

## Oral History Interview with Jerilyn S. McIntyre

(This transcript has been reviewed and edited by Jerilyn S. McIntyre for errors of fact or wording.)

>>LIBBY STREET: Good afternoon, my name is Libby Street and I am professor emerita from the Department of Psychology here at Central Washington University. I am here today representing the Central Washington University Retirees Living History Project. It is my great pleasure to introduce today's interviewee, Dr. Jerilyn S. McIntyre, president of Central Washington University from 2000 to 2008.

Rather than the customary approach in which an interviewer asks a series of questions, we have agreed after a few introductory questions President McIntyre will talk about her term of office here with only occasional prompts.

That said, President McIntyre, can you tell us a little bit about your life and career path?

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, I will try to keep this short. You could go back to "it was a dark and stormy night," I suppose. Anyway, my family is from the Midwest, so I was born in Nebraska and both my parents were school teachers and my dad -- by the time I was kind of aware of things -- was Dean of a junior college—what was called then a junior college in Nebraska—but he had a chance to become an executive for the California Teachers' Association so we moved to California when I was seven years old.

I went to elementary school, junior high school and high school in Pasadena, and then from there went to Stanford to get my undergraduate degree. I reached the end of four years and that was a period in which students could major in whatever they wanted and were pretty much assured of getting a job. But I reached the end of my four years and I remember having a conversation with a friend of mine about what you could do with a degree in history if you didn't want to teach because I didn't actually want to become a teacher at that point. He thought hard and said "Well, you can sit around and know things," which I didn't think was a good career move.

Anyway, from that point on I went and got my master's in journalism because I always liked to write; worked for a couple of years as a journalist; and then decided after all I did want to become a teacher, so I went back to school. I tried my hand at teaching at what was then called Chico State College—now Cal State Chico—to make sure I really wanted to teach and I knew I wanted to teach beyond the high school level. Having convinced myself of that after two years of teaching, then I went and got my Ph.D. at the University of Washington.

After that, my first job after the Ph.D. was at the University of Iowa in the School of Journalism. After four years in Iowa, much as I liked that situation, I decided I wanted to move back to the West and I had a chance to go to the University of Utah to teach communication and history. At Iowa it was very quantitatively oriented. Communication is a field in which you can be a historian or literary critic type or you can be a behavioral scientist. Iowa was very behavioral science in its orientation. Utah was back west and I had a chance to teach history courses.

Anyway, I was plugging along in an academic career that I found very rewarding and then I had a chance to get into administration. And I liked it. So it was just through a series of accidents that I moved from Associate Dean of Humanities to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. That wasn't an accident, that was sort of a deliberate career move. But then the University of Utah got embroiled in a controversy about cold fusion, and everybody above me resigned in the academic area—vice president for academic affairs and vice president for health sciences—so there I was. They did an internal search and I was named Vice President for Academic Affairs and that continued when the new president came along because he liked what he saw and wanted me to continue. And then when that president took a position at the University of Houston, I served as an interim president for a year and decided that it wasn't rocket science and I might want to do that at some point. So I started looking around for presidential positions.

So I think it's like anybody's career, you start out with a career path in mind—in my case it was initially journalism and then teaching—and then all of a sudden you look back 20 years later and you have become an administrator.

>>LIBBY STREET: That is very interesting. Could you tell us a bit about what attracted you to Central?

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, there were a couple of things. Like I said, I got my Ph.D. at the University of Washington, so I knew of Central. I will confess I had never been to Ellensburg but just knew of it as a school in the system that had a good reputation. I had a very close friend, Karen Morse, who had come from Utah State to become president at Western. And so I knew the situation that would be likely to exist would be one where I would have a colleague that I knew and someone that I respected.

I was aware -- you always do a little research to find out what is going on -- I was aware of some of the tensions on campus, but I really felt (both) the strength of the institution that I knew of and the type of institution appealed to me because even though I loved my time at Utah, I spent a lot of my time at the legislature explaining why there were teachers on -- faculty members on the faculty who didn't teach. You know, the research function sometimes really takes over and I felt that what Central did was closer to my heart and what should be happening at a college.

And then the final thing was that both David, my husband, and I have a background in Washington. As I said, I attended UW and he worked for a while in the Tri-Cities area at Hanford for Atlantic Richfield. So in many respects, I guess what I am trying to say, we were attracted to the situation because there were a lot of other opportunities out there, but Central was just an appealing situation. And the tensions I was aware of, I thought, were the kinds of things I might be able to help with because I had dealt before with issues of, you know, trust between administration and faculty and staff. And I had had some experience with coming into a situation and trying to build a team, so I felt they were issues I -- I might be capable of dealing with.

>>LIBBY STREET: What did you expect to find when you came here and what did you actually (find)?

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, I expected to find the -- the challenge of getting the team working together and moving ahead in the same direction and I must say the search committee was very reassuring. It was a great search committee. They were very

candid about the things that were going on. I came in thinking I have a campus culture problem but I can build on the willingness to move ahead. Instantly, almost instantly with the summer retreat, the Trustees talked about the importance of having a strategic planning process that involved the campus and the community, everybody working together, defining where we were going to go. I felt that process would be one where everyone could work together. It would be a signal that I wanted to work with the campus and they would have an opportunity to have their voice in what we were doing.

So Trustees, in their first meeting after I got here, their summer retreat, laid out their notion of what the strategic plan would be. I then added to it. And what I wanted to do with it was to have it be short and memorable. (Because) when I moved into the president's office, the strategic plan took up, I think, eight shelves in the bookshelves in the president's office and I had this sneaking feeling that nobody ever read it. So my goal was to have something -- I think I said this in the first faculty meeting I had in the fall -- that folded out. It would be (on an) 8.5 by 14 (sheet). It would be (only) that big. It would be something that could fold out and you could see the goals and objectives under each goal. And there would be a limited number of goals, so the Trustees could add what they thought should be in the list of goals. Then the campus process elaborated on the goals, put specific objectives to the three to five-year term of the plan that I thought would work. So that's what I was dealing with.

What I found as we approached fall quarter was a downturn in enrollment that appeared to be unexpected. Gwen Chaplin, the chair of the Board of Trustees, a wonderful chair -- I mean, I had great chairs to work with my whole time here -- but anyway, when I was interviewing for the job I asked Gwen do you have anything I should know about, like enrollment problems? And she said "no, no, no, our enrollment is -- looks very solid." And then -- I don't think anybody knew that it was going to be as dramatic a downturn, but we were heading into the biennial budget session with the legislature and we fell 600 FTEs short of what was our projected budget request enrollment. So we had an enrollment problem. Along with that we then had to absorb a budget cut because we fell below what we had been funded for in the previous biennium.

So those things, along with the fact with here I was trying to get the campus to work together, and I was going to have to cut budgets immediately after I arrived, were surprises. As I said, I didn't blame anyone. Gwen apologized and the Trustees apologized because they said they did not know enrollment was an issue, but again, the campus pulled together and we managed to move out of it.

>>LIBBY STREET: Can you tell me a little bit about some of the other challenges you faced?

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, I think I will start with the ones that I found because they kind of led to some other challenges. It was the beginning of the biennial legislative session, so we couldn't just hide and hope that we would solve the enrollment problem somewhere in the middle of the biennium. We had to go to the HEC Board—Higher Education Coordinating Board. And tell them that, you know, our budget request was off by 600, and they said well, you are going to have to give back some money.

Both the HEC Board and then the legislative representatives, both in our districts and then the ones who were heads of the key committees were willing to work with us as we developed a plan to re-grow the enrollment. And while they did cut our budget, they -- Helen Sommers for example—they basically said if you get your enrollment back, we will make sure we do everything we can to make sure your enrollment funding returns to you. So that was a challenge.

But in the meantime we had to develop the plan and to re-grow the enrollment. It helped that we were going through a strategic planning process because the campus was working through the issue of what the university centers could do to contribute to enrollment and that became an important part of the solution. And we also identified in the strategic plan some notions of the kinds of students that we would go for—for excellence in students. There had been a bit of a tendency to just get students in the door and they weren't particularly well prepared and so our enrollment problem was probably more retention than it was overall the issue of freshman enrollment. So the strategic plan helped point us to the kind of university we wanted to be.

But then another component was marketing, and I -- you know, among the things I found, by the way, when I came here, were some really good people. I mentioned to David when I went back (to Salt Lake City) after my interviews, that what I regarded as middle management was really strong at Central. I felt the faculty was strong, staff representatives I talked to were very capable people, but some of the people, for example those in administration and institutional research, were really capable people. So they were among the people who became part of the -- the team trying to develop the plan to re-grow the enrollment.

We also had help from Steve Jordan, who was president of Eastern Washington University because they had had an enrollment decline, too. So, in a gesture that is less typical of presidents than you would like to believe, Steve called me up and said I will tell you what our solution was and what we did. So I did have some guidance and advice from Steve Jordan.

But what we did was get money from the legislature—one-time money—to put together a marketing plan that involved getting our message out to potential students and faculty and others so that we would become better known. That was a crucial component because earlier that year we had an article (written about us) -- I think it was in the Washington Business magazine—I have forgotten the name of it -- and it wasn't a negative article, but it addressed the fact that people didn't know (who or) where we were. I mean, some of the people in the legislature thought we were in Wenatchee. So we were a blank slate, which is not good when you are trying to sell the strength of an institution.

So part of what we did in the marketing was not only develop a skilled admissions team under Mike Reilly, but also a message and we had a marketing plan and publications that were developed to get the message across. And it had -- I can never remember what the slogan was or what the tagline was—we picked up in one of the other of those the fact that Central was in our name. I think the slogan was “What's Central to you?” And then whatever it was—the tagline—was “Your future is Central.” We developed brochures and recruitment materials and advertisements that supported the recruiting effort in a very substantial way.

So that was the first of the challenges and, by the time I retired as president, we ended up not only re-growing our enrollment and getting the funding back, but I think if I remember correctly, my last year we were something like, somewhere between 11 or 1200 FTE above where we were that first fall. And we also, I believe, got the funding for that my last year. So that was a huge challenge that affected a lot of what we tried to do, but we did it, and it was really capable people (who did it), not just the (marketing) task force, but also some work in Student Affairs.

Charlotte Tullos hired some talented people who were skilled in (enrollment) management. She put in some first-year programs and her people were wonderful and the first-year programs were instrumental in increasing our retention rate, which is crucial to growing your enrollment. The faculty were great in that-- for a while—we did have to cut budgets. We cut budgets by eliminating vacant positions. That's not the way you really like to do a budget cut because that's haphazard, but we tried not to go in and cut away people who were in existing positions. But then the faculty had to do things like teach larger sections or teach sections they might not have been intending to teach. I felt the campus as a whole over a period of years was very willing to work on the enrollment problem and deal with some of the budget consequences that followed.

>>LIBBY STREET: What do you think were some of your achievements during your presidency?

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, I mean, enrollment I would have to say that. I also -- there were a couple of things and maybe you can prompt me on some of them. The strategic plan involved as I say goals and objectives under them, but then, again the campus worked together and developed performance indicators, accountability on how well people were doing on goals that within each division would be salient.

For example, in academic affairs, you know, the research publications, the number of classes taught and enrollment and so forth are measures. It's a little harder to come up with measures for facilities, for example, but in each division they developed their performance indicators and then every year the vice presidents were supposed to work with their people to report

on their progress on the performance indicators they had defined for themselves and make requests in concert with those performance indicators. The campus had said as part of the planning process that we would address both essentiality and excellence and those didn't always come together. You know, something might be essential, but it isn't doing quite so well, so that might be an argument a vice president could make we need more money here in order to do the sorts of things we ought to be doing. So budget decisions I made every July were guided by the documents that the vice presidents submitted to me that showed how they were doing on performance indicators and the requests they made in order to move ahead on that.

This was something we explained my first Fall here. It was a cycle, every year you would come around and do an assessment on how well you had done and what's I tried to do with the State of the University address, which was every October, tied to the date of my inauguration, which was October 5th. In October I reported to the campus on how we were doing on strategic planning— not division by division— to try to make it clear that the strategic plan was crucial and the performance indicators were a major part of what guided our decisions in the budgeting process.

I had done this before at Utah in the academic area— I used performance indicators within the context of the strategic plan— so I felt comfortable with the fact that we were doing it here. What was unusual is that (at Central), it was university-wide because the divisions are so different and toward the end we were being asked to make presentations on how we did it. Now, I retired before we got out on the stump making speeches about it, but it was a very innovative approach to accountability and budgeting within the context of the strategic plan, so I am proud of that. Maybe I can lay out some things and we can talk a little more about them.

There were infrastructure issues. The music building, as I understand it, had been a request to the legislature for something like 13 years, a long time, and we had never gotten the funding. And here I am going in taking a budget cut from the legislature for the loss of enrollment, but we still had infrastructure issues that had to be addressed.

So we were going ahead, once again, with the proposal for the music building funding and there were some great legislators (who helped). One was Pat Lantz. She was a legislator from the Tacoma area. You know, she didn't have Central in her district at all, but she was very committed to trying to make sure that we made some progress on that. I think the request we were making was something like \$24 million for a new music building and I was told by Pat and others that was too much. There was just no way they were going to do it.

So I had an epiphany somewhere along the way and I talked to Linda Schactler, who was our interim director of legislative relations, and said suppose we got half the funding in one biennium and half the funding in the other biennium and we start building at the end of the first biennium. Then we could have a continuous building process, but funded over two biennia. Linda said I will give it a try and she went to people like Pat and others who made the decisions. They said thank you for coming up with a solution so we could help. That's how we got the funding. It was risky because there's always the chance they will give you the full funding (for just) one biennium and then say "sorry that was a previous legislature that made that commitment." But we did get funding over two biennia and we were able to build it that way, you know, in a continuous process, and so that's a success.

Another achievement I am proud of, too, even though this was something that came out of working closely with the students, was the student union building and also the remodel of some of the residence halls on campus. The students wanted a new student union building. I must admit when I interviewed here I thought the old one looked okay for me, but it wasn't a place where you could hang out very easily and the current thinking about student unions was (that a union) was not just an eating place, but a recreational facility. So, the student body president at the time, whose name I forget— a woman and she was very capable—came forward with her student leaders and said we want a Student Union Rec Center. We don't want to just remodel the old union. What I said, along with (Abdul) Nasser, the vice president for financial affairs was that, you know, this is tied to enrollment. If we get bonded for this, we will have to have a revenue stream that comes from increased enrollment— increased people living in the residence halls, increased people

eating—so we have to make sure that the enrollment targets are met. But if this is something that if the students want, we will try to make it work, and we tied in some of the remodeling of the residence halls to the bond. All of that happened, happily, since enrollment did grow; we were able to provide the revenue stream to support the bond.

This leads to another area, I think, of achievement for the campus as a whole and certainly for the people on the management team. We set as a goal working closely with the community on a variety of things and in a variety of ways, trying to be visible and active in the community. But the building of the Student Union Rec Center was controversial because it required the rerouting of the power lines that had been laid across campus—routed across campus. They were overhead power lines and my understanding was when that was dealt with previously, there was such a (negative) community reaction, that's why they went through campus, they didn't go around campus. (For the new building), we were going to have to put the power lines around campus.

So we had a number of community meetings to work with community leaders. You and Bill Vertrees and others met with others downtown in addition to the open meetings we had in the community and we tried to address the various questions that came up, one of which had to do with the radioactive character of power lines and the feelings that that was something people didn't want in their neighborhood. We brought in people who had done research on that to point out that was an exaggerated concern and (in any case) if it was a concern, it didn't make sense to have those power lines going right by residence halls on campus either. You know, they were also dangerous to students if they were dangerous at all. What we tried to point out was if they are high enough and the power is diminished enough, that they are not a concern. We addressed that issue with experts coming in.

And the other thing we did was try to route them in a way (that), if they did go around campus, (they) wouldn't be as visible, for example on the street. There's a lawn in front of the music building, and people on that street were very upset. Well, we took the power lines behind the music building and along the canal at that point so we made them as unobtrusive as possible.

We got the SURC built, but it was partly through a dimension of working with the community among the constituencies that we felt we had to be sensitive to. We worked with the community on that, so that's an achievement, not just the building itself, but the process of understanding how important it is to be involved and collaborative with the community.

Do you want me to keep going?

>>LIBBY STREET: You talked about the community here in Ellensburg, what about the wider state community?

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, among the things I did—and this was guided by people initially like Linda Schactler and then by Ann Anderson, who became our director of government relations, and also folks in university relations—we pointed out the importance of getting out around the different communities, specifically the communities surrounding our university centers, because they were an important part of what we were doing, an important part of (building) the infrastructure, by the way. By the time I left, we had funding to either remodel or build new buildings at every single one of our university centers, so those were part of our campus.

You do a number of things. You make speeches in those areas, you meet with community representatives. I was out and around in those communities specifically.

And then as one of the goals that we decided we needed to set for ourselves as we moved ahead in building adequate funding for the university—one of the goals became a comprehensive campaign, a fundraising campaign. So that was also something that involved getting out to alumni groups, to community groups of various kinds around the state.

I think very early in my time, even before we had fundraising as a dream, I was invited over to Seattle to talk to people in construction management because that's obviously a very good program at Central and that's an industry that is very committed to the quality of education at Central. So I went and talked to that group. I mean, I can't come up with list of every single one, but it was partly alumni groups I would go to, partly community groups in areas where we had university centers, (and) partly

organizations that had some reason for being interested and concerned about what was going on at Central.

>>LIBBY STREET: Talk a little bit more about the capital campaign, what your goal was?

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, you know as I did get out and around and work with the alumni board, which was another great board. The Board of Trustees was terrific, (and) the alumni board was (also) very good. I got to know a lot of alumni there. And the fundraising (Foundation) board was excellent. And so that is another example of strengths that the institution had that I made sure they were aware of—some really very committed people, very devoted to Central, who would be willing to help with the fundraising campaign.

(But) it's not that we didn't make fundraising requests a little along the way. The first year I was here, we decided that we wanted to have kind of a "mini" fundraising campaign to raise money for students' scholarships. We called it the Students First Initiative, and we had success at that, so that told all of us, not just those of us in administration, but also the alumni and fundraising board, that there was a possibility that, if we tapped into our alumni friends and donor friends, we might be able to undertake a campaign.

So that happily is another thing where I had had experience and David had a lot of experience at Utah. So we went through all the steps. We did the feasibility study where you go out and talk to people and find out what's likely to be the successful amount raised, to find out if there was willingness to support. There had been wonderful people who held dinners at their house over on the west side for me, and so I got to know a lot of people who struck me as potential donors.

So moving from that sense of things to the feasibility study, it became clear that Central was ripe for a modest fundraising campaign. As I recall the recommendation from the consultant came back that we should set the goal of \$18 million over five years and we ended up raising \$21 million in three years and everybody was really proud of that.

What it did was not only raise the money, it also built an

infrastructure at the university that was supposed to be a capacity-building campaign. In other words, get the people in place so that three, four years later, you could have another campaign. We built the infrastructure. We (also) built a mindset among donors who initially, some of them, said “you are a state school, why did you need private money?” Again with some wonderful marketing materials and publications, we were able to show all of the things they were proud of, remind them of what they were proud of about Central and also attach the message that you can be the margin of excellence if you contribute to this.

By the way, I thought of another thing I think was an achievement along the way with some of the great work done in public relations. We established *Central Today* as a little larger, glossier publication to tell the university’s story. It appeared two or three times a year. One of the issues was a president's report to the donors, but I heard time and time again from alumni how much they liked that magazine and how it made them feel tied back in and I do think it helped the fundraising campaign for them to know what was going on at Central and for them to have not an expensive, but a nice looking publication informing them of all of the things that they had remembered so fondly at Central. It came up a lot of the times in alumni conversations.

>>LIBBY STREET: Talking a little about your leadership team, you mentioned Charlotte Tullos.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Yeah.

>>LIBBY STREET: You have not mentioned Dave Stolz.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, you know, when I came on board, for one reason or another, the management team that was in place didn't itself feel that it worked together particularly well. I remember my first retreat with the cabinet was kind of an encounter group for people who said things across the table like “you have never ever talked to me about” (anything). It was an (Indiscernible) meeting, but anyway, it became apparent, when there were a couple of people who left for other positions -- that what needed to be done was to get in place a management team that obviously worked together well. So we had searches going on for the vacated positions, and then I opened searches for a couple of others and there were incumbents in those roles and I

said they could apply for the job, too. I wasn't saying they wouldn't continue, but it seemed to be important from the campus standpoint to make sure that the team was the team that the campus felt good about and that the team itself felt good about.

So we did, basically, create a new management team. And Dave Soltz was hired as provost, came in and I think, did -- came in with a credibility of a solid researcher, but with a sensitivity to the teaching role at Central, so he put together a good team, as well, working with him, but he seemed to have campus respect. That's what people told me when he was selected.

Charlotte came in in Student Affairs and we then had management in Student Affairs and enrollment management. Those had been two vice presidents before, which didn't make sense to me. So we merged those. Charlotte was actually someone I had known before. I didn't know she was going to apply for the job, but I did know her from an experience at IEM, so I was aware of her abilities and she came in and immediately pulled together what had been two different teams in the Student Affairs area, and they became a great team working together and guided by an understanding of how campus life affects retention and enrollment. So Charlotte was a great hire there.

Abdul Nasser left for a position elsewhere, so we did a search for a financial affairs vice president and hired Rich Corona who turned out to be terrific. Not only because -- again, these are all people who built their team and worked well with their team—but he had a really good understanding of financial issues and a respectful approach to the (other) areas. For example in facilities management, it wasn't his expertise, but he respected those in that area and so he had a great vision for that, but he was basically someone people felt worked well with them.

He also worked very well with the other vice presidents and with Charlotte in particular. Sometimes facilities and student affairs vice presidents don't understand the importance of working together. They met regularly and even if they argued about things, they would work through their difficulties.

And then university relations was a position where there was an interim when I came here. The person was an interim

administrator, so I knew I had to search for that, but that took another year, if I remember correctly, to hire another person. And I knew at that point we were going to have to do a fundraising campaign, so I looked for someone not just who would have an understanding of public relations, but the fundraising capacity was also of interest to me. Because we had good people like Rob Lowery in public relations, I didn't feel like I needed to hire a public relations vice president. I needed someone with a background in fundraising.

And then the other thing I realized, I hope you won't mind if I bring this up, you were the -- you were an essential assistant to the president—if I remember correctly, (to) Dolph Norton—so in trying to streamline the team, I thought that was a position we could eliminate. We were trying to consolidate the cabinet. I got two or three months into the process and realized I couldn't do without Libby Street's assistance. But what you did is you took on the responsibilities of something that was a cabinet position at Utah. It was called vice president -- in that case, vice president for budget and planning—but the planning role was something that you took on that was extremely important and so you became a very valuable part of the management team. And I -- it wasn't something I had in mind, it just became very apparent as we were doing the strategic plan, and we were looking ahead trying to put in place a vision of the campus that came out of the strategic plan, I needed someone who knew how to do planning. I added a position by keeping you on board.

So I would have to say, you know, when I first came to the campus, the previous cabinet and I always got along fine. I mean, they were all good people, but we would make a point of going over to the union and sitting at a table prominently where people could see us getting along. And with the cabinet -- the management team—I put in place, at a certain point we said we go out naturally, we don't have to pick a date once a month where we go over and look like we get along. We do get along. People see that and that was my feeling about that management team throughout the time I was here. And when Paul Baker left and Ellen Hall came on board in university relations, she fit in perfectly. She was the perfect person, by the way, to wrap up the fundraising campaign. That could have been a real problem if we had had a change in that particular administrative role right in the middle of the campaign, but she came in and she fit in

beautifully.

So you know, the management team was a strength. Every year when I was evaluated by the Trustees, there were certain criteria on which they evaluated me and one of the things I was commended for was the quality of my management team and that's a tribute to all of you who took on those roles.

I also believe, by the way, as a leader myself, you can't do everything. You have to pick good people and trust them to make the right decisions and I felt almost without exception -- there were some issues -- that I did pick good people. I could trust them to be out making the right decisions in crucial situations so...

>>LIBBY STREET: Great. We haven't talked about the union.

>>DR. McINTYRE: The which?

>>LIBBY STREET: The union.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Oh, yes.

>>LIBBY STREET: The faculty union... (Indiscernible) would you like to talk (a little) about that?

>>DR. McINTYRE: I remember the vote was taken on my birthday. So I won't forget that. But you know, the reality is I had a good relationship with all of the (existing) unions on campus—the staff unions. You know we did a couple of things to try to make sure that all of employee voices were heard, so we expanded the membership of the president's advisory council, so there was a staff representative and there was a faculty representative, and a student representative. And I would meet with the senate executive committee, and also with representatives of the staff unions in my office, and then I would periodically go to the Exempt Council. So I had good relationships with the various employee groups.

And the woman, Susan Donahoe, who was president of the union—she and I were friends. She had brought (to my office) several of her colleagues very early in my time as president and talked to me about the union, the issues that the union had. But I

(really) got to know her because of a trip I made overseas to China. She and her husband were part of the group that went there, so we continued to be good friends. I could always talk to her.

I tried to address some of the concerns she raised with me and you know, in these tight budget times, we set aside money to try to advance faculty salaries toward a much higher percentile than they had. And we had a plan over several years where we would set aside a certain amount in the budget to do that.

We also set aside money for -- at Utah what we called instrumentation funds. It's basically money for research so people could apply for support for their research. And we were making progress on some issues that I know were of concern to the faculty.

I think the key thing that happened was not so much that there was something roiling around still with the union, although there may have been in some sectors on campus. But the legislature passed enabling legislation, and my understanding of the history of this on campus was that unions had been of interest at Central for a long time, but there hadn't been the enabling legislation before. So when the legislature did that, Central, Western and Eastern all voted to unionize. And you know, I felt we had made progress on a lot of issues of importance, but I didn't take it personally, let's put it that way. I think the key thing was the passing of the enabling legislation so that -- you know, we moved ahead into that era.

It changes the relationship between administration and faculty—I guess I can say that now—in a way that I didn't think was necessary because I didn't regard myself as management and them as the workers. As I said, I got very along very well with the staff unions. I never felt there was that division. But we went through a period of adjustment the first negotiating period or two, where I think those lines were being drawn in ways that I regretted.

>>LIBBY STREET: Another project that you haven't mentioned is the book that you...

>>DR. McINTYRE: Yes, yeah, thank you for reminding me of

that. Yeah, going back to the various constituencies that were important. In the fundraising campaign I had been a part of at Utah before I came to Central, one of the things they did was to produce a so-called coffee table book that could be given to alumni and donors and to remind everyone of the history of the institution. So as we approached the campaign, I thought it would be good to have our own coffee table book. So we put together a campus committee, if I remember correctly and designated Karen Blair as the historian and Glenn Bach as the graphics person and you were probably involved in a significant way, you and Warren. David was, too, I know—in proofreading some of the things—and it produced *By Teaching We Learn*.

There had been a history of the first 75 years, but (the new book) not only picked up the history from that point on, but also had a different cut on the different periods in history. It covered the whole history of the institution and divided it up by presidents and faculty and students. I mean the chapter arrangement was different and it was more of a coffee table book because Glen was able to draw on some of the photo archives of the library. It's a handsome book. I still have several copies sitting prominently in my home. But that was -- that was somewhat related to the fundraising campaign. Even though I think from what I understand, you know, some of the current students for a while liked buying that at graduation too, as kind of a memento of their time at Central.

>>LIBBY STREET: What about Spheres of Distinction.

>>DR. McINTYRE: I was about to talk about that. You know, one of the things we tried to do as we were getting more funding from the legislature and trying to tie the budget process to strategic planning, was—you know—there was an opportunity in addition to the instrumentation funds to invite proposals for great new or innovative approaches to doing things on campus. So I wanted to set aside a certain amount of money every year that could be base funding or one-time money. It was base funding in my budget, but some of the distribution was one-time money. So I invited proposals from across the campus on initiatives that they just needed a little seed money to get going.

Initially I wanted to call (the program) “Centers of Excellence” but one of the wags on campus said, why call them “Centers of

Excellence?” Why don't we call them “Margins of Mediocrity?” So we were getting push back on the name “Centers of Excellence” and I went home one weekend and I thought, okay, how can I get at the same thing (but avoid) a name that was controversial for reasons I could never understand? And I—you know, “Spheres of Distinction” was sort of “Centers of Excellence” morphed into another label, but it turned out to be something people really liked.

We got lots of proposals, some for base funding and some for one-time funding and it seem to matter that people had a chance to get just a little money to get something going to prove that it would work. And then in the context of the budget cycle they could make an argument with their vice presidential budget memos to continue it or maybe they would have completed it over a period of time. So the Spheres of Distinctions are, I think, another achievement that I am proud of that I think really did create some interesting things on campus just with that a little bit of seed money.

>>LIBBY STREET: Were there any programs started through that (stand out?)

>>DR. McINTYRE: Now, there are a couple that I am proud of that are outside of that. The wine program, for example, we got federal funding for that. And the Performing Arts and Presidential Speakers Series (was funded with other) money I set aside within the budget. Those are initiatives that I think are very good.

You know, the (Spheres of Distinction) that I remember, strangely, are things like...campus security wanted to have a security patrol. You know, create a cadre of students to go around and make sure it's safe at night when women are leaving the library, for example. I don't know if they still do that. That's an example of something I thought was a really good idea and so I gave them a little seed money and it made it work.

I don't know, do you remember any of them that came out of that process? They tended to be things (that needed) one-time money. I didn't get a lot of requests for base funding. It was “can we have a speaker series” for example, or bring speakers in, not a series, but bring speakers in for such and such a

purpose. The one that for some reason sticks in my mind was that security patrol that I think was a really good idea.

>>LIBBY STREET: Great. Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, you know, I talked about the constituencies. I do want to make note of, you know, the legislative work we did. We had good people, Linda (Schactler) and Ann Anderson, working with the legislature, and people of good will in our legislative district that we established very strong relationships with, so I think the legislative constituency was well served.

I mentioned alumni donors. You know, we did reach beyond the campus in significant ways to a variety of different constituencies and I it took a lot of time I must admit, especially for times I went back to alumni gatherings in Washington D.C. But they were all worth it. They were all worth it.

If I haven't mentioned the boards enough, I should emphasize I felt I was very fortunate to have the Board of Trustees I did and alumni board leadership and the fundraising board leadership I had. They -- they were right on board when we said we wanted to do something.

You know, (remembering) some of the people that I met in some of those visits elsewhere, Washington D.C, for example. I remember talking to a woman who had been estranged from the university for a while. (I) talked to her about what was going on. She subsequently came back and became very active in working with the fundraising board so all of those things over time ended up being seeds that were planted that blossomed eventually.

>>LIBBY STREET: How about... (overseas programs).

>>DR. McINTYRE: Oh, yeah. You know, again, I hearken back to a lot of my experience at the University of Utah. We had overseas connections at Utah, but I never felt they were genuine. I shouldn't say it that way. I never felt they reached in as deeply into departments as they should. They helped particular individuals.

But when I came here and just heard a little bit about what was going on in International Studies, it seemed that we had some really strong relationships, especially in Asia, with a number of universities where not only faculty members went, but we did have some -- some students placed there as well.

I didn't go to those campuses immediately. Budget issues made that seem like a bad idea, but the first one I went to was a trip to China where they invited us. Northern Jiaotong University was one of our international partners. They invited ten faculty members to come over and give lectures and I thought that was the right message for them to be sending us. So I went with that faculty group as my first overseas studies experience. That was in 2011. David and I had to get back to a meeting on campus, so I came back early on September 10th, 2011 and the rest of the faculty --

>>LIBBY STREET: 2001.

>>DR. McINTYRE: 2001. Did I say 2011? Yeah. (Just before) September 11th, 2001. Our faculty members were still over there, which was a little scary. Anyway, that was my first overseas experience. Over the next few years I went to Japan and I went to Korea and in every instance found really good working relationships and I think they continue. So that is, I think, especially in the 21st century, a crucial component for the university to have is the opportunity both for faculty and students to have a contact with another culture and understand what's going on in the global society.

>>LIBBY STREET: I think it was also in your presidency that we started to diversify the..(enrollment).

>>DR. McINTYRE: That's true. I am glad you mentioned that. That was one of our strategic planning goals. We had various objectives under enrollment growth and one of them was to increase our minority enrollment. I don't know the specific percentage, but it went from something like 7% the first year up to around 12 or 13% and we were particularly attentive to recruiting in the Yakima valley—Native American students and Hispanic students—because that represents the demographic of the region. So there were conscious efforts not just to hit a target. I didn't want to call it a target, but to recruit more. The

consequence was the percentage increased, but more resources were devoted to that. And then along the way we recruited for really outstanding students from underrepresented groups who then became ambassadors to their community, and I think that's one reason why that percentage has continued to rise. We have Emily Washines of her community and others like that going back to the community and saying Central is a good place to go.

>>LIBBY STREET: Well, thank you very much, Jerilyn.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Thank you.

>>LIBBY STREET: And I believe we are done.

>>DR. McINTYRE: I think we hit most of the points, didn't we?

>>SPEAKER: Did you put the date?

>>LIBBY STREET: I did not.

>>SPEAKER: That will have to be put on.

>>LIBBY STREET: This concludes our interview on August 22nd, 2014.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Thank you.

>>SPEAKER: You are amazing, names and committees and things you accomplished.

>>DR. McINTYRE: You end up not being able to say (something about) them all either. I wanted to mention something about committees. Yeah, I really did feel the campus (was great when we said we are going to have another campus committee).

>>SPEAKER: Right.

>>DR. McINTYRE: I think most of the time something real came out of it. People were willing to participate because they didn't think they would waste their time.

>>LIBBY STREET: We didn't talk about athletics.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Do you want us to talk about athletics?

>>SPEAKER: Whatever you like.

>>DR. McINTYRE: I am looking to see if there's anything else. I kind of became mindful I was straying from my (notes)--

>>LIBBY STREET: I thought you covered most of it looking at it.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Oh, I want to -- I should mention athletics because you know... I also didn't mention the students' relationships as a constituency in the Fireside Chats, but I think otherwise I covered everything, so can I?

>>SPEAKER: Sure.

>>LIBBY STREET: So tell us a little bit about athletics at Central.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, this is another issue that came up in conversations with alumni. Some of the members of the alumni board had been athletes at Central and so that's an important part of the sense of pride of the institution and history of the institution.

Central changed athletic conferences my first year as president. We had a very far flung athletic conference that I think included the Hawaii schools and Alaska schools. You could see it was going to be a big travel budget. But in any case it reorganized into a different athletic conference.

What that does when you do that...We were Division II by then. The campus before I arrived had made the decision to move from NAIA to Division II. Well, I became active that way. That was one of the constituencies I decided I should be involved with. I became active with NCAA meetings. I wasn't part of their leadership team, but I attended their conferences and tried to participate in those conversations at the national level and also when the conference met.

When you are in a conference by NCAA organizational rules or protocols, you have a certain number of sports that are your

conference sports, and typically all of the teams in the conference participate in all of those sports. And there were ten that were the conference sports for the Great Northwest Athletic Conference that we joined and there was also the issue that more than half of them had to be women's sports. So the table was kind of set for what we were going to do within the conference.

And unfortunately the consequence of that was that some sports that had longtime followings and people were very proud of them and some alumni had fond memories of participating in them—they weren't conference sports and as I was looking at athletics and the fact that it ran a rather large debt—deficit—every year, we had to look at ways that we would trim athletics' budget.

As we were looking at that, I established a presidential commission on the future of athletics and it was supposed to take a look ten years down the road and had some great people serving on it. And I think while there was some pressure to move to Division I, they recommended staying with Division II as I recall. I must admit I don't remember the particulars of the report, but that report went to the Trustees. I seem to recall them saying stay Division II, try to build funding, promote the sports that we have in the conference and in ten years do an assessment to see how well we are doing, you know, not only in fields of competition, but also with the budget issues that were clearly out there.

And by the way, I would meet annually with the athletic department to see how -- how they were doing to reduce the deficit spending pattern they had. It wasn't -- it wasn't an ongoing debt. It was every year... I use this example: If every year you spend \$10,000 more than you have, then in ten years you have an accumulated deficit -- did I say \$10?—in ten years you have a deficit of \$100. Well, we weren't talking about hundreds of dollars. We were talking larger amounts than that, but every year they overspent their budget. I was trying to get them to pay back what they had overspent, which was largely one-time money and also develop a budget that they could live with. Within all of that—the conference sports definition and the budget pressures—we did end up eliminating some sports that did have a long history and a lot of followers.

I am now remembering the time table. Actually, we appointed someone who had been on the swimming team to the presidential commission. So I don't think the decision to eliminate some of those sports preceded the creation of the commission. I would have entertained the idea that we kept those sports, but that did come out of the commission.

What came out of all of the conversation at that time was that some of those sports would continue as club sports. Central had a very strong club sports program. Wrestling and swimming—those were the sports that were eliminated—became very strong sports in the club sports program. I know it's not the same. I don't want to minimize the concerns of the people who were deeply troubled (that) we eliminated those sports, but we were competing in wrestling, for example, all over the West because we really didn't have (any local) schools that had wrestling programs. So while I can't say that the coach's salaries and the stipends to the students would have been a consideration, the travel schedule and the fact that we didn't have real competition around the region was a consideration in the elimination of wrestling as one of our varsity sports. As best I can tell, it has thrived as a club sport as rugby did until apparently recently rugby became a varsity sport. They can move back and forth. I do remember at the time a lot of supporters of swimming and wrestling were very upset and there was a brief period when, if you looked up my name at Wikipedia, it started with eliminating swimming and wrestling as what was said about me.

Athletics has never been well funded relative to what some of the other schools do, and that is something (you consider) when you try to add scholarships, you know our scholarship support. At that time I felt one reason we needed to consolidate the budget was to try to concentrate some of the scholarship support in the conference sports we had. I didn't feel they were lavishly supported and I could see some of the arguments that some of the coaches made about needing more scholarships in order to do better. But you know, Central has done a great job, even with that handicap. of having fine athletic programs and a sense of pride.

I was interested just before I retired, that Western addressed their budget issue by eliminating football. I guess they weathered that crisis, but that would not have flown in the conversations I

heard surrounding the president's commission and the future of athletics on this campus. There were too many alumni and donors, frankly, who had been on football teams and there was too much of an identity with the campus for that reason. I don't know; it just didn't seem to be a plausible solution to some of the budget issues we were facing. There was certainly a very strong cadre of alums who were absolutely, totally opposed to eliminating football and as I say were actually arguing for us to go to Division I.

>>LIBBY STREET: You mentioned students several times. Can you talk a little bit more?

>>DR. McINTYRE: That is one of my proudest memories, and I think maybe even an achievement. We worked very closely with students and student government. Dave Soltz and I would go over and talk to the student government meetings whenever we could, but one of the things we did -- Merrill was the name of that student body president. What was her last name? I worked with the student body president my first year and I wanted to have a way to meet with students to hear their concerns. Again, that had been an experience I had had at Utah. So she didn't think that students would just show up to come talk to me. She said you had to create an occasion, and it didn't seem likely that we could have a meal. She said students will always come for food. I didn't think we could fund a meal once a quarter for students to come to. So what I did was kind of combine two different questions I had.

One was how can I hear from the students what they are thinking about? And then I had a request from the fellow who ran the student radio station to appear monthly on a president talks to campus show or some such thing, and I told him I couldn't imagine that anyone would listen to that radio show if I did that, but if we had the students come to a radio broadcast where they were heard talking to the president and also students could call in, then that might be my way of doing the radio broadcast, but also involving the students.

So fairly soon after I arrived—I can't remember if it was the first year or the second year—we started something called the Fireside Chats and that was because we set up the broadcast in the reception center part of the president's home next to the

fireplace and we had good turnout. Students would show up and ask questions. They asked tough questions. I don't recall we got very many questions from people calling in, but it apparently was listened to.

And at a certain point because we had worked closely with student government, they decided they wanted to take that over and publicize it and organize it. So once the Student Union Rec Center was built, they said let's hold the Fireside Chats in front of the fireplace there, the pit, and we will get the word out to students so we will have better turn out and then there will also be people walking by. They thought there would be some utility to the fact there was (foot) traffic next to where the Fireside Chats were going on so that was a good way of communicating.

But I had wonderful relationships with students to the extent that, you know, something came out of some of the student leaders' Facebook site called "JMAC Sightings." It was mildly creepy to be honest. They apparently would report where I was on campus every day, you know, she was seen at the student union wearing her red leather jacket and those sorts of things.

So one of the student leaders said "why don't you become a member of this Facebook community?" and I didn't know what Facebook was at that point. So I said, well, I am willing to do that. I think if I join however, as myself, it might put a damper on conversations. So I joined as Harley T. Katt. Harley was the cat who lived next door to the president's house. And they knew who I was. They knew who Harley was. So they communicated with me that way (and) they communicated through the Fireside Chats. I also had regular meetings with the student body president as part of my monthly meetings—they might even have been more frequent than that—and some of those (students) have continued to be close friends ever since then. I get wedding invitations. I am still on Facebook as Harley T. Katt, by the way. And I hear from them all the time, get text messages of significant things in their lives. So that was an important for me that I stayed in touch.

I also taught every other year. My home department is Communication and so I said I didn't think in the biennial year I would really have the time because you never know when you will be in Ellensburg when the legislative session is going on, so I

made an arrangement with the Department of Communication to teach every other year and that was a good way of staying in touch. Student leaders are one category of students, but they are not representative of all students, so I got a better sense of what other students were thinking about (by teaching). Some of those, too are among ones I still stay in touch with. The ethics class I taught a couple of times and I taught a magazine article writing class once.

So student relationships are extremely important, I think, for any president. I mean, that's why you are here and they were never afraid to tell me what they thought. But on the whole, it's been a wonderful post retirement benefit that some of them continue to stay in touch and tell me what they are up to.

>>LIBBY STREET: Speaking of post retirement, you have been retired for five...

>>DR. McINTYRE: I have been retired -- technically I have been retired for four years because I had a year's leave of absence where I produced some course materials for teachers.

>>LIBBY STREET: What have you been doing?

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, I have been involved in various boards around the community in Salt Lake City, both at the University of Utah and now I am member of the Board of Trustees of a small liberal arts college. I have no interest in being a university administrator full time anymore, but I do have some insights into how a university is run, so I like to do that.

But David and I have both developed careers as writers. David has a collection of poems and he just finished a novel. And I— after flailing around for a while, trying to figure out what I did—I published a couple of humorous short stories and a personal essay and then under the brand of a publishing house that David and I established, I published a novel for middle grade readers called *Paws in the Piazza* that, interestingly enough, has as its hero a cat named Harley. So it's doing pretty well. I am learning how to market novels and it's been sent out for review and almost all the reviews are positive.

>>LIBBY STREET: Congratulations.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Thank you. Harley lives! Harley T. Katt.

>>SPEAKER: I still remember what you started when you were a president, in women's athletics. Whenever they had a game of basketball, the one thing that we remember was our new woman president who said, if they are going to have cheerleaders for the men's basketball games and they are going to have a band at the men's basketball games, they are also going to have cheer leaders and a band at the women's basketball games. So that went over very well, particularly among the women athletes.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, you know, you just reminded me -- you reminded me of another relationship and that was with the student athletes. David -- among the things that David and I tried to do is we tried to get to as many activities on campus as we could. Music programs and the speakers series obviously—we tried to get to those things, but we also tried to attend as many athletic events as we could and we tried to attend women's athletic events as well as men's athletic events. So it was women's basketball, but it was also the women's volleyball and soccer, and softball. You know, your schedule doesn't allow you to do everything, but we did get out and around a lot. So I did intend for us to be supportive of all of the programs, both men and women's programs.

But yeah, when I came here, during timeouts, it struck me particularly in the basketball games, during timeouts, there would be canned music of—I am sure it was music that appealed to young people, but it didn't appeal to most of the people in the stands on my side of the pavilion and that also didn't seem right. We had this wonderful music program and we were playing canned music, so I did say first of all, let's have a pep band and we can provide support to students who play in the pep band. It would showcase the music program and then they would be expected, subject to student's schedules, to perform at the men's games as well as the women's games. So the pep squad, which was the pep band and cheerleaders, was supposed to be supporting all of this and that seemed to go over well, too. The pep band was very well received and people didn't seem to miss the canned music anymore. In all those ways it showcased not just the women's programs—emphasized that we had both men's and women's programs—but also showcased the quality

of the music, emphasized that we had a music program.

>>LIBBY STREET: And speaking of the music program, the building, I understand, has your name on it.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Well, that was -- that is a tremendous honor and I appreciate it. We put in place some requirements for naming buildings my first year because there were some controversies about why some people had things named after them and others didn't. So there were certain criteria that were supposed to be established—special achievement or size of donation and whatever. And the Trustees, as I was retiring as president, felt that what we had done to get the music building after so many years of not succeeding, was an ingenious solution. We got a building that it didn't appear we were going to get and so they apparently initiated a discussion that, on those grounds, the building should be named after me. It's a source of pride (for me). As I said during the -- during the program where, you know, we did the naming ceremony or where the naming was acknowledged—music has been a big part of my life. Some people that are in music that don't end up having music careers and I am one of them. You could go around the campus and ask which building would have the most meaning for you and frankly music was the one that had the most meaning for me, even as an abstract proposition. But anyway, I do think the building is there because of our legislative efforts and I am glad that was recognized.

>>LIBBY STREET: And you still play the piano?

>>DR. McINTYRE: I still play the piano, yeah. I tell David after six years of daily practice, which I have been able to do during retirement, I am almost as good as I was when I was nine. But, you know, old fingers are not as nimble as young fingers.

>>LIBBY STREET: Okay. Thank you.

>>DR. McINTYRE: Thank you.

\*\*Captions provided by EnlightenedCaptions

\*\*[www.enlightenedcaptions.com](http://www.enlightenedcaptions.com)