



Tony Wilcox Oral History Interview, June 23, 2015

Title

“A Career Built on Service”

Date

June 23, 2015

Location

Milam Hall, Oregon State University.

Summary

In the interview, Wilcox discusses his upbringing in New York and New England, his enrollment at the University of Massachusetts, and his love of running, including his participation in several Boston Marathons. From there he recalls the years after graduation that he spent as a milkman, his decision to pursue a Ph.D., and the shift in his academic focus to exercise science. While reflecting on his doctoral candidacy, Wilcox notes the research that he conducted, his acquisition of a more scientific skill set, and his earliest experiences with teaching. Wilcox then recounts his first academic position at Kansas State University, again noting his research agenda and the pleasure that he took in combining his scholarly work with his personal love of exercise.

The remainder of the session is devoted to Wilcox's work at and institutional memories of Oregon State University. He begins by describing his first impressions of OSU, commenting on the running culture in Corvallis, the state of the Exercise and Sports Science Program at the time, and the initial duties of his position. He then provides a detailed overview of his years in the Faculty Senate, specifying memorable issues on which he worked and sharing his memories of serving on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, as well as President of OSU's Faculty Senate. He likewise lends his thoughts on the current state of the Faculty Senate and its continuing capacity to act as a vehicle for change on campus.

As the interview nears its conclusion, Wilcox discusses other noteworthy components of his past university service, including contributions to the establishment at OSU of the Linus Pauling Institute, and to an influential task force devoted to classroom space. The session ends with Wilcox's broader reflections on his work as an administrator, his forthcoming transition into retirement, and his sense of where OSU is headed as it nears its sesquicentennial.

Interviewee

Tony Wilcox

Interviewer

Chris Petersen

Website

<http://scarc.library.oregonstate.edu/oh150/wilcox/>

Transcript

Chris Petersen: Okay Dr. Wilcox, if you'd please introduce yourself with your name and today's date and our location.

Tony Wilcox: Yes, I'm Anthony Wilcox and I am here in the School of Biological and Population Health Sciences, formerly a chair in the college and co-director when we formed schools, and today's date is June 23rd, 2015.

CP: So we're going to talk a lot about you lengthy and multifaceted service to OSU, but I'd like to talk before that about some of your back history, beginning with the very beginning, I suppose; where were you born?

TW: Niagara Falls, New York, on the New York side. My mom was living—they had just moved to the area and were living on the Ontario side, but she came over and made sure she had me on the New York side and then we moved to that side immediately, shortly thereafter. But then I went to high school in the town of Weymouth in the Boston area, which is where my parents are from, the Boston area. Went to the University of Massachusetts for my undergraduate and graduate work, and on my way to OSU my first faculty position was at Kansas State University from '80 to '87, and then I arrived here in '87.

CP: And we'll dig into all of that here in a little bit. So you grew up partially in Niagara Falls and partially in this community near Boston, is that what you said?

TW: Yeah.

CP: Can you give us a sense of sort of community life for you growing up?

TW: Well, of course, it was the Baby Boom time and so it was perfect. I liked the point in which I moved from Niagara Falls to the Boston area, because then in the high school years it was great to be in the city and what the city has to offer. And plus, being in the mid to later '60s, it was a kind of a time of foment and it was interesting to be near the major college centers of Boston. But as a Baby Boomer in this town outside of Niagara Falls, there were just kids up and down the street and plenty of fields to play in. So it was a great place to grow up.

CP: What were your parents' backgrounds?

TW: They're both from the Boston area and my dad worked in, sort of, business. It was a company in Niagara Falls, Ontario that he was working for, until it got bought-out and closed out, and that's why they moved back to the Boston area. And my mom, I was one of eight kids, so she was a homemaker until my dad died at a relatively young age when I was in college, by that time, when she started working.

CP: Seven siblings.

TW: Yeah. Yeah, there were six boys; I was the fourth of five boys, then a girl, then a boy, then a girl.

CP: What were you interested in as a kid?

TW: Oh, I played a lot of sports in town. And then in high school, well, we were working after school so I didn't do sports so much as a high schooler. I used to work. But I liked to read. I really got wrapped up - and something that is interesting to being in New England - because I really enjoyed reading many of the New England writers like Emerson and Thoreau and Hawthorne and Melville. It was just, you sort of felt a connection of place as well as reading their literature.

CP: What was school like for you growing up?

TW: Well, I always did well and I enjoyed it. And was involved to some extent in the student council when I was in high school.

CP: Was there always the expectation you were going to go to college?

TW: Yeah, yeah. I'm trying to think, you know in terms of my—well and the other thing we had to be concerned about, of course, was by the time I was in high school, the Vietnam War was underway, and so there was the issue of the draft. But, of course, you had a college deferment. I was the first one to actually go to a four-year school and complete it. One of my older brothers, instead of being drafted, enlisted in the Navy, because then you had different options or risks of whether you'd be in Vietnam or elsewhere. And actually, I got married at the end of my freshman year. But by the time, towards the end I think it was when I was going to complete my four-year undergraduate, by that time—and I had a fairly low draft lottery number, which they were operating by at that time. But then Nixon discontinued the draft, so I didn't end up having to go in. I was a father by that time, too.

[0:05:01]

CP: You went to the University of Massachusetts; I'm interested in the adjustment to college for you from going from high school to college. Was it easy?

TW: Yeah, it was pretty straightforward and I went as a math major. I started as a math major but I could see by the end of the first year, whereas I had the facility, it wasn't something I wanted to focus on. And so for a time I was what you might call undeclared, but then I switched to philosophy and I finished a bachelor's in philosophy. So that was a liberal arts education. And then I worked for several years while my wife then went back to school and completed her English major degree. And then when she finished I entered grad school, and by that time I had gotten quite involved in distance running in the community. And so when I went back to school it was in exercise science, so that's from the liberal arts side to the science side. I had a little catching up to do on the background sciences, but having been a math major that side of my brain worked pretty well, and so I was able to do that transition. And that's one of the preeminent programs in our field of exercise science, so it was a good place to be.

CP: Yeah. So I'm interested in this distance running piece, this was a time period during which running kind of took off in the United States, is that correct?

TW: Yes. So I started in '72, and I think that was the year—I wasn't following it, but once you got involved—I think that was the year that Frank Shorter won the marathon. And of course there was, I don't know the exact timeframe, when the Kenneth Cooper fitness aerobics movement, and so running was a part of that. But I got involved in road racing, because by that time in '72 I was a senior in college, so I wasn't going to run for the university by that time. But New England has a long history in road racing, and of course the Boston Marathon is kind of the epitome of that. And so I fell in with some former UMass runners who were still in the area and trained and raced in a lot of road races.

CP: Marathons?

TW: Well you know it's interesting, by the time the running boom really took hold, there grew to be this homogenization of races where everything was 10Ks. But at that time there were all sorts of distances, very unique, towns would have their annual race and it would be nine miles, twelve miles, just a variety of distances. And over a couple of years—so I started in '72, I was prepared to run the '74 Boston Marathon, I had qualified, but then my daughter was born the day before it, so I didn't end up running that one. But I ran in '75 for the first time and I ran Boston probably about a half dozen times, and I finished fifteenth in '76, which was quite an exciting event. And it actually is still on record as the hottest Boston Marathon ever. It was in the nineties that day, so it really threw up how people would finish in that, because of the differential way in which heat would affect people, so it was an exciting time. And then in '76, that was in spring; in the fall I entered grad school, so then running took a lesser place in the activities, although I've continued it to this day.

CP: You finished fifteenth in the Boston Marathon?

TW: Yes, yes.

CP: I had no idea. That's quite an achievement.

TW: Yeah, it was pretty exciting, and somewhat unexpected. I expected to do very well, I knew I was in good shape. Then you had to give up all notions of what time that would translate to, because of the heat and the way it will affect how you have to pace yourself. So I ended up fifteenth and it was in two hours and twenty-nine minutes, and I figured I—

before the day broke that way, I figured I might get in the low two-twenties. The Olympic qualifying time—and actually that year the trial was in about a month and it was over here in Eugene, and I'd never been to Oregon at that time—the qualifying time was, I think, two twenty-threes, so I thought "well, there's a chance I might be able to make the qualifying time," although having run a marathon a month before you are not going to run a good one, and I didn't expect that I would go. But, you know, it's just something to shoot for. But of course I think the winning time just barely got under two twenty-three, maybe just the first runner. Then everybody else was kind of from then on out.

CP: Well you mentioned that you finished your undergraduate work at UMass and then your wife went back to school; I presume you were just finding jobs to support the family?

TW: Oh yeah, I worked as a milkman out in western Massachusetts for those years, which is, I guess, on some level you just say "okay, that's what somebody with a philosophy degree will do." And it was kind of fun, it was an early morning job and so that kind of got me on an early morning cycle; to this day I still run early in the morning. And it was great though, because I'd do two routes out of western Massachusetts in the hill towns, beautiful country out there, but the winters—in fact that's when I started, it was some guy who had been a longtime milkman and he just didn't want to do another winter, and so he stepped down and I responded to an ad, and I did that for probably three years while my wife was finishing up.

[0:10:45]

And you could run the route, because it's just - you complete the route and then your day's work is done. So if I ran from time to time—it was kind of interesting, because I think a lot of people on that route were used to this older guy who would take his time and they'd stop and maybe have coffee with him and things like that, and who knows when he finished the route? Whereas I was probably already gone by their house before they even woke up, so this was all new. And I guess the milk would be fresh and there for breakfast, but I would just run the route and then be back. Of course it would take a lot longer in the winter, but then in this time of year it'd be pretty quick. And so it was two routes, two times a week, and oftentimes I'd get back before my son was done with pre-school, and so I could pick him up while my wife then had her classes. So it worked perfectly for her completing school and me having an income during that time.

CP: That's funny. I have to assume you were sort of toward the end of the generations of milkmen.

TW: I think so. You know, you think in terms of, well especially being the rural hill towns, they didn't all have shops nearby where they could pick up milk. But yeah, I think it was kind of dwindling at that time, and you wonder—when I arrived here in Corvallis there was still a milk route, and it was out of that building that's on the corner of 9th and Buchanan.

CP: The Sunny Brook Dairy.

TW: Yeah. And they, I guess I probably should have taken milk from them, but by that time we were like everybody else and we'd just get it at the store.

CP: So you went back to school, I assume after your wife finished her schooling. Was this always the intent, to get a PhD?

TW: Well it's kind of interesting, because it offered some time for sorting out. Because having earned a liberal arts degree, you're not really locked into a particular career choice, you know, who knew where it might go? And so working while my wife finished sort of gave time to sort through. It probably might have been law or something like that, but this engagement and success in running, you were just curious about factors, the physiology of exercise. And so that's what drew me in; and the presence of a strong program there lured me.

CP: So you went back to UMass where you'd been.

TW: Yeah.

CP: And it's a completely different field.

TW: It was interesting because it was after the Boston Marathon that year that I started to act on it, so that's in April and that's well beyond the normal time for applying for admission into a grad program that fall. But I did and I met with the chair of the program, and as it turned out he was a—he would swim. I think he was from a background in sport where that's what he'd do, and that's what he would still do as his exercise. And one of the people that he would regularly swim with was a faculty member, a professor in Philosophy. And I had, as an undergraduate, been a teaching assistant for a logic class that he taught. And so they spoke to each other and he recommended me, and so it all worked out very nicely that I could get that recommendation and start that fall that way. But it was sort of a convergence of circumstances that allowed that happen, because otherwise I'm not sure that I could have been admitted on such short notice.

CP: And UMass had a strong program, you mentioned.

TW: Yes. Yes, and still does. We are ranked in the top ten as a doctoral program here, and they are somewhere in the top four, or something like that. And historically, that was one of the earliest graduate programs in exercise science as a discipline, except for physical education - but the science as an academic disciplinary study of the factors that determine our outcomes provided by exercise; the study of human movement.

[0:15:22]

CP: Tell me about your life as a PhD candidate.

TW: Oh, well I worked with a young faculty member, Priscilla Clarkson, who then, as I say, was young, but she achieved a high degree of success in the field and was president of the American College of Sports Medicine. She passed away a couple of years ago, again somewhat prematurely, of cancer. But it was exciting to be part of her lab when she was just developing it. And we would do things like muscle biopsies and assessing fiber types - which was her area of inquiry at the time - and fat cells, studying the response of fat cells to exercise as well, sort of that decrease in their dimensions as one loses weight.

So my dissertation project was actually an animal study. Most of the work they did there was human but we did one on the effects of exercise and caffeine on fat cell size. We were trying to see if caffeine, because it promotes the release of free fatty acids from adipose tissue, if you can join that with exercise, whether it gave a preferential and a larger response to reduction of fat tissue. And we did see some. Obviously something that - ultimately what happens to fat tissue is dictated not just on the exercise side, the period of exercise that you do and the caloric expenditure, but also on the food intake side. So we didn't control food intake, that was ad lib, but there was a comparison group, and it showed some reduction in fat cell size in the caffeine group.

CP: Coming from the liberal arts background, was it easy for you to acquire the scientific toolkit you needed for this new program of study, or did that take some time?

TW: I did have to take some undergraduate classes to prepare myself, you know, to take the anatomy and physiology series, because I hadn't, and some physics. The exciting thing about the study in exercise science - right now kinesiology, in fact, here we are transitioning from Exercise and Sports Science as the name of the program to Kinesiology, and that's basically in effect now where we're changing web pages and such to reflect that - it's the study of human movement, but you can see that that can be done from a lot of disciplinary approaches. So I was studying exercise physiology, biochemistry of human movement, but there's also sports psychology, and biomechanics is the application of physics. So I had to kind of ground myself across the various sub-disciplines. But as I say, having the background in math and science, it came, it just was sort of doing your apprenticeship in those undergraduate classes to get you ready for it.

CP: Did you do any teaching?

TW: I did. First I was helping. I was fortunate to have an assistantship during that time, and I would help with grading and course planning or working in the lab of my major professor. But I also had the opportunity to develop a course and teach that over my last year there too, so that was a good set-up and preparation for the faculty position.

CP: Did it come pretty naturally to you?

TW: Well, the excitement and preparation of engaging in subject matter and wishing to work with students and stimulate that interest. But you know, the art of being a teacher is something that never ends and I always felt as if I had many of the qualities - the interests, the excitement and the enthusiasm, but also an orientation towards the students, a real feeling for their intellectual growth and engagement. I didn't feel as if I ever had the full range of dynamism that could really make a class go to the next level, but you do what you can and try to work on the toolkit. To this day, actually.

CP: Well you finished up at UMass and you mentioned your first faculty position was at Kansas State, how did that come about?

[0:20:10]

TW: I know, that's the thing that our doctoral students learn in terms of where are the opportunities when you come out? And my first choice of place to be would not have been Kansas, but it was a good program and a good group of colleagues and we were all sort of in a similar—or many of us were in a similar stage. And so it was kind of exciting, we got a good feeling of cohort among the faculty there. It had a master's program, didn't have a doctoral program at that time, but it was a good place to be and it's a college town, so it has the positive attributes of that. It's still in Kansas, and that never felt like the proper fit, both for environment or sort of the cultural/political feeling of the place. So you worked hard, you were productive and kept an eye on where other opportunities might develop overtime, but to work to make sure you have the basis to be competitive for opportunities.

CP: Yeah.

TW: Yeah, and so when the Oregon State opportunity developed and I was fortunate enough to get the position, that was a great turn of events. And I'd never really, I'd never been to the Northwest prior to that. It's been a good fit.

CP: Kansas State was one of the great department names I've ever come across; Department of Physical Education and Dance and Leisure Studies.

TW: Yeah.

CP: Just wanted to make sure I got that for the record.

TW: Well even here at Oregon State at the time, well I think it probably just was just Physical Education. You know, it harkens back to that earlier roots of our field as teaching educators.

CP: Yeah. Well, tell me about the research that you started at Kansas State.

TW: Well I would continue with—in fact I did another animal study with caffeine and exercise, but then also transitioned to doing some applied work with humans and running economy and factors that may affect running economy, which is measuring the oxygen consumption when a person is running, and you can do comparisons. It's not a true calculation of efficiency, and that's why they use the term economy, that if you compare people at the same speed, the one who accomplishes that speed utilizing a lesser amount of oxygen consumption would be said to be more economical; that they're achieving that outcome of speed while utilizing less oxygen. And depending upon, even if they all have comparable maximum oxygen consumptions, if somebody's at a lower oxygen consumption to do that speed, that would suggest, in a practiced turnout, that they have a higher ability to still increase before reaching their maximum. And so it can translate—it's a factor that relates to performance. It doesn't determine it by itself but it is one of the factors that can differentiate levels of performance in distance running.

CP: That must have been a lot of fun for you to be marrying your scientific professional research interest with something you're so passionate about in your own personal life; running.

TW: Yeah, and I think in our field—and this is something I talk about in the introductory class that I teach because it's a large class, we have a large major, in fact it's been around the third or fourth largest major on campus. And many of them, when I have this class, it'll have about two hundred and twenty-five or thirty students in it, and I'll oftentimes ask "how many of you were involved in sports in high school?" and virtually all of them have. Certainly all of them have been involved in physical activity, and to me it's unique in how somebody who's engaged in that physical realm in sport wishes

to pursue the intellectual study of that. You know, I'm not sure that other fields of study on campus have the same sort of connection, although you often see, for example, people that life experiences do determine which way some will go and decide what major to pursue. Like you see it with Ethnic Studies, you know, that people have wrestled with this in their life experience and so they make the study of it, and the sociology and such, an area of pursuit intellectually.

[0:25:08]

So I think there are parallels, but this sort of physical to intellectual comparison that can often happen, that embodies itself in Exercise Sciences, is sort of unique, because you can certainly have the physical gifts but maybe not the intellectual inclinations that you could take that in many different directions. Roger Bannister, for example, breaking the four minute mile; he was in med school at the time. And there were probably some carryovers in how he thought about his training, because of what he was learning about human physiology.

CP: Was that applicable to you as well, from what you were learning?

TW: Well mine was kind of going the other way, and we see that in our majors. You know, you get involved, and actually you're reading the popular press or press directed towards, like, the running community, and they'll be talking about aspects of science, and you get engaged in that. One of the things that was happening at the time I was running and entering graduate school was the research around carbohydrate loading for marathon performance. And that's when the research was actually happening, and it was being translated into the magazine articles that would give you advice as to how to prepare. And you could see that link between the research.

Although that's a great example because, in actually, that was a case of the researcher seeing what the athletes were doing and verifying it through science rather than the science saying "this ought to work," and to do an experiment and show it, and then the runners pick it up and do it. You know, this was conducted in Scandinavia where prolonged cross-country ski events is a major form of sport, and they were seeing that these endurance cross-country skiers were modifying their exercise and diets leading up to accentuate a high-carbohydrate diet before these very prolonged events. And so they went to the lab to study in deep what's happening to muscle glycogen as a result of the preparation they were undertaking.

CP: Well you were at K-State and you mentioned you were keeping your eyes open for other opportunities, and one arose in 1987, I gather, at Oregon State. Tell me about making that change.

TW: Yeah, it was—I remember it was in May, so it was a little bit later in the academic year when I came and interviewed. And the chair at the time was John Dunn. He's now president at Western Michigan University. And he was moving out of the chair position to be an associate dean in the college - and I wasn't part or aware of it at the time I was interviewing - but they were also hiring a new chair, Chris Zauner, who's the person who came in to be chair. So I felt that the interview went well and I had a good feeling for it but it was still, you know, it's out of your hands and you see which way it goes. So I was very happy to get the news and get the call from John indicating that the job was being offered. In fact, I think it fell on our anniversary date where we had a dinner planned anyways, so we had something to raise a glass about that night.

CP: Well what kind of initial impressions do you remember having of the university and of the town?

TW: Yeah, I stayed at Nendels hotel, which no longer exists. It's a shopping area there at the corner of...

CP: 9th and Circle—

TW: Garfield?

CP: Garfield, yeah.

TW: Garfield and Circle. I mean 9th. But it was a little chilly in the mornings, as it can be here. It was in May and I'm coming from Kansas where it's not summer-hot yet but the temperatures are rising. And just so green, you know, I was really taken by the place. And actually, I think especially by the time we were moving here and we loaded up the family—I have a son and a daughter—at that time, by '87, my son turned sixteen just after we moved here, and my daughter is just about three years younger, two and a half years young. She was entering the eighth grade and he was entering the

eleventh grade. And just the sense of excitement, adventure, but it kind of occupied this sort of mythical place in your consciousness. You know, you don't have a great sense of it, but for people who aren't from here, just whatever sense you have, you know, the woods, the water and the mountains, and so it was exciting.

[0:30:11]

In fact I remember we took - I stopped at Utah State in Logan because there was a colleague who had taken a position there, so that was one of our stopover points. So then we took the highway through Idaho but got off of 84 once we got to around Ontario, and we were at a point in the day that we stopped there rather than - because it would have been too far to get to Corvallis - a little earlier than when we would usually stop. But we didn't just make Oregon the last day, and so instead of taking 84 we took—and I get confused which ones, I think it was 26, the one that goes through John Day. And then so, came into Sisters and down the Santiam Pass into Sweet Home and stuff, and just driving through that ribbon of road through the tall trees, it just felt awesome to us, especially coming from Kanas. And we had a much easier go than—and of course Kansas is at the other end of the Oregon Trail. You know, we were in a car, in a rental truck, rather than an oxen-drawn wagon. We had a much easier go of it. But it was sort of a great way to enter the state that way, I think.

CP: What was the running culture like in Corvallis at that time? I assume you became part of the community, the running community.

TW: Somewhat, although by the time I came, when we arrived here I was pretty much done competing. So I would mostly just run on my own and run in the morning. But then you'd run into some people, and once you've—you know, the early morning runners—and once you cross paths a few times you'd fall in together and then make it a habit. And so I have a group of running friends that we've been running together for, I think the first person that that happened to, he moved here in '90, and so we've been meeting once or twice a week in the early mornings ever since. And then that's grown to there's four of us now that keep regular contact that way. But people have different goals with it. I have competed some over those years but not regularly. And the other person, Gerhart Behrens, has helped us start a running club here in town and still likes to race and helps to promote other people's involvement. Mine is maybe more a little associated to my old days as a philosophy major - kind of run by yourself and think your own thoughts, spend a lot of time running in the woods.

CP: What was the state of the Exercise and Sports Science Department when you entered it?

TW: Oh yeah, it was one that had - it was in transition some. Shortly after we arrived, it changed from being Department of Physical Education to Department of Exercise and Sport Science, and it had a very strong physical education teacher orientation, and has maintained that throughout. We've modified it within the last year, but we always prepare our students well, those that are preparing to be physical educators, because we see that as such an important opportunity for our field, to be working. You know, it's one of the few places where it's built in to—especially the elementary age—the opportunity to engage and help to try to establish a lifelong habit of enjoyment and participation in physical education.

But it was a time of transition to the disciplinary scientific approach where many of the older faculty—in fact some of the older faculty here at the time were really more coaches. There were some that their home was in Physical Education, but Dale Thomas, the wrestling coach, was a member of the faculty, and Gene Tanselli, who had been the baseball coach, but by that time he was no longer the baseball coach but he was on the faculty. Maybe a few others. Chuck Daly, I don't think he was ever a coach, but he was a long-time starter and timer of basketball games and a starter at track meets, things like that. So you had that sort of old school, and then young faculty were the ones who were prepared to engage in the research process. So that's continued through the time I've been here.

CP: Did you get to know Dale Thomas at all?

TW: A little bit. He was a kind of gruff person, so...but he was still on the faculty. I'm not sure that he was teaching much, maybe he taught a wrestling course, but he was still primarily the coach, so we'd see him around. And I couldn't say that I knew him well. I think sometimes he'd be at the faculty meetings, but not regularly.

[0:35:11]

CP: What were your initial duties in this position?

TW: Well, it was teaching exercise physiology-related classes. But also, I arrived in '87, and John Dunn, who was a real leader on campus, he was on the original Bacc Core committee that was developing the Bacc Core, and that came into effect in 1990. And I had experience at Kansas State, which was one of the early schools with this lifetime physical activity approach, having a required course for all of our students at K-State, the concepts approach. So it wasn't just engaging in the physical activity class, like our PAC classes, but it had the conceptual approach that you knew the knowledge base associated with how to—what are the reasons for being physically active and what are the health benefits and how to implement and design a program for yourself.

And so I had led that program at Kansas State, and I think that was a factor in being hired, because they were transitioning here. Up until the Bacc Core went into effect, all students had to take PAC classes. They had to take three credits of it. And so this was changing that to be a three-credit lifetime fitness requirement, where it'd be two credits of the lecture content base and one credit of a lab to sort of show you how to implement and assess and initiate an activity program that's appropriate to your interests and needs, but with a lifelong perspective. And so I helped with that transition, and we hired a new faculty member who began in 1991. So that came into place, and I helped to see that through and design it.

So that was part of the early responsibilities. I also took responsibility, as the graduate coordinator, to help with managing and designing our graduate courses and requirements and such, and that was kind of my first taste of service administration. So I served in that role and really had a sense of responsibility for helping the program develop that way. So then in '94, when Chris Zauner left to take a dean position, I was tabbed to be the chair at that time, and I think that that helped considerably. But I also started to get involved in faculty governance as well, around that time.

CP: Right, and I want to talk about that. So you've been heavily involved in the Faculty Senate over a couple of different stints, from what I can gather. Why don't you tell me about how you got started in the Faculty Senate, what drew you to it in the first place?

TW: Well it's kind of interesting. I'm not sure that it's still the case, but I sort of had the sense that you have elections for faculty senator, and sometimes I think that the new people get elected, because others are, maybe they've filled it before. But so I got elected to the Faculty Senate, I won't remember exactly what the first year was, but I remember that Mike Martin was the president elect. He came on in my first year and he was a dynamic, smart guy and really engaged. But see, these were things that I connected with. As I say, I've been undergrad coordinator plus I also started to get—I can't remember if I was already a faculty senator, I may well have been, I think I was, but early on I just saw that there was a need for changing some of the academic regulations.

And the first one that I became involved with, and proposed a change to, was to move the time at which a student could withdraw from a course. At the time that I arrived here it was five weeks, and my proposal was to move it to the end of a seventh week. And I remember moving that through the process and just getting engaged in the faculty governance and the committees, proposing it at the committee and working it through the Senate and such. It was kind of interesting because one of the things that I did at the time was to do a comparison of the other PAC-10 schools at that time and found that five weeks was by far the earliest of any. The U of O probably was like us at that time, but no other of the PAC-10 schools had as early as that.

[0:40:02]

And of course, part of the problem with it is that lots of the time, students don't even have indicators of how they're doing. They may have had their midterm in week 5 and get the results after that week is over, and it just didn't seem an appropriate timeframe. Of course, being here at Oregon State was the first time I was ever in a quarter school; like a ten week term school and how fast that goes. So what I found was Oregon State was the earliest, and when we moved it to seven weeks we were still the earliest. Most of the other schools - some of them, like Stanford, you could have changed it during finals week or even after the course is over. So you get those people that are resistant to change and you could say "well, we're still the earliest, if that's your concern." So yeah, that was my first engagement in the process.

And the other part that I took on, more just vocally but I think we probably made a proposal around it too, was the ROTC policies that prohibited anybody from being gay, being in the ROTC and pushing that. Even, in coming up against the fact that Oregon State's always going to have an ROTC, and yet that disconnect and incongruence between the values of the university, and yet they need to abide by, at least in that component of the program at Oregon State of ROTC, have to

abide by the federal military dictates. And obviously, over time that changed. But I remember being vocal in the Senate around that, and of course there were many people who felt similarly. They just would butt up against a sense of "well, we can't take it any further."

It was interesting because you know that Graham Spanier was the provost at that time, and I remember a conversation with him about it in the Senate, it came up. And this was at the time of the first Gulf War and everybody could see how easily we could win that war; I mean it was just a pretty small-scale military operation. I mean, it was a big deal, but Iraq didn't have much of an army to fight against. And I remember Spanier sort of making the comment "do you want us to take on the military?" sort of similar to "you see what they've just done in Iraq?" And I kind of thought "no, I think we're asking you to take on discrimination, not taking on the military."

So anyway, that level of involvement early on. And then I was elected to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, so then it gave me an opportunity to be engaged across the state system in faculty government and see what some of the issues are, and also get an appreciation of how here at Oregon State we had, I think, a good model for a faculty governance. And it worked pretty well, I'd say, in terms of administration being responsive to the faculty role and the running of the institution.

CP: You served two stints on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, what did that entail?

TW: Yeah, so I became president, I was president in '97, and so I was president-elect in '96. So I think it was the three years prior to that was my first stint, because I think it ran for, when you add the stint on the—well the EC is, I think, just a two-year span. So I was on the EC, and then I think that went directly into the three-year cycle of presidency. I think it was because of those engagements, you know; being involved at the Senate level about those issues and the academic regulations, those sorts of things - you become known. And whatever other roles I might have been doing on campus at that time. So it's a large commitment, but it was good to be part of it, to be able to learn from it and be able to help shape and influence events. One of the things I think was a major activity at the time - John Byrne would remember better than I, or if you're talking to Roy Arnold - the financial challenges we had and how after the measure that changed—

CP: Measure 5.

[0:44:59]

TW: Measure 5 changed the funding. And the reduction of programs and the engagement and the process that had been defined for reducing programs. And it was kind of interesting; one of the things that I remember that I think was somewhat strategic in it, was suggesting that the College of Veterinary Medicine be something that we would give up. And I remember the term—I hadn't heard it before—that it was sort of like the Statue of Liberty ploy where you put it on the table and knock some other things with the idea. And I can't say this for sure, but probably with the idea that the state legislature would never allow that to go away, and so you kind of helped to preserve other programs and they would find ways to keep that one going. So thus the Statue of Liberty term - you know, "yeah, there's no way we're going to sell the Statue of Liberty."

And yet at the same time, being on the Executive Committee, you would be on the receiving side of—this is probably pre-email—letters, things like that, input from faculty in those units that were very concerned. You know, they felt like they were on the chopping block and were challenging you to stand up and defend them. Even if it is kind of tactical and didn't come to pass, you come to realize a lot of people grow very concerned about their jobs during the course of, while this is being determined, before you see what the outcomes are. And then there were real programs that were cut back, and you are in the cross current of that when you're in the Executive Committee.

CP: Tell me a bit more about your experience as president of the Faculty Senate in 1997.

TW: Yeah, so Paul Risser was hired in '96, and so he—I'm not sure if it was happening before that. I was not the first person. Ken Krane was president before me. I think Sally Francis was the president at the time Paul was hired. But Paul brought the Faculty Senate president—and it may have been a standing process already—to be a member of the cabinet. And so we had that opportunity, as the president, to sit in at the cabinet meetings that were every week with all the other top administrators. And it's interesting, my memory would be a little bit lacking on what some of the key issues were.

I remember one that we pushed through was about benefits for domestic partners, which at that time was not assured, and we couldn't actually determine it, but as a Faculty Senate strongly supported it. And I think the OUS system put it into place during that time, and I remember moving that through our Senate as an initiative that needed to be done, and fortunately had support. One of the other things was initiating a taskforce. The, I think it was OUS, or maybe the legislature for OUS, redefined some of our faculty positions. And we had certain categories, which they now created - this "professional faculty" category which combined a category of faculty that we call no-rank faculty, which is a pretty almost pejorative title for a faculty level, and also administrative staff members that didn't have faculty status before that - and they were moved together and created "professional faculty."

And so we created a taskforce to determine—you've got a combination of people that before were not considered faculty but were represented in the Faculty Senate. I mean, that were faculty, the no-ranks that were in the Senate, apportionment and all that stuff, and then you had this other category that weren't. So we created a taskforce on that membership and the inclusion of it.

And something that I think, there's no going back on that, but sometimes you can see the effect that that's had on our Senate, that this mixture of professional faculty and teaching/research faculty, oftentimes because there's maybe not a strong sense of service, or there are just too many things and faculty aren't inclined to give it the time. Sometimes I don't think our Senate has a strong enough component of the teaching/research faculty membership. Not to disparage or diminish the contributions of professional faculty, because several of them have been Senate president since that time. They're very engaged. But the issues that you're working in the job are different, and they're less directly involved in curriculum matters, things like that. And it sort of has changed some of the dynamics and conversations that you have in the Senate.

[0:50:34]

So sometimes it seems like, well, would we be better served if it was purely teaching/research faculty? But I don't think you can turn back the clock on that, especially when you elected to go the more inclusive direction; it doesn't play well to think about being more restrictive. But that came about at that time. I think the taskforce report may have actually happened past my term, but we started it at that time.

We started one other during my term and that was a taskforce that I headed up on this major budget overrun that happened in the IT section of campus. And I thought we did a very good report on that in terms of understanding the causes of it, the failure of management that led to that. So recommendations for how we ought to build our budgets and avoid something like that in the future. But, you know, it had Telecom and Computing Services, Media Services, things like that, and they had run up a major deficit. One of the things that is interesting is that Karyle Butcher, who was the head of the library at that time, has come to me, I remember immediately afterwards and multiple times since, just saying "you saved us." Because the library was on the block to have very serious cuts, and that report helped to see where the causes were and where they weren't and such that it helped to change the course of making cuts that made a real difference to the library. So that was something that was nice to hear; it was rewarding to see that it had that kind of impact. And I do think that that was a major value contribution to the campus at the time.

I think that that may have also been why I was asked to chair a taskforce on Athletics, which I would not chalk-up as being one of my better outcomes. Because once you're doing anything with Athletics you begin to see—it's almost like that earlier time of trying to see if you can change ROTC, it's like uh-uh. And this was a case where Ken Williamson was the president at that time and Risser had made some budget commitments to help bail out Athletics - and that's often, that'll always be something that faculty will question. You know, this is E and G dollars, and they have run up such a significant debt, dictating that E and G dollars are going to fill it. And yet there's a sense of impotence in seeing that that happens. And so I think, can—"well there isn't much we can do about it, let's start a taskforce." So the horse was already out of the barn by that time, so there wasn't a lot that we could do.

But it was an interesting experience because Bob De Carolis was just fresh on campus at that time, and Mitch Barnhart was the new AD and he was making some significant changes, you know, a young gun, and he had some good ideas from where he'd been. So Mitch came and met with us sometimes, but Bob was a member on it, and I came to appreciate his straight-shooter approach. He was honest, forthright, it was nice to come to know him through that setting and maintain that connection and relationship over the years. You know, it was disappointing to see the development this year that's

he's—and again, it's just the dynamics of Athletics, that's my sense—and I don't know, maybe it's been out there and people know this, that some of the big donors probably didn't want to donate if he was still the AD, for whatever reason, and probably having a lot to do with the renewal and extension of Craig Robinson's contract, which was a major mistake. And you can see that in business, you can see it in government; you may have a pretty good record overall, but if you make a major mistake you kind of have to go. And that would be my reading of what happened there, but he was a good guy.

[0:55:13]

It was interesting though, because I came to know him through that setting and then I'd be in the Senate when he would come and visit in later years. And when he was the AD, he always seemed to be so defensive and I always had the sense - and I would tell him this, I'd say "you don't have to be that way," but it just sets this tone. And I think it's because, well, I'm not receiving all the angry emails from faculty, that he would have it in his mind that the faculty are going to be foes. Whereas you, you're doing good stuff and you can come and speak honestly about that and feel proud about it. But I think he had a wariness about dealing with the faculty.

CP: That's interesting. Do you feel like the Faculty Senate has evolved as a vehicle for change, or as a force that can shape policy on campus? Where do you see it positioned in 2015 versus where it's been over the last twenty-five years or so?

TW: You know, I had a couple of stints. I think when I was leading up to being president, I had been in the Senate for maybe two terms or something, or maybe two terms that ran into the IFS and that sort of thing. And then I was in, I think, for another two term set, and that was the second time on the EC in the 2000s. I forget the exact years. And I was elected back on this past year. So you get to see it at different times.

And I remember I was in the Senate whatever years this would be, I'm forgetting who was president at the time, but they put through the second academic regulation that I shaped. I was just aghast that when they put in this—they passed an academic regulation that after a year an I would convert to an F. And that just seemed wrong on so many levels, because if you look at the academic regulation; a teacher is only supposed to approve giving you an I if what you've done so far is passing, which doesn't mean you'll pass the course, because whatever you've missed might be such a percentage that there's no way you could pass. But at least what you've done so far is passing. And it might just be a minor amount, so that even if you were to score it without those points you could still pass.

And so the two things that just outraged me about that was, one, that default turn to an F meant that the faculty member wasn't giving the grade, and that's just wrong. It has to come from the faculty member. And it's not necessarily reflective of the work that you've done. And yet that passed. And I remember arguing against it, but you get the agenda a day or two beforehand and you really can't be organized like you should. So then when I got on—and this was when I got on the EC, I was just pushing hard that they'd change that. And so they finally did, and that was my proposal that we now have this I/ and then whatever the default grade would be.

But interestingly, from that earlier opportunity that I had shaping an academic regulation, I thought "well, I'll go and see what the other PAC-10 schools are doing," because as it did the other time I figured this will only shore-up my argument. And I found quite the opposite. Every other school does this same stupid thing. But there's no fundamental educational value and principle behind having an I convert to an F. It's just punitive; "you didn't do what you said you'd do, we'll give you an F," and it's not even, as I say, coming from the faculty. So I felt good that at least as an institution we departed from that, to at least make it based on the grade that the faculty member gives you.

So that's when I was on the EC the second time. Jeff Hale was the president around that time, and whoever else. I forget who else was president. Lynda Ciuffetti was president when I was on the EC. And I felt that it was helpful, you know, my experience was helpful and I really enjoyed helping on the EC, helping with things that she was bringing forward. Yeah, Paul Doescher, I think, was the other president during that two year stint. So I think it was very, it's always been, very well engaged. And I think we've had some very good presidents that really have made remarkable contributions. Linda is an example, and she was on the state board because of that level of engagement.

[1:00:15]

Now I'm a little concerned as I'm back on, because there's so few people that actually attend the meetings. Now you can do that online. And so it may well be that a lot of people are connected to the meeting, but the kind of debate and consideration and discussion that you could have is much weaker when there's just fewer bodies there. And in some ways it's also, people have to be told, that are coming to meet with the Senate, that there may be a lot of people that are online. Because they come and think "well, what sort of active body is this if there's so few people here?" So that, I think, is going to be a challenge. Now that they've made that option available more and more people—and it's valuable to have it, I mean because we have some senators that are in Extension, that are across the state; we have some senators that are at the Cascade campus, and there's no way you can expect them to be there, so this enables them to be engaged. But a lot of people are exercising it here on campus.

And I made this point in a recent Senate meeting we held over at Weniger - and I think that the meetings should be held, where possible, in classrooms here on campus. LaSells is kind of removed and I think some people will opt to just do it from their computer rather than walk down to LaSells. And especially maybe now with the new classroom building opening up, if they see that that's valuable they could try to make it more the regular thing that the Senate meeting will be here in the core of the campus rather than at the edge of it. And that might help to contribute to the engagement of the meetings. But I think, as a body, it continues to be a very good model. And from what I understand, it reflects well on OSU, the level of contribution that the faculty have in faculty governments.

CP: Well university service is a really cornerstone of your vita and there's a couple of other bits that I'd like to touch on beyond the Faculty Senate. For one, you were on the faculty search committee for the Linus Pauling Institute in 1997-98, that wound up hiring some people who have made a very important impact for the Institute and for the university. You want to talk a little bit about that process?

TW: Oh yeah, that was fortuitous. Tim White, our dean, was also on that search committee. He was our dean at that time, because of the strong connection of health. But I think, actually, it's hard to know whether my participation would have been through my heavy involvement in faculty governance or if it might have been from the discipline of Exercise Science and bringing that to it. But yeah, that was a great opportunity and really shaped an important institute to create it here on campus. Of course it does connect, I guess, with your library. I remember Steve Lawson came; he was already here I think, because John Byrne and George Miller, I think was the VP for research at that time, and they brought it here and this was just to implement this great vision. And so it had great hires out of that in selecting Balz. And originally I think it was two faculty positions but they had such a strong feel that they were able to convert that into three, and that would be Rod Dashwood and Maret Traber and Tory Hagen, and they were just the centerpiece of it for a time. We really got it off to a great start, and I was sad to see Rod go a couple years ago, because he was doing such great work. And our own Emily Ho. We have several faculty members here in our school that are members of it, so it's been a great shaping influence, and not just for the quality of the work, but then the building; a first-rate scientific enterprise over there.

CP: The other thing I want to ask you about is an issue of constant conversation on this campus, and that's space. The university space committee you've been involved with for quite some time. You want to tell me about that?

TW: Yeah, I would consider that to be one of the areas that I feel gratified that it's made such a change on campus. Sabah started this—well he created this taskforce on space, and Mark Abbott was the chair and Stella Coakley was on it, and she ultimately became the chair of the continuing committee afterwards.

[1:05:27]

But at a certain point, when we were on that taskforce - and it was a pretty large taskforce - it was determined that we ought to have a component of it focus on classroom space. And since I was chair of Exercise and Sports Science with so many majors and so engaged in undergraduate education and with the Lifetime Fitness Program and so forth, I was the logical choice to chair that subcommittee. And we had, I think, a couple of people like Barbara Balz. I'm forgetting exactly how she spelled her last time but it's something like that; she was the registrar at the time. And some people who were both on the taskforce. But then we enlarged it and brought in people who had relevant backgrounds for the subcommittee. And it was interesting because, at the start of that, some of those people had a fatalistic view about what we could accomplish, because we've been on committees before that have focused on classroom space and nothing's ever happened.

But I think that it was an opportune time and it was fortuitous, because when we developed our report I think the ground was fertile for it to actually receive a receptive response from campus leadership, because I think we did a lot of groundwork on that in terms of documenting the needs. I'd have to revisit it now. We developed recommendations, and there were four or five of them, some of them in terms of just, "start right now and start remodeling, because the classrooms as a whole are in sorry shape." And I remember taking the opportunity to join some of President Ray's speaking with the faculty, just so I could raise this when it was a time that this report was coming out. We bring people here and we show them the campus, we induce them to come to OSU, and our classrooms are where they're spending so much of their time. This is the educational environment; we need to not do a bait and switch here. We need to give them a good environment. And so start working it that way.

The other thing was to develop the software, to buy the software for scheduling - and we didn't have it at that time - to access departmental classrooms, because we were coming under a crunch and we were going to need the space; and to create a standing committee; and there's probably another recommendation there. And I remember when we brought that report back to the full committee Mark Abbott said, he looked at it and said in the meeting—and these are the first times I ever heard the word; we've all heard them since but it was the first time I ever heard the words—said "these are nonstarters." And I'm thinking, "I've never heard it before but I think I know what he means by that." But I also thought "no, that's not going to be true." And every single one of them came about. And I have to commend Sabah for probably being a key component of that, of seeing the value for making this commitment to the renovations of the classrooms.

One of them was to create a classroom committee, and I chaired that. And that was probably one of the most rewarding things for all of us who were on that committee to be part of, because we could see the tangible outcomes from it. We didn't control a budget, so we had to learn to see whether or not there was a budget for doing renovations. And they started first with StAg, and Sabah mentioned this, and I feel it myself; the first building we did was StAg over two summers. And then, of course, they gut it to do this upgrade for earthquake, seismic upgrades. And you've got all these ones that we invested our first dollars into, and of course they're going to be wonderful classrooms when their done, but you think "well, if we had picked other ones they'd still be wonderful now." And then Milam was systematically done, Weniger was systematically done, a couple of years ago we did the major auditoriums, like Gilfillan. Some took a major overhaul and some were more modest, like Gilfillan, and the one down in Withycombe. And we did, as I said, the Weniger ones, that was over a couple summers.

[1:10:12]

So you really saw a major effect. And then one of our last things before the committee was disbanded was to have an assessment report of what we've accomplished and where we should be looking for the future. And one of them is—and I hope that this new space committee that, actually I think their first meeting is tomorrow, and I'll be on that, which will be helpful because I can bring the history with the classroom committee. But Rebecca Mathers is going to be on it, it was Kent Kuo before that; you know just having—so is John Greydanus. We have people who were there—John Gremmels—just by virtue of their positions. And they're at the table. And what the real innovation and value was, and we also now have faculty there too, so they had a role. But we had a committee that was dedicated to it and it helped keep the attention going. The budget wasn't always there. There's just too much vagaries there, so I'm hopeful one of our prime recommendations is that there'll be a dedicated budget for renovation over time, and maybe—because Glenn Ford and Rebecca Warner are leading up this new one, and of course space is part of Glenn's portfolio, but he's also the budget guy and they help to ensure that there'll be a continuing commitment. And we can't lose sight of the great value, when we have this wonderful classroom building open up; we can't forget that a lot of the time spent by our students are in other classrooms, and we want those to be suitable for the educational experience we're trying to deliver.

CP: Well, I want to return to some departmental history as we head into the homestretch of this interview. We've already established that you became chair of Exercise and Sports Science in 1994. I've talked to various people about their movement into administration and they often have sort of mixed feelings about it, because there's a compromise there, and your time shifts in a different way. And I'm wondering, as you reflect back on that initial shift more towards administration, there's obviously less time for research and teaching. What do you remember about that?

TW: Yeah, I think it was a crossroads, because there's a lot of people on this campus that are able to keep their research agendas going full bore. But with our department, it was just not going to work that way for me, in terms of it was one

or the other. And I didn't have the same sort of research agenda that many faculty have on campus, but that was going to have to be of lesser attention during the time that I was administrator. And so that was a consequence.

But then there was so much over the years, so much change and progress and innovation to happen. I mean, the department grew astronomically. I don't know how many majors. We can go back and look, see what the records were, but probably when I assumed the chair position there was maybe like three hundred or so exercise science majors, somewhere in that range. And now we're up around twelve hundred or thereabouts. And I'm certainly not taking credit for that, because that's something that we see all across the United States, that the exercise science programs have really grown, partly because of this keen interest that the students have through engagement of physical activity and sport and wish to pursue it as an intellectual area. But also because of the pre-therapy and allied health fields that this is a wonderful way in which to prepare for those professional schools, so that's just grown astronomically.

And so that was a change and a commitment that I was happy to make. I think that I bring—I've always had the view in the role of the administrator that you just don't have all of the tools in the toolkit, but you want to have key ones, and it's a team effort. We worked in a college and we had good associate deans, like Jeff McCubbin was one who was in our program who was an associate dean. And so we could serve our department real well between me and things that he could do, and we've always had good deans. You know, Mike Maksud to Tim White to Tammy Bray. I think we've had great deans, great leaders on campus, and so it was always rewarding in that regard to work with people that you had such regard for, their vision and abilities.

[1:15:07]

So those are many of the rewards. But I think my ability to work with the faculty, and I think some of the things with the faculty governance too, I take pleasure in working with a group and having outcomes. And I think that those are the things we've had the opportunity to talk about. Some of the things that you actually could help catalyze, but certainly—and I take responsibility, I think I do bring something that helps it to have a successful outcome, but it's not only me, you know, it's the people that are engaged and you like working with them and you see things that they bring that you never would have thought of and that they can make things happen. And collectively we really have made things happen.

I think one of the talents that I could bring to them is that I have the ability to write reports that would summarize things that we've done and make recommendations in a way that have had impact. And so both at the faculty level, when you're writing P&T letters or program proposals or category ones, things like that, that was an important skill to bring. And that's where, in the transition from being a co-director, it helped our colleges merge, Health and Human Performance and Home Economics. And then Tammy was hired - Jeff and Clara Pratt were the transition people - Tammy was hired, who was a great hire, and she just, we can see how far she's run with it and how far our college has gone under her leadership. And so that was an exciting time to transition.

And then a couple years into that, we merged Nutrition and Exercise Science. So now it was a different challenge as chair, to bring another department in that had been in Home Economics. And then more recently converting to a school model. So there was always things to forge and try to make successful and bring the faculty together. And so I stepped down at the end of 2014. I figured it's time to pass the baton, you know, I've been doing this for twenty years, and I think the transition has gone well. And somebody who doesn't have the history on campus and the knowledge of things but brings strong experience from another institution, and that's a great infusion, strong research grants with us, is Norm Hord; knowledge of the research science, nutrition science kind of research, lab science. So I think it's been a very good transition.

CP: So where is your focus these days?

TW: Well I actually am retiring.

CP: Oh, okay.

TW: So this had been a year of transition where I've done my best to help. And that's actually part of what my responsibilities have been, to help in the transition this past year and meet regularly with Norm and Anna and help a lot through the transition. And then I'm retiring as of the end of this month, but I'll be working half-time next year. And so

there's another transition going on where Sunil Khanna is coming on as co-director, and Anna will do that transition like I've done in this past. But it's been a great pleasure.

It was kind of interesting, the comments made when I was stepping down. We had a nice little event where I'm stepping down as co-director a year ago June, and I was commenting how, when it was determined that I was continuing on, I had been a chair, I would be one of the co-directors, and Anna was coming in from the public health side and she'd be the other co-director. So it was a bit like an arranged marriage, that it was determined and you would work together on this, and yet it was an arranged marriage that worked very well. She had been chair of Public Health during the time I was chair of Exercise Science; she was chair for probably about three or four years. I was chair for a year after Tammy arrived and then she went back to being a faculty member to work on her promotion. And so she had that experience and she'd be here on campus, and she's just a great person who's got a lot of keen insights and wisdom, and it was just a pleasure to work with her. So those first three years of the school working together was eventful that way, to really help to try to get it off. And to work with somebody you just had implicit trust in, you know, that's important. Co-directors have different modeling. And we'll see over time whether it stays co-directors or it become director and associate director.

CP: Well, as we conclude here, one question we're asking everybody for this project is to give us their perspective on where they see OSU heading right now and its direction as it heads towards its 150th birthday. It's been a lot of growth, a lot of change in the last few years - where do you see OSU as being positioned right now?

[1:20:40]

TW: Well, I think very well. You know, I think OSU has guided, as I said earlier, I think it's got a strong sense of faculty governance. And so that, I think, creates a culture and a tone on the campus that engenders success, that there's a sense of teamwork. It would be interesting to see if, over time, there—I'm not hearing it, but you know I've been working in my office, I've stepped out of administration, I can't say I'm right in the middle of things on campus, but I'm not aware if the voices for a faculty union are getting any stronger now that U of O has done that. But I see U of O as different than us, because I think that - and we're seeing it with their board too - that the relationship between the faculty and the presidents there, especially the previous ones, has not actually been as consultative. And I could see where the faculty would see the need to unionize, whereas I think our faculty, there will always be that voice since—sometimes maybe it gets to the point of an adversarial approach or just a sense of "we are cooperating, but the deck is definitely stacked on their side and we should have a larger voice."

So I'm not aware that we're going in that direction. And it's interesting to compare ourselves to U of O on many of these value sorts of things, because I think they really acquitted themselves horribly in the treatment of the student who was raped by the athletes. I mean there's one thing in terms of—because we did poorly with the one that, Brenda Tracy who's spoken up in this past year, we did poorly at that time, but not as institutionally. And then the U of O, to have countersued her and to have accessed her records - I mean, so that was something we brought up. You know, I was asking about, after the president's letter, about what we're doing to try to respond to. I'd like to see a little bit more sharing of what we're doing to prevent, however much you can. But what are the efforts to help prevent that there be sexual assaults on campus?

But some of their responses—so it shows you they're a different institution. And I think their board is taking off in a different direction, whereas I think ours, we've got a good president and it seems as if the board is off to a good start. That'll be the testing, and so that's the part that's hard to predict, because it's so early on, is how that interplay will be and where they will or won't assert themselves relative to faculty roles. Because that's what we see in Wisconsin, where the governor is inserting themselves in what the faculty governance is, at that major American institution. And U of O, it seems as if the board is asserting themselves in places, but I'm not sure that that will play out here, but I think we'll have to be vigilant about that. But the early—the things that I read don't suggest that that's where our board is wanting to go. But it's a brand-new time. It will be interesting to see how things play out with the Cascade campus, in terms of state support for that, because we wouldn't want to see it drawing out of our own resources; we'd like to see that take hold successfully.

Yeah, so I have some optimism for the trajectory that we're on. It always seems to be under-resourced and trying to do what we can with fewer people or whatever, and to dig down you can only ask so much of your faculty. We've hired great faculty and we want to make sure they succeed and we'd love to see them stay and succeed.

CP: Yeah. Well Tony, thank you very much. This has been very interesting and fun for me and I wish you all the best in retirement.

TW: Yeah, thank you very much, I'm looking forward to it, it will be a nice transition. This is the first summer in who knows how many years that I actually have the summer off.

CP: Well, enjoy.

TW: It's kind of fun. Well thanks so much for this, I appreciate it.

[1:25:09]