

INTERVIEWEE: CARLA ESPINOZA
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Affirmative Action

INTERVIEWER: Samuel C. McCulloch
Emeritus Professor of History
UC Historian

DATE: March 3, 1989

SM: This is an interview with Carla Espinoza who is Assistant Vice Chancellor, Affirmative Action, at 1:15 or 1:30 p.m., March 3, 1989. Okay, now, I might add you're a very good friend of mine, too. Now, question, could you please tell me the events that brought you to UCI?

CE: I'd be happy to, Sam. Essentially what brought me to UCI was that I competed in a recruitment.

SM: Speak a little bit closer, please.

CE: The position was announced in 1979. I can't forget this simply because it seemed to take an inordinately long time to complete this recruitment. I remember in February of 1979 I applied for the position as Affirmative Action Officer for UCI. I remember, too, that the position paid \$35,850 and I thought, "Am I prepared to take a pay cut?" because at that point in time I was making more money. But, I worked for Los Angeles County. It's a Civil Service operation and I had been promoted essentially all the way up through the personnel ranks and, unless I was prepared to wait a very long time until the Director of Personnel retired--which still hasn't happened to this day--then there wasn't much growth opportunity for me. And I'd always had a special place in my heart for higher education, so I

decided, well, I'll compete for the position. In December of 1979, they had the first cut, as they re-evaluated all of the applications and the resumes, and in February I was notified that I should come in for an interview.

SM: That's slow.

CE: That was very slow. It was a year later that I actually came in for the interview. I met with the search committee and I met with at least three other special interest groups: some of them were community people; some of them were student affirmative action people--or at least those that ended up being student affirmative action people--and with a couple of administrators and a couple of faculty members. I didn't have a feeling one way or the other about whether I was a strong candidate or not. I think one of the things that disturbed me, and I think that seems to be the notion out there with a lot of folks that aren't familiar with higher ed[ucation], that there is an expectation of a Ph.D. And I kept saying I don't have a Ph.D. I guess I was trying to disqualify myself. I wasn't sure if they'd picked that up in the C.V. (Curriculum Vitae). Let's see. In March, I was called by Jim McGaugh who was the Executive Vice Chancellor.

SM: In 1980?

CE: That's right, in March of 1980. I was called in by Jim McGaugh. He wanted to do a final interview. I guess there were five of us that he was interviewing as his finalists.

And he said to me, "What do you think you can do for this campus?" And I simply stated that I didn't think it was a matter of what I could do--I'd already demonstrated that as a consequence of my resume and the previous screening process--but more what did he want me to do. I think from that moment on, Jim McGaugh and I had a marvelous relationship. There was a great deal of candor and honesty. At that point in time, he asked me if I'd be interested in the position. I said, "Give me a few days to think about it." This was on a Thursday. The following Monday, the Director of Personnel, Ralph Lau who is going to be retiring this year, asked me if I'd made my decision and I said, "Yes." And I've been here since June 2, 1980.

SM: Hold it about here. That's very interesting, Carla, and I share your appreciation of Jim McGaugh, whom I thought was a very fine Vice Chancellor and a very fine person, and my relations basically as Chair of the Academic Senate, when I used to meet with him once a month and sometimes more often, got to know him very well. Though he was here at the beginning, you know, in 1964, when we all sat around the table and created our program and he sat there as head of Psychobiology. Is there any word as to who might be the new Director of Personnel?

CE: I anticipate that there will be a recruitment that will start here shortly, but there is no candidate that we know of.

SM: Well, now, secondly, of course, I'm interested to know what your responsibilities were. First, what they asked you and thought you should do and then, secondly, how you set about doing it and what you added and so forth.

CE: Very good. My primary responsibility was to develop, to enhance the existing Affirmative Action program. My predecessor who will appear in your dissertation, if you will, was Ramon Curiel, had advanced from the Affirmative Action Office position--he was Assistant to the Chancellor. And what he had developed was a generic kind of program, but it wasn't focused on the specific needs and deficiencies within the campus, so, I was asked to do that. One of the ways in which I proceeded to do that was to make sure that I secured the assistance of a data analyst. That was not an area of expertise for me, so I had to make sure that I was able to get someone who at that time was out of Bob Daly's shop. Now, it is not called the Academic Information Systems, I think.

SM: Who is he? Bob who?

CE: Bob Daly.

SM: Daly?

CE: Daly, yes. Because it was my assessment and my experience that you can't do an effective assessment of the campus difficulties and not even measure progress, unless you have a solid data system in which to be able to do that. So, that's the first thing I did.

The second thing I did was go back and measure what the strategy was when my predecessor developed his plan, which I believe was back in 1976, and I set about measuring progress from 1976 to 1980. As you may know, anytime you're changing systems in this large a bureaucracy, there are all kinds of contact points and red tape, if you will. One of the stumbling blocks for me was the Office of the President because they weren't sure that we needed to develop another program. I maintained my momentum regarding the program, because I knew at one point in time we would be asked to defend our hiring practices; and, sure enough, in 1983 we were, as a consequence of a discrimination complaint that was filed. The Department of Labor, Office of OFCCP, which is the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, came in to do an audit and asked us to prepare a new Affirmative Action plan. And, fortunately, I was ready to do that. So, that's one aspect of the assignment that I was given.

The second was to assist faculty and staff, especially those with hiring authority, to identify qualified minorities and women and to identify strategies for bringing them to the campus. It was easier, actually, to be able to tell hiring authorities where to look than it was to encourage them to recruit from those locations, and I'll explain a little bit of that. Since about 1983, I would say, early 1983, and mainly with deans and directors and department heads, one of the things that I would offer would

be assistance in terms of recruitment resources, where they could look, where, for example, there would be a preponderance of minorities, maybe even a . . . One of the things we used a lot were the black colleges and universities. It wasn't until 1986, when I actually posed the question, "What happened to all of these people that I referred you to in the past?" that the deans, in their candor, said something to me like, "Well, the institutions from which you chose to recruit are not institutions from which we typically recruit." So, that message took a long time for me to be able to translate. And this is a point that I'll come back to when we start approaching the other question about why [there is] a Faculty Assistant for Affirmative Action now in 1989.

So, there was the program plan, there was recruitment, and then there was the aspect of politics; and I don't mean that in any pejorative way. I think . . . when I say politics, I mean selling the concept of affirmative action, selling the concept of equal opportunity. For the most part, there has always been, if you'll forgive the expression, an arrogance among the faculty at UCI--and not just the faculty, this is among our managers. And this arrogance translated into a pursuit of excellence that wasn't necessarily realistic. It wasn't realistic in terms of the labor pool and it wasn't realistic in terms of the fiscal resources available to Irvine. Now, we've come a

long way from that. But, at the point in time when we were wanting to do recruitments of exceptional people, we didn't have the resources to be able to compete with the UCLAs and the Berkeleys, for example. So, I had to do some of that. Kind of that persuasive talking. And then the fourth component was the discrimination complaint component. I will note, and I was preparing something in writing for you, Sam, just to be able to give you some kind of an assessment, but it's interesting that our complaint . . . our number of complaints has increased 500 percent. Part of it is because we've grown; part of it is because individuals have become much more sophisticated and knowledgeable about their rights, and also because, I believe to some degree, it has to do with the credibility of the office. I mean, you don't go somewhere to complain unless you genuinely believe that your complaint's going to be addressed. So, I think we've been able to satisfy that.

In terms of the discrimination complaints, I had to . . . there was a point in time where I had to make a determination as to what my role was going to be. And I spent a lot of time talking with Jim about that in the early 1980s, because I was troubled that if I prepared a finding that was against the institution, and the institution didn't satisfy the complaint, that the complainant could take our own finding to use it against us. And I was troubled for a very long time about what to do about that. And Jim simply

encouraged me to pursue truth and to make an honest assessment, based primarily on my experience. And make some judgment calls. So, that's what I have done and I say to employees now when they come in to file a complaint, that as long as they're working internally and we can address it internally, then my responsibility is to pursue the truth and to get resolution for all the impacted parties. Once they go outside, I become an instrument of the institution. I am Management like any other entity and, so, my responsibility is to protect the liability of the institution. And that's served me well. Those are the basic four items.

SM: That's very interesting. I might pursue one point here before we go on to the next one. You mentioned that you were available in your office. When we, the faculty, would be hiring a position on any . . . and if we weren't following affirmative action guidelines, then we could be called down. And I thought personally that this worked--I was sorry it had to happen--but there were two cases when we were hiring in the History Department that we really didn't follow it; and, there was a woman candidate who was certainly, in some of our estimations, the best. But they [some history department members] rode over us, you know, and wanted to . . . So, I know Ken Bailes, I guess it was, was delegated to go and see you and wrote his case up. Did you have many of those cases where you . . . where the

department was . . . (background noise) Oh, don't pay any attention to that. That's where I put my books.

CE: Actually, we've had numerous cases where there has been disagreement within a department or where there's been a minority or a woman that's appeared in the top three and that is not the person to whom there's been an ultimate offer.

My objective is to make sure that the department has covered all its bases. If, in fact, there was a minority or woman in the top three, present an argument to me as to why that--the other person--is better; and, although you can become very sophisticated about responding, in terms of the paper process, I think the departments for the most try to respond to the element of affirmative action while still satisfying the needs of the department. So, I'm looking not only for where the department intends to go and what they intend to do with the position, but also for strong justification as to why a woman or a minority who is already in the top three would not have satisfied that need.

SM: I might add another question which I know that you have legal training and I know that you're pursuing a law degree. Tell me, does the work you do in the law school help you with this kind of an appeal-appellate situation?

CE: That's a good question, Sam. In terms of the techniques, the mechanics and the law itself, yes, certainly law school does help me. In terms of the ethics, that's a different

question that comes up, because in law school you're taught to argue both sides of an issue. When I'm on the job here, when I'm trying to argue on behalf of the institution, it's very hard to keep in mind that I've got another party over here that also has some relevant issues that need to be addressed. So, in that sense, there is some conflict; but, for the most part, law school has allowed me to think in such a way that I've been able to survive in this position for eight years here at Irvine.

SM: You're doing very well here, Carla. I'm reminded of a quick story which I've never put on a tape. There are three people outside the gates of Heaven, a lawyer, a mathematician, and a CPA. And, "Oh," says Saint Peter, "you can't get right in. You've got to answer a question, at least one." "Well," they said, "what's the question?" The first man--he says to the lawyer, "What's two and two?" and he says, "Four." "You're in." And he says to the mathematician, "You should know this. What's two and two?" He says, "Four." And now, he says to the CPA, "What is two and two?" The fellow thought and he says, "What do you want it to be?" (laughter) So, you see.

Now, the question, question number three, do you have enough staff? I notice, happily, that you're up on the fifth floor now, from the first floor, and that you had about three or three and one-half people, and now it seems to be more.

CE: Yes, I do have an increase in staff from what we had down on the first floor. I started out with two clerical people and myself, but, as I mentioned earlier, our work load has increased from, oh, I think at one point in time, we were accepting approximately one complaint a month. Now, we're accepting one complaint a week, and that's a significant increase. And that's faculty, staff, and students, and regardless of whether the complaint may end up being determined by us to be frivolous or may end up with a conclusion of our inability to substantiate the allegations, we can't reach any of those conclusions until we have done an investigation. So, essentially, every person that walks in to file a complaint gets their issues heard and examined. Now, right now I have two professional people besides myself. I have two and one-half technical people--technical-professional, and then I have a clerical support staff of three. That's much larger, but, in terms of the work load itself, it is not near enough.

SM: Yes, that's short and to the point. Next, I wanted to know about when you were promoted to Assistant Vice Chancellor. Was it 1985?

CE: Yes.

SM: And 1985 brought new duties. You probably have outlined most of them already, but there must have been something in Jack Peltason's mind where he wanted you to do other things than what you were doing.

CE: Yes. As a matter of fact, most of what we were doing prior to Jack's arrival here was reactive. We were becoming very good firemen. My difficulty was that, in terms of the people that I had and certainly for myself, that kind of career, that kind of occupation, can burn you out very quickly. There needs to be something that allows folks to get very positive strokes; and one of the things that I felt was appropriate and something that I wanted the office to do for a very long time, was to get involved in program development activities.

And, by that, I mean anything that . . . any program that would allow, for example, for self-improvement for employees on this campus; programs that would allow us to do policy information training; even programs that allowed for self-improvement--things like how to cope or being a single parent--things that would motivate primarily minorities and women--they were available to everyone--but motivate them to consider this a positive work environment and induce them to stay here . . . employed here. That was our retention effort.

The other kinds of programs that we have become involved with now are student programs and those are more educational programs about diversity, cultural diversity; and some of the things we're proposing for the coming years include the History Department and Social Ecology and some of those academic departments that have already the

expertise, either among the faculty or among the TAs, and allow us to tap into that knowledge and present it to students or to the campus.

SM: That's really interesting. That's interesting and it's particularly interesting in terms of my own writing of this history of UCI. I gave a talk to the Research Institute of the Humanities, you know, Murray Krieger's, and they have all these high-powered people come from Berkeley and one guy was from Duke, another fellow was from Oxford University. And I gave a talk about my problems as a historian of UCI. And one of the panelists . . . I guess you'd call it a seminar. . . . she was from Berkeley. She flew down each Wednesday for this, and she . . . Lisa was the first name. I'm trying to get the second because she's, I think, a historian of science, but she's very keen on the question of minorities and affirmative action. And she said, "Do you have available to you all the tables and the material that the University of California has, particularly Irvine, in this area?" And I said, well, I didn't know, but I would be interviewing you on Friday, I said--this was Wednesday--and I would ask you. Because, apparently, as you well know, in the seventies and before, it was legally impossible for you to find an ethnic person. They never, ever could or did reveal their ethnic background.

CE: Yes.

SM: You couldn't have a picture. As I remember, I was on the scholarship committee in the late fifties and sixties, and you weren't allowed to see a picture of the student, because he or she might be black or Chicano or Japanese, you know. So, legally you couldn't. In fact, I literally refused to obey an order from Eloise Kloke who, way back at the very beginning, like say 1967, asked the deans to provide information on minorities, and, you know, women, and all this. And I said, "That's illegal." Now, you see, it's all swung around. It's different. But she [Lisa] wants to know, and if you could--we'll talk about this after--where will I find the information for Irvine, because . . . Of course, she raised another interesting question. Have you ever thought of interviewing those of your staff or faculty who have left you, who have either gone to a better position, who have gone somewhere because they didn't want to stay, or because they were . . . they didn't make it. They were simply ruled out, didn't publish enough, or what have you. And, I thought to myself, you know, if I were to interview George Kent, for instance, who I know very well, I don't think it would be a very profitable interview question. On the other hand, there would be something for those who have left us for better positions as to what they thought of Irvine and where we were good and where we weren't good.

CE: In terms of whether or not we have information about the ethnic composition of the campus, we do. As a matter of fact, we have some data back as far as 1976, but the most comprehensive data actually begins with my tenure at Irvine. And that's not to brag, it's just a matter of timing. In terms of availability, now it's much more scantily available--it would depend on what you were requesting--but nowadays we have very sophisticated breakdowns. We have breakdowns by handicap, by degree of handicap, by the status of the individual as a veteran. Age, which is not something that was covered back then, is something that we have data on now.

In terms of the second part of your question, I would say that we've been doing random exit interviews for about four years. And we started doing . . . It started as a consequence of the recruitment process, because I would see that the search statement, the affirmative action search statement that comes from the academic units, would say that they offered a job to a minority or a woman and they turned us down. And, of course, I was curious as to why that was happening. So, I began a kind of system . . . a system of randomly contacting some of these folks and asking them, you know, why did you turn down a position at Irvine.

Now, as a consequence of that, I learned so much from that that I thought, well, maybe I have to contact a few folks that have left us. So, again, on a random basis, if I

know that someone of color or if a woman has been here for a certain period of time and she has some insight to the campus, I'll make it a point to either contact these people before they leave or make some arrangements to contact them when they're gone. Some very interesting information comes from those kinds of interviews.

SM: Carla, I shall be in touch with you over the next year, year and one-half, and get this information before I start writing this book.

CE: Sure.

SM: Now, do you consider that we're doing better in affirmative action? I mean, I divided it up for the students, for faculty decisions on incoming faculty, for administration and handling of administrative searches and all that sort of thing?

CE: The thing I want to do, Sam, is I want to distinguish here, in terms of affirmative action, the process in terms of the intent in affirmative action, the end result in terms of the impact. The process . . . I don't think . . . I think there would be less than a handful of people that you would find on this campus who have hiring authority who would intentionally discriminate. So, in terms of the process, people are very alert to that. People are very keen about making sure that it's done right, that it is fair, and then let the chips kind of fall where they may. When I talk about impact, the impact of affirmative action, have we made

progress? I think in some areas we have. We've certainly made progress in terms of students; and part of that is by accident and part of that is by design. But in terms of faculty and staff, especially staff at the higher levels, I think we've been less successful for a number of reasons.

And now I'm talking about the impact. We've been less successful because, regardless of the intent, all of us come to a decision by virtue of our background, no matter whether we're deciding to buy a pair of shoes or a piece of computer equipment. We either elect not to buy brown shoes because we've been told they don't look good on us, or we decide not to buy a certain piece of computer equipment because we have heard all of the advertisements for their competitors and not for them. And I think, to some degree, we cannot help but be affected by our environment and our background.

The difficulty here at Irvine is that we have a very . . . an extremely decentralized process for recruitment. Now that appears to be more expeditious than going through a centralized process, but it also allows for many more variables: variable standards, variable personalities, variable measurement of those standards. And that's just in terms of those that can be measured objectively. But then you have those that are subjective and we are all making subjective evaluations of people when we first meet them. So, certainly it's going to happen in an interview process or an evaluation of their credentials. There is also an

interesting phenomenon within human nature that says we tend to gravitate to those that are most like us. And, if all of the decision-makers are of a certain kind, of a certain race, of a certain gender, then those . . . they're going to pull those into the circle who are most like them. And I think that there needs to be significantly more education about what diversity is and how it contributes to the growth and development of an institution such as this one; because, otherwise, we're not preparing our young people for the world that they're about to enter and we're not enticing our current work force to stay and advance here and help us grow as an institution.

SM: That's a very good answer, Carla, and it really gives me what I want to hear. Now, the next question, I seriously want to know does the conservative nature of Orange County affect your work? Have you found a problem?

CE: You know, that reminds me when I made the announcement back in 1980 in Los Angeles County that I had accepted a position at the University of California, Irvine, I heard all of these moans and groans and "You're going down there to red-neck country? What in the world are you going to do for affirmative action in red-neck country?" And "All those cowboys down there, they don't want to know anything about affirmative action." Let me say that being in Orange County has impacted my work, but not for all of the reasons that were discussed earlier.

Orange County has a much higher cost of living than any other county in the world, in the United States, at least in the continental United States. It has the highest income per capita; it has the highest cost of housing. And it's very difficult to induce a young scholar, particular a single woman or a single man, to come to southern California. And then, in the process of enticing them to come to the campus, they travel over with them to a real estate agent and they see the cost of housing. So, that's impacted it, certainly in terms of enticing people to come here. The other part of that is that Irvine . . . Orange County's reputation as "red-neck country." Again, we're influenced by things that we've heard. Somewhere in the recesses of memory, we've heard that Orange County is John Wayne country--and personally I thought John Wayne was quite terrific. We hear that Orange County is Nixon country, and we make . . .

SM: (inaudible) quite so (inaudible).

CE: . . . and we show certain . . . we make assessments. You know, we do the same kind of generalizing, frankly, that I'm opposing. But, certainly, Orange County has impacted both the difficulty and the pleasure in the assignment.

SM: Well, we're going to change the tape in a second. I'm going to just turn it over, Carla. But that's a good answer and I immediately say that we, the founding faculty, really wanted that faculty housing to get started. And it was only until

in my time as Chair of the Academic Senate, we simply made the case where we were losing this person, we were losing that person (inaudible) housing too expensive. We lost a person who went to Arizona. Well, who would go to Arizona when she could come to the University of California? We were really chagrined. And housing was clearly one problem, economics. So, the housing of faculty has taken our first-year apartments, for the younger faculty members, and then the housing. There was no cost at all for land and so forth, and about the same system that Stanford has--and Stanford's capitalized on that in getting their faculty, the good faculty. So, we recognize what you've said, but we took awhile to get it through. Now, the last question, have I missed anything? Anything you'd like to add? I'd like to add one or two things.

(End of Side 1)

I'm sorry this interview is to come to an end, but I want to ask you this question. Recently I read in the local paper here that Aliko Songolo, who is a friend of mine, associate professor in the French Department, who is from the French Cameroons, wherever that's called now--Africa--and he's been appointed by Vice Chancellor Tien to follow the question and monitor and watch the whole affirmative action, ethnic minorities, and so forth, which I feel is your province, and I don't like to think they are going to undercut you.

CE: Well, I certainly don't like to think that either. So, in terms of keeping a positive face forward, my assessment is this--and I have talked with Dr. Tien briefly, although very briefly, and that does disturb me that we haven't had more in-depth conversations--but it's my understanding that Dr. Tien made the decision to bring in a (inaudible) for two reasons. One is obviously a political response to a very sensitive issue and . . . But first, even though it's second in my list, I think the foremost rationale is that there needs to be a faculty member who has the credibility of the faculty to induce them, entice them, cajole them, bribe them, whatever it takes to get them to pay attention to the issue of diversity.

From my part, I'm pleased that it's Dr. Songolow. I don't know that I'll be pleased with his successor, since this is a rotating assignment, but, in terms of the objective and the individual, it certainly saves wear and tear on me. Except for that person to be part of the Affirmative Action Office, the work needs to be done. And, as I said earlier, I don't have the staff to be able to address those kinds of issues with the depth with which they need to be addressed now.

I think Dr. Tien has made a wise decision. I would only advise him--and I have been advising him--that as he takes on each of these individual activities--and he's taken on numerous things--that he doesn't allow them to become

fragmented, because we're more likely to fail by fragmentation; and it would be a much more dramatic failure because we will have announced to the world what wonderful things we've done and then fail as a consequence of not keeping an overview of those duties. So, I am preparing a proposal for Dr. Tien that basically says my office needs to continue to have overview responsibilities and I hope I am able to secure the support of faculty in doing that.

SM: Well, that's what I have in mind, Carla. I sort of see things, from having been an administrator, sometimes in administrative terms. I mean, what is your table of organization, which I used hate all these things, but I can see that they have their value. And I don't want to see that that work is being done so directly for Dr. Tien [that] it isn't coming through your office. You are, to me, you're the Assistant Vice Chancellor of Affirmative Action and all these . . . He could have . . . A number of people could be doing a number of things, so long as A, you knew very much what's happening, and, B, you're happy because it's not on your budget. But, C, it ought to go through you to Dr. Peltason.

CE: I am proposing, as a consequence of the draft that I have for Dr. Tien now, I am suggesting that there has to be a closing of that loop and it doesn't happen when we have all of these different activities going on around me. Plus, it specifically states in several letters that I have received

that I'm accountable for the overview affirmative action programs.

SM: And that's coming from whom?

CE: And that's coming from Dr. Peltason. So, that's a clear statement to me, and I want to make sure that there's nothing that gets in the way of my being able to do that job. The other part of it, too, is--and the point I wanted to make earlier--is that affirmative action needs an ambassador. And I think, although I consider myself a great spokesperson, there are certain audiences that need to be persuaded by a colleague. And I think one of those audiences consists of the faculty members here at Irvine. And I think Dr. Songolo could satisfy that. Again, because it is a rotating responsibility, my office needs to have overview, continue to be assigned to it, by virtue of the fact that we need to maintain the continuity. The accountability, after all, does fall back on us.

SM: Well, I'm glad you've certainly got this in hand and I think you're right to put a memo out carefully, with a copy to Peltason. And I'm sure . . . I agree with you that you ought to . . . I always felt some people should work for you or help you who are faculty qua faculty, you know, and could help you, but I don't organizationally . . . I think Dr. Tien's starting out like a race horse and I hope he doesn't take on too many duties. Well, now, as a last

question, Carla, are there any . . . anything I've missed, anything you'd like to mention? I'd like to know.

CE: Yes, there are a couple things I'd like to mention as areas of concern. That doesn't mean that I have any ideas yet on how to solve the problem, but this whole idea of faculty affirmative action. I do believe that it's going to take education. It's going to take sensitizing. And, while we've been successful in doing that to some degree with students and with staff, faculty seem to have a natural tendency to feel that they know it all, or that they have their area of specialization and this is all that really matters to me. I mean, now I understand what they mean about you're that professor with the bifocals and the ivory tower and never comes down to the Munchkins down at the plain.

I would like to see more faculty voluntarily participate in cultural diversity programs. I go to conferences across the United States. First of all, I usually see the same people over and over and over again, so I know that conference, regardless of the quality of the material, it's preaching to the same choir. The ones we have to try to address are those that we're trying to approach as converts. And those converts are not coming to Mass regularly. They neither want to come voluntarily and, because of the nature of this organization, we will not

mandate that they attend such training or conferences and so on.

So, that's something that I would like to see changed. And that's maybe, again, Dr. Songolo can develop a strategy for inducing faculty to participate in some way, so that they don't feel that they've been forced or that it's been required of them, but they've done so and they're still going to get something out of it. The other thing that I would like to see more of is quality mentorship programs.

SM: Say that again. Quality . . . ?

CE: Quality mentorship programs. Particularly . . . not exclusively with graduate students, although that is an area of focus, but I'd like to see mentorships occur within the staff ranks and certainly among undergraduates, because it's at the undergraduate level that you determine whether or not you want to do research. It's at the undergraduate level that you have to come to an understanding of what graduate work is and I think that's one of the reasons that typically students from the Cal State system do not do very well when they come to pursue an advanced degree within the University of California. And that's because they have no understanding of what pursuing an advanced degree is. If I had to go back and do it over again, I probably wouldn't, simply because I just had more energy in my youth and so I was willing to take on a lot of things.

But I think the average, everyday individual doesn't recognize that that research involves study, library time, analysis, presenting of hypotheses. You know, those are not things that you learned as an undergraduate; and that's why I think typically Cal State students do less well than even transfer students from the community colleges, because their objective is to transfer into an organization like the University of California. So, they've already got all of the strategy mapped out.

Then, my third point would be, if I were to say, you know, what would be a high priority problem that I would want resolved, I'd like to refer back to the data question. We have enormous capabilities. We have . . . You can push a button and generate data about an individual, a group of individuals, recruitment, but we seem to be reluctant or fearful to use that data to help the individual. I mean, we generate reports all the time to people that couldn't . . . to organizations that could never help the individual; and I have to keep referring to the Chancellor's statements about "affirmative action wholesale" and "affirmative action retail." And, yes, at the wholesale level, you're impacting a lot of people, for example, with developmental programs and training programs. But at the retail level, when you're dealing with a person at a time, we can't dismiss the value of that, because in reality, that's how affirmative action is done: a person at a time. And we need to use the

automated sophistication that we have available to us to be able to help those individuals, whether it's to do career planning or education tracking or performance goals and objectives. Whatever they end up being, I think we could do it effectively and competently with automated systems.

SM: Well, that really is a very good statement, Carla, and I fully subscribe to what you've said. And I know that you're right about . . . in these conferences you go to around the United States, you tend to be meeting the same people, and not the people we ought to or want to meet. I was amused . . . your saying "preaching to the choir." The choir, you know, never listens. They're there to sing, so the preacher or the priest is out there to convert . . . he's trying to convert the congregation. He knows the choir is long since lost, or, we might put it another way, gained, because they're there permanently and they like to sing, and so on. Well, of course, they could be paid for that, too. Well, thank you very much, Carla, and I'll just sign off.

END OF INTERVIEW