over and see what was going on. They determined that the buildings were out of code, and so that caused us to look at the other new construction that JPI and Capstone had been involved with. One of the projects, the Charter Oak, had virtually no problems. Husky Village had problems. This project was constructed by the same, Capstone Company, had code violations and problems and they're being fixed. We are seeking through legal means recovery of all expenses. So it's my hope that there will be no expenses, other

than embarrassment and inconvenience but that the dollars will be paid for through the legal process.

My biggest concern was: is this pervasive? But most of these issues have arisen since Linda put in new controls and new procedures, lead right back to that one office of Architects and Engineering and those two people and those they supervise. We've got now the interim Architect and Engineering man, a man named George Krauss who has been here for a long time doing a wonderful job, and the people over there are working very hard. We have, even with the new redoubled attention to detail, process and procedure, have found no new issues in the last few months. Most of what we're reading about now was self-identified by the University a year ago. We've put in place changes in procedure, process and personnel, checks and balances that the Board has approved and it's just now that it's a feeding frenzy, particularly by the *Hartford Courant*. Most of the press played this as a one-time story. The *Hartford Courant*, a couple times a week, just reports the same old stuff.

BS: This is something I was going to get to later, but may as well ask you now. I mean, you can take a litany of *Harford Courant* stories and having been working on the UConn History book, I've followed this very closely, but—well, you have the President's house, which is a story that broke in January, I think. Then your divorce, the sealed divorce, and one question I have is why did you become the poster boy for this? I mean there were a hundred and eighty-five others, too, I think. The building violations. There's the allegation of contributions to the Foundation that contractors

were involved, which was sort of was a spin-off of this. The Student Union overrun. Laurie Arenson's meeting with Rowland. Nike contracts. Jeff Hathaway's automobile situation, tickets and all of these sort of have come out in the past six months, which I'm sure you're very aware of. Did anything happen to make this turn? I mean, up until that time, the publicity for UConn was unbelievably good. The publicity for you was unbelievably good, for ten—well, for eight years or eight and a half years, and then all of a sudden this stuff—was there anything with the *Courant* that happened?

PA: I don't know. I've my theories and I'll be totally candid with you, but could we kind of go off the record and you tell me what—because I don't want this to sound like sour grapes or anything like that.

With respect to the divorce, why I was a poster child, I mean, that's personal. That's not how I perform in the job.

BS: Yes.

PA: What I'm told is, you know, John Rowland's in jail. He was a big guy that they got and UConn now is turning out to be the biggest thing in the state and “You happen to sit in the chair where you're the personification of the biggest thing in the state and the *Hartford Courant* has these eight or ten investigative reporters and they have to have something to pick on. So, Phil, what you ought to do is just hunker down and wait for the next big scandal away from UConn because they're going to.”

I was told at the time when we were going through the divorce, her lawyer is the one who proposed this, simply. I mean

it's tautology. It's circular, you know, that you're news because you've got a highly visible job. Well, why would you want this? Well, because you're going to report anything you know about me and I don't—and the judge apparently, when her lawyer asked my lawyer, they said “That's routine.” They said “There have been several people who are visible or they have great wealth,” which I do not have, “but that this is routinely done in Connecticut Superior Courts, and if you want to do it, fine.” And the rest played out as it did.

With respect to all of this University stuff, what I emphasize is it is self-reporting. Big organizations have problems inevitably. People make mistakes and it's how you address the problems that ought to be newsworthy, but they have chosen, unlike the *Journal Inquirer*, unlike the *New London Day*, unlike the *New Haven Register*, they've printed a lot of things I wish weren't in the news, but they've been fair-minded and accurate.

BS: The JI printed an excellent editorial about how UConn—a few weeks ago.

PA: Yes.

BS: You probably saw it. I thought it was outstanding.

PA: Yes, and you know, Chris Powell is not your normal liberal. I appreciate it. Paradoxically, the *Hartford Courant* said the House deal was a good thing. I don't know if you saw that one, but the *Courant* Editorial Page continues to be very supportive of UConn and enormously supportive of me. It's the news side.

I'm not going to allow myself to get negative on this, but I was told by one of our highly visible coaches, who had been here

several years when I arrived and, you know, we had had some early successes simply because we were building—we had money to build after a couple of decades of no building. He made the gratuitous comments about how well things seemed to be going and morale was increasing and all that. I said, “Yeah, well, when you’ve got money to build building, people are happier than when they see the fire traps.” He said, “Well, be careful, Phil, because it’s the nature of this place that the more you succeed, the more they like to tear you down. I haven’t called him back to talk about it, but the question is, you know, the land of steady habits and if you do break out of the pack

Part of our marketing strategy was to call attention to a good faculty becoming even better. A good student body, the friends and alumni who contribute back to this place. I think we’re number seven in the country last year for the number of alumni who actually make financial donations to the University. That demonstrates that people have had good feelings for a long time, we just didn’t reach out to get them and now we have formal programs. But, you know, we make a big thing out of the valedictorians and salutatorians and the SAT increases, and there’s a lot of people now who have B students—taxpayers who have B and B+ students who would have been shoe ins a few years ago and we don’t have space to admit them, simply because of operating budget limitations and physical space. We’re not in a city, so there’s no significant private stock of housing that can take the overflow of students and one could visualize that that’s going

to become a political problem that arises from our successes, and frankly I'm quite proud of it.

In certain circles, that type of thing is regarded, not as success, but arrogance and I'm never going to use the word "elitist." I talk about "pursuit of excellence," and success, here it's defined as arrogance and breaking too far out of the pack.

Among those who have made reference is Tom Ritter, who of course has been highly visible over the years. I had thought this was something, a change in attitude, simply because in the time I've been here, as you say, they have been so positive to UConn and to me. I thought maybe this was a change that arose from the recruiting of Brian Toolan, who's the managing editor, from a tabloid in Philadelphia, and that's just the way—and Ritter and others say that's not it at all. This is the way the *Hartford Courant* has been for decades and you just pay that price for being in a highly visible position.

What I have tried to do is not hide anything. I mean we identified these problems ourselves. When we knew about them, we reported them to the Board in a public meeting, so they became newsworthy. By the time we reported them, we had by and large fixed them and that was last October and before, but they're still, every day, new news. Last week—well, this week, Wednesday, we had a Board meeting at which I gave an update. I asked Linda Flaherty to prepare a report for me from her perspective. We engaged Price Waterhouse to do an independent review and we directed our new auditor, Mike Walker, to conduct his review. So the news from the *Courant's* point of view is that there are these

three new audits that came out condemning the University. Well, these audits were commissioned by the administration to find out where we were and indeed they confirmed that the problems that we had reported a year ago were there and they were serious problems in management and checks and balances, but they have now been fixed. So the headlines: New Audits Reveal Great Problems at UConn. So why they're doing it, I don't know.

Yesterday, coincidentally, they cut the ribbon at the—

BS: Convention.

PA: New Convention Center and the event was hosted by a number of corporations over there, but the lead corporation is the *Hartford Courant*. So everybody got little party favors, a little stack of cards that this editorial cartoonist produced. There were six note cards in the party favor, and one of them was a galaxy with all the orbits of Venus and Jupiter and Mars and UConn, a big basketball right in the middle of it. He's up there talking, this Engelhardt guy, and said, "Well, we all love UConn," and Jack Davis, the publisher, puts me right next to the Governor as a Guest of Honor and they're beating the hell out of me. "You're doing a great job, Phil," says the publisher of the *Hartford Courant*. It's schizophrenia. [laughs]

BS: It's certainly interesting, to say the least. But it is a change, it's a sea change as to what was happening before January.

PA: Yes, and one prays for the second sea change or another target.

BS: Okay, well, let's go back.

PA: Bruce, I brought with me some material. Have you seen the testimony I gave to the Finance, Revenue and Bonding Committee?

BS: I don't think so.

PA: In April. That kind of summarizes our position on the thing and the action plan on the back of it.

BS: Can I keep this?

PA: Sure.

BS: Okay. Is this—you had sent out a notice to the University, didn't you?

PA: Yes.

BS: Yes, I do have that. I think I do, but I'll keep this because this is probably a little more detailed, I would assume.

PA: Yes.

BS: But to go back in time now, and the administrative structural change. When Linda Flaherty-Goldsmith came, the shift in the title of the Provost and the leaving of the Provost, was that something you anticipated or not?

PA: Which Provost, Peterson?

BS: The former Provost. Yes, Peterson.

PA: Yes. He—whereas the head of the Health Center found that to be a suitable change, appropriate change and was entirely supportive, John had some difficulties with it because rather than seeing it the way Peter Deckers and I were defining it, this will allow an academic to devote himself virtually exclusively to academic affairs, strategic planning, programmatic decision making and communicating with the Deans and faculty, which had been a

deficiency that was reported repeatedly with respect to John, he preferred to dwell on the fact that it was a demotion. I said “I simply need a professional business person to do business and I need an academic to lead the academic pursuit of quality and service and so on.” So he was unhappy and he knew that I was unhappy and it was very clear to him that the Deans were seeking appointments with me as a group and individually to express their dissatisfaction with the leadership or lack thereof. So as he sought a couple of different jobs, I was candid with the people who were interviewing him, but I said he has certain strengths that might very well fit elsewhere, but the way we had defined the responsibilities here they’re different. It turns out in Tennessee the man who was Provost at Knoxville at that time had been an Assistant Dean at Colorado State when I was out there. I think an historian, and not a hale fellow well met. Very matter of fact, made the trains run on time. Decisions were made. He didn’t—I mean he sought consensus building, but he didn’t care whether people liked him or not. He was your old time conventional academic dean, Dean of Liberal Arts, and John very much enjoyed the wine and cheese activities and was a genuinely nice man. It’s just he didn’t like being the Provost and so when the people from Tennessee called me and said, “You know this place. Do you think he’ll fit in?” I said, “If he keeps Loren Crabtree as the Provost and he does the external stuff, I could imagine that he would be enormously effective.” But only time will tell. I don’t know that the jury is in yet, but from what I hear he has much support.

BS: Much what?

PA: Much support, and frankly we now have here I think we're blessed with a man who has experience, does make decisions, a very civilized soft-spoken individual, but he knows academic quality and he knows how to pursue it. From all the reports I'm getting, even those who don't get the decisions they want, the Deans and the faculty leadership, the Senate Executive Committee, all find his leadership and style fit in very nicely.

BS: This Peter—

PA: Peter Nicholls.

BS: Peter Nicholls. Now, how was he selected? Can we go into that for a minute?

PA: Very conventionally. I put together a search committee of overwhelmingly faculty leaders, chaired by Bob Birge, to whom I've previously made reference, and then put on the head of the UCPEA union and a graduate student and an undergraduate student. But the rest were all, in a sense, AAUP members. That's why I didn't put Ed Marth on because it was, I think maybe a ten or twelve person committee and all but two or three were faculty. I told them what I wanted in terms of characteristics, but that I did not have a candidate.

BS: What were the characteristics that you were looking for?

PA: A congenial person of integrity. Somebody who knew academic quality. Someone who by virtue of his or her personal accomplishments would have the stature and the record to be a tenured full professor on appointment. Somebody who had a backbone and could make difficult decisions, but communicate

them in a civilized and respectful way and someone who would have the capacity to lead a discussion and create a strategic plan, which is not a document. It's a process, and allows people to buy in, so that it's their plan, and that would inform allocation decisions. We're not going back. No place in this country is going back to the good old days when there was a five or ten percent increase in operating budgets each year. We're going to have a very good budget year this year, relative to the last several years, but it's not nirvana and therefore we have to allocate resources and allocation has to be based on a University wide shared vision of where we're going to go. Essentially those things.

There were several individuals, a few Deans and a couple of others who had an interest in being Interim Provost, including Fred Maryanski, and the condition that I laid down was anybody could be a candidate and do your work with the search committee, but whoever is Interim Provost will not be a candidate and Fred agreed to that and I appointed him. Fred had been here. He had been a very good soldier for a long time, came up through the ranks here, earned his spurs, tenured full professor the conventional way and then got into the administration. Then a few weeks after—a couple of months after we had our agreement and I appointed him, he all of a sudden developed an appetite to be a candidate, and I said I didn't want that to happen. The search committee was very firm in its resolve that there was a deal and they had communicated to individuals they were attempting to recruit that there was not an inside candidate and if that happened, they would lose all of their credibility. I would lose my credibility and so on.

But it so happened that Peter Nicholls had been at Colorado State for two years, so I had never worked with him. I had met him briefly before because my successor once removed asked me to go out and give a speech at his inauguration, maybe a year ago and I met Peter on that occasion. So it's entirely a coincidence that we both come here from a stop over at Colorado State, but the committee came up with him. I told them I didn't want a candidate, I wanted a list of three to five unranked candidates, any one of whom they would find acceptable and they came up with three very good people. When we started the due diligence, one woman who had been at Indiana University, Provost at Indiana University and had—a former president of IU is a friend of mine, Miles Brand, and he just recommended her enormously highly, but then some of her enemies at IU started calling their discipline colleagues here and just blackballed her and by the end of the day, she would have been—even if those allegations were not true, she would have been unable to lead because the sociology was such that she had ten strikes against her.

Frankly, I've forgotten who the third candidate was. Oh, it was somebody who was an executive vice president of the University of Nebraska who was a doctor and was very good.

[end of Side A, Tape 1]

BS: Okay, go ahead.

PA: You asked how—what was the process to choose Peter, and that was what I was attempting to describe.

BS: Okay, so we have a new Provost here. Now, to go back at the time, because I was looking at the administrative structure. In

2003, as well, there were some facility changes or new facilities that you talked about in one of your Presidential letters. I think one of them was the Waterbury campus that was opened and built. Could you talk a little about that, and then also there had been the competition for the new Fine Arts Building, bringing [Frank] Gehry and other architects here.

PA: We had completed a seventy-million, I think, dollar facility in Stamford from the Old Marscopial Road facility downtown, renovated a Bloomingdales department store. We had spent, I think something like forty-five million in Avery Point on a new science and instructional building and restoration of the Branford House. There were plans later in the second billion dollars to do a new library classroom building, tear down some of the old World War II things. Nothing planned for Waterbury, except modest renovations. The then Governor was from Waterbury and expressed modest displeasure with that plan.

Oh, and we also had like fifteen million for the law school renovations, which were—those buildings were in a terrible state of disrepair. And forty million for the West Hartford campus, including the School of Social Work, and three hundred million for the Health Center. But virtually nothing for Waterbury or Torrington except minor upgrades, and those were not political decisions. They were programmatic decisions. Torrington only has three or four hundred students. Waterbury not much more, and we had situation up on the hill in Torrington where the facilities were not in a bad state of disrepair, except for the library facility and we had a million and a half or something.

The then Governor and legislative delegation said they needed that changed, and I said, “Our problem is that we’ve already spent this money twice,” and we had to make certain commitments based on our program planning, but we told members of the legislative delegation to get these different allocations to get the second phase approved. The Governor was wonderfully supportive. Without him we would not have gotten the second billion three hundred million, but he said he would find, I think twenty-eight million dollars to construct the building in downtown Hartford, and that part of their plan—

BS: Downtown Waterbury.

PA: Downtown Waterbury, I’m sorry. This was right in—one block is right across, if you know Waterbury, right across the street from the Palace Theater, which was under renovation and reconstruction and a Magnet School down at the other end of the block. So it would have renovated and rejuvenated an entire city block that’s only a block or so from the town green, and it was clear that he wanted to be remembered as a Governor who revitalized the cities of the state, and this was consistent with that plan. But he did—well, through his leadership and his direction, he came up with money that we would otherwise not have spent. It’s a facility that works—

BS: This is Governor Rowland that you’re talking about.

PA: Governor Rowland. It’s a facility that works very well. It’s attractive. It’s efficient and I think that in the last two years enrollments at the Waterbury Campus have been increased in a

higher percentage than any other of our regional campuses. So it's working.

BS: What about the competition for the Fine Arts Center that occurred in I think June of '03.

PA: The Dean of Fine Arts, David Woods, became aware of the National Endowment for the Arts competition. It was the last competition they were going to have, the federal administration having zeroed it out as a program and he asked if we could participate. We had twenty million dollars in the second phase budget for fine arts. The current drama building was ready to implode. "Well, you're going to have to raise whatever amount it is," and we decided how much we'd budget and decided on a ninety million dollar number, of which twenty would come from the state. But this particular Dean has the personality and the tenacity and the effectiveness to raise money. He's demonstrated that before and he's been very effective in establishing linkages with people in Fairfield County and New York City. He has produced a one of a kind relationship with the Metropolitan Opera. He has gotten people like Raymond Sackler to endow a serious quarter million dollar lectureship and performanceship and composition competitions. So normally I would have looked skeptically on a promise that a Dean will raise seventy million dollars, but if there were someone who could, he would be one I would have confidence in.

So we went ahead with the competition. As I recall, there were something like seventy submissions. The NEA gave us seventy-five thousand dollars and the idea was that the final three

in the competition would each get twenty-five thousand dollars and that would be enough to induce some of the best architects around to incur the cost to do the competition. This was kind of a modest nod, in addition to the stature of having a NEA competition win.

Frank Gehry, Zaha Hadid, the London based architect, both of them had won Pritzkers.

BS: Pritzkers.

PA: Pritzkers, yes, and Mac Scoggin from Atlanta, who had formerly been Chair of the Harvard Architecture Department were the three finalists, but there were other very notable competitors like Cesar Pelli and it was a gilt-edged group who participated and the committee came up with those three and the selection group by osmosis chose Frank. We are still at the point where he has finished three schematics and has now done the schematics. We have the Dean, unlike many other Deans, as I've said, is entrepreneurial. Everybody's motivated by location, location, location. Nobody wants to use the unattractive and inefficient space at the Depot Campus. We have a lot of square footage out there and we've got Human Resources, Collective Bargaining, the ERI and a few of those types of things where it's really faculty it's their second laboratories, but they still want to be in the center of the campus. Dean Woods said, "You know, for our puppetry program and for our creative types, whether it's painting or music composition, where it has certain limited performances, the parking out there is better. There is that theater out there and artist's studios have good light, so we'll take that space. Free up

the space in the middle of the campus and downsize the Gehry proposal to create a performance center and a drama building.”

That’s where we are right now. He has proposals into some of his wealthy friends and one can only hope that as stock market returns and people have wealth increases in the next few years, that two and three of them will make up the difference between— actually, they have thirty million dollars in fine arts, ten of which had been designated for Jorgensen renovation and twenty for either renovation or creation of this space in fine arts. It’s the Dean and the faculty’s prerogative, from my perspective whether they want to just do more modest renovations and just kind of facial uplifts for the Jorgensen and spend more of the remaining amount on the new Fine Arts facility. The jury’s not in, but I’m optimistic.

BS: Okay. The Capital Campaign that ended, can you talk a little about that?

PA: I’m pleased. I’m having fun here. It’s just a great time to have this kind of job, when one group that heretofore had neglected the place, namely the State of Connecticut, for so long all of a sudden has come out and really created not a 2.3 billion dollar but a 2.8 billion dollar program over twenty years. It’s the only place in the country that it’s happening and what is so pleasing to see the academic response and to see the private sector giving response.

Of the nine hundred and sixty million dollar initial program, twenty million was set aside for a matching grant program, and the view was that because there had never been a formal asking program here, that it would probably take three, four years to exhaust that matching money. It was exhausted in something less

than eighteen months and what has happened is we've, with trepidation—with profound trepidation, set a goal of three hundred million and while I emphasize that a hundred and forty-six was an in-kind gift in engineering, still there's the fact that we've concluded with four hundred and seventy million or something. But we exceeded the dollar amount by twenty-five million and got the three hundred and twenty-five, and this in a place where we didn't have a history of this, and secondly it was two of the three years were in a down market.

So we're right now in the phases of planning a new, bigger campaign to be started in a year or so but, you know, it's—the endowment is at once—it's the ultimate form of delayed gratification because it's right now people are saying, “Well, you've talked a lot,” but—I haven't heard this in the last couple of years, but the first two or three years in the Capital Campaign, question was, “Where's the beef? What's going on?” Well, the dollars don't start kicking off until you—and the Deans frankly didn't know how to spend the money. I mean, they would complain the state operating budget, but there'd be scholarship money and endowed program support money sitting in the Foundation that would go unexpended. So now I think they've learned the tricks and the endowment, under law, under UConn 2000 is limited to faculty professorships, creation of endowed professorships, endowed scholarships or academic program support. So it's very limited. It's very good. It's disciplined and it's really quite wonderful.

Once again, we're victims of our success. Now that there's four hundred million, the *Hartford Courant* is filing FOI's to get in and audit it.

BS: The matching money, to jump up for a moment. It looked like it was going to be lost, but then it was retained, right?

PA: We are blessed right now with Denise Merrill in the driver's seat and we went for a couple of years after Ritter left without having an aggressive, strong advocate in a position of power. As Co-Chairman of Appropriations, she's—she not only is unequivocally supportive of UConn and she's smart, but she now has the moxie and the power to make decisions.

The current Governor was on the search committee that brought me here, so we've been friends since the time I got here, and I like her and I respect her.

BS: That's Jody Rell.

PA: Jody Rell, but she is conservative. I think in John Rowland's case, he was a pragmatic guy who was not terribly encumbered by philosophy and Jody Rell, if I'm right on this analysis, really does look upon big complex state institutions as a family and she's constantly talking about having to, as a family, balance the check book and decide whether you're going to buy a new car or send the kid to college, and all of this type of thing. There's an element of that that's—[phone rings] [tape off/on]

BS: You were talking about the Governor before the phone rang.

PA: Yes, she's a fiscal conservative and frequently draws the analogy between a family and its finances and a big state agency. My view is that we certainly have to live within our means, but from the

point of view of the state, there is a social return and an economic return to having an educated workforce and to have a vibrant, vital, aggressive public research university, with all that it implies. I think there's a certain element of looking upon this as no different than the Department of Motor Vehicles or the Department of Corrections, and that's a comparison that I reject.

To go back to our prior conversation, if you fight that fight, and I regard it as my job to fight that fight, and you don't want to play by the same rules as anyone else, and you get yourself out from under the authority of the Department of Higher Education and the Department of Public Works, the Department of Administrative Services, then you act like a free-standing university that is different than those other agencies. The faculty and our staff are different than state employees. We are all state employees, but we're different and one indication of that is that the loyalty to this institution caused the AAUP and UCPEA to accept a freeze a few years ago, which allowed us to continue our progress. You didn't see that in the rest of the state agencies, and I just keep telling people, "You have to understand, we're different. And we're serving everybody in the state, even those who don't come here, because the economy is strengthened by our activities and that helps the poor schmuck in Danbury who doesn't even know where Storrs is." Well, we've won a few of those battles and that gives rise then, by all of those authorities in Hartford who have lost control over us, to call us arrogant. I'm sorry about that, but when put in that context, I'm quite pleased about it.

This first year of budgeting would suggest that we've got more work to do with the new administration because higher education, not simply UConn, but higher education was treated like all other state agencies, and we can't have that.

BS: Well, the operating budget, at least according to the statistics I read, in 1990 was 50% from the state and now is down to 36% or something?

PA: Right.

BS: Do you see this as a general phenomenon? I mean, is UConn different from other institutions?

PA: No. Those numbers are generally accurate, but you've got to be careful how you interpret them. Number one, it's a national phenomenon and many comparable institutions get from the state fifteen to twenty state cents on the dollar. In the case of the University of Virginia, they get about nine state cents on the dollar. So it's our dirty little secret that thirty-five is still multiples of other places, but it is also the case that there are both changes in the numerator and the denominator. That is to say, we've gone from maybe fifty million in federal research support at that time to over two hundred million now. So I mean that's driving up expenditures. If we didn't have that, the state percentage would be much higher.

It is also the case that last year the Foundation kicked in I think twenty-six million dollars for scholarships and that's in the numerator. So the state percentage would shrink even more. And tuition has increased somewhat dramatically over the years.

Notwithstanding the fact that we had two years of freeze and the state kicked in the equivalent of a three percent increase.

So much is at play there, but undeniably state governments across the country have not kicked in, in ways that I as an educator, believe they should have. But in strapped budgets and in an era when lower taxes are better than higher taxes—I mean we're not in the 1940s and '50s anymore, and there are so few discretionary items because the last twenty-five years unfunded mandates and entitlements are huge. Even with trying to cap Medicare and Medicaid payments, they're just overwhelming. K through 12 and higher ed are among the few entitlements—non entitlement programs and when very effective politicians in the K through 12 arena show pictures of little kids on dangerous school busses, all of a sudden we're lucky we have gotten what we've gotten. But I would not say that publicly. We're out there fighting every day trying to get more.

And it is also the case that while the state appropriation, the block grant is accurately reflected by those numbers, in the same period organizations like Connecticut Innovations, which is a quasi-state agency awarded us, I think, over the years maybe five or six million dollars, and in the first billion and in the second billion, both contained roughly four hundred million dollars that would mimic operating expenses. A couple hundred million for telecommunications and technology, which is to buy computers, phone networks and all of that, and another couple hundred million for deferred maintenance and that's stuff that would have to come

out of tuition and other fees. So it is a highly undesirable trend, but the reality is not as dire as that would suggest.

BS: Okay. In terms of Governor Rowland, did he have a sense of diminishing—the diminishing operating budget? You know, he bonded a lot. You have UConn 2000, 21st Century, but was he choking off the University in any sense or—

PA: Well, he said he wasn't. I think in the last three years, as his personal troubles really began, the sincerity of his dedication to UConn was becoming ever more tense. When we could go to him with a particular plea, money would materialize, but the Office of Policy and Management, led by a small handful of people who were terribly, were angry and jealous of their lost prerogatives and control over this University. I mean, you were here. I wasn't here, Bruce, but the old days and the approval of paper clips, you know. There are fifty year olds in that organization, who I hope you won't use this but one named Pam Law and another named Kathy Guy who are angry, angry to this day over “How can they”—you talked earlier about what gave rise all of a sudden to eight years of great news, perhaps overly inflated, to six months of terrible news.

This culture, I didn't believe it when people told me about this, but when I arrived here, I paid visits to the editorial boards and the editorial editor of the *New London Day*. Morgan McKinley told me that I really ought to go see Leo Donahue, who when I got back to the office people said, “Are you crazy? Thank God that guy's no longer in there. He was the most anti-UConn person ever in history,” but that whole notion that “You can't trust them. They must be crooks until proven otherwise,” permeates

state government here. The Department of Higher Education. Certainly the Department of Public Works, which gave us Babbidge Library, which gave us the Natatorium, and now the last building they built for us is the law school library and the stones are falling off. So I mean, this group of wonderful people who contributed to the inefficiency and the lack of success are now angry and it seems like with each passing success, they're even more angry and want it to stick it to us. Not only us, but CSU and Com Techs.

Your question was, was Rowland squeezing us? I think Rowland kind of wanted to do good, but he didn't get into the details. I'm told, although I wasn't here, that it was Tom Ritter who got the first [UConn 2000] Bill in Rowland reluctantly signed it.

BS: Oh, very definitely, yes. I've written the stuff—

PA: But there is no question in my mind because I was here, that without Rowland we would never have gotten the second because he squeezed the Republicans and he took the Democrats issue away from them and they were all mad at him. The Democrats despised him because they were the ones who are for higher education and the Republicans were mad at him because this guy who ran on no bonding, to reduce bonding, has thrown us further in debt. But he's our Republican, we have to support him. So I think that near the end, he looked upon this as his monument and I think he also thought he was doing good. I think he initially was motivated by athletics. He was a guy's guy and he enjoyed hanging out with the coaches and the players and talking sports

and watching sports. You don't do what he did for us and hate the place or consciously try to starve it. I think what happened was the state—you know, he did believe in lowering taxes and he went too far in the first couple of years. That combined with the bad economy, just took away discretion. Even busting the spending caps a little bit ate up all the revenue because of the entitlements and the unfunded mandates from the federal government, and he had bureaucrats around him that were resentful that they no longer controlled UConn. That's my honest interpretation. I don't know whether I'm right or wrong.

BS: So in a sense his fall put us into a new era with this whole issue of ethics and just the general view of how government should operate. Do you think that this possibly is part of the reason why the change has occurred in the past six months?

PA: There's no question. There's a cynicism and a sense of distrust, even among leaders of the same party. I'm preoccupied with UConn and the treatment we're getting and headlines of the *Hartford Courant*, but if you look at it, one day it's Children's Hospital. The next day it's the State Police. The next day it's the Department of Children and Families and just everybody's a crook. Everybody's doing wrong.

BS: Oh, with the—

PA: With the campaign finance. She out-Carusoed Caruso [a state legislator advocating campaign reform] and threw it right back in their lap. [laughs] How much more ethical can we be, you know? If we can't entertain legislators at athletic events or Jorgensen events anymore, they're the ones that are telling us that. I hope

that doesn't happen because those are enormously effective, almost unique venues in which to make people feel good about UConn.

BS: Well, the issue I think is—JI had a story, I think it was this week, about the tickets, getting tickets that you pay for, but other people can't get the tickets. Do you—how do you deal with that one?

PA: Well, I'm very straight forward about it. There was a guy named Alan Levin, who was a reporter for the *Courant*.

BS: Yes, an investigator.

PA: Yes, and he was on that thirty-five dollar orange juice kick.

BS: Right.

PA: Which happened at the Big East tournament the year before I was here. That happened in March and then I arrived in August, but it blew about the time that I arrived and I went, "Holy, God, what have I hopped into here." So from that, they extended out into the "Why does the Governor get tickets anyway? He was there every time," and I said, "Civics 101, Alan. The people of the state own the University of Connecticut. They elect leaders. I want the leaders who represent the people and who make the decisions to feel as good as they can and know everything we're doing at UConn." "Yeah, but why should the Governor be treated separately?" I said, "Because he's the damn Governor. Do you get it?" Well, they don't get it, but from my point of view. This is the way it's been done everywhere else in the country and I'm comfortable with it. If it doesn't fit here, then when in Rome, do as the Romans.

But with respect to giving more—on an occasional basis, giving more favorable seating location to elected officials when we

have seats available and charge them for it face value, but they still do get an added property right? My answer, why are they different? Because he's the Governor and because these are people we're trying to impress and we're trying to entertain and it's unique.

Then you can get over into the other ticket situation in athletics and that is our employees. I made a judgment a month ago, and frankly, I don't think I was right. I took the heat on behalf of getting the University out in front of that, and that was the use of tickets by coaches and a limited number of athletic administrators. From my point of view, if you provide something of value in a contract, all of which have been approved by the State Ethics Commission and the Attorney General, and our Trustees approved it it's ok. These are compensation packages that are awfully high, but they're comparable to retain the kind of talent we have over there. If one element of that compensation package is in the form of a ticket that has certain value, why should I be able to tell them that they can't trade that ticket for something else of value, any more than fifty dollars that's in their compensation? As an economist, everything's fungible. But it was also clear that that issue was just consuming people. We had an ethics decision that said it was okay, but we had a political environment that said this is just going to consume us if we continued our policy. So I said, "You know, no more tickets for exchange of anything and give back the cars." That's all been done now. Some of the people in the Athletics Department are quite angry with me, but I still think it was the best thing for the University.

We're exceeding the requirements of the state. Quasi-independent bodies like Freedom of Information Commission and the Ethics Commission have ruled that what we're doing is acceptable. Our Trustees have ruled it's acceptable. The Attorney General, and still it's not enough for the *Hartford Courant*. Southwestern Connecticut, people don't even know about any of this stuff, but in the Hartford region, it's obsessive.

PA: When we met with the JI editorial Board they didn't even ask us about this. I mean their whole thing was Freedom of Information. Most journals are preoccupied with complete transparency and ultimately their issue is the Foundation. So we're getting ready to get up and leave and I said, "You guys haven't asked about the construction program," and they said, "That's a one day story. You reported it. You fixed it. We reported it. It's over." They said, "We haven't done editorials on it and we're not going to." So, you know, I—you tell me, you've been here longer than I have.

BS: You mentioned Trustees. You have a new head of the Trustees who came in 2003, I think.

PA: Yes, previously had spent a year or two on the Board of Directors at the Health Center.

BS: Oh, okay. So that's John Rowe.

PA: Right.

BS: He seems to have credentials far beyond the norm for Trustee Chairs and Trustees at UConn. Can you talk a little bit about this? I mean, what brought him as the head?

PA: He's superior. He's a wonderful human being. He's funny. He's witty. He also happens to be a member of the Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Medicine.

BS: Right.

PA: He received a long time ago one of these McArthur Genius Grants. I've been told by third parties—I checked him out before I asked to have him appointed to the Health Center Board of Directors. Four or five friends of mine who worked in other academic health centers say that Jack actually was one of a handful of people who gave definition to a subfield of clinical and research work in gerontology. That in his work at Harvard over those twenty years, his laboratory produced some of the seminal stuff that actually gave definition to the field of gerontology and that what he discovered was just different than all the conventional wisdom. Internal medicine people treated old people like old versions of young people. Jack's contribution was old people are different people than young people and therefore the clinical treatment should be different. You have different systems and the redundancy diminishes as you go on. Then he became president of Mt. Sinai and then five years ago, or whatever it was, he became president of Aetna. He's thoroughly involved. He is brilliant. He's a good friend and I regard it as a great privilege to work for him.

Concurrently we have Dennis Nayden, who has two degrees from UConn, formerly president of GE Capital, a younger man by ten years, maybe, but he has a sensual attraction to UConn. He loves this place. He believes he had an excellent education here.

He can talk ad nauseum about how if it hadn't been for UConn, he wouldn't have had the opportunity that he had and he wants to give back. He leaves corporate meetings to take my phone calls, when I ask him for advice or something. He and his wife gave a million dollars to convert that little Fleet Bank over here to the Nayden Physical Therapy Center.

And then thirdly, and I'm just picking three of the committee chairs. Lew Jacobs is a different man, but he is the Chair of Emergency Medicine, Clinical Chair of Emergency Medicine of both the Hartford Hospital and at the Health Center. He created our Emergency Medical Trauma Department. He's the guy who created Life Star and got that program going and funded. He's Chair of Academic Affairs and a wonderful human being. He's very smart, but his credentials are just different than these two corporate types.

Then you add to that Tom Ritter with all that he brings to the table. I mean, those four people, plus many others who are really good Trustees, but I have right now the kind of advice and support that's highly unusual in a public university, and the University and I are better for it.

BS: Going back to Rowe for a minute, were you the impetus for his appointment or did someone come to you and suggest that he be appointed?

PA: No, the Governor. I'll tell you this—I ask you to be sensitive in how you use it, but I got him to the Health Center. I knew of him and Peter Deckers and I went to see him in his office. I said, “We have a certain number of appointments, and I'd be honored if you

would take this appointment,” and he said, “Let me think about it. Appreciate it.” Then he called me two hours later and he said, “Give me a few days,” and he called me two hours later and said he had called Rowland and said, “You know, I’m being asked to be on the Athenaeum Board. I’m being asked to be on this Board and Chair of United Way.” He said, “I would like to do the UConn Health Center appointment, but if I accept it, can you—will you regard that as my pro bono service to the State of Connecticut because I just don’t have time for all of the others?” Rowland encouraged him to take it. So that’s the role I played there.

Then when [Roger] Gelfenbein was not reappointed by Rowland, he asked me who I would like as Chairman of the Board and I said, “Well, you know, there are two or three people but Jack Rowe has just turned out to be better than I had any right to expect, and another would be Tom Ritter. I know he’s from another political party,” and Rowland said, “Will either of those be acceptable?” I said, “Yes.” He said, “Well, Tom is a friend of mine.” He said, “We get along fine. We’ve been friends over the years, but,” he said, “he’s now a lobbyist,” and he said, “I think it would be unfortunate to have a lobbyist, no matter how much we all respect Tom,” and how pressured that judgment was, given where we are now. So he gave me Jack and I have rejoiced in it ever since.

BS: The Health Center itself. One of your charges I think was to sort of bring the Health Center closer to Storrs. Could you talk about what’s happened the past couple of years with respect to that?

PA: We have more and more joint research projects are being produced and we have a big project now. This was the litmus test, by the way, in the search for the Provost. I said, “You know, Peterson didn’t know how to do it. Emmert didn’t want to do it because he wanted independence. Nondiscrimination and affirmative action is one and I mean a lot of people just regard this stuff as words, but they’re litmus tests for me and you’re going to be evaluated on it. One was to meaningfully bring more programs together. We have five different biology departments, groups of biologists on this University with Marine Science. But our Molecular and Cellular people and our Physiology and Neurobiology people are actively involved with the people over there. Jerry Yang and his Regenerative Biology program has several collaborators from over there out here. The late great Janet Greger participates—this is symbolism, but it’s symbolism that represents reality.

We’ve got a big one now that’s in the proposal stage that Ann Ferris, who is a professor of nutrition out here, and Eileen Story, who’s a professor of medicine in the Health Center, produced a proposal that would have far-reaching effects, and involve activities that they wish to culminate in the School of Public Health. The intermediate stuff might be an Institute of Public Health. What I’ve agreed to at this stage is the pursuit of some degree programs and research programs in public health, but it would involve reorganizing community medicine faculty, psychiatry faculty at minimum, many more, over there. Nutrition and agriculture, allied health, pharmacy, nursing, and God knows the biology programs. So if that comes to fruition, and as recently

as Thursday morning, Deckers and Nicholls were in my office reaffirming their support. We are having three Deans of Public Health from around the country. I think the Dean of Public Health at Columbia, Johns Hopkins and maybe Chapel Hill. I'm not sure of that. I know the Dean of Columbia's coming because he's a friend of Jack Rowes'. It's important to have Jack signed onto this. Those three, the two Provosts and I are going to have dinner with Jack Rowe one night and kind of give those Deans the charge and then ask them to evaluate our prospects. Whether we ought to stick with degree programs, do an institute or a full-fledged School of Public Health.

I mean, we're making progress, and we're doing—

BS: Okay.

PA: I'm sorry. [unclear] We're also—we now have an MD-MBA program. We have an MD-PhD program and I mean they've been facilitated and more students are participating. There is a JD program with a special track in ethics and medicine at the law school. So it's slowly but surely coming together.

BS: How about the Graduate School, in terms of what's been going on there? Revised policies and changes and such?

PA: You read the memo earlier this week? It's kind of off the record. She's so smart and has such rich experience.

[end of Side B, Tape 1]

BS: Interview with Philip Austin by Bruce Stave, Tape 2, June 3rd, 2005. Okay, you were talking about Janet Greger.

PA: She's an enormously intelligent person with rich and appropriate experience, both in terms of graduate education and research

administration, but she has the capacity to anger people she's attempting to help, and they're virtually unanimous that she was, in spite of her enormous talents, she was not effective. She was alienating senior principle investigators and other colleagues and the intensity and aggressiveness of her personality, unfortunately, just rendered her inactive. Unsuccessful in doing her job.

So we are now at the point where Jim Henkel will in the interim run the Graduate School, lead the Graduate School, manage the Graduate School bureaucratic affairs and Carol Welt will do the research administration, under the leadership on an interim basis of one of two people Peter Nicholls has talked to me about who are senior faculty here, been here a long time, who are widely respected and who have probably signed on to the changes that we asked Janet Greger to make. It is the case that UConn in the past has played by rules that in the old days were okay, but we didn't make the changes that you have to make, according to OMB Circular A-21. She insisted on it, at my request and agreement, but it meant changing ways of doing business like the Booth Center and the Environmental Research Institute, where the old ways were found to be just, not only inappropriate, in some cases illegal and many senior faculty, particularly in engineering, were irritated because they were, you know—an SSF, Specialized Service Facility, has legal definition and certain conditions must be met in order to comply with that federal regulation. And to not do isn't just a no-no. It's illegal. So we changed those things. I believe that some of the professors who did their work through the Booth Center, which really had evolved into a center for escaping turning

back direct cost recoveries to the central administration, and they kept them all there, were of course irritated because their revenue flow had stopped. But we were out of compliance with the law and unfortunately she did not have the capacity, the personality to deliver bad news effectively.

The two professors who are being considered by Peter right now both have the personality, as well as the strength of character and they have signed onto the direction that we're taking the University.

BS: Can you mention who they are?

PA: I really am uncomfortable.

BS: Oh, okay. No problem.

PA: Because I don't know which way he's going to go. Well, can I tell you and you don't tell anybody.

BS: Okay. I don't—this is.

PA: Okay, it's Harry Frank in Chemistry and Deb Kendall in Molecular Cell. They're both senior. They're both tenured full professors. They're both—

BS: Both good people.

PA: Widely recognized and they've got personalities that are congenial and respectful. What he will do with the passage of time is conduct a national search and select someone as a permanent replacement, but you know, the federal government looks at you differently when you're doing twenty million of research, than they do when you're doing thirty five or forty and we just have to be squeaky clean. ERI, interestingly, just at this current state of difficulties. Sometimes things have to be so bad to make changes

in a culture that you get people's attention? The ERI mess was awful and you know, some of the engineers say, well, "They're saying we're all crooked." No, they're not. They're saying there were four people who were demonstrated to have broken laws and enriched themselves, but the rest are just good researchers, trying to do their best work and they did it in an environment that's no longer legal and we had to tighten things up. Without ERI we'd still be, you know, knocking heads. In this current stuff or the year ago stuff that's now still news in the *Courant*, you know, sometimes it has to get bad enough to get the attention and you just go in and you dig and you change the way things have been for sixty years. Because now, you know, people have invested—will have invested three billion bucks in us and they're going to scrutinize us, and they have every right to do it.

BS: Okay. What about the question of the size of the student body here. The latest figures I saw were twenty-six or twenty-seven thousand or—

PA: It will be twenty-eight this fall.

BS: Twenty-eight.

PA: We've capped the freshman enrollment at Storrs at thirty-two hundred for four years and the real growth this year is occurring on the regional campuses. There's a jumbo class at the law school just graduated this year, but the deal that I've presented to the Board and presented to the legislature is, "Look, right now," as I mentioned a while ago, "our biggest political problem is turning away students who would have been shoe-ins a while ago." I mean our faculty ratio, faculty to student ratio has gone from one

to fifteen to one to eighteen over a period of years and that arises from, again, both the denominator and the numerator. Increase the student body, and we've had these early retirement programs and the state's only allowed us to fill fifty percent of them. So the ratio changes.

We had the proposal to add a hundred and fifty faculty over a five year period. I don't think it's going to get funded at all this year, but I'm not going to withdraw the proposal because I think we have to keep attention on the fact that if we keep creeping up in the student-faculty ratio. Then we lose the magic and this wonderful investment will not have been fully exploited.

I've passed by the Board of Trustees, the former Governor, the former President of the Senate, and the former Speaker, none of whom are around anymore, the deal that when the revenue flows start again, when the state starts having surpluses, what I would be willing to develop is a plan to move from twenty-seven and a half to thirty-five thousand students, but what I need is a firm permanent adjustment in the base of twenty-five million dollars, so we can hire faculty sufficient to get back to one to sixteen or one to fifteen. A hundred and fifty new faculty was backed into to get the one to eighteen back down to one to fifteen and that's the rationale we presented it on and it didn't have legs. There isn't any money this year, but Denise is aware of it and I'm hopeful that if there's money next year, we can charge with that again.

BS: Well, why is increased size so important?

PA: Pragmatism. If students can't come here, they don't go to Connecticut State in very large numbers. If you look at where they

send as their SAT scores, it still is now Boston College, Boston University and Syracuse and Rutgers. Parents are taxpayers. They've been paying taxes for twenty-five years. They think part of their social contract is they're going to have a good research university that's publicly subsidized and so they'll have much lower tuition. If their kid does well in a good school, they deserve to get into UConn and frankly, I believe in that social contract.

Now, as I said, we are denying access to B and B+ students and their parents are having to pay \$42,000 at BC, BU and Syracuse as opposed to sixteen here. That's a political problem, and those parents are complaining to legislators. Legislators are calling me and saying "Can't you make an exception?" and my position is, "No, we can't. We're full. We can do no more." That's a political problem that has repercussions on our perceptions by the elected leaders of the state and I'm trying to keep this snowball going. So if you want us to do more, if you want us to serve more Connecticut students, and I think Connecticut will be further ahead if we do, but you can't carry ten tons of canaries in a five ton truck, you know. So give me the resources, and I'll give you more of the same product. That's it.

BS: We, I think are the smallest or one of the smallest Research One institutions.

PA: Right.

BS: Does the number have anything to do with that, as well as this pragmatic element?

PA: Well, I don't think size has inherent value. In fact, size could have—size does increase certain problems. It changes the nature

of the challenges and the nature of the opportunities, but I wouldn't go for growth just for the sake of growth. I would go for growth for the sake of economies of scale. I think we have enough range at the undergraduate level to give all the breadth that a good school can give, plus some. I think we probably have too many expensive Ph.D. programs and I've asked Peter to get the Senate involved and whatever the committee is, along with the Executive Committee of the Senate and start a debate and discussion on the priority setting, which is another word for a strategic plan. But I think the service of more students and with more faculty, you can build momentum, as my good friend the Dean of Engineering says, when he's on one of his harangues, that they've got the quality of fifteen or twenty of the big schools and then he compares chemical and mechanical and computer engineering with the University of Illinois and Berkeley and all of those, and they have four times the number of professors for the same number of students. Yup. We are where we are. They are where they are. They have a hundred years of history out in the Midwest of funding education the way it should be, those big town schools, built in the '50s and got to the size they were and got their constituency and were raising money and we didn't.

You know, I wish I had known Homer Babbidge because he's either hated or reviled at this place, but when I've asked people who've really had very unpleasant memories of him, "How could this be?" This man is a hero over here and you dig through it and what I've gotten out of it is because he pursued this philosophy of a public ivy and it was during those years when all

the other great publics were being built and he kept this place small and we lost the opportunities. I don't know whether that's right or wrong.

BS: I'll give you my chapter on Babbidge in the UConn history.

PA: Okay, am I generally right?

BS: Interestingly—well, there was a lot of concern that he was trying to make this into a, you know, another Yale and the agriculture dean, I remember at the time, was outspoken about this. Then on the other side you had the humanities who loved him. Yes, so it's—

PA: Yes.

BS: Yes, it's a very interesting presidency, actually, because it's split down the middle. Ten years, first five years wonderful honeymoon. Second five years, the Vietnam protest, women's movement, civil rights, etcetera, etcetera. But anyway, you'll read the book.

PA: [unclear]

BS: Okay, you mentioned numbers and that ties into another thing when I think of numbers. Spring weekend. How has it gone the past two years, from your perspective?

PA: Uh, thank God we've had no serious fatalities. Thank heavens it's been reported more accurately. I mean they still are using that awful tape from 1998 the week before they lead into it, you know. There has been a greater police presence. The students have quite frankly, and this is not rhetoric, the students have been wonderful. The student government has worked with us. They understand. They accept the fact that it's an embarrassment, it's dangerous and that thugs and gang members come in from Hartford and Boston

and New London, are particularly dangerous. This year we were blessed by a terrible rainstorm and cold weather on Saturday night, but last year it was nice weather and the kids were more well-behaved.

This again is one of those situations where it's a national phenomenon and I've gone to meetings over the years where this was one of the three or four topics on panel discussions. Nobody knows what to do about it, so we work lock step with the State Police, with Betsy Paterson here locally, and I put together a task force a couple, three years ago that had the addiction people from the Health Center and the heart people and others from out here, student affairs, police, Marty Berliner, who's the local City Manager, and student leaders. We have avoided real bad stuff, but it's all a matter of luck, too. How you get testosterone laden adolescents who combine too much beer and are complete ladies and gentlemen. At eleven pm they're standing around here in X Lot having fun with their friends and by one o'clock, thirty or forty of them have to go nuts.

So I mean it's a tentative answer. I'm still worried about it and I'm still embarrassed about it, but my biggest fear is that there are those who take the simplistic approach and say, "Well, what we ought to do is put them in the parking ramp.

BS: In the—

PA: Restrict the party to the parking ramp so they can't—and I said, "Yeah, then they go nuts and they fall off the side and they kill themselves." "Well, we could put chain link fencing around so they couldn't fall out." I said, "You remember the story about the

tragedy at CCNY a few years ago where they were there for a rock concert. They'd all been drinking, went downstairs and they crushed about fifteen kids because the crowd at the top just kept pushing." Then he was, "Well, you can't have a party here. We're going to arrest anybody who's here to go off the campus." Then what you've got, rather than a handful of drunk kids stumbling home and vomiting on the street, you've got them driving cars and then they will kill themselves.

I'm in a perpetual state of soliciting advice as to what to do for this. [laughs]

BS: Okay. Another side to things, the Mansfield Downtown Partnership, relationships with the town generally and such?

PA: Well, I think they're wonderful. More important than what I say, Betsy Paterson, who's been around here a long time, says it's the best town relations since she's lived and worked in Mansfield. I think that results, whether that's entirely accurate or not, is immaterial. I feel that way. She feels that way. I think that condition is arrived at because we've tried very hard to be good neighbors and Betsy herself has tried very hard. Some of the activists who've found fault with everything we did, have either died or moved on. [Peter] Newcomer and those names.

So that's generally the case. I mean, we have things like local people, including some professors and staff members who buy housing and then allow them to be trashed and rent a house that should be single family and occupied by no more than four people, and they rent it out to ten kids. The kids think they're getting a heck of a deal. That remains an issue and Phil Barry is

now one of our Trustees and is connected and experienced with—he knows everybody in town, so he’s an easy platform on which to exchange information without making it too official. It is the case, as is often the case, that the laws are on the books to enforce that, but Mansfield doesn’t have the police force and maybe not the will to go after it. So it’s easier to take a cheap shot at the university.

Fortunately and mercifully, neither Marty Berliner nor Betsy do that. I’ve asked Tom Callahan to oversee the relationships over the last five or six years. He and Berliner have, from my observation, an excellent mutually respectful relationship and they take care of things.

Then finally with respect to the town project, we were blessed by the presence of Philip Lodewick, who took that on as his latest good work. I mean he had been Chair of the Foundation. He and his wife contributed a million and a half to build the Visitor’s Center. He’s gotten New York money for—there are four people with very deep pockets who are now invested in it. My understanding is that we have one more step to go to have the Trustees and the town cede authority to the development authority, which means that if the town decides to get angry again, they will have lost the authority to do so.

The Trustees have empowered me to make these deals and when we get to the deal where we’re transferring University authority to this authority for that one parcel of land, that they will approve the resolution I bring to them. I think it’s just wonderful. When we do surveys of departing students, once at their graduation and then a year later, six, seven years ago it was and also students

who we admit but don't come. I'm over summarizing here. John Barry and Scott Brohinsky do these surveys and it used to be that there were dreadful buildings, nothing to do in Storrs, classes were too large, library was cruddy. I mean all of the stuff. Residence hall food was bad. The single remaining issue of those kids is that there's nothing to do in Storrs. There's no town.

So my dream is and what I've asked Lodewick and that group to do is to think of Amherst, Massachusetts or Princeton, New Jersey. We're a small town variety of that, but have something like that that's a yuppie, coffee shop, bookstore, restaurants and so on there for the students and the faculty, and the townspeople, and I think with Betsy, she's been able with authority because she's lived here and has credibility, she's been able to persuade the townspeople, "For God's sakes, this is going to benefit us. This is not the University intruding on us." So I think things are pretty good.

BS: Okay, just one or two more questions. Just jumping around. The Academic Plan, you mentioned early on the aspirational peers that we have and such. You had mentioned North Carolina and Virginia, which I think would be at the top of the state universities, Berkeley. But you know, right now the aspirational peers that are listed are Ohio State, Purdue, Rutgers, Minnesota, Georgia and Iowa State, etcetera. Which indicates to me that we're at a stage that, you know, we're good but we're still not really top.

PA: Right.

BS: How do you assess this?

PA: Well, and those peers, you will recall, Bruce, are a step up from what many around the country would regard us as, institutionally, being comparable.

BS: Exactly, yes.

PA: You mentioned earlier we're the smallest Carnegie One. That's right, and one of the reasons we're not at the other place is we don't have the additional hundred and fifty professors who are pushing up the research productivity and all. So if you take the Lombardi measures and you standardize, you reduce it by—you get a ratio for the size of the faculty and the size of the student body, we're beyond those people. I mean, Ohio State is a great big place, like any university, you have an enormous strength--pockets of strength and then you've got some mediocrity. Ohio State is real good in some places and it's an open university in other places.

Similarly with Rutgers. It was so-so for a long time. Then Ed Blaustein was president for a while and he tightened things up and then Ed died and they had ten years of lethargy. I think the minute we accept that with satisfaction and we don't talk about our journey to the ranks of Virginia, North Carolina, we start floating again.

We won't be Berkeley. Berkeley's now what, the entering freshman class all come from the top 1% of their high school and they're all Asian. I mean, this—at the end of the day, the political problem I described, we're still going to have and it's still going to be a challenge to get to Virginia's level because once you get too much, too selective, then you're elitist. You're not just good,

you're elitist and Virginia's got George Mason, VPI, all of those other schools in the state that are very good. We are the only show in town (with respect to a public research _____) and so we've got our challenges just to get to that, but Berkeley and UCLA and maybe some of those are out of our reach, but I think to define what at the graduate level conveys to the faculty around the country and to businesses around the country and to intelligent government leaders, what you are and the contribution you make and how important you are to the country.

I mean, these are very good schools, but none of them have had the opportunity that we have had in the last few years to progress. They're day, in a sense, was thirty years ago and it's now our turn to charge ahead.

BS: Okay. Let's see. Oh, the effect of the basketball championships last year? The dual championships, men and women, how do you assess that and what effect did you see it having and such?

PA: Well, that's also subjective, isn't it? But it most certainly is not unrelated to the fact that in a three year down economy, we did exceed three hundred million dollar goal by a hundred and seventy-one million—or whatever the number was. It is not unrelated to the fact that ten years ago we received nine thousand applications for undergraduate admissions at Storrs, and we admitted 70% of them. This past year we received nineteen thousand plus applications and we could only admit 50%. It's not unrelated to the fact that this past year out-of-state SAT levels are higher than in-state SAT levels, and they pay \$27,000 rather than \$15,000. Now, those kids are smart enough and they have options,

they're not going to come here for basketball games they can't get tickets to. But that sizzle, I think, has an effect up front of creating an aura of excitement so they come and look at our programs.

Then they see the beautiful campus and the beautiful buildings and they know they can infer the quality of the classroom instruction and so on.

One thing that we sell is the opportunity for undergraduate research and that twenty-five hundred dollars that you can get to work with a professor. That's an enormous impact to many students that basketball doesn't have any effect on, but nothing gets attention like a dual championship. The hyperbole and the rhetoric about the first time in history, that gets old pretty soon, in fact, because it's the first time in history and a lot of things are not.

Then you've got Diana. You've got to love that kid, but she has her warts, just as all of us do. But Emeka Okafore is too good to be true. That kid—I've yet to find his warts. All of his physical talents and his personal discipline and a 3.8 in finance in three years. Will you give me a break? And then he volunteered for Habitat for Humanity.

BS: Oh, is that so?

PA: And he's one of the nicest young men you'd ever want to meet. I mean, he carries his celebrity with such grace, it's just wonderful.

BS: Okay. This week there was talk about a veterinary school. Could you elaborate on that?

PA: We have a Trustee who just won't let go. Mike Martinez, he's a horseman and he loves it. He's a good man, but we had a study done. Kirk Kerr, who happens to be a veterinarian, identified a

recently retired Dean from North Carolina State named Oscar Fletcher. Oscar spent a couple of weeks here looking the thing over. I think he had his report written before he came and we went out to Oscar because we proposed Mike Wait_____ would have an outside review completed. So the outside expert's always smarter than the one that you've in residence. Oscar concluded it would require three hundred million to build a hospital and sixty million to run it. Give me a break. I mean, we're trying to cut back on the graduate programs we have and put more resources in the ones that are still remaining.

Peter Nicholls comes from my same background, Colorado State, which has one of the consistently ranked outstanding veterinary schools in the U.S., and two reasons give rise to that. Colorado State is under the WICHE, which is that equivalent of NEBHE. Western Interstate Conference in Higher Education has created a program that I think there's twelve other states in the mountain region in the west that buy spots at Colorado State and they subsidize four kids or six kids a year from their states to go to Colorado State and those states pay the difference between out of state and in state tuition. So everybody wins. Then also the structure of the university out there has all of the basic science programs in the School of Veterinary Medicine, so they have the size and the momentum. We built a state of the art teaching hospital and it helped us recruit the best faculty around.

We can't afford that here, but what I suggested of the four options, start a program with a teaching hospital, start a program without a teaching hospital, which is a laughable option. Create

the kind of program I just mentioned or do nothing. The last option is, of course—the fourth option is my preferred option. I mean, you have Tufts, you have Cornell, you have Penn. Let them go there, but if it's a sufficiently high priority state objective, then the state could create a program that would subsidize four kids or six or ten kids from Connecticut to go to those schools each year.

BS: They don't do that?

PA: They don't do that, no. Even Dobbelle invited me to have a beer a month ago.

BS: This is the NEBHE President?

PA: New England Board of Higher Education, and that's the equivalent of the WISCHE that I made reference to. I said to him, you know, "What you may want to think about is Tufts is private, so this issue applies to Massachusetts, as well as Connecticut. Just see if you can put together a coalition of the six Governors in New England to come up with something like that, and you'd have yourself a new program." Then it's not UConn's responsibility. This is not UConn's responsibility. This is the state's responsibility and we've got to this stage, frankly, only because of the tenacity of one Trustee and Jack Rowe did not want to blow off one of his colleagues, and I didn't want to either. So we did a study.

BS: All right, anything you'd like to add?

PA: No. You know, it's been a great privilege to be here and it's been fun and what I said earlier to your specific question about athletics, we're in a lot better place than I would have guessed two years ago when things were about to implode. Frankly, that's the case, notwithstanding some of the current issues, we still have seventy

buildings completed successfully and we're recruiting students of the type we're getting and it's just fun.

One of my greatest fears early on was that there would—that these buildings would be looked upon as ends in and of themselves, but the academic results are coming also, and that helped us sell the second billion dollars. You don't hear about the 'brain drain' anymore. It's not reported very much, but the Program Review Committee of the legislature that Jack Malone claims was always terribly upset with UConn because the union people complained because of our prequalification and then competition, selection of architects and contractors didn't always result in unionized companies getting contracts. It so happens that 60% of the contractors in the state are non-union and we by law cannot have a bias one way or another. We have to have open competition. Well, a lot of these contracts were not going to union companies. The union guys complained to Jack, who is very much a union sensitive legislator and he beat the hell out of us. Week in and week out the union asserted UConn was giving all these contracts to out of state contractors. They didn't say non-union, they said 'out of state' contractors. 88% of our contracts go to Connecticut contractors and again, by law we cannot exclude out of state. We have to take low bid, once they are prequalified. The minute we would exclude out of state contractors, you know damn well Massachusetts or New York would never hire another Connecticut firm. So I mean, it is the fact when you have a competition, you have one successful firm and five unsuccessful and Jack Malone sent in his shock groups here about four years

ago now, to investigate whether or not we had an anti-union bias. He had three women come out here and they virtually lived in our Architects and Engineering Services Department. They wrote a wonderful report giving us an A+ Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval, and Jack Malone has turned around he's been our best friend ever since.

So I mean we've had our little bumps throughout the ten years, but it's been a great ride.

BS: One question about UConn 2000, 21st Century. You used the figure—you said that it's really not 2.3, it's 2.8. Where does that other five?

PA: Well, the forty million on Waterbury, ten million for Fine Arts, even four million for the new facilities building—that green thing over by the Police Station, fifty million for the research addition at the Health Center, a hundred million for the stadium. All of this is in addition to the 1.3.

BS: Right.

PA: Then the federal support that Chris Dodd, Rosa Delauro and Rob Simmons got us. Rob Simmons just got us four million for the Road to Nowhere over here by the Police Department out to Route 44. The Ag Biotech Building is federal money, Department of Energy, and so on and so on. The HIV research over in the Psychology Department is largely federal money, and then in addition to that were those activities that will generate new revenue streams. For example, Hilltop, Charter Oak and some of those were built with two hundred million dollars of Special Obligation Bonds. So you add all that and you're at 2.8 billion. Standard &

Poors, and Moodys and Fitch give us a higher credit rating than the State of Connecticut. Now, that's because the State of Connecticut has allowed us to do the \$2.3 Billion without incurring debt. But because of that and because of the strong student demand, they've said that we would not suffer a reduction in our credit worthiness if we issued another four hundred million in bonds. I don't want to do that, but if appropriate projects come along and I can see at the end of 21st Century, if the price of steel keeps going up, if inflation comes back at higher levels as the economy comes back, there could be some projects that might be dropped or reduced and I can see that it would be prudent for the good of the University to issue another hundred million, two hundred million, and just service it out of general university operating budgets. But right now, that's more an issue for the future.

BS: Okay, another thing that I got reminded of. I don't think that we asked for your assessment of Rentschler Field. How do you see it—

PA: I was worried. Boston College and Syracuse being the only two big football programs in the northeast. Syracuse was very strong for a while and they've been in a slump for several years. Doug Flute at Boston College showed what a football program can do for a little liberal arts school that's kind of floating around. All of a sudden you get that kind of notoriety and you get Father Mohan and you give definition and a little old private Catholic school in a nice part of Boston charges ahead. But there's an awful lot of failure out there, too, and I thought, "Jesus, it's away from the campus. You're not bringing back the alumni and the legislators to

the campus to put on some seminars before the games and give them refreshments and then let them watch a football game and leave. Or have people come in for a weekend, stay at the hotel.” So it was with certain trepidation that I invited the five constitutional officers, the Lieutenant Governor and Governor, plus some big donors to the box for the first game. We had a picnic for all of the members of the General Assembly right outside the stadium. I think a hundred and six people showed up, Scott Brotivsky told me. It was just unbelievable. I thought maybe twenty of them would show because there was no tradition. I thought, “What happens if we’ve got five thousand fans because they’re all pissed off because we left Memorial Stadium or something?” and that morning they called me and said at 9:00 there were already ten thousand tailgaters out there and it filled the place up.

BS: This is the first game you’re talking about?

PA: Yes, Indiana University. So when I spoke to the legislators, I thanked them for coming, thanked them for the investment here, thanked them for general support of the university and I said, “All of us, including myself had doubts and were skeptical, but my skepticism has been removed and I just want you all to know all that tailgaters that you passed coming in here having a good time with their families and their friends, are also Connecticut voters. So just keep that in mind going forward.” [laughs] Then we had, you know, we had some schlock games, Bowling Green, and they didn’t sell out. But this last season was a sell out season. There was one game that it was raining, but even the Pittsburgh game, for

heaven sakes. It was a night game, it was raining, it was uncomfortable and they sold forty thousand tickets. It's phenomenal.

BS: So better than you anticipated?

PA: Much better than I anticipated. I didn't—I think I told you the last time, I embraced this football venture, but I've been at places where I know what football can do and it's largely number of players who come from backgrounds, poor kids that have had their challenges, and you put them all together and you teach them to go out and be tough guys and break bones during games. Then you expect them to be refined gentlemen during the week. It's not fair, and I mean, we had a little incident over in Willimantic just a couple of weeks ago. Fortunately, I mean they were stupid or the one—I think they've thrown the charges out on three of them.

BS: I think two of them they threw the charges out.

PA: Two of them?

BS: Two, yes.

PA: I mean, you just wonder. Well, you know what goes through the mind of teenagers when they have too much time, for that whole set of reasons, I would not have embraced and supported this for the sake of football qua football. It was that Lou Perkins, Jeff Hathaway and Mike Tranghese, our Commissioner, taught me the new realities of the structure of intercollegiate athletics and that is basketball is no longer going to be a stand alone sport. That the realities imposed by the market suggest that it's football that's going to drive all the revenue and the future of the Big East.

[end of Side A, Tape 2]

BS: Yes, so you were saying?

PA: That football to me was not intrinsically attractive. It was because football going forward and the big television contracts, was going to be a necessary condition, component of any institution that was going to remain in a large conference. Frankly, Bill Lehey, Father Lehey from Boston College told us that one of the reasons he was thinking about leaving was we were not—we in the Big East were not putting enough emphasis on football and that was the only Catholic school in the Big East that did football. What I wanted to make sure was that the magic of the men's and women's basketball was not lost on my watch and if we needed football, A, to get membership in a major conference and B, to keep the revenues flowing so we didn't have to use state and university money to support the athletic department and C, keep the basketball magic. And I reluctantly concluded that we had to move to football.

So am I happy? I'm not only happy, I'm relieved.

BS: Okay. Very good. Anything that you want to—

PA: No, I think you've touched most of it, Bruce.

BS: Okay, very good. Then I think we will stop here.

PA: Great.

BS: Well, thank you. Okay, good.

End of Interview

Interview with Philip Austin by Bruce Stave for the University of Connecticut Center for Oral History, April 23, 2007

STAVE: The last time we spoke was on June 3rd of 2005. A lot has occurred since that time. And I'd like to start where we left off and then pick up from there. So when we last spoke, the last thing we were discussing was the Big East and what was happening at that time. And it seemed to be a crucial kind of situation. Could you take up what occurred then and how it's worked itself out over the past two years?

AUSTIN: Well, I forget exactly where we were in June of 2005, but there was that period when Miami and Syracuse were going to leave the Big East Conference. Syracuse was not ultimately invited to join the ACC. They went back and included Virginia Tech and Boston College. We were quite worried at the time. Principally, the chancellor of Pitt, Mark Nordenberg and the president of West Virginia, David Hardesty, and I knew that we had to put together at least a 1A football conference in order to be competitive and stay in the Bowl Championship Series, which is a motivation for all, unfortunately, because that's where the revenues are significant, high revenues that arise from television contracts, a source of those revenues. And so we spent a good deal of time thinking that if we went to the 16 team proposal, that it arguably would be the strongest basketball conference, certainly in existence today, and possibly—several commissioners have told me in the history of intercollegiate athletics. But football remained a challenge. Syracuse, of course, did remain, ultimately. And Louisville, South Florida, Cincinnati joined

us. And it's turned out to be quite a successful football conference as well. The ebbs and flows, as with all sports, except basketball at UConn [chuckles] seems to be perpetually strong. But this past year or so, West Virginia and Pittsburgh have been very strong in football. Ironically, we, who had just gone to Division 1, were taken to a bowl the first year that we were fulltime Division 1. That, I think, is a result of good coaching. And we were blessed with some good players and the coach not only recruited well but he used the red shirting option very well, so that first year we were at Division 1 we were disproportionately powerful. And then they graduated and we were back, as they say, to rebuild it. But it has turned out to be quite a successful venture thus far. I'm told by those who know more about this than I that the Big East place in the bowl championship series is secure, which means that the revenues will be adequate to underwrite the activities, other things equal, and also that we will have access to a championship berth post season play each year. And of course, what caused me to agree to go into that Division 1 football initially, having been at two different places where we were at Division 1, one that never won anything and one that had a winning [unclear] preoccupation, Colorado and Alabama, respectively. I knew the ups and the downs of football but it was also the case that our then UConn athletic director advised me, and it turns out in retrospect he was right, that unless UConn had a football Division 1 team it would not be in a serious conference, because the conference would be unstable and, therefore, lose the ability to arrange the type of basketball schedules to which UConn fans have become accustomed. And it was not going to be on my watch that we lost the UConn magical basketball. So knock

on wood. It appears that we've weathered the storm and it's turned out much better than I feared. And it appears even that we have overtaken the Atlantic Coast Conference in some sports.

BS: At the time, you were somewhat perturbed about Boston College's behavior, I think, and particularly Miami's and the president there. Did this—how did this evolve? What happened over the past two years?

PA: There are so many new things each day to be perturbed about. [chuckles] The fact is that both of those presidents repeatedly lied to us. We were told that—by the former president and Donna Shalala, the new and current president, “We're in this with you. The Big East is stable. This is where we want to be.” And all the time, they were negotiating with the commissioner of the Atlantic Coast Conference. And Boston College, which had wanted to become part of the ACC, was not invited in the first round. And the president of Boston College was very upset about that, like a lover spurned. And he said to—three of us, Chancellor Mark Nordenberg of Pitt, President David Hardesty of West Virginia University and I went to his home in Chestnut Hill and we said specifically, “Can we depend on you or should we be seeking other partners?” And he said, “If they call, we will not go. If ACC calls, I won't even take their call.” Well, three weeks later they joined the ACC. So it was the fundamental dishonesty of it all that was the source of irritation. Alternatively, Charlie Steger hosted a meeting at the Virginia Tech location in Old Town, Alexandria where VPI has a continuing education center. And he said, “Guys, let me tell you. The governor of Virginia wants Virginia Tech to be in the same conference as the University of

Virginia. He has directed Casteen to vote to invite us. He said, “If we’re asked, I’m going to have to go. But, frankly, you are my friends. We’ve grown up with you and I prefer to stay with the Big East. But I’ve got to do what I’m told.” And we said, “You know, Charlie, —we all —operate in political environments and we appreciate your integrity, appreciate your honesty and candor.” They went to the ACC and he remains one of my closest friends to this day. It’s the president’s job to try to keep everything moving in the correct direction. When the governor of Virginia tells the president [chuckles] of one of the schools, “I want both of these together.” And the implied threat, of course, is there’s not going to be any state funding or whatever. You tend to listen.

BS: Okay. Now, you mentioned Charles Steger and let’s jump ahead to very current times. A week ago today there was the horrendous incident at VPI, Virginia Polytech. And you issued a statement here. What—well, from the perspective of a college university president, how do you see the situation and what kinds of thing at UConn will be done to try to prevent it? And how much does this go into the planning of things? Or is it so unusual that it doesn’t go into the planning of things initially?

PA: Well, unfortunately, what with Columbine and that terrible incident in Austin, Texas 40 years ago, 50 years ago.

BS: Right, the Charles Whitman—

PA: Yes, and then they used to seem like they were *sui generis* unique events. Unfortunately, now, it appears that these outrageous animalistic behavior models are not unique, whether it’s Columbine or

the World Trade Center or the Indian reservation out in the Dakotas
in—

BS: Wounded Knee?

PA: Yeah. And, well, I was—

BS: No?

PA: —thinking of the one where the religious cult, the FBI went in or
the—

BS: Oh, that was in Waco.

PA: Waco.

BS: In Waco, yes.

PA: Yes. That was different because it was a group of alleged whackos
and the federal government. But the one where the guy parked the
bomb in front of the Building in Oklahoma City. I mean, outrageous,
just unacceptable behavior, unfortunately, is occurring more and
more. What are we doing about it here? I am quite pleased with the
professionalism and behavior of local—our university police
department. They are fully accredited, which is more than just words.
Many big cities and towns do not have national accreditation for their
police departments. But we have. I've asked for them and then,
subsequently, the governor asked for a review of all colleges and
universities in the state with the State Police overseeing them. But we
have a group internal to the university that's reviewing our processes,
controls and procedures regarding what we would do, how we notify,
things as—as broad as—what standards must be met to close the
university, and who has the authority to make that decision and how is
it communicated? Down to do we stop relying on the Internet as our
principal platform for communicating and get to text messaging,

because kids all seem to have hand-helds of one type or the other. One part of us says, “Well, the thing to do is the university to make the decisions more efficient, to use the Internet,” and we just declare, “That’s the way”—or do you conform to your populations [unclear behavior? And I tend to think, other things equal, you conform to behavioral models of your population, if you really want to be efficient and effective. So we are going through that review. And even if nothing comes of it, I think it’s important to communicate that we are reviewing and updating to reassure the community that attention is being paid to this. But I must also say, every circumstance has a certain element of uniqueness. Before last Monday, if something had happened here over on East Campus, would we and the police made the determination that it was the result of a lover’s quarrel or something that seemed contained, and the police determined we didn’t have to close down the university, I probably would not have closed down the university. In retrospect, given that, you change as history changes the realities of your life going forward, I would probably ask the question two or three different ways. Are you sure we shouldn’t close down everything until you find the perp? It’s had an effect, but I have to say that, as outraged as all of us are, we’re not as outraged as I wish we were because this is starting to become commonplace.

BS: Have you been in touch with Charles Steger?

PA: I’ve sent him an e-mail expressing my sympathy and saying, “If you want to talk, call me. I know how overwhelmed you must be.”

BS: Okay. We—before we began taping, we started talking about Spring Weekend, which the 2007 version just ended. And this ties into

policing on campus and such. Could you talk about Spring Weekend in the past two years, since 2005, how it's evolved, what's being done and your view of it?

PA: Well, I think it goes without saying; I wish it didn't exist as a social phenomenon and that it apparently is even more outrageous at places like Penn State and others around the country. That it exists elsewhere gives me very little comfort. This is our situation and it's the one we have to deal with. That said, I think the police department, with the full and wonderful cooperation of the State Police, have learned how to oversee this thing. And that includes not just police force and police presence but the communications leading up to the three-day event. Our chief of police, Bob Hudd, has in the last several years issued a "jerk letter," as they call it. It's your right to enjoy your friends before final exams begin, a weekend with your friends. We encourage that. If you can legally consume alcohol, we understand that the responsible use of alcohol can add to the festive nature [chuckles] of the party. But if there's illegal consumption of alcohol and we find it, or if there's anything, any behaviors that call into question the safety of any one of our student body, faculty or staff or property, you're going to be busted and the full force of the law will be upon you. And the university will not be there to defend you. Period. And as I was saying before we started taping, the judiciary, local prosecutors over in Rockville and the State Police have taken this very seriously and understand that we want our kids protected and maybe look the other way if it's a modest infraction or simple behaviors of a yet-to-be-fully-mature child. But if they're thugs, whether they're our students or, increasingly, from off campus, non-

students, we don't want them here. Get them out of here. And the longer they stay in jail, the better. Again, this is not an excuse, but I'm told that of each of the three nights there were 20-something arrests and only four or five or six were UConn students.

Unfortunately, it's still billed as our party. So if bad things happen, it's our fault. But the behavior our student government and student leaders generally—the SUBOG people as well as SGA, have really been commendable. They've worked with us throughout the year. They've gotten the message out to other students. By and large, there are no minority kids there. This is a white boy situation, if you look at the tapes and those who are arrested. And I think in significant measure, it's because the cultural centers and the athletic department have said to their kids, you know, "If you get in trouble over there and you get busted and you get sent to jail, that's only the first of your problems. When you come back here you're going to be in real trouble, if you come back." And unfortunately, they come in from, in overwhelming numbers, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Upstate New York, even Long Island and Jersey. We draw heavily from those places for our undergraduates and they come here to see their friends. Alas, it is also the case that gang members from Hartford and Boston are here. And even Coast Guard and Navy personnel out of New London and Groton come up to have fun. But the word is out. Our students don't want it. We've manipulated and adjusted the types of performances and the times of performances so that the kids who really want to have fun and not get in trouble have legitimate options. As I say, the student leadership has been there. We've manipulated things like wristbands. This year, only UConn

students could have them so that non-students—the last couple of years we'd issue one, two or three or four to our students. They could give them to their guests. This year, it was manifestly obvious who was not a UConn student. [unclear].

BS: Have you ever considered to end it? You know, just to cold turkey or whatever?

PA: Yes. No one should have to have done the same thing in two different places. In Fort Collins, Colorado, Colorado State University, there was a similar event called College Days. And it too was—in the late '80s was getting increasingly uncontrollable. One Saturday morning, about two in the morning, a group of drunks, egged on by the presence of TV cameras and the TV trucks, spotlights, went crazy. There really was a town of Fort Collins and they broke a few plate glass windows in stores, which was enough of an outrageous event that it rose to the standard of just, "That's it. Over. I'm not even going to talk about it." Here the overwhelming number of students want to have a party. They want to behave themselves and have a party with their friends. And it's—that is an appropriate type of event. It's just the thugs who come in and change the nature of the event to be unacceptable. We have talked about closing it down but those who advise me on the non-police part of this—adolescent behaviors—but including the police, the Student Affairs and other friends of mine who do this type of thing, said, "This has taken such hold sociologically and psychologically, all you'd be doing is pushing it off campus. And then you'd have the added threat of drunken teenagers driving back to their dormitories rather than stumbling to

them.” And so it has been my conclusion that just going cold turkey is not a feasible option.

BS: Okay. You mentioned the town. Storrs has been famous for not having a town. But now, we’re involved in the Mansfield Downtown Partnership. Could you talk about that? How it evolved over time, how it seems to be going, where you see it going and the Town Gown relationship?

PA: Well, I’m told by many people who have been here a long time, including, significantly, Betsy Paterson, who’s currently our mayor and has apparently been around here for 40-some years, formerly over in Coventry and then here in elective office, I guess—she says that the—that the Town Gown, so-called, relationships are better now than they ever have been. And I think part of that is that we, as a university administration, have worked very hard to try to cause that to come to fruition. And it is also the case that Betsy herself has tried very hard to cause good relationships. And quite candidly, I think some of the local troublemakers, who were responsible for wanting to oppose everything the university did—they were very comfortable with the revenue that the university brought here and the job creations and all that. But now they’re inside the tent; keep everybody else out and don’t let a thing change. Well, you know, we have been blessed with a \$2.8 billion construction opportunity and that means change. Period. Over. The state’s taxpayers, through their elected representatives and elected leaders, have made the decision that the state university is going to be something different than it was. And that means change. And the local town Democratic Party [chuckles] that had three or four very difficult people on it has now changed.

And as I say, I credit Betsy. I credit Denise Merrill. I credit a lot of the local elected and business leaders, who finally have come to the understanding that the university [chuckles] is going to change no matter what. And this isn't just me. I'm out of here but I'll bet you that the momentum is going to continue, because people at the state level have spoken and the town leadership now understands it's to the mutual advantage of all.

BS: Well, who—who—what's the origin of the Mansfield Downtown Partnership? Who came up with the idea?

PA: Well, I'm told that for 40 or 50 years people have been talking about it, that it's not a new idea. But I guess eight or nine years ago, Scott Brohinsky, the director of Government Relations and Public Affairs, along with Dolan Evanovich, who's the director of Enrollment Management, began surveying—well, they surveyed a lot of different people at a lot of different times. But I said, "Why are people who we want here not coming? If they get to the point of applying, we admit them. What I'd like to do is get a survey sent to those who are very good students. We'd let them in but they decided to go elsewhere." And eight or nine years ago there were several reasons they didn't come. The buildings were awful, nothing to do on the weekends. Food—you know, all the tradition undergraduate stuff. "Didn't have the major that I wanted." And there's no town. The last three or four years, the only remaining significant objection; other than, "My family situation has changed. Finances are such and such. I had a sick parent. I want to be with my girlfriend in Boston," or—all of those things are things over which we have no control. But the one that was most often repeated was the lack of a town. So we spent

some time with Philip Lodewick, who was an alumnus, a very successful person. Both he and his wife have donated mightily in terms of time and personal resources. They underwrote the Lodewick Visitor's Center. He's been president of the UConn foundation. She's a member of the Alumni Board of Directors. One evening we were having dinner and he made a point regarding lack of a town. And I said, "Why don't you grab a hold of this and take it on?" And he did. [chuckles] To my surprise, he did. I have an assistant named Tom Callahan, who was in my office until recently. He moved over to Facilities and the administrative side of the house in the last several months. But he was responsible for community relations at the time. And he said, "You know, there's a pent-up appetite out there in terms of the elected leadership to do something like this. Everybody's a little concerned, candidly, about the Planning and Zoning Commission, which has a reputation for opposing many good things." But he said, "There have been some changes on that commission recently and I think it's going to require tenacity. It's going to require outside resources." I said, "The university can't pay for this. We can maybe contribute some land and our good offices to try to get it done, assuming the town is going to be cooperative and stick with it, under the leadership of a separate entity, which was chaired by Philip Lodewick. I was asked by Betsy and Tom Callahan and Phil Lodewick to go to the Planning and Zoning Commission within the last month and testify in favor of this. Everybody knew I was in favor of it because it got started in my office. But they said that little extra kick might make a difference. I don't know whether it did or not. But I have to admit. I went in there very skeptical. [chuckles] This

crowd had opposed similar proposals in prior years, opposed a whole lot of good things, in my view. Some of our antagonists on other construction projects spoke in favor of the town center proposal. As I understand their rules and processes, that was but the first salvo there's another public hearing sometime in the next couple weeks. And then they will take a vote. During this extended period, they can—any member of the public can submit testimony in favor or in opposition to. But that particular night, I'm told that there was unanimous support for the project. It's being underwritten—to the tune, I think, of 165, 170 million dollars by four outside entrepreneurs. The technical, architectural and planning and development work is being conducted by a group from Tuxedo Park, New York, called Leyland Associates, and they do this type of thing around the country, typically. They asked me, when this was just a dream and they came here to make a proposal, they said, "What's your vision?" "What I'd like is something that mimicked in an appropriate small town, Connecticut way, Amherst, Massachusetts or Princeton, New Jersey." And I think that's what they're giving us. And there is the very real possibility of up to 400 units, apartment units where retirees who want the intellectual stimulation and cultural stimulation of the university campus, would be in the back part of that development. Who can be opposed to this? I mean—

BS: [chuckles]

PA: Whether we ultimately produce a Frank Gehry structure right on 195 across from the E.O. Smith High School is yet to be determined. But there's going to be a performing arts facility by some prominent architect at that location, which would be a further draw that would,

architecturally, aesthetically, culturally and otherwise have our students and our visitors feel that it's just an extension of the university. So it's like the hotel. How can you have a place this big that doesn't have a hotel? Well, how did you get it? Then you called a developer and said, "We'll give you a 50-year lease. Use your own money and come in." He said, "Okay, thank you very much." We went through an RFP process so that it looked clean. But in retrospect, why wouldn't you have and so also with the town? You need one.

BS: And the community that would be built would be combining commercial, residential—well, what would be in there, essentially?

PA: Well, I don't think anyone knows at this point, precisely. Some talk about upscale, little yuppie shops. I certainly would think coffee houses, bookstores, maybe something like Husky Blues was intended to be where kids can go and, if it's legal, have a glass of wine and hear a performer. I still don't understand why you have to drive five miles to get a tank of gas or a grocery store. And I would hope that something like that could be located there. If, in fact, we get through this next iteration of the town and the university with the approval of Planning and Zoning and we get the state approval, which I believe will be forthcoming, then a separate entity, a development authority will be created. And the university and the town will forego its authority.

BS: Oh.

PA: And so this new entity will make decisions about what can or cannot be in there, within broad parameters. I doubt if we'll be opening a gas station yet, because the Planning and Zoning would never allow that

to be among the feasible options. When people put up \$170 million of their own money, they don't want a group of tree huggers [chuckles] having veto authority. They know what the limitations will be and they've made the decision that it's a business deal and they have to be able to make decisions that are consistent with local customs and mores and not violate traditions and values, but still get done. You can't spend three years studying whether or not you're going to have a hat shop.

BS: Right. Okay. [chuckles] The "Willimantic Chronicle" had an editorial a couple of weeks ago raising all sorts of questions about the place, you know, that people would be here in the summer and, you know, parking and traffic and—

PA: I found the thrust of that editorial to be consistent with the judgment and lack of wisdom that usually appears in that paper.

BS: [laughs]

PA: Usually, the "Willimantic Chronicle" and Edith Prague can be depended on to be wrong. [laughter]

BS: Now, you mentioned the Frank Gehry Building. That was a very exciting time when the competition was on. What's happened with that? What—what are the issues there?

PA: Well, in UConn 2000, the School of Fine Arts has been allocated \$30 million. And the general thought was that 10 million would go for some kind of renovation of Jorgensen, and 20 million would go to support the creation of replacement facilities, generally over where Fine Arts is now. The dean of Fine Arts is very entrepreneurial—which is why we had the NEA Grant, one of the few schools, and I

believe it was the last NEA Grant under that authority. It was the last competition.

BS: This is David Woods?

PA: David Woods, yes. Whereas most deans wanted nothing to do with the so-called Depot campus, he saw it as an opportunity and saw that funky space out there with the high ceilings and a lot of exposed brick and very good light—was exactly appropriate for fine arts—and nice parking, unlike over here on the main campus where parking is a challenge. He said, “Well, why not? Move puppetry and some of the Fine Art programs out there.” He did and took some of the pressure off his space needs here. The thought now is, if we do a performing arts facility of the type that’s envisioned, why would we redo the Jorgensen? And could the Jorgensen be put to other use? It requires—it’s—the Jorgensen has some structural challenges that have to be addressed. But it doesn’t have to be a performing arts theater. And so those questions are now being addressed and so-called Building and Grounds Committee is working with Dean Woods in trying to determine, for example, something as broad as, “Do we want to keep—we have to keep the Jorgensen, but does it have to be a performing arts facility?” Something as broad as that right down to, “What would happen to the Dramatic Arts Program—instructional programs and performances during a period when they are now located where the proposed Gehry Building would be? What do we do in terms of swing space and accommodating them for the two- or three-year construction time? That’s obviously going to be a set of decisions which I—I got the thing moving but I will not be making the decision. It’ll be long after I leave. Specifically, the question

about, “Are we going to have a Gehry Building?” Well, if we don’t do something with Jorgensen, presumably, the dean could say, “Well, I’d like to use 30 million to—you know, School of Fine Arts doesn’t need the Jorgensen anymore. I’d like to dedicate 30 million to”—it’s now a \$70 million Gehry—reduced Gehry project. But he’s going to have to raise money. But most often, he’s out talking to wealthy people, attempting to get their interest and having a naming opportunity and raise the other, roughly, \$40 million. He’s not been successful thus far.

BS: Yes. Why—the newspaper, some time ago, had a story that they—you know, just a few hundred thousand dollars had been raised or something like that, I think. Maybe I’m off but—

PA: No, I think you’re right. What he has—it’s the type of people who come to the Jorgensen still, which as I understand history, were the types of people who came in the dry years to the two basketball programs. They are loyal friends of the university but they’re not in a situation to make a million-dollar gift. Now, of course, what I told Lew Perkins a long time ago was that there would not be—we can’t take money away from academic to put it into athletics. And that was translated into his point system and a heavy philanthropic support system. You can’t have it both ways. But unfortunately, that means that a lot of the people who before would come and pay two bucks to see Rhode Island or New Hampshire beat the UConn Huskies, now they’re coming and they’re seeing Arizona and North Carolina get beat by the UConn Huskies. And what that implies, whether we like it or not, [chuckles] is \$25 tickets and seating in accordance with how much money you’ve donated. It’s an unfortunate reality of life. The

Jorgensen is still, in large measure, people who are loyal, cultural friends of the university. They want to consume those activities but they're in a position maybe to give 500 or a thousand dollars, not two and a half million. And that's a reality of life that David Woods has to deal with. He, however, also knows how to, for example, put together a deal with the Metropolitan Museum—or the Metropolitan Opera and other things like that. So he can satisfy the local people who, thank heavens, we have as friends. But he also knows how to deal at the upper reaches of wealth and culture. And what we're hoping is that he can interest some or many of people in that category to come in and underwrite this thing.

BS: Okay. The architectural—there was an article in the “Hartford Courant” a few weeks ago, maybe months, by Thor Thorson—by Rob Thorson about the Gehry Building and how he thought it was architecturally terrible or environmentally bad or whatever. Has there been much of that? I mean, is there support for that point of view or—

PA: Well, I happen to value Professor Thorson's writings. Most often, I'm in agreement with what he says. I think it's science based and it's just good, pragmatic—

BS: Right.

PA: —addressing of contemporary issues that's stated in a way that's persuasive and challenging and provocative. And yes, there are people who say that, dramatic as Frank Gehry's work is, and as much sizzle as he's had the last decade, that he's known for cost overruns and for leaky buildings, particularly Bilbao. Frank invited David Woods and John Martin and me out to his studios in Los Angeles. He

took us over to see the Disney in downtown L.A. And I'm not given to being overwhelmed by things cultural but it was a moving experience. The dramatic presentation of the exterior of that facility was something to behold.

PA: He took me down to center stage, and one of the other members of the visiting parties went to the least desirable seat in the house way up on top in the back. And he said, "Talk to Phil." And the guy started talking to me. We carried on a conversation. Phenomenal. I'd love to see UConn have something like that. As we get the Metropolitan Opera up here—you shouldn't have to go to the Berkshires and Tanglewood to have a destination point. And if we could get that type of facility with the School of Fine Arts, particularly, but far beyond the School of Fine Arts and then start having regional conferences, we could get another couple of hotels built here.

BS: Oh, is that so?

PA: My successor will be in a position to induce with long-term leases with hotels and other ventures. Joe and Sally Renzulli have their thing every summer, as do a number of others. When you have high school teachers—this is not a judgmental comment; it's a reality—because of the financing challenges, they'll stay in dormitories, even some not air-conditioned. But if you're going to bring in those who have federal grants and contracts and other things, they have expense accounts and they're going to set up their—their regional meetings and national meetings at places where there are options. And if we have that kind of divisional faculty groups here and alumni ventures and people from Hartford and New Haven that can support these things, why wouldn't you have a more robust and vibrant performance

activity in the summers? And I think Gary English and Judith Thorpe and Ken Fuchs, who's our new chair of music, are there under David's leadership, just waiting to respond to the demand. But we have to create the demand.

BS: Okay. You mentioned the hotel. How has that done? Has it met expectations or not?

PA: Well, not surprisingly, on the 10 or 15 weekends or periods during the year of high use, you can't get a room. And I don't know this for a fact right now but I'll bet—well, I know Commencement's fully subscribed. But I'll bet you next year's Convocation and Parents Weekend and all those are already overbooked.

[end of side 1, tape 1]

BS: Okay, go ahead. You were saying—

PA: It took the owner, who was a developer out of Long Island, and one of his investors, [chuckles] it turns out—

BS: Right.

PA: One of his investors is an old friend of mine who was chairman of the Marketing Department at Baruch College.

BS: Oh.

PA: But they went through a couple of hotel managers who didn't quite get the local flavor. And I think they expected, notwithstanding what was in the contract, that the Athletic Department, for example, would just be a constant demander of their services. And the Athletic Department, except for its basketball teams, does not have the resources to put up their teams or visiting teams in a hotel when

there's a \$30-dollar difference between what they charge here and what's charged over at that Days Inn in Vernon, or the one just down here in Willimantic next to the big Y. When those two places are willing to give our athletic teams a \$49.95 room and the Nathan Hale was \$89, that's 40 bucks times the number of rooms. And finally, they got to the point where they were saying, "Well, we'll meet the lowest price and then no one will have a better price." And so I think they're doing quite well. Until recently, they were doing very well indeed with the food. I haven't seen numbers recently.

BS: Okay. Now, you mentioned earlier, \$2.8 million worth of construction and, in your letter to the university on November 9th of 2005, you made a comment that the construction have made us a national university, but we made some mistakes. And of course, this whole issue of construction has become, well, a major point in newspapers and things for the past year and a half or whatever. Can you talk a little about this, what happened with the construction situation and your point of view on it?

PA: Sure. Well, mistakes were made. No question. In terms of how and why, I think there's not one common answer. In the case of the student union, it's not accurately described as a cost overrun. What happened was the project plan was prepared and the woman who was the project manager estimated net assignable square feet rather than gross assignable square feet. And so there was a \$15-million disparity. Had she made the right calculation at the outset, we would have taken that number to the board. The board would have approved it. You know, it would have been a non-issue. But the mistake was made. We took it back to the board and there was \$15 million more,

which would have been the initial number but now it's called an overrun. Well, go figure. The part that is just absolutely incomprehensible to me and is a source of irritation and embarrassment is our employees signing off or allowing, a process to be loose enough, that there would be a sign off in facilities that kids lived that had fire code violations. Now, what we quickly learned was that there were violations in the fire code but the students were not in danger. Indeed, the Commissioner of Public Safety, Len Boyle, to whom the state fire marshal reported, had a son who I believe lived in Hilltop. I called him and I said, "Can you tell me? Should we vacate those buildings?" And I said, "I'll go out and rent every vacant hotel room if these kids are in any danger." And he said, "No, they're not unsafe. There were technical violations of the code but my son is going to stay in there. The state fire marshal told me it's perfectly safe." And I certainly would not have allowed student occupancy in unsafe facilities. So that mistakes were made has never been disputed. We were upfront about that from day one.

PA: Thank God it was detected. Even though it gave rise to this line of other problems. Within an hour after we discovered the problems, the board of trustees, the governor's office and the state fire marshal knew about it. We tried to report it in a timely way. There was no attempt to hide. We, fortunately, had the services of Linda Flaherty-Goldsmith by that time, who knew that the checks and balances were not sufficient for what UConn had become. I changed the organization chart to accommodate her operation. We upgraded and made it a contemporary public [unclear] professional operation, something other than a mom and pop organization—

BS: She was chief operating officer?

PA: Chief operating officer and had had that kind of job at other universities and university systems where we worked together, but also in private sector enterprises. So she knew on the finance side that you did not have the same office that produced a request approving the request, something as elemental as that. Also with everything seemingly under the old organization chart that, frankly, was just put in place two years before I got here, which we've talked about in the past, [chuckles] apparently was constructed to accommodate the personalities of my predecessor, the then so-called chancellor, where everything was under the chancellor's office. And it was dysfunctional. Linda fixed that. And then our new governor, as she has demonstrated she does on every challenge—create a commission to study it and get headlines. And she put in—or her chief of staff put in in charge of that commission a former legislator from Storrs.

BS: Is that Jonathan Pelto?

PA: Jonathon Pelto, who was very upset with me because I terminated his contract with the University a few years before.

BS: Okay, I was going to ask you about—

PA: And he and Lorraine Aronson have hated each other for years. He was very upset with Ed Allenby because Ed Allenby hired Tom Callahan over him. And I'm told it goes back to the point that he believes his parents, who apparently both were professors here—

BS: Right.

PA: —were disrespected. And so—and then it is also the case that, since I have been here, I have said that the archangel of the University of Connecticut is Tom Ritter. He's done more for us than any next 20

people. And in recent years, I've called great attention and praise, and I mean it sincerely—Denise Merrill—now in a position of power, has helped us mightily. And he believes apparently that I'm disrespecting him because he takes credit for all that's good, that's been done.

BS: Yeah, why his appointment? Was it intentional on the part of the governor? I mean, did she know the enmity?

PA: I'm told by people who follow, the governor probably didn't have much to do with it. It was the chief of staff.

BS: Oh, chief of staff?

PA: And—

BS: That's Lisa Moody?

PA: Lisa Moody. And that she and others are quite envious of the university because, once again, Tom Ritter, in a move that in my view was almost as important as the money, released the university from bondage. The Department of Public Works, which gave us the library, the Natatorium, the library over at the law school, the Department of Administrative Affairs, the Department of Higher Education—all of these institutions, but primarily the Department of Public Works, were removed from the oversight control of UConn. We still are beholden to the legislature and to the Secretary of the Office—OPM, Office of Planning and Management, the State Budget Office. But by and large, the board of trustees now oversees this university. And they make the decisions; they set the direction. It's no longer a state bureaucracy. It's no longer a state agency, which is so important in terms of attitude and flexibility and moving on. And while in no way do I minimize the mistakes that were made in \$2.8 billion construction, maybe \$20 million. We don't even know that yet

because we're seeking recovery through the judicial system. And it may be a fraction of that. But when you consider what was—what would have gone on, we'd still be still be sitting here planning a new chemistry department, our south campus if we were working with the Department of Public Safety. Look at history. I hate to hit bumps in the road but it's certainly—a lot of it is inevitable. And when you encounter a difficulty or a challenge, you fix it and move on.

BS: Well—

PA: The head of the commission would not allow us to move on, just constant—he's angry.

BS: The—there were two individuals who were dismissed, I gather—at least two. Larry Schilling and Dale Dreyfus. What role did they play in all of this?

PA: Well, they oversaw the offices that—where the difficulties occurred. And I think legally I should be careful here—

BS: Yes, I understand.

PA: Because they—

BS: Well, this is confidential.

PA: They resigned but had they not resigned, they would have been in pretty bad shape.

BS: Were they or others aware of these violations when things were signed off? I mean, was it—I guess a way of asking this, was it a matter of intent or not intentional? Sloppiness or—

PA: Both of those people are very smart, Dreyfus having had a similar job at Yale, and Schilling having had a similar job many years ago at Columbia. These are not dumb people. They also are not laggards. They both worked very hard. I do not believe that Schilling is a

dishonest man. I believe neither of them would ever have pocketed a dime that belonged to the university. I believe they both worked hard and they were overworked. And in the case of Schilling, he suffered the ultimate problem of telling people above him administratively what he thought they wanted to hear, rather than telling them, “We’ve got a problem. I need more staff.” In the case of Dreyfus, I believe he was a control freak. He had to be the ultimate arbiter of everything. He didn’t want people questioning him. He used to refer to himself, I’m told, as the mayor of UConn. [chuckles]

BS: [chuckles] The mayor.

PA: And it is also the case during that period, and here’s Kevin Sullivan, who likes to be known as a strong supporter of UConn, had this concept of administrative caps. That is, you could only spend x percent amount of dollars on administration in your block grant budget. Well, you’ve got \$2.8 billion to spend and you’re going to be stuck here under state rules with the same people who were here for 25 years when the state wasn’t investing anything. They had no experience. I mean, that leads to untoward results. And we had a bias during those years when students were increasing in such large numbers, and we had the early retirement program where we produced the arithmetic result of moving from a 15 to 1 student/faculty ratio to 17.5 to 1 student faculty ratio. And so virtually every discretionary buck we put into new faculty. That part is good; unfortunately, at the expense of putting more people in facilities and so on, which may have—now, here I’m speculating—which may have given rise to people who were spread too thin. No matter how hard they worked, no matter how smart they worked, just

couldn't do all those jobs. So we now have, at least until the end of 2016—we've doubled the inspection staff. And this place is tight as a drum right now. We probably are spending way too much to assure that we're crossing every t and dotting every i. But I don't think the university really has a political option. We have to be accountable and project that image. I'm told by Aronson, our CFO—the last three years were the best operating budget years in the last 21. So what the "Hartford Courant" and Jonathan Pelto are doing seem to have no effect on what the elected leaders are doing in terms of operating budget and confidence in UConn. And we had 22,000 applicants for 3,250 positions, undergraduate Storrs based positions. You know, I'm irritated and I'm embarrassed by what happened but life goes on, you know, and the rest of the world seems to understand that, except the investigative reporters and the "Hartford Courant." If not UConn. It's the Supreme Court, the State Police, the Children's Medical Center. It's a destructive investigative reporting mentality that cannot celebrate success; they'd rather find crooks. Fortunately, they didn't find a crook.

BS: [chuckles] But that, they have not said. And that's—well, in a sense, the whole Harry Truman notion of "the buck stops here." Whatever happened, you had a lot of the, I guess, blame or, at least, in the newspapers, the blame. How did you feel about this, the fairness of it? And were you given an opportunity to show that perhaps you were not [chuckles] the man involved and in—

PA: Well, but you know it is true. The buck does stop here and most often, in places big and complex as this, the person on top really didn't have—you know, we talk about Steger down an Virginia Tech.

BS: Yes.

PA: He's being blamed for not locking down the university. Well, what the hell? I mean, he's got a police department. You have advisors and you listen to them. And what happened here was ultimately my responsibility, but I wasn't out checking fire permits and all of that. It was that I allowed Dreyfus and Schilling and company to operate out there and had confidence in them. My only explanation is that a year or two before I knew something was wrong and I brought Linda here, got the board to change the organization structure. And when we discovered this, Linda was already changing the organization structure. That doesn't mean that this didn't happen on my watch and, therefore, ultimately someone's responsible. The "Hartford Courant" hammered us and the trustees in their news reporting, but I've been very gratified that the "Hartford Courant," the "Journal Inquirer," the "New London Day," the "New Haven Register" editorially have been—

BS: The "Journal Inquirer" did—Keith Burris did a story about you two weeks ago.

PA: Yes.

BS: Which was unbelievably favorable, I mean [chuckles]—

PA: A little over the top.

BS: Yes—

PA: And Morgan McGinley at the "New London Day" had a similar one. And I think Daryl Perch from out here writes the "Courant" stuff.

BS: Right.

PA: And, you know, they've all been quite wonderful and you just wish you could add things up and divide by two, the good and the bad, and

get somewhere in the middle. [chuckles] It is the case that—the only paper that’s really run with this story over time is the Courant. The rest of them reported it and it was a one-day thing and it was over. It was the “Hartford Courant.” And a guy named Altimari, who was fed all of this stuff by Pelto day in and day out. And now, he’s on this thing, we should be using UConn 2000 monies to rectify the deficiencies. There’s a state statute that says we cannot do that. We sent that to the governor. We put it out. He doesn’t stop talking. Truth is not very important to him.

BS: Have you been in contact with Pelto at all directly?

PA: It would serve no purpose. I testified one day in front of that commission and Linda and Laurie, Tom Callahan and others went back repeatedly. You could tell when a person is not seeking the truth; the person is on an agenda or following an agenda.

BS: How much was this construction business part of your decision to step down?

PA: None. In fact, the board asked me to re-up for another five years. And I said, “You know, there’s a reason that the average in these jobs is about four and a half to five years, and I will have completed 11. And I have a lot of other options that have been presented to me. The last year or so I’ve been president of the New England accrediting group, New England Association of Schools and Colleges. And they have—they invited me to chair or to oversee an initiative in Asia starting with Vietnam, Thailand and Indonesia. Since 9/11 there’s been a reluctance on wealthy people’s parts around the world to send their children out of country for post secondary education, unlike pre-9/11. If you go to the Middle East or large parts of Asia, wealthy

families' children have a western European and North American degree for a reason. Well, the second best thing would be to have the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval, which is one of the independent accrediting groups. And so the people at NEASC have asked if I'd like to get involved in that. As the president, I can't take blocks of time off. And I've been asked to be on a couple private sector boards of directors. The NCAA has asked me to remain involved but—that's not me. I've enjoyed very much my experience there. And then, we apparently had 70, thereabouts, professors in law pharmacy, nursing, community medicine, agriculture and business, who have an interest in public policy specifically health policy. A long time ago, when I taught at George Washington, I was director of a Ph.D. program in public policy. Bob McCarthy, our dean of pharmacy, was aware of that and the deans had me for lunch a few days after I announced in December that I would be stepping down. He said, "Why don't you move your appointment from economics to pharmacy"—[chuckles] "and oversee this, coordinate this effort?" So he sent three of his professors, who had public policy and economics training, and they worked on health policy. I don't want to create an institute and I sure don't want to run anything, but it would be great fun to spend a couple of years producing an internally cohesive and consistent research agenda that could draw from faculty from different parts of the university and maybe even get some degree programs for which there would be a demand in health policy. And you can't do that if you're the president, so I probably will be working as hard as I was but it'll be my own work, not the rote, repetitive commencement in the spring convocation in the fall and all the others in between.

BS: [chuckles] You'll be taking a year off, I gather?

PA: Yes.

BS: What will you be doing in that year?

PA: Well, if I do the public policy, of course, I'm legitimately going to be reviewing literature. And I've asked some of the political science guys here to help me develop an up-to-date bibliography that I can start reading and reviewing. I've asked Dr. Rowe, the chairman of our board, who does know health policy because of his unique background—to suggest things I might start reading and reviewing. So I'm going to do what you're supposed to do on sabbatical.

BS: [chuckles] Okay. Now, going back to construction for a minute. There are two things that were constructed recently, the Burton Football Complex and the Shenkman Training Center. Can you talk about that in terms of why they were constructed? And do they relate at all to the new desire to have a basketball training center or whatever you call it?

PA: Well, everything's related, certainly. And an upgrade gives rise to insatiable appetites for more upgrades elsewhere. And certainly, the basketball coaches see what's happening around the country and they see that they had the successes here. And all of a sudden football gets this because you need an indoor practice facility if you're going to compete at the level we do. And they can make the case that Rutgers and Syracuse and Pittsburgh, West Virginia all have their indoor facilities. And one answer could be, "Well, they have it and we don't. Go out and practice in the snow." And then the question is, "Well, if that's going to be the case, what does that do to your recruiting, your fitness and, therefore, your competitive position?" And the bottom

line is if you decided to go to this level of competition, do you provide the wherewithal to be successful? There's a circuitous inevitability to this whole thing. It was built because the decision was made by athletics that this is the only way you could compete at Division 1 in contemporary times. And they're named Shenkman and Burton because each of those guys gave two and a half million bucks. And I think the athletic administration staff raised another 17. And the total price, I believe, was in the high 30 millions. And now there's talk about the basketball facility. That gives rise to the inevitable, "Well, why don't we just put that money into academics?" And the answer is because that's not the tradeoff. That's not the way Jim Amann, who is now speaker of the house, structures his agenda. These are capital monies, not operating monies, and the speaker is enamored of UConn athletics, which is reality of life over which I have no control.

BS: [chuckles] Okay. On research, stem cell research has gotten a lot of attention here. Could you talk about the origins of that, what—and what has been happening and such?

PA: The origins of our capacity to compete, of course, go way back, preceding my arrival. But the one step that we took since my arrival was to retain the group that Jerry Yang had put together and to enhance it. And I think maybe eight or nine years ago Yang was recruited by Rutgers and offered \$20 million and 10 faculty positions to set up a center for regenerative biology. And we countered because Jerry had had much success here, attracted much outside money. And his group was attracting students and producing very good research. So we offered him, I think, four faculty positions in addition to what he already had, which allowed him to recruit Ted Rasmussen and

David Goldhammer, both of whom I'm told are of the stature in biology that Jerry and several of our other people here are. And there's a good deal of faculty expertise in PNB and MCB. And that's not even getting to the group over at the health center. And one indication of their competitive ability, Yale—you know, Yale doesn't have much of a business school. It doesn't have much of an engineering school but it's still one of the best universities in the world. And one of the things that drives that is its medical complex and basic science complex. They're superior. And so it's a source [chuckles] of enormous satisfaction to me that our faculty, in competing for the first \$20 million, got 60 percent of the support.

BS: Twenty—you wanted \$20 million of—

PA: Of the state—

BS: State.

PA: The State of Connecticut appropriated, or authorized the funding over a 10-year period of \$100 million. And they spent the first year planning. So the second year of that ten year program has had \$20 million to distribute. And with the exception of a woman at Wesleyan, who I think got \$400,000 to support her work, which was done, I believe, in collaboration with one of our people out here, the entire other \$20 million—60 percent of it went to projects overseen by UConn faculty and 40 percent by Yale, which is quite a testimony to the quality of our faculty.

BS: And in terms of the medical school now and the health center, how does that relate to what's going on with the research?

PA: I'm pleased for its intrinsic merit as to what's happening in stem cell research and providing an outlook for our faculty in those areas to do

the research and their teaching and so on. But it is also the case, I've been trying very hard for 10 years to cause this place to think like a university, to move to an interdepartmental approach to problems, including our five biology departments, three here on this campus, the Marine Sciences at Avery Point, and 200 of them over at the health center. I mean, our National Research Council ratings, but if we just reported now rather than ten years ago, we'd be much more respected than we are. And we'd be respected as we should be as a faculty. There's an interesting dichotomy between the State of Connecticut's view of stem cell research and the Bush view of stem cell research. The federal policy right now prohibits the conducting of any stem cell research in buildings in which there's a dollar of federal money, and therefore, construction or the purchase of instrumentation. None of the buildings out here meet that standard. So we have recently bought needed research space (in addition to the stem cell work) across Route 4, Farmington Avenue, the so-called Pharm Tech Building, which was constructed for a private sector firm to do animal testing. That building is constructed in such a way that we can isolate, I think, 25,000 square feet exclusively for stem cell research and it will meet the federal standards. The program and facility will be chaired by a guy named Mark Lalan, who has the equivalent position of Greg Anderson at the Storrs based program. The two of them, along with Deckers and Nichols and several other scientists, constitute an internal committee that will review for scientific appropriateness our proposals. Also, a so-called ESCRO Committee, chaired by Ann Hiskes in philosophy, will review, for bioethical considerations, all proposals. So I think we have a series of built-in checks and balances

that will cause us to retain both scientific integrity and bioethical integrity in this whole area. I'm not [chuckles] a scientist, but everything I've read, everything I've been told, that we're a long way from having cures for Alzheimer's and Parkinson's and diabetes and so on, but that the science is sound and, with a little luck, we will have clinical answers to those conditions.

BS: Now, with respect to stem cell research, apparently Jerry Yang didn't get financing.

PA: That's right.

BS: Was this a surprise to the administration? And what transpired? Do you know what transpired?

PA: I don't know what transpired, really. Jerry had a couple of big proposals. They funded two core facilities at the five million level, fund one for Yale and one for UConn, and then a bunch of smaller ones. Jerry's a friend of mine and I respect him mightily. He's brought great positive attention to the university. So I'm not being critical. I'm reporting here that there was a certain independence, that there was talk that both Yale and UConn would get so-called core funding. And Jerry maybe thought, because of his reputation, he could get his own core, very high level. And the committee just was not disposed to do that. Then there's also the fact that, apparently, Commissioner Galvin, Bob Galvin, did not think there was a conflict of interest. Jerry was on that committee, the selection committee. [chuckles] He recused himself for his own proposal. It was just very complicated. But he's—he has funding from other sources and his work in his laboratories continue.

PA: Goldhammer and Rassmussen both had substantial funding, so that the fact is that—the group, Regenerative Biology Group has substantial funding.

BS: Okay. Now, you mentioned Deckers. There's a whole issue going on with respect to the Health Center building a new hospital. Can you talk a little about the origins of this? What—what's happened with the Health Center? A few years ago it had a debt or deficit, which then was fixed and things looked pretty good for a while. And then, apparently there's a new deficit.

BS: Yes. And there's the whole issue of building a new hospital. So could you talk to that?

PA: Yes. The Health Center is only 35. How do other academic health centers around the country accommodate the financial challenges? The problem is occurring at many major health centers. The bigger and the more research-oriented, the worse, because given our reimbursement rates, for every dollar of research we do, we lose 25 cents. [chuckles] Requires a quarter of operating funds from other sources. But six years ago, we did—the model of funding the Medical School and the Dental School were flawed. From day one, they were inadequate, the state resources going in to support it. We had the problem six years ago, seven years ago now. And we fixed it. The state gave us 20 million bucks and they said, "Take another 20 out of your bottom line in terms of costs." In terms of revenue enhancements and cost reductions, we had saved about \$75 million in that seven-year period. We're now saying, "Look, for the last six—for the last five years, the profitability of the hospital has been used to plug the gap resulting from inadequate funding by the state, which

means that we did not have that money, so-called profit, excess of revenues over costs to put into contingency funds, to put into maintenance, to put into constant upgrading of the physical plant. Places like Penn and Harvard and Yale have their bazillion-dollar endowments. And when they have these deficits, they plug it with their endowment money. We don't have that flexibility. So we requested the \$20 million adjustment, permanent adjustment over two years, and I think we're going to get it. We are required, even though the hospital has a firewall around it—research and education will use the state money—no state money goes into the hospital. The clinical activities are kept separate. We are required, however, to, under SEABAC, the statewide union bargaining organization, to pay the same fringe benefits of any other state employees, which in the current year, we are paying, I think it's 42 percent, the other hospitals with which we compete, pay something like 29, which has produced this current year a 10 and a half-million dollar differential. If we were paying the same fringe as our competitors, we would have had a 10 and a half-million dollar less problem. I think the state is going to address that as well. In the case of the hospital, we've had some consultants in. Nobody disputes that we need substantially upgraded space. Nothing has been done there, for the reasons I just mentioned, for 35 years. The operating suites are too small. The rooms are doubled and I'm told that the room size for doubles is still less square footage than some of the singles at St. Francis and Hartford. But still, people come to us. Ironically and paradoxically, in this condition, [chuckles] they've still received the top 100 Solucent Award and one of 15 only academic health centers to receive the award. There's

wonderful health care being delivered. It can't go on much longer.

The operating principle of these other three hospitals, Hartford St.

Francis and New Britain General, which is now called something else.

BS: Central Connecticut, I think.

PA: Their principle is that one additional bed at John Dempsey be the end of western civilization as we know it. You know, it's just stupid. But those places have power. The archbishop has power. Hartford Hospital has the blue bloods. They have power. And a lot of important, powerful people in the legislature from New Britain and elsewhere listen to their constituents, so the political process has slowed us down in terms of a new hospital. Our outside consultants have advised it would be much more efficient to build a new hospital and convert the old hospital to research space rather than try to renovate the old hospital. Of the second 1.3 billion, 300 million was set aside for either the hospital, or included a new research tower. What we included in our legislature proposal was to use \$45 or \$50 million of that \$300 million for a new hospital and to raise \$50 million from private philanthropy and to issue \$400 million in debt, for which we would be responsible in clinical revenues to service that debt. But we scared the heck out of our competitors and so we're going to study it for a year during which time [chuckles] we will be lobbying.

BS: [chuckles]

PA: And I have been asked if I would stay around and spend part of next year lobbying for that, since I've been in the middle of it. And I said, "You know, that's not fair to my successor. I should get out of Dodge, let my successor come in and create a network of people,

create a power base and, if he or she asks me to come back, I will come back as a favor to my successor. But I'm not going to be looking over anybody's shoulder." God deliver me from coming back to lobby. [laughter] It's one of the reasons I've had enough.

BS: Okay. We mentioned—let's see, you mentioned Peter Nichols being on the committee. He has been provost now for two years, I guess.

PA: Or—I think it's two or three.

BS: Two or three?

PA: He may be entering his third year.

BS: Yes. And I wanted to find out how that has developed and, particularly, the restructuring that went on within the university here at Storrs, how that was dealt with and what happened as a consequence.

PA: I think he's super. I feel so lucky to have him. Frankly, I wish I had inherited him or knew of him and got him here much earlier. He's intellectually completely honest. He's experienced. He has that British reserve. He's so civilized that people, I think, confuse it with weakness. But [chuckles] Family Studies and Allied Health are no longer confusing it, I think, with weakness. I suggested to him when he arrived here what a former trustee, Louise Berry, suggested to me when I arrived here, and that is there are too many schools. I remember she said, "You've got to work on this. You've got schools with deans and all of the apparatus that surround deans that are smaller than many departments." And, it's inefficient budgetarily but it also gives rise to confusing signals and silliness in terms of appointing committees. The dean of Liberal Arts and Science has 50 percent of the action. Now, we exacerbated that by putting the former

Family Studies CLAS. We're now at that point where on Buildings and Grounds, for example, Ross [Mackinnon] has to be on that committee as a perpetual member. We're rotating the deans of the professional schools.

[end of side 2, tape 1]

BS: Okay, you were saying?

PA: I think the attempt for an apparent merger probably exacerbated the problem and created more bureaucracy than even before as they were four freestanding schools and colleges. The deans of the schools were upset and so Maryanski, who had a part with Peterson in creating that thing, blew it up when he was running for provost position, quite candidly. And Peter, with the advice of people in his office, decided to go part of the way but to make it permanent. And I think that was probably the right thing. There isn't a right way and a wrong way. I mean, you can make the case for several different organizational structures. He was criticized, not so much on the substance but on the process or lack thereof, prior consultation. And of course, that too is subjective and judgmental. The question is, when you've been talking about this for 15 years and you've tried several different things from day one that the deans of the different places are going to be in opposition and will get the faculty and the alumni riled up. When I realized I how serious he was, I invited in the AAUP and the UCPEA unions and the Senate Executive Committee and talked about it. But I was candid with them. I said, "You know, what I'm doing here is a courtesy to demonstrate that we should be talking to you but we're not

consulting, because he's already made the decision and talked to the board." And even some of those people said, "Well, you know, given where we are, more process is better than less process." And that's true in any academic institution. But even they said, "Well, you know, Charlie Super and those guys would have been out trying to kill the thing," as he tried to do from the grave. So it's—it's—Jack Rowe, the chairman of the board, said to Peter at a public board meeting, "It's a learning experience. "You did the right thing. Maybe you did it in the wrong way. So let's all learn from this and move on."

BS: So what effect has it had since that has occurred?

PA: I think it's still too soon to tell. The Kinesiology and Physical Therapy people won—ended up in the School of Education. Allied Health was split up and part of the School of Education, part in Nutrition over in Agriculture. Family Studies is a freestanding department within the School of Liberal Arts and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

BS: And, let's see. I have it here someplace. Well, those are the two schools that got—

PA: Three of them, though.

BS: Family Studies—

PA: Allied Health.

BS: Allied Health was divided into two parts.

PA: That's it.

BS: Yes, yes. And one part went to the Neag School, and one to the Ag School, the—

PA: Yes, Nutrition.

BS: But the influence—the effect on the provost, did this sort of register with him in terms of operations in the future, or subsequent to those operations?

PA: I think so. He was provost at Colorado State and he was dean of Liberal Arts at Kansas State. He knows about shared governance. I think what his staff persuaded him of, and they probably were right, that this is something that's been tried, attempted three or four times over the last 15 years. And each time, the cost of doing it was so great that people backed off. And then this aberrant merging of four schools but not really changing anything was silly. I invited him when he came here to look at maybe 10 transcendent issues, this being one of them. And he just decided to fix it. [laughs] I think Suman [Singha] and Veronica [Makowsky] and he got into a dark room one night and said, "This is it." Let's go.

BS: [laughs] Okay. Let's see. How about animal research, particularly the situation with the research on monkeys and such? But generally, UConn has had some checkered problems with animal research.

PA: The University has changed in recent years with respect to research. Ten years ago every principal investigator could get a closet close to his or her laboratory or office and have a colony of rabbits or mice or whatever. And we got zinged by the USDA. And part of it was—well, the word arrogant was used, that UConn just didn't pay any attention. There was no response from UConn after having been written up by the USDA. And that's when we made the decision. We had an emergency. We had to fix it overnight and we set aside \$20 million out of UConn 2000 to build an animal facility in the basement of the Biophysics Building. And I'm told now that we have one of the

best in the country. We're within shooting distance of having AALAC accreditation, which is the highest. The Health Centers had that for quite some time. Now, that's one thing and I don't think—I haven't heard anything about Storrs-based animal programs, animal research in five or six years. In the case of the four rhesus monkeys at the Health Center, we had a kid out here working on a master's degree in sociology and—

BS: Justin Goodman?

PA: Justin Goodman. You know, he's a sweet kid. He came in to see me. Medical schools are just different. You know, they don't have the humanists and philosophers and the historians and the English faculty—not—don't even have to get to anthropology where they huff and puff a little bit. The case of the medical school, the doctors tend [chuckles] to just say, "Go talk to the dean. Fix it. Just pay me and leave me alone." And Deckers follows that model pretty closely. And so when Goodman tried to see him the answer was, "I'm busy. I've got my faculty to support, and get out of here, kid." So of course, he came to me. And I talked to him once, he was very respectful, very articulate and, I believe, sincerely concerned. And I said, "What you have to understand is you and PETA on one side of this issue. And you say you can solve all of these medical conditions through computer software. But I'm listening to the NIH and scientists, and you're a sociologist. You don't know any more than I do. And I have to rely on experts who make these judgments. And medical faculty throughout the country and throughout the world say that these experiments are the only way in which we can advance knowledge, that may or may not have relevance to clinical outcomes 20 years

from now. But there's a review process at the NIH, at the Food and Drug Administration, Center for Disease Control. The Academies of Sciences have review panels and they approve protocols. They recommend funding and the government makes the decision. These experiments are going to be done. And I'm going to support our faculty if they're in existence to get them. Period." What I didn't tell Goodman was that Skip Lowe (Storrs based Psychology Department Head), again, had a faculty member who wanted to do primate research here in psychology. And I said, "We just can't do that. You know, that takes it to a level with non-human primates that's just too troublesome for me. It's different when you have four in existence and you've run pretty close to academic freedom violations if a fully tenured, full professor was successful in acquiring support from the NIH, from peer after peer review. Our own internal faculty review committee gave it its stamp of approval. I'm not going to tell him to stop. But I did tell Peter that once—part of the protocol was to euthanize the monkeys after the experiments were done to do the pathology on the central nervous system, the brain and the eye and so on. We got down to one monkey left that had not had any experiments performed on it. And it turns out that, with all the pressure this professor and the veterinarian internally engaged in an activity, an experiment, or medicine that was not in accordance with the very precise protocol requirements, and so Peter just said, "That's it." He violated the protocol. It's not because the sociologist but it's because our own PI violated the protocol. You can't start the experiment on the monkey. And that monkey was shipped, I think, to Mississippi to some kind of facility. To me, it was very

straightforward. It's an academic freedom. He did follow the protocol. When he violated the protocol, shut him down. And that's what we did. And the Goodman kid unleashed PETA on us, so during the high point of that I was getting [chuckles] 50, 60 e-mails a day from Great Britain and Australia, Indonesia—

BS: Oh, PETA, the P-E-T-A.

PA: PETA, yes.

BS: Yes.

PA: People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals.

BS: I see.

PA: But you tell me why I should worry about what somebody in Great Britain thinks about me or you. [chuckles] I'm worried about State of Connecticut politicians.

BS: Okay. It's just about noon. I don't know if—

PA: I have to run. Thank you.

End of Interview

Interview with Philip Austin by Bruce Stave for the University of Connecticut Center for Oral History, April 30, 2007

STAVE: Let's begin by discussing some of the environmental issues that arose in recent years.

AUSTIN: There were a series of issues where some local people who opposed any significant change were provided some issues because of mistakes that the university made that included something as simple as hazardous waste pits that were created maybe 30 or 40 years ago and in compliance with those then regulations and statutes and laws, but now were out of compliance with the new, more rigorous regulations now in effect. The university was obligated to bring those pits up to current standards. And for a variety of reasons, the university did not comply with consent decrees, including changes in plans that arose from the subsequent enactment of the UConn 2000 program that caused, rather than a covered berm on one pit, to cover it with a parking lot. And until that situation was resolved, no action was taken and some of the local activists found that a cause for demonstration. Another issue was the much discussed hilltop apartments where the administration, as represented by Larry Schilling, Dale Dreyfus and Vicki Triponey, provided a public hearing for the community with a certain set of graphs and materials that did not contain a so-called detention pond. Engineers did subsequent work in the ensuing weeks and months and determined that there was a need, because they had added yet another building so there became a necessity to construct a detention pond. And that resulted in tearing down more trees than was contemplated when the

initial briefing was made, and that caused some of the neighbors to accuse the university of intentionally misleading, which was not the case, but what was represented at that meeting was not what ultimately happened. The Fenton River issue, I'm told, resulted from a "hundred-year drought." And it was exacerbated by the fact that the water tubes that allowed us to draw water from the Willimantic River were compromised. Because of the inadequacy of the Willimantic tubes, we've had to use the Fenton for the University water supply. Now, the question is, was the university responsible? And all I can say is that when you have 20,000 students and faculty and staff returning to eat, take showers and use the toilet facilities either you close the place down or you take a chance and pray for rain. A measure of what issues the Commissioner of Environmental Protection thought about this was she asked that we agree to restock some trout in the Fenton River, that she understood that this was not intentional, it was not devious, that we had reported it to her agency. So there were a series of things that, as I mentioned to you the last time, I think were acts of God. There's no other way to say it. The inadequacies of the pipe from the Willimantic River was inadequate – arose from inadequate investment by the State of Connecticut and the infrastructure of this university. And when we got hit with a dry summer we did not have the infrastructure and enough redundancy in our systems to serve our population. That has now been corrected. And again, the staffing patterns, as I mentioned the last time, were very much mom and pop. There had been 30 years with virtually no state infrastructure support. All of a sudden, we have this wonderful \$2.8 billion thrust upon us, and we had to build up personnel and

organizational infrastructure, change the organizational structure to do that to oversee investment appropriately. And we made mistakes. But in the case of the Fenton River, it's one that I don't know what else could have been done, in retrospect.

BS: Okay, with respect to the environment, there's a new emphasis on LEED. What's happening with that?

PA: The administration has recommended to the trustees that will be the exception when we do not seek LEED certification, which means that buildings will be environmentally sensitive, will be energy efficient. And ultimately, a few more upfront construction dollars result in operating efficiencies that more than compensate for the additional upfront investment. We have received much favorable press with the new Burton-Shenkman Indoor Practice Facility, which is LEED certified. We have, for some time, been constructing to LEED standards. The expensive part, as I'm told by the people who do these things, of receiving LEED certification, is in the personnel costs, outside consultants, getting the users, the so-called owners of the facility to buy in, to become part of the venture. And those who are activists in the LEEDs movement say that it's that sociology that gets people to buy in and be concerned about efficiency that is very expensive. But it's that change in behavior that's as important as the more efficient buildings. What the trustees and I have said that it's a policy of the university, we will always be LEEDs compliant in terms of the efficiency of the buildings and the materials used in the buildings and sensitivity to the environment and the efficiency of use. There may be a case where it's just too expensive to go through the whole process but it will be the exception when we don't.

BS: And so—and this is a new policy for the institution?

PA: Well, it has been a practice for some time and the board formally adopted it a couple years ago.

BS: Another topic, you dealt with the issue of the sweatshop campaign. Can you talk a little bit about that?

PA: There were issues regarding our contract with Coke and there was Justice for Janitors. And those were the three issues over the last decade.

BS: The contract with Coca-Cola?

PA: Coca-Cola.

BS: Okay.

PA: And what was clear is that in each case it was a national movement and driven in a couple of cases by the AFL-CIO out in Washington. The fact is that we have long been a signatory to Collegiate Licensing—CLC; I forget what the name stands for, but two groups that are at the forefront of what I would call responsible behavior in procuring paraphernalia, mostly sports related. And of course, we are in the crosshairs with UCLA and Michigan and North Carolina and Duke and Notre Dame and Georgetown because of our athletic successes and the name recognition, brand recognition. And therefore, much national attention was dedicated to this and we have a philosophy professor who's into student activism.

BS: Who is that?

PA: Luyster.

BS: Luyster, okay.

PA: And so many of -- many of these students leave his classes and go to the Student Center or to Gully Hall or wherever and make demands.

And most often, their demands have been university policy for the last five years, but that says, “Don’t confuse me with the facts.” I believe that the University of Connecticut continues, along with Notre Dame and Georgetown, Chapel Hill, UCLA—continues to be among those institutions of high visibility, high academic quality and great athletic success as being responsible leaders on this issue. People can scream all you want about exploitation in Asia—there also are cases in Upstate New York, an hour from here, making baseball caps with illegal immigrants [unclear]. This holier than thou, “I have a monopoly on compassion and concern for people.” It doesn’t stand the test of analysis but makes people feel good. And then the ultimate analysis, I think we were able to demonstrate that the University of Connecticut always could and continues to be able to hold its head high, that we are attempting to do things the right way. We are attempting to cause school spirit to soar among our current students and faculty and staff and alumni. And with the purchase of paraphernalia, which I don’t fully understand psychologically, but that’s a part of the esprit de corp and my belief has always been, and I think Bill Simpson and the co-op agrees that it’s much easier to be a responsible corporate citizen, to do things in a way consistent with integrity and compassion and add another buck on the sales price. And it’s not going to diminish demand. The demand for that type of paraphernalia is highly inelastic and can add another buck and hold your head high. Now, that has been our policy and I don’t think the facts are in dispute.

BS: The co-op, I think, set up a no-sweat zone or something like that. Do you think that made much impact? I mean—

PA: Yes, I think it made some people feel good but our policy is that, through this CLC—there's another organization too. I don't remember it right now. Their policy is to disenfranchise corporations offshore that are found to not be in compliance with some rigorous but enforceable standards. The problem, of course, is that—I didn't realize this when we got into discussion of this issue, but the whole collegiate market to places like Nike and Reebok and other places is so miniscule that, you know, the professional sports and other business parts, and it's less than five percent, less than 10 percent—

BS: Is that so?

PA: It's a small fraction so it's—when [chuckles] these kids wanted the University of Connecticut to say we were going to take a walk, well, who would know? If all of higher education took a walk it would not have a measurable impact on the profitability of some of these corporations. It's important when you're exercising moral judgments and taking great stands to understand not just what makes you feel good, but what the impact is going to be.

BS: Okay. What about divestment—the recent thing in Sudan, how has that evolved and—

PA: Well, the State of Connecticut had a policy. Therefore, the university had a policy of disinvestment in Darfur and Sudan long before the students became involved in this. The 501 C3 UConn Foundation had not addressed specifically Darfur but had policy language to the effect that companies and countries that engage in inappropriate and inhumane behavior should be avoided by our investment managers. A group of students went to the UConn Foundation board meeting in New York and made a very, very effective presentation. They were

articulate. They were sincere. They were compelling and persuasive and the foundation board added more forceful language directing its fund managers to stay away from Darfur as an investment target. So I think the foundation had responsible positions before, and because the students went about this in the right way, they became even more forceful and precise.

BS: Was this—I don't know if you remember back at other institutions—similar to the South African divestiture? Or do you think there's a difference or—

PA: No, I think there's a difference. Here—here, you can't find anybody who can justify what's happening in Sudan. And there are just bad guys and then there are victims who are being exploited and raped and killed, starved and—for no reason other than power and awful, inhuman activity. In South Africa, there was a legitimate point of view that Reverend Sullivan's principles were doing more harm than good to the people we were attempting to protect. [chuckles] I went full circle on this. I've been involved with these issues for a long time. At Colorado State, when I was president there, we implemented Leon Sullivan's principles. Four years ago, I took a group from here to South Africa on an ANC relationship project, and my name was on the lips of some people because I was one of 50 presidents who, as a group at that time, had signed off on Leon Sullivan's principles. And a prominent member of the ANC lectured me as to how immoral [chuckles] those of us who did that were, because we caused their people to lose jobs.

BS: Oh, that's fascinating.

PA: So it's—I mean, again, those who think they have a monopoly on morality and compassion and concern don't impress me.

BS: That's fair. Now, all of this ties into the issue of human rights and there's a human rights initiative on campus. How did that develop? How do you see it fitting into what the university does?

PA: Well, I think any place worthy of the name university ought to be concerned about human rights and teach compassion and that people have an understanding of people who are different. I have developed a mosaic by people telling me stories about what happened before I arrived. And you've lived it for 30 years. I'm now completing 11. My sense is that, in an effort to exonerate his father's good name, Chris Dodd caused the Thomas Dodd Center to be built. And because of the senior senator Dodd's involvement in Nuremberg, the initial interest substantively had to do with issues related to the Holocaust. And that gave rise to a set of investigations. Then later, because of another of your colleagues and his connections, we got this ANC Project going.

BS: That's—

PA: Amii Omara Otunnu and the UNESCO support and the Mellon support for the oral history and archival education and activity. And then the USAID support for the relationship with Fort Hare University. So all of a sudden there's another dimension, substantively different but generically the same as what the Dodd Center had done previously. And then, coincidentally, along came Nell Newton as our dean of law, who was a superior dean and a good fundraiser, but she happened also to have scholarly interests in Native American law. And she, I think, was the lead author in compiling a

compendium on Native American history and Native American law. Also, we have an anthropologist, Kevin McBride, who had relationships with the Mashantucket Pequots that preceded them getting—

BS: Right.

PA: —their license to steal.

BS: [laughs]

PA: And Kevin had great credibility with them, takes his graduate students down for digs and so on and so forth. So all of a sudden here we are with more than a small amount of activity in what can generically be described as a platform for our faculty and students who have interests in human rights. So as time progressed, we created an institute, brought in this man, Richard Wilson, invited as a visitor, Victor Osyintensky (sp?), who is known internationally, we had a couple of very successful alumni, namely, Gary Gladstein and through him, George Soros, endow chairs and arrange for lectureships. Soros has a long personal history of concern for human rights around the world and he has the bankroll to put teeth in his rhetoric. And in point of fact, he's coming up here, I think, this summer to—

BS: Oh.

PA: —to give a seminar. Again, Gary Gladstein—God bless him. We would not have gotten him had it not been for Gary. And then we started a minor so that we now have the full panoply of scholars who have legitimate interests, the capacity to analyze issues and write new things about them. We have degree-granting programs. We have philanthropic support to attract and retain scholars and scholarships. And, you know, the ANC support is now fading away formally

because the dollars are fading away. But, presumably, there's enough of—intellectual momentum and people on the ground who are working on this that they can see funding from different places to support their work. And I'm really quite pleased the way it's developed.

BS: Is this unusual for school to be doing it this—you know, have you talked to other presidents about this or seen other institutions do the same thing or not?

PA: I'm not aware of them doing it the way we have done it here. I know that, as you would expect, the University of Chicago would probably have an approach different than ours. But that—the law in economics, intellectual orientation out there has human rights as an area of concern. But they're set up as committees, as you know, and it's different than the way we're set up here.

BS: Recently, we had the question—well, I think it ties into the whole issue of globalism in terms of the university's place-- but UConn and Dubai, and that seemed to create some controversy, or at least was put on hold for a while. What happened with that?

PA: Well, it's—the way you stated is correct. It's not dead. It is on hold. And one of—one of the reasons is that there were some ambiguities that have to be resolved. At the end of the day, we're still in Connecticut so you don't really solve problems; you create new committees whenever you hit a bump. And the committees and the attorney general had difficulty just giving a yes or no answer. And I thought we owed it to our potential partners in Dubai to give them an upfront yes or no, rather than dangle. If we go through all this work, will the AG approve it? And the Commissioner of Higher Education

characteristically has “serious concerns” about this. It shouldn’t even be of interest to the Department of Higher Education. It’s a university venture. It’s a contract. We would be selling our services to Dubai, our faculty services. In exchange, we will be able to have a platform, in my view, 20 years from now, to have a supply of students and faculty from that part of the world. And it will be a place for our faculty and students to spend a semester or a year and do work. And what is emerging is the Singapore, the Shanghai or the Hong Kong of the Middle East. It’s the most progressive of all those countries out there. Obviously, we were concerned about gender and religious discrimination. I’ve been encouraged by both Senator Dodd and Senator Lieberman to pursue this thing. I had Scott Brohinsky consult with three of the Jewish groups at the State of Connecticut, and they have offered to write letters of support for our moving ahead in this way. I have talked with several of the Fortune 500 companies. If you go up and down two or three main streets in Dubai, what you see is, first of all, it looks like Las Vegas. But secondly, the logo of virtually every North American company, Fortune 500, is there. That is the staging area in the Middle East. Rich people in the Middle East and the sub continent, since 9/11 have been reticent to send their students here, at least in the numbers prior to 9/11. They’re afraid to, but they’re not afraid to send them to Dubai. They do want a Western European or North American degree with those implied Good Housekeeping Seals of Approval. And the person who is one of three people who report to the ruler of Dubai was a student at UConn 30 years ago, he loves the place. And so they held off Pitt, Michigan State, UCLA. They have Harvard running their hospital system, a

wholly owned subsidiary of Harvard called Harvard Health International, and Stanford, Duke, the Duke Business Program and a few others. But they want a University of Connecticut Dubai. They will comply with all of our cultural values and minimal requirements regarding non-discrimination regarding intellectual freedom. There cannot be a dime of Connecticut taxpayer money going into this thing. They have to pay for the whole thing plus enough profit to create a contingency, a reserve fund for contingencies, for unexpected problems. They've agreed to everything. But, you know, do-gooders in the Legislature and other places find reasons not to proceed — everybody's so proud of what's happened at UConn, but this is the land of steady habits—

BS: [laughs]

PA: —and red brick. And there's envy; UConn really shouldn't break out of the pack. "We're comfortable in our normal relationships. Just stay the way you are but, by the way, keep winning basketball. Keep getting more—better students," et cetera, et cetera. So we'll get through it. But right now we're waiting for some AG opinions and there have been some uncertainties on the Dubai side. The Emir died and his younger brother is now creating a power base. And it's to the younger brother that our former student reports.

BS: Reports, mm-hmm.

PA: So if anything, our situation has stabilized and been enhanced.

BS: Who is the former student? You knew the name?

PA: Yes, it's Ahmad Byn Byat. And his deputy for this project is Dr. Abdullah, who is a Ph.D. in computer science from the University of South Carolina. They're all very westernized.

BS: Okay, that's part of globalism, the future perhaps. What about the issue of diversity on campus? You've dealt with that in the past number of years and such. Are you satisfied with where we are or—

PA: Well, I'm enormously pleased with the diversification of the undergraduate student body. We've had something like an addition of 4,000 students. And there's been something approaching a 90-point increase in SAT scores and there's been over a hundred-percent increase in the diversity of the freshman class in '96 relative to the freshman class this last fall. So intellectual competitiveness and diversification has occurred concurrently and I'm very pleased about it. Similar progress cannot be reported with respect to the faculty. That, of course, has to do with the institution of tenure. Students are with you four or five years. Faculty, once you make a tenure decision, are with you for 30 years, other things equal, though attempts have been made, including in the History Department, where, if I recall correctly, seven or eight years ago we found an outstanding African American woman, I think from—

BS: [unclear] not sure.

PA: —UCLA? [several words unclear]; I'm thinking the West Coast. And there were two of them, two finalists, both women. And so we— at the time, I think Mark Emmert and I'm sure Fred Maryanski and I agreed to provide a second position so we could bag them both and bring them in. They both came and I believe the one outstanding woman stayed one year—

BS: Oh, yes, she went to Yale.

PA: She went to Yale.

BS: Yes, Jennifer Basile (sp?).

- PA: So, you make progress. You try. But everybody is trying and even when you bag one, they last for a while and some leave—that doesn't mean you should stop doing it.
- BS: Okay. The issue of ethics on campus, —there's a lot of emphasis now about, well, faculty have to take a—an ethics seminar kind of thing. And what does this tell us and what does this sort of—what is this saying about the institution and about what's happened to higher education, if anything?
- PA: Yes, much ado about nothing, I think. What happened with our former governor a few years ago—created a firestorm and a lot of people demagogued the thing. They abolished the old Ethics Commission, created a new one. And, frankly, there's, in my personal opinion, I want to be out of office before you print this. But there's much demagoguery and hypocrisy from the top on down in government. What these training sessions are attempting is really to protect our faculty and staff; it's not really the University of Connecticut. Every state employee, including faculty and staff, is bound by state ethics laws, and if a faculty member unintentionally or out of ignorance engages in behavior that violates the state ethics code, it's breaking the law. These training sessions are an attempt to get people's attention by saying, A, you know, if you're on a research grant or if you're doing this or you're doing that, there are new, more rigid interpretations by a state agency that has control over all of us, “and we are here to tell you what those regulations are.” It's between you as an individual and the State Ethics Commission. I don't think all of this would have happened had the former governor not had his problems. The former head of the State Ethics Commission got a

little rambunctious on a couple—Alan Plofsky—and was openly hostile and critical of John Rowland. And that caused Plofsky to have his problems and that caused the Legislature—there's a particularly dishonest, deceitful man named Chris Caruso, who's now the head of the Government Administration and Ethics Committee. And he's had his hand in this thing and they brought in this—the new—and a strange man from California to be Alan Plofsky's replacement. And he had alienated, I guess, almost everyone, including Caruso. And the new governor—

BS: Right. His name, I've seen—

PA: Bycel. And of course, the new governor, who was hand picked by the former governor, has now made ethics her big thing. And her chief of staff is out shaking down commissioners for campaign—[laughs] I mean, the whole thing, it was—the benefit of hindsight—

BS: [laughs]

PA: I mean, it's so reprehensible and it's so unethical. But we're doing all this under the general rubric of ethics.

BS: Of ethics. [chuckles] All right. That puts it in perspective. Campus safety—I'm thinking particularly of the hit and run situation that we had on campus here this year. Was the student Carley Wines? (sp?)

PA: Yes. Carley Wines.

BS: Yes. How are these things dealt with from the perspective of a university president? I mean, what can be done to deal with it?

PA: Well, you know, a university is a microcosm of society. And we organize ourselves in towns and cities and campuses, other organizations. We create our rules a priori and then the rules are enforced. And people break the rules. And no matter how many

precautions one takes, if an adolescent with his girlfriend, allegedly drunk, way over the intoxication level and in a big SUV, you have a problem. There's not much you can do if you're going to have an open society where people can make their choices, so bad things happen. But that's not adequate in and of itself. When stuff happens you have to show institutional concern and you do have to reexamine and update processes and procedures. In light of a new tragedy like VA Tech, you reexamine to see, had that happened here, could we have done something differently? So we have created a group to look at this headed by our chief operating officer. Participants include the vice president of Student Affairs. Consultants are our UConn police department, the state police and others. And our immediate reaction was to put more visible lime green signs and highlight more aggressively the crossing paths on North Eagleville Road. I drive in the intersection of Gamble and the business school and the co-op. And it scares me every time I go by there because people don't watch. They pay no attention to the designated areas to cross. They have earphones in their ears and people who are visitors to the campus may just assume it's like driving in New York City or Washington, that you take your life in your own hands so you are—well, not so here. And, alas, it's going to happen again. We'll have more training sessions. We will have a more aggressive training program next fall for incoming freshmen. I've put things in my letters to the community about not only our sadness over the loss of a child, but how we will redouble our efforts to be careful and increase enforcement. I've asked the police to be ever more vigilant. But it's the nature of humans, that our guard will drop and we'll have another

tragedy sometime. In the absence of telling people they can walk only certain places and have a police state, I don't know how you would—

BS: Okay. Right. Let's see. New administrators. You mentioned the COO would be Barry Feldman, I guess. But there's a whole list of them. The Law School has a new dean. Business—I don't know if they've gotten a new dean or not.

PA: Yes.

BS: They do—

PA: That's not been announced but—

BS: Oh.

PA: —he has agreed to come.

BS: Okay. The Dental, Medicine, Nursing, Social Work—you have a whole list of these. Is this unusual or is this usual to have so much movement in terms of the administration at that level?

PA: Well, it's been so stagnant. I mean, most of the incumbents have been here as long as I have and many of them are completing a second five-year term. And we'll have two more next year. The dean of Liberal Arts has agreed to do us a favor—

BS: Yes—

PA: —and stay on a year because of the high turnover. We fired the dean of Engineering.

BS: Right.

PA: And the dean of Business came here and he didn't fit in and he didn't like the job and his wife hated Connecticut. I mean, certain of those things you can't handle. But in the case of the dean of Social Work, it was 10 years. And in the case of Nursing, there were some issues with the faculty and, by agreement, that dean moved on at the end of

her term. The dean of Law was a terrible loss. Nell Newton was a superior dean but when she came here she and I sat in the Hartford Club. And I said specifically, “You were at DU for a short period of time,” Denver University. And I said, “Are you coming here and just waiting to pounce?” And she said, “I’ll make a firm commitment to you.” She said, “Basically, I grew up in San Francisco and I went to the Hastings School of Law. If they ever invited me back I would interview. I will not interview anyplace else.” She said, “I’m perfectly comfortable completing my career here but I want to die in the Bay Area.” And of course, seven years later—

BS: That’s where she went.

PA: —that’s where she went to become chancellor and dean of law at the Hastings School of Law, which is the Berkeley University of California.

BS: Right.

PA: So I miss her very much. She was a splendid dean but she was true to her word and moved on. I believe Kirk Kerr, our dean of Agriculture is also going to retire. I think he will have completed three five-year terms.

BS: And the COO, Barry Feldman, he was a town manager. Right? So is this a usual kind of shift or—

PA: Well, he happened to be available. He’s a town manager. He’s also a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Connecticut. And he’s taught, both at Storrs and the West Hartford campus, for the last 10 or 15 years. He’s not a career academic but the job that he occupies is not appropriate for a career academic. I mean, what we have here, for want of a better word, is a requirement to have a town

manager. We have our own police department, our own fire department, our own water supply, for God's sakes. We have safety issues. We have police issues. We have procurement issues. We have infrastructure issues. We have construction issues. And that's exactly—

BS: Yes.

PA: —what he did for 21 years with great distinction, I'm told, for the city of West Hartford. And I—I, of course, brought Linda Flaherty-Goldsmith here as the first occupant of that position. We had a messed up organization structure that I inherited. And I didn't know how bad it was but I knew we had to get closer to the conventional public research university model. So the then-board agreed to it and I brought Linda, who formerly had worked for me in Alabama, here. She said she would commit to three years to come and help get the thing turned around and organized. She stayed three and then her mother became very ill and so she left. But we were fortunate that Barry Feldman had had enough in West Hartford and was financially secure so he didn't need a job. But he was looking for a job. I don't think he's 60 years old yet. And three or four people suggested that I talk with him, at least as an interim. And I did and I liked him, brought him here with no promise. We did conduct a national search and brought in this Isaacson-Miller headhunting firm from Boston. I said, "What I need is some cover to show that this is not a slam-dunk deal." I asked Rich Schwab, the dean of Education, to run a transparent search that contained people from around the campus. And he came up with two or three people but Barry was by far the most suitable. One of the things that was of concern to me was we're

now in one of those uncomfortable transitions where I had already, when I appointed him, announced my intention to step down. And, you know, a new president is going to come in and he or she is going to want to be surrounded by people in whom confidence reposed.

[end of side 1, tape 1]

BS: You were saying the downside—downside cost to—at—Barry Feldman would be—

PA: Would be, on a relative basis, smaller than to someone who would move a family here from elsewhere, a complete relocation.

BS: Okay, the—in 2006, we—the university celebrated its 125th anniversary. And this became—there were a number of events and things. And this—in certain respects, it's strange that the 125th would be chosen as the thing to celebrate. But what was the reasoning for this—why this initiative to do this for the 125th?

PA: Well, I guess I don't accept the premise—

BS: Oh.

PA: The centennial, of course, was a big one. But it is also the case that we were about—at the 125th, we were about at the halfway point of a period of massive investment by the State of Connecticut. And we thought we should celebrate it by celebrating, call attention to our state selected leaders, that the investment they made is paying off, and keep investing and it will keep paying off. And so we got legislators out here. We took our dog and pony show to the state capitol and celebrated the successes of our faculty and the research programs, our students that are graduates in the work force, that by their presence,

helps create and attract and maintain existing high quality jobs and, therefore, profitability for industries and so on. And when you have any celebration or any ceremony, it's to call attention to something that you want to celebrate. Why do you have a commencement? And so also here with the 125th, it provided a platform to say, "We have invested a billion bucks and look at this place. Aren't you proud to join with us in celebrating? And we've got another 10 years to go. And you ought to give us more resources and be even better for it." And by the way, it brings in alumni—I believe we had five events, including one at the Wilbur Cross.

BS: Right, that started it, I believe.

PA: That started the thing. What I remember is the kid we talked about the last time in sociology had himself chained to the front—to the gate out in front to protest the rhesus monkeys. But we also drew people from the town and the state, elected leaders, rich people, alumni. And the speaker—one of the speakers was a black retired executive with, I think, UTC, who was recruited to join a Jewish fraternity.

BS: Al Rogers.

PA: Al Rogers. Now, I mean, that's something to celebrate. That's what gives an institution its character and its definition and you don't hide those kinds of things. That's something to be proud of and something to celebrate and the 125th gave us a platform.

BS: Okay. All right, now, a couple of more general questions. It seemed to me that from January of 2006—we touched on this last time when talked about the construction a little bit. But it—I think the first article that I remember appearing that was sort of negative had to do with the president's house being refurbished for a million dollars or

something like that. And that seemed to launch an attack almost on UConn and to some extent on you, which did not exist in the first eight years. I think this was in January of 2006. And I remember the date because someone—I was at a meeting and someone had asked me about this. And they said, “What’s going on here? You know, what did they do?” And do you think there was any reason for this, that this thing started off as it did and, you know, after having so much positive publicity—

PA: Yes.

BS: —and not a bad word said?

PA: I think the house was in the middle. I don’t think—

BS: It—

PA: I don’t think it was either the cause or the first event. I think, frankly, maybe the start of it was an op-ed piece to “Northeast” magazine that was written by a local called David Morse—

BS: Oh, David, yes.

PA: —who is not unbiased and, in my opinion, not an honorable man, that caused some of us to go to the editor of the “Hartford Courant,” Brian Toolan and say that Karen Grava had informed the editor of “Northeast” magazine of, I think, seven factual errors, in fact, in the article that David Morse was going to write on some of the environmental issues known. And she was effectively told that, “Look, ‘Northeast’ magazine is an opinion piece. We don’t care about the facts.”

BS: [chuckles]

PA: Karen called me, incredulous. I said, “Karen, she didn’t say that to you.” [chuckles] She said, “She did, Phil.” So I said, “Well, you can

change your story if you want, but I have no option but to call Brian Toolan and register the most serious objection because this hurts the university. It hurts our recruiting; it hurts our credibility, even though people who know David Morse know what he is, and married to a former English professor or something. I guess I don't know her. But I do know Morse and he cannot contain his anti-expansion and sick environmental [unclear]. I think that's what got us.

BS: Was that the article on the water situation or there was a—

PA: Well, it was water and it had Mrs. Schwep (sp?) out on Separatist Road who had chloroform or coliform, whatever it is, in her cistern. And this was, so she said, probably resulting from UConn runoff. Well, you know, I'm not a scientist. But people laughed, including the people from DEP and said, "That's caused from animals falling into cisterns and fecal matter contaminating the water. That has nothing to do with UConn. That made it into David Morse's articles and she went crazy. And Helen Koehn—I mean, all the locals who can be depended on to help put on a show were there in all their glory, including this guy, Peter Newcomer.

BS: Yes, who subsequently died.

PA: Who subsequently died. One of my staff was at the—at the post office, the Storrs post office. And it was after my friend, David Ivry, died but who was also active in the—in the Horse Barn Hill Pfizer project.

BS: Right.

PA: But he died and then Peter Newcomer, who was another activist died. One of the old ladies was heard to say, "Oh, isn't it awful? You know, this new guy, Austin, he's—he and his people are killing us

all.” [laughter] “One by one.” Which I, of course, wore as a badge of honor. [laughs]

BS: That’s funny. [chuckles]

PA: But I think there was that and then there was, as I mentioned to you the last time, I think, there was a local former legislator who was very upset that we terminated a contract with him. And he had long-time anger and resentment toward four or five of the people who immediately surround me. And he’s a very clever little guy.

BS: Jonathan Pelto?

PA: Jonathan Pelto.

BS: Yes.

PA: And he has friends on this campus, the old timers, and had access and took—got information out of—he knew more about the details of what was going on, frankly, than I did, and fed it to a guy named David Altimari, who’s a investigative reporter. And they just went on with it. I have never denied that we made mistakes. I have not said what big contractors have said to me, that in the whole scheme of things, the number of problems that have occurred here at this level, magnitude of construction projects seemed small. But those mistakes just happened. But that’s for someone else to say. That’s not for us to say because we appear defensive. In the case of the house, I would have preferred that the damn thing burn down.

BS: [laughs]

PA: You know, it’s—it’s not a house that’s suitable for a contemporary university president that uses a house to raise money. I’d done—I voted with my feet. You know, some of you were upset with—

BS: Right.

PA: —me for moving off campus, which the board, by the way—Lew Rome and Bill Berkeley had encouraged me because my predecessor was not seen very much around the state. They encouraged me to live in Hartford [chuckles] or even Stamford, which would not have been doable. But—and for seven or eight years, we did live in Farmington. But the place was loaded with—this is not a defense; this is just an explanation of what went on. I really wish we could have found a way to spend \$500,000 and build a perfectly nice, suitable house on that beautiful piece of property. The real property is perfect. It looks down on the campus; it's very nice. But the house itself was loaded with asbestos. It was loaded with mold, loaded with lead. The board had approved, I think, \$460,000 to clean it up and fix it. And then [chuckles] when they went to repair the roof on a sunroom, the walls fell in.

BS: [chuckles]

PA: Which added money. The mold and asbestos was budgeted, I think—the removal was budgeted \$79,000. It cost \$200,000. When they tried to open up the side of the house facing Oak Hill Road, they had to incur another \$250,000 to stabilize the house or the second or third floor would, they said, fall in. So, I mean, it was just one thing after another. And here I was, who was opposing the project to begin with, sitting here being blamed for excessive appetites. [chuckles] So—

BS: They made a thing about the hot tub or something like that.

PA: There is no hot tub in the house.

BS: [laughs]

PA: I mean, that's the hypocrisy of the whole thing.

BS: [chuckles] That—all right. Then what would you think—what do you think is your greatest accomplishment as president?

PA: Well, changing the level of expectation and investing the—leading the effort to invest the money in ways that capitalize on our strengths and cause our strengths to become even greater, and ultimately to attract the best professors and best students we can. And, you know, we have strength throughout the university, including the arts and humanities and social sciences. But it's a land grant institution so we have some enormous faculty strength in the basic sciences and technology. And those happen to be disciplines for which federal and corporate support is available. And I'm very pleased that in the decade we've more than doubled our sponsored research, which is one proxy for productivity in those disciplines for which that kind of support is available. Now, that is in part because, finally, we're giving our faculty laboratories that don't leak and up-to-date instrument—state-of-the-art instrumentation so they can compete with their peers nationally for support. But it's also, I think, that there are—there have been recruited, and our three biology departments, our physics, chemistry and technology areas and Engineering School and so on, nutrition, patho-biology and agriculture. And there's an expectation now that all faculty will compete for those kinds of funds. As I say, that's one proxy for faculty excellence and productivity—the same thing's happened to the health sciences, double decade-sponsored research. And the SAT scores of the students have increased dramatically. That's only one proxy but when you add a hundred or 125 valedictorians and salutatorians from some of the smaller schools—arguably, some of those might be kids who are less

achieving than number 20 out of a good school in Greenwich. But you put it all together; the trend seems to be moving in the right direction. And that's sending the message that the buildings are not an end in themselves. It's what they enable us to do in terms of producing the academic product that has intrinsic merit, but also in the service of the people of Connecticut. We are a land grant institution. And I'm pleased that the quality of the academic product here has been good for a very long time. But the dreadful nature of the buildings caused good students to generate the so-called brain drain. The minute you gave them South Campus and the new chemistry building and the revised Q Building [unclear] and a few others, they knew that they were getting a heck of an academic product, as they always were, but it was now in a congenial and efficient setting. And so the place began like a snowball down the hill. And I think it's my successor's job to work in the shared governance that I hope has characterized my time here within university setting. I value that good relationships preexisted me but I've steadfastly tried to enhance them and protect them. And I think the challenge to my successor is going to be to establish those relationships and build on them, and with the shared governance model, continue that so-called snowball.

BS: I was going to ask you, what advice would you give to your successor?

PA: Just push the expectation. People laughed at, I'm told, Tom Ritter when he came on with the billion bucks the first time. "You can't do it. What's wrong with you?" Four years later it became clear to me, a billion bucks wasn't going to do it. And what we would have was a society of haves and have nots, where you had half the faculty

[chuckles] living in plush luxury and the rest in Monteith and Arjona and I said, "I'm going back to John Roland and ask for another billion and a half." Many people said, "Are you crazy? He'll kick you out of the office. He'll be angry. The legislators will take money away from UConn and their operating budget." We did it. He gave it. He didn't say a billion and a half [chuckles] but he contributed a billion, three. And Scott Brohinsky tells me that the last three years have been the best operating budgets in the last 22. The challenge for my successor, I think, is to just continue to ratchet up expectations and don't allow the occupants of the land of steady habits to say, "No, you can't do it. Just continue as we've done it." That's the—that's really the message. "You can't do it because we haven't done it before." Well, the hell with you.

BS: [laughs]

PA: You can do it and it'll be interesting. I'm staying away from the search. It's inappropriate for me to be anywhere near it. And I'm going to be out of here, as I said last week, to let my successor establish him or herself. But if asked for my opinion, I will obviously do what I can to be supportive. The trustees have to, as in any search, come up with the right combination of scholarly accomplishment, political moxie and personality to raise money and do the political stuff outside, as well as with the faculty and staff. I'm too close to it to know what's appropriate. But the big thing is don't let people be satisfied.

BS: And what would you think was, if any, your greatest failure as president?

PA: Not acting sufficiently quickly in reorganizing the administrative infrastructure. I should not have waited for a consensus to build in both the board and the Senate Executive Committee. And then even when I created Linda's position and changed the thing from the— from the so-called Chancellor Model, there was a great deal of skepticism that I was just creating more administrative redundancy. State Legislature had their administrative caps. "Well, we've got a billion bucks to spend and then I'm sitting here"—and I shouldn't have allowed the Senate Executive Committee and some of the deans and others to—I shouldn't have consulted as much. My instinct is to be engaged in a priori consulting. That was an error. I should have brought Linda here years ago and I didn't.

BS: I see. Okay. If you know enough about the previous presidents, your predecessors, could you make a judgment of your presidency compared to what has come before you?

PA: I'm not the right person to do that. I don't know that much about them. The opportunities that they were provided were so much more limited. And the expectations were so much more limited than the reason that I came here. I came because of the building opportunity. They did not have those opportunities. You know, Harry is my buddy. He's my friend to this day. Harry was loved by the students and I'm not the touchy-feely type with the students. There was some lesser feeling for Harry on parts of the other constituency groups. Harry didn't believe in private funders. In fact, if the three of us were sitting here having a beer, he would say with conviction that if you raise private money you're going to supplant rather than supplement state resources. Well, I reject that philosophy. I think he was wrong.

But he thinks I'm wrong. Well, we are now sitting on \$300 million rather than \$50 million. [laughter] He didn't have the relationships with the successful alumni. I would say that, in developing those relationships also academically, gives rise to engaging a Mark Shenkman or a Gary Gladstein here, which gives the human rights thing more than just rhetoric, puts financial teeth in to drive meaningful, substantive projects. I know that people in certain UConn circles, John D. Biaggio and John Casteen are not highly regarded or not remembered fondly. They're both my very good friends and I respect them both mightily. And they left here and went on to enormously successful careers. So what happened here, I don't know, you go back to Jorgenson, who was here for 30 years, that was—that's like being on Mars. The expectations of American higher education were different. The expectations of this place were so different. Glen Ferguson, I've met one time, seemed like a perfectly nice man. But his time here apparently was not real happy. It's for somebody with the benefit of the passage of time to make those comparisons, and I hope 25 years from now that they don't find any of us to be superheroes or any of us to be bad people. It's just a matter of working within the environment you're given.

BS: Okay. And in the very laudatory article that Keith Burris of the "Journal Inquirer"—I think we mentioned this last week, but he referred to you as the "anti-Silber."

PA: [laughs]

BS: And that's a reference to John Silber of Boston University. How did that—

PA: [laughs]

BS: How did that feel? [chuckles] Do you know John Silber?

PA: Yes. I spent a week with John Silber 20 years ago. The Pentagon has a program they run two or three times a year where they get 30 or 40 people, five or 10 university presidents, a few newspaper publishers, some corporate executive people who have access to op-ed pieces. And, of course, the whole idea was to expose us to what their plans in the four services were and to cause us to become excited and look to us to write op-ed pieces in support of the military. Well, I never wrote an op-ed piece. But I've observed John up and close, before and after, [chuckles] observed him at a distance, including before he went to BU. He was then a very flamboyant, provocative, argumentative dean of humanities or something at the University of Texas, Austin. I think an honest observer, a knowledgeable observer of higher education generally would say the two places—two private universities that have made probably more progress—they're not the two best universities in the world right now, but they've made more progress over the last 30 years—are NYU and BU. And there cannot be two people more unlike than Johnny Brademus and John Silber. But—so leave Phil Austin out of the equations. [laughter]

BS: Okay. Is there anything that I haven't asked that you'd like to add?

PA: No, I think you pretty well covered it, Bruce.

BS: Okay, then we'll stop here. Thank you and we will go on.

End of Interview