Q. Today is September 18, 2006. I am Marvin Zahniser and I am sitting in the handsome board room for Dr. William E. Kirwan in Adelphi, Maryland. Dr. Kirwan, Chancellor of the University System of Maryland, served as President of The Ohio State University from 1998 to 2002. I am here to interview Dr. Kirwan on behalf of The Ohio State University Archives, in order to gain his perspectives on his years as President of Ohio State. As a personal note, Dr. Kirwan was known to me long before Dr. Kirwan came to Ohio State, for his father, Albert Dennis Kirwan, was a well-known historian who wrote at least three favorably received monographs likely to turn up on many doctoral candidate reading lists. So, Dr. Kirwan, will you tell us a little bit about your upbringing in an academic household?

A. All right. I was actually born in Louisville, Kentucky, but my parents had just moved to Lexington. My father was a high school football coach and history teacher at Manuel High School. He had graduated from the University of Kentucky and [had] been a huge football star there. So, he was recruited back to the University of Kentucky to be the football coach at the University of Kentucky. So we had moved, my parents had moved to Lexington with my older brother, but my mother’s pediatrician was in Louisville, so I was technically born in Louisville but grew up in Lexington, as in my early years the son of the football coach. I used to go out to practice when my father was coaching, put on my little
uniform, and I thought that was really a big deal. My father sort of broke the stereotypical mode for a football coach, because he was a very intellectually oriented person and had a master’s degree in history, had a law degree. From my earliest moments our house was full of books. We were always reading and storytelling. So it was a very rich and exciting, I would say in many ways, childhood.

I’ll never forget, however, it was during the war years, WWII that is, my father, Kentucky didn’t have a team, he was already getting tired of coaching. He had coached there for about six years, and he was burning out of coaching and really wanted to get back into, become more involved in the academic life of the institution. So he went to the President of the University, Herbert Donovan, and said, “You know, if I go off and get my Ph.D. in History, can I join the faculty?” And Donovan was probably thinking, “Well, what football coach is going to go get a Ph.D. in History?” He said, “Sure, you can.” So my parents sold our house in Lexington, Kentucky, and used the proceeds from the sale to go to Durham, where he got his Ph.D. in History from Charles ________. And I’ll never forgot when he came home to tell me and my brother what was happening, he said, “Boys, I’m going to quit coaching and I’m going to get a Ph.D. and I’m going to become a faculty member.” And I was six years old at the time. And tears rolling down my face, I thought I said, “Brit, what’s wrong, what’s wrong?” I said, “Oh, dad, everybody knows the son of a football coach; nobody knows the son of a professor.” So anyway, we moved to Durham. He got his Ph.D. believe it or not in two years. He did have a Master’s. So we lived in Durham for two years and came back. Then he became, as you mentioned very graciously in the opening,
even though he started sort of mid-career, but quite a successful historian, then
graduate dean, and then he was the interim president of the University when a
president left. And the search for a new president went on for longer than
anybody thought. So he actually served for almost two years. And when the new
president came in, he was such a revered person at the University, that the Board
declared he was the eighth president, I think it was, of the University. He wasn’t
the interim president; he was actually the eighth president of the University. So
his portrait hangs with all the other presidents. It’s a really nice tribute to him. I
actually went to the University on a football scholarship, but only played one
year. Got much more interested in being a mathematician than playing football,
graduated from UK and went on get my Ph.D. from Rutgers in mathematics.
Came to Maryland and then started my academic career.

Q. Very interesting. Very few people have that kind of father who was a coach, a
professor, and a university president.

A. All in one. And just an unbelievably, both of my parents, wonderful role models,
because I grew up in the segregated South. I did not go to school with an African
American until my senior year in high school. And when I went to the University
of Kentucky, there could not have been more than a half a dozen African
Americans on the campus. And yet in this sort of segregated community, I
always had this sense of the injustice of the treatment of African Americans and
passion in equity and diversity had been impassioned throughout my life and
career. It’s a reflection of the values my parents had. I know we all are indebted
to our parents, but I just feel this unbelievable sense of gratitude for the values
they instilled in me, and the life that we enjoyed together as a family. It was a very rich one.

Q. Tell us a little bit about how you met your wife, and how she’s contributed to your career. And your family life is obviously very important to you.

A. Okay, sure. Very, very important to us. As I said, I went to public schools in Lexington, Kentucky. One would [not] normally think of Kentucky as a place of high quality K-12 education, but Lexington certainly had superb schools. I got a great education. But when I went to the 7th grade, in those days they had something called junior high school, that was 7th, 8th and 9th grade.

Q. I was in one, too.

A. And now it’s middle school I think. It’s shifted a little bit. But in any case, in my first year, the 7th grade, the junior high school grew from a number of different elementary schools. I sat behind, my name was Kirwan, so that comes after “H.” I sat behind a Patty Harper, who was this very attractive young woman who was in my home room. So I knew her from almost day one in junior high school. We were not romantically involved until we got to be seniors in high school. But I knew her starting from the 7th grade on through. Always thought of her as somebody I would like to get to know better. For us, it’s amusing. When we got to be seniors, we had a senior trip to Washington, D.C. She had a boyfriend who had already graduated from the high school and was in college, and I had a girlfriend who was a junior. So, we went on this senior trip together by train from Lexington, Kentucky to Washington, D.C. And the sparks flew, and by the time we got back from that senior trip, the other two were history. And so we began
our permanent relationship from that moment and continued through college. And we got married right out of college. She’s been just an enormously supportive person. It was a different era where [there was] more of a tradition that women stayed home and took care of the family and that’s the tradition we came out of. But when I was a graduate student she actually began working. I was registered in Rutgers, I had a fellowship. But she worked. Then when we moved to Maryland, we had a son by then and she became a homebody and worked there at the house taking care of me and our son. Then, we had a daughter, so we have two children. Since the children have grown up, she’s had various jobs. She’s worked in schools, teaching assistants and volunteer and so on and so forth. But as I became an administrator, she really assumed the responsibility for being a host with me for so many University events. We both entertain a lot as any President would be expected to. And she sort of orchestrated and managed all of that. She did so with, I think, a lot of grace and charm. She’s a person that does not have a large, she’s a very gracious person. She doesn’t have a large ego and is very warm and friendly, and people seem to naturally gravitate to her. So I think she’s been not just in sort of these public events, but she’s been enormously supportive, but on a personal level, always wanting to, in a way, sacrifice her own interests for whatever I thought was important for my career. I will forever be indebted to her. I think she would have preferred, she is sort of a shy person, she would have preferred that I had remained a professor of mathematics because of so many time commitments and so on and so forth. So it sort of meant less time in some ways together. But she’s
been just very unselfish in allowing what I thought was important for my career to sort of take precedence. She was a little uncomfortable about leaving Maryland to go to Ohio, but we’ll get into that later. But anyway, we have two kids. They’re both married. We have four grandchildren, two grandsons, and two granddaughters. Both kids live with their families right near us here in Maryland. There’s no question that, we’ll get into why I left Ohio State and came back to Maryland. But it seems relevant at this point to mention that a huge factor for us was the fact that we had these young families and these young grandkids. I don’t know if you have grandchildren or not, but there’s nothing quite like new life, the bond that exists between grandparents and grandchildren. So we see them a lot and that’s brought a lot of joy to our life.

Q. After such a long and distinguished career really at the University of Maryland and as president, what finally prompted you to accept the OSU presidency? And let me follow up with that, some people thought you were probably over-promised about what was it possible to do in the Ohio environment as it had developed over the previous 30 years?

A. I genuinely thought that I would never leave Maryland; that I would end my career at the University. I’ll come back to that in just a second. I had been approached about other positions and sort of gave them some passing thought, but really declined to get involved to see any other search to conclusion. People said they wanted to talk to me. Well I said, “Sure, I’ll talk to you,” but then basically dropped out of the search. Ohio State had a most unusual approach and I thought was highly effective recruiting. Never seen anything really quite like it. First of
all, I’d gotten several letters from Ohio State, phone calls from the search firm that was doing the search, and I kept saying that I really wasn’t going to leave. I was flattered. I thanked them but I wasn’t going to leave Maryland. And then they did a very unusual thing. Alex Shumate was chairing the search committee and Bernadine Healy was on it, and several other faculty. Alex Shumate told the search consultant, “You get us in that office. I don’t care how you do it. You get us in his office.” So, Bill Funk, who was chairing the search, called up my appointment secretary and said, “There’s a group from Ohio State that wants to talk to Dr. Kirwan about the Kellogg commission,” which the Kellogg Commission was a big activity at that time looking at the role and mission of land grant colleges. So I said to her, “Sure, I’d be happy to talk to them.” So, the day comes and into the office walks Alex Shumate and about six other people and they sit around the table. Alex, who is just unbelievably charismatic and impressive, looks at me and says, “Well, Dr. Kirwan, we really don’t want to talk about the Kellogg commission. We want to talk to you about being President of Ohio State University.” And he told me later, “I knew at that moment you were either going to let us talk or you were going to kick us out of the room.” So, I told Alex that, they kind of went through their spiel. I thanked them and told them how flattered I was and so on and so forth. And he said, “Look, do one thing for us. We’re moving the search committee around the country and we’re going to be down in Alexandria. Just humor us and come talk to the search committee.” Being a properly raised southern sort, I didn’t want to offend them and I said, “Okay, I’ll come down and talk to the search committee,” which I did. And so I
was very impressed by the quality of people around the table, their belief in the University, their desire to see it move to a different level. Alex kept using the term, “We’re looking for a president and we’re going to move Ohio State to another level of excellence. It’s a very fine institution but we have alignment around it becoming one of the great public universities in America, which was my mantra at Maryland and something I wanted to see happen. But I was impressed by the clarity of the message and the commitment and the quality of the people. They had a really first-rate team there. That conversation ended and they called back and said, “You’re the one. We want you to come and be the President. We’d like you to come and visit the campus.” I said, ”Okay, I’ll come and look.” But even at that point I thought, “There is no chance I’m going to take this job.” I shouldn’t say no chance – why would I go out there? I didn’t really think anything was going to happen, so much so that my wife didn’t go with me. So I went out on a stealth visit to Ohio State. It was so stealth that even my closest associates at Maryland didn’t know I was going on this visit. And Ohio State was unbelievably, there was no rumors coming out of Ohio State. Just because I had been in Maryland so long, I am certain that if the word had started to bubble up, it would have become an issue and I never would have gone to Ohio State. Nobody knew this was going on. So I went out there, and again, it was just a magnificently orchestrated visit. I met with the Board. I met with the search committee. They took me to see the governor. Again, it just seemed like unbelievably high-quality people, so committed to the institution, and just an alignment around what was going to happen. And so I came back and told Patty,
“You know, this is pretty serious. I’m impressed with where Ohio State is headed and find all of this pretty exciting. Meanwhile, and going back to my tenure at Maryland, I had been President for ten years. And I don’t know what the right time is, but I genuinely do believe that someone shouldn’t be President indefinitely. After ten years, it is time to begin, and I had already had pangs, had begun to have some pangs of how much longer should I be President? What’s right for the University? Isn’t it time, I’ve put my heart and soul into this and good things have happened, but isn’t it really time for somebody else to now come in and build on this? It’s not about me being President of Maryland. So I was having these sort of pangs. And then I was really upset with the governor, because I felt the governor was not living up to the commitment that he sort of made to the University. The state had been in bad economic times. It had come out of them and they had not invested in higher education the way I’d been led to believe they were going to. I was pretty upset about that. So all of these things, these sort of pangs of wondering in my own mind, the frustration with the governor and the state on the other hand, and this sort of story coming out of Ohio State that would make the blood race. It was all very, very kind. So Patty and I did some real soul searching and she said, actually there had been some other offers on the west coast and what not, it was just too far from our kids and family and what not. But Ohio, there’s her family still in Kentucky. We have a vacation home in western Maryland. It’s about the same distance as it is from Columbus, from Silver Spring or College Park. So she said, “Well, if you want to do this, we’ll do it.” Sight unseen, she was going to do this. Ohio State was actually
playing at the Sugar Bowl down in New Orleans. Alex was calling me up every day, “What are you going to do, what are you doing to do?” So I said, “You know what, I’m going to come. I’m going to come to Ohio State and didn’t think we’d ever get to this point, but I’m going to do it.” So, then I started telling people here and the word got out.

Q. And it did cause a disturbance.

A. Well, it did. But for me I think emotionally more than I realized. But it was also, it was, all through the period, I guess it was announced in January, I think it was January. I didn’t come until July 1. But all through the spring I’d go visit Ohio State. The whole transition was handled so professionally and well by Ohio State. I was truly impressed by the effort and thought and energy that went into not only the search, the recruitment, but also the transition. They sent a plane out here to get me and I’d go there and visit people. So I felt like when I got there I really hit the ground running. I think, and I don’t know whether this is sort of consistent with your second part of your question, a couple of things that were, I guess I had not really thought through well enough about the transition. One was, and I guess at some level I knew this, Alex Shumate, with whom I developed this incredible relationship and friendship and fondness, I felt what a team we would make, was off the Board before I got there. The Governor, who was out of there by November. So there’s a different leadership of the Board. And I probably should have done more research on this topic, but I had not really understood how much of a decline the Ohio economy was in, and in the Midwest. Whereas I think at some level there was this desire and interest, I began not long after I was there, to
realize Ohio State’s economic fortunes were not in great shape, and there wasn’t much that you would be able to do about that. It was also a period, Ohio had made a transition from being a fairly Democratic state to a very Republican state, kind of a anti-tax state. There were also things about the structure of higher education in Ohio that made it difficult to really have an impact on funding, because the funding for higher education went through the Ohio Board of Regents. And so really you were sort of arguing about some incredible bureaucracy that spread across the entire state. It wasn’t about The Ohio State University or even engineering at Ohio State or business or history; it was about this entity that served hundreds of thousands of students with a budget that was gigantic, and was so divorced from anything to do with quality or initiative or whatever. I thought that was a huge disadvantage. I think it is a huge disadvantage. You can’t tell the story about what’s you’re going to do, the difference an institution can make, because there’s no venue to do it. There was no time at which I could go talk to the Governor and say, “You’ve got to invest in Ohio State because here’s what going to happen if you do,” because there just wasn’t a venue. There was some general hearing in the legislature when the higher education budget came before, but it was not, it isn’t done in a way where you even have a chance to get people to understand what the impact of investment is higher education. Not that Maryland is perfect by any stretch of the imagination, but all fall I’ll be down there talking to the Governor’s staff about why, here’s what we need and here’s why you’ve got to make this investment, and then I can go talk to the General Assembly about it. It’s hard to get the
people who feel passionately, I found in Ohio, to make the case to anybody. You can make it in ______ or to business or the Chamber of Commerce or something like that, but you can’t, there isn’t the forum where policy decisions are made. I found that very, very, very frustrating. So I’ve ranted on and on there for too long. … has one of the nation’s lowest percentage of adults with college degree of any state in the union.

Q. Yes, that’s right.

A. And this is maybe overly simplistic. What I think is part of the issue in Ohio is that you have, what happens – Ohio built a very strong blue collar manufacturing economy. And they were doing very well, thank you, for many, many years. Meanwhile, this economy begins to die out in America. And what is growing up in its alternative is a knowledge-based of a high value-added service economy. And Ohio didn’t make the transition because they had this embedded sort of manufacturing mentality. I don’t mean that in a disparaging way.

Q. I understand the arguments about the need to have manufacturing enterprises. You come over to the knowledge economy and you’re talking to a large uneducated segment.

A. Exactly, exactly, that’s the point. That is the point.

Q. And they couldn’t understand what you were talking about.

A. They couldn’t understand what you were talking about. And you couldn’t make that argument politically. So the political leaders, you couldn’t run on that platform, because your political base, where’s my job for tomorrow. Not so much where my children’s jobs are going to be. Where’s my job for tomorrow. In fact,
I think the Midwest is at somewhat of a disadvantage right now. I think the booming areas tend to be on the coast right now because they were less captured. I don’t know whether it was the automobile industry or what that made this huge, is both the agriculture base, which is huge in the Midwest, and the industries coming out of the automobile industry, which were very traditional production and manufacturing economy.

Q. Today the automotive history is not very encouraging for Ohio. They’ve already announced they’re closing a plant up in Maumee.

A. Is that right?

Q. In northwest Ohio. And the parts manufacturing. It’s going to be very hard. So here you arrive on this very large campus. It was actually five campuses, one great big one and four smaller ones. What impressed you as needing to be addressed first?

A. Something else that I was not quite prepared for that maybe I should have been but I wasn’t. I had grown up on the College Park campus. It was the only job I had ever had was the University of Maryland College Park. So I came in ’64 and I left in ’98. And I knew almost everybody on the campus. I knew the faculty. I knew the staff. I knew the maintenance workers. I knew everybody, not literally but a high percentage of the people, on a first-name basis. I knew who I could listen to. I knew when somebody told me something, the lens through which they would be speaking, or the perspective from which they would be speaking. I was sort of comfortable as one could be. It didn’t mean I didn’t have some challenges and issues and people getting upset about various things for sure, but I knew the
campus like probably few people ever do know a college campus. And what I found such a challenge when I got here, I didn’t know anybody. I’d read a lot of material and so on and so forth. But I didn’t know the people on the campus. It was such a strange feeling to be at a place where I was the President and I didn’t know anybody. When I was at College Park and I knew everybody. I think in a way, if I’d come from some place where I’d been President seven or eight years and come to Ohio State, it would have been okay, and sort of like starting over with my previous position. But this was such a radical change. Also, I found Ohio State, I thought, there was a certain, maybe this was a mis-read on my part, but there was a certain sense of, I don’t want to use the word complacency, because that could be maybe seen as a pejorative term, but there was a certain satisfaction with the institution as it was. And for good reason. It’s one of the great land grant universities in America. Some of the passion I heard for change in the search committee I didn’t sense when I got a broader exposure to the campus. Obviously, a lot of highly motivated people, but the sense of being in a hurry to achieve a much loftier status, the burning passion, I didn’t see as pervasively across the campus as I had sensed during the recruitment process. Also, it is such an enormous institution. It is probably hard for anybody coming in, sort of getting your arms around, what are the levers that make change and how can you, what are the areas of greatest need. How do you find that out? Who do you listen to? Who do you talk to? The vastness of Ohio State. I think it has more academic programs than any other university in America. All the allied health and pharmacy and social work, and all the professional schools, a huge
College of Agriculture, as well as a very fine Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. So, one thing that I inherited that I was very pleased about, was the selective investment program. I’ve been thinking about setting priorities, investing priorities, I’ve spent most of my adult, excuse me, my administrative life, worrying about, I think the selective investment program, which I guess, Dick Sisson and Gordon Gee, some tell me Dick Sisson was really the original conceiver of this notion. But in any case, I thought it was the best conceived strategy for making targeted investments. Now, none of them had been made yet. They were in the process when I got there. But boy did I leap on that. I thought, “This is a wonderful strategy,” particularly in this huge, big place for really being able to focus. I threw myself into that with a vengeance. Actually, it sort was a factor and a decision I made fairly early on, which I think was a little controversial. Dick Sisson was serving as the Interim President with the understanding that he could go back for a period of time as the Provost. But he decided he didn’t want to do that. I could understand that perfectly well. Ed Ray had become – who had been his number-two person – became the Provost or the Interim Provost. The first thing that I did when I got there was because of the size and trying to get a fix on what I should be focused on in getting started and trying to move this institution forward, I brought in the former president of Cornell.

Q. His name is Frank Rose.

A. Frank Rose, yes. I brought him in to be my eyes and ears. I had a great amount of respect for him. He had some history with Ohio State.

Q. Yes, I used to be in a small group with him when I was a young assistant.
A. Is that right?

Q. I’ve known him for quite a few years. I’ve known Frank for quite a few years and had the highest respect for his leadership and judgment. He knew the Midwest. He’d been to Michigan before he went to Cornell. Been associated with land grant universities and everything. So I asked Frank to come in and sort of look at, go out and talk to people. I thought we had an awful lot of vice presidents. How we were structured, how we made decisions at the institution, to give me his best thinking on all of that. He went out on the campus. He did a lot of interviews. He actually had two other people that worked with him. But he was the main author of this report. And Chuck Young was one of them. Chuck, for whatever reason, couldn’t spend much time on this. So, Frank wrote this report and put forth sort of a, provided some suggestions on the administrative organization. He felt, and I felt, that the Provost did not have sufficient presence at the institution. And I think part of this may have been Gordon’s administrative style. He was ubiquitous, shall we say. And I felt that there needed to be, I felt that the academic voice needed to have some special status in the councils that advised the president. And also, there were too many people reporting to me. So anyway, out of that came this structure that made the Provost position both Provost and executive vice president, with the vice president for research reporting to that individual. We got rid of a vice president and we created a vice presidency for communications, which I felt was an area that needed more attention. In any case, out of this we created this vice presidency and I thought about, now what do we do with filling this position. I just couldn’t bear the thought, here it was six
months into my presidency when this report came out, five or six months, and now we were going to start a search for a Provost. So that’s going to take a year to do that, and we’re going to have to bring in [candidates]. I wanted to get things moving. So I began consulting with people about the idea of just appointing, which was most unusual, to appoint Ed as Provost and executive vice president, with the understanding that he would undergo a review at a certain point, and if a change needed to be made, it would be made. And for the most part, I got a very positive reaction on the campus. It wasn’t uniform. Ed has an interesting personality and can be a bit caustic at times. Maybe in some instances as being a bit sharp or whatever. But by and large nobody questioned his academic values. He had been so involved with the academic plan, that this met with a largely positive reception. And so I just decided to make the move and declare him the vice president, so we could get to work on moving the institution forward. And that we did.

Q. And you were happy.

A. I was. I was. We can talk about the administrative team. I think that comes up a little later.

Q. It does. All right. I think Chris Perry is convinced that the greatest mark of the Kirwan administration was crafting that academic plan, and actually selling it to the various communities. I’d like you to reflect a little bit about that and your role in it, and how you saw that move forward.

A. We had some pretty strategic planning at College Park. I’m absolutely convinced, I had become convinced that for a large under-resourced institution, if there
wasn’t some conscious strategy about what you were going to be doing to advance, nothing was going to happen. You’d have these little activities going off in different directions, but when you added them all up, you’d be back where you were. There wouldn’t be any consistency. There’d be no accountability. There’d be no measurement. So I had come somewhat reluctantly, I guess all of us in academics sort of bristle at notions that come out of the business world, but I had become convinced that a place like Ohio State and College Park had to have a good strategy plan with accountability, with measurement for progress. So I sort of charged, I got a group together. There were two issues. There was the Academic Plan and the Diversity Action Plan, which I felt was also very important. I think we ought to talk about diversity at some point before we finish the interview. So I put together a group to develop this plan. And they started working in trying to draw upon existing documents. A lot of people had given thought to different aspects of sort of a research enterprise. We had done the selective investment stuff. All of the background work for that. So there were reports out there. There was a report on the quality of student life at Ohio State. So there were documents to draw upon. And I thought that was really important, to use the good thinking that had existed before, but to pull it into a coherent amalgamated plan that was readable and also measurable in terms of the outcome of the results. So this group started producing documents that we would circulate out on the campus for feedback, and they weren’t very good. We just couldn’t seem to kind of get this right. And I began to get somewhat impatient and somewhat frustrated that we couldn’t get something together that was exciting
and created a vision for the institution. I’ll never forget, by this time we had hired
Lee Tashjian, who was the vice president for communications, who came from
the corporate world. Ohio State grad but came from the corporate world. He had
a good sense, I thought, of communication strategies and what not. And one day
he talked in my office and he’d been working on the plan too, and we were all sort
of spinning our wheels a bit. I was feeling very frustrated. I didn’t want my first
product to be a ho-hum or kind of drop off the table with a thud. And so, Lee
Tashjian came into my office and said, “Brit, you’ve got to read this book by Jim
Collins, called “Built to Last.” So I read this book. It was pretty unbelievably
well done I thought. He had been a professor at Stanford in the business school
there. He got his Ph.D. I forget from where, some very good place. Anyway, he
wrote this book on “Built to Last.” What he did was, he took two corporations
and one of them had staying power and great success, and the other sort of fizzled
out. For example, General Electric and Westinghouse. Now what is it in General
Electric, in that organization, that was fundamentally different than
Westinghouse? He had about eight pairs of these companies. Johnson & Johnson
versus some other now-defunct or mediocre pharmaceutical. And he said, “What
are the common threads of these companies that have been built to last?” And it
was really powerful. Didn’t have any academic institutions in it but really
powerful. So he said, “You know what, maybe we could get Jim Collins to come
here and help us figure this out, how you do this in an academic setting.” And so
he said, “Why don’t you call him up? Here’s his telephone number.” So I called
him and told him I was President of Ohio State and we’re trying to do a strategic
plan, and we’re having trouble. We can’t get this thing quite right. I’ve read this book. I told him what we were trying to do. I said, “Ohio State is a wonderful university, but we want to move this institution to greatness. That’s what this is all about. I want a strategy, a vision. So we’re just wondering if there’s anyway we could persuade you to come here and help us out and talk to us a little bit.” He laughed. He said, “Well, Dr. Kirwan, let me tell you. I can’t do this for two reasons.” And I said, “What are they?” He said, “Well, first of all, you can’t afford me. And secondly, I’m writing another book and it’s called ‘Good to Great,’ how you take something that’s good and make it great. I’m right in the middle of this book and I just can’t take the time. But you know what, I’m very impressed with what you’re trying to do. If you will bring your team to Boulder, Colorado,” which is where he then lived, he retired and left Stanford. “If you will bring your team out to Boulder, I’ll spend two days pro bono with you.” I said, “That’s an offer we can’t refuse.” So we got about ten people and went out to Boulder, Colorado. And we sat around with Jim Collins for two days. It was absolutely, first of all the quality time we had together for two days where everybody was just focused only on this, and secondly, his thinking about how you go about crafting a good strategy for an organization, was just absolutely amazing. The first thing, I’ll never forget, we all gathered around this table and he’s sitting, it’s sort of a U-shaped table, and he’s sitting and he looked around there and said, “Okay, the first thing I have to ask you if we start this is, what are your values?” We’re sitting around the table and we all kind of looked around and thought, “What are our values?” So then we had an exercise about, “What do
we really value?” He said, “Why are you different at Ohio State? What is your uniqueness? You’ve got to be able to articulate what it is that makes you stand out as something unique.” Anyway, we came back from that experience and from that put together a plan and circulated it several times. It didn’t take too long after that until we got this document in what I think was in very good shape. Chris Perry actually came on about this time. He did a lot of the writing for the plan. I like to write. I don’t know that I write well, but I like to write. I was wordsmithing this thing all along too. And that’s sort of the story of how it took place. I really don’t remember the length of time, the period over which, but then once we had the plan, we developed a whole strategy about how you communicate this plan to the public, the university community. I remember we had a big Senate meeting and I laid out this plan with television cameras and everything. It was a pretty exciting day from my perspective.

Q. Pretty exciting for the University, too.

A. Yes. What made me feel, we’ll get into my leaving Ohio State, which was also in some ways as painful as leaving Maryland, but one of the things that made me feel it was, the effort that we put into this was successful, is I’ll never forget when Karen Holbrook was hired, the Board told her, “Look, if you come here this is your plan. We want you to execute this plan. We don’t want to have another plan. This is the plan. We have embraced this. We like this plan.” I was just on the web site the other day for Ohio State and they have a section on the academic plan. I’m sure it’s been modified and refined and updated and so on and so forth, but in some sense it still is.
Q. I guess to prove the qualitative root to improvement. Would you tell us just briefly how you interacted with the deans? President Jennings and Gee tended to meet the deans in sessions, and I didn’t read anything in the book that indicated that this was your approach. I wondered what your thinking was on this.

A. That’s a very good question. When I got there, I learned what are the various groups that the president meets with. And there was something called a coordinating council, which was huge. It had all the deans and the directors. And then there was another group that I think was mainly the vice presidents. The coordinating council perhaps worked from Gordon’s perspective, but the feedback Frank got was that the meetings didn’t seem to lead to anything. It was a lot of sort of talking around the table, which has some value, but it wasn’t an agenda-setting or an action group in any way. I was also very sensitive to the fact that if the Provost was going to have some elevated status, the deans had to see the Provost, not the president, as their immediate boss. And so I made a decision that, I’m not going to meet with the deans on a regular basis. That’s the Provost job. The deans report to the Provost, the Provost and the deans work together on the academic agenda, and I will always come to the meeting when I’m asked. I will always meet with the dean whenever the Provost wants me to. But I’m going to let the Provost manage the deans. And so that’s the way I had operated at Maryland. My tendency, if I don’t force myself into some discipline, my tendency is to go to any group that wants me to come and so on. I didn’t want there to be any missed signals with the deans about who their boss was, and so on and so forth. So I consciously decided not to go to this coordinating council and
to let Ed run that. And then I tried to upgrade what we called the cabinet. I don’t like that name, whatever, but the vice presidents would meet with me in a much smaller group. And that was really kind of a policy-setting group. We orchestrated these meetings so that Ed’s group with the deans would meet before the cabinet, so that any agenda item, most of which were academic matters, he had the voice of the deans to come on that particular item. He could report on the voice of the deans.

Q. Did the deans do any end-runs?

A. Oh yes, absolutely. I was pretty good about, deans were always asking me to come visit the college, which I would do, and I thought I should do, but not for business meetings. Understand what they were working on. I think the one area where there was perhaps a little tension, and it was inevitable, had to do with the medical school. Because the head of the medical school was both a vice president and a dean. We, I think, 80 percent had this work okay. Fred [Alfred SanFillipo] reported to Ed on all college matters. Fred reported to me on general hospital and university health matters. New faculty, new programs faculty appointments, department chairs, all went to Ed. They didn’t come to me. Other stuff, the non-college matters, came to me from Fred. So I would meet with Fred on a regular basis, but in that role as vice president, and Ed would meet with him on college matters.

Q. I suppose you came to campus thinking that Bernadine Healy was going to be one of the major advisors.

A. Not only major advisor but was going to be a soul mate in moving things forward.
Q. So absent her, what was the process by which you began to develop a concept of what this huge complex needed?

A. One thing that Frank Rose wrote in this report, which I think is a public document, anyway Frank Rose wrote in his report to me, one of the things you have got to address early on is the, I want to use a word but I think it’s too strong a word, the dysfunctional nature of the medical enterprise. And basically what we had, what I inherited was, a vice president for health affairs I think it was called. That was Manny [Manuel] Tzagournis. Bernadine Healy, who was the dean at the school of medicine, and the president of the hospital, which was [R.] Reed Fraley. So there was this three-headed enterprise. The relationships were not good. Bernadine being a strong, hard-charging, take no prisoners, sort of approach. Manny, sort of beloved and benevolent and very easy going. They did not have a highly effective constructive relationship. It was unclear to me who Bernadine reported to. Did she report to Manny? Did she report to the Provost? And it tended to come down to, sometimes the president of the hospital would side with the dean of the medical school, although I guess the president of the hospital reported to the vice president for health affairs. It was not a structure that made for decisive, that promoted careful planning and decisive action. And so Bernadine, I think, my honest guess is that, she was beginning to look around and think about leaving even before I came to Ohio State, because I think she felt she was not going to be able to do what she needed. The structure just wasn’t going to work. So I got this. I certainly agreed with Frank Rose’s assessment – this was not working. I appointed a committee of respected people who had been on the
hospital board and I thought knew a lot about the health care profession, to provide me with advice on how to restructure the medical operation, and to look at other models around the country, etc., etc. They did a very thorough job, wrote me a report, gave me some options. I scheduled a presentation of options with the board and then made this recommendation that if we were really going to be able to have the structure that would promote building a first-rate medical enterprise, we had to consolidate the authority and power in a single person. And so I opted for a model that had a vice president and dean. And the president of the hospital reported clearly and directly to the, oh, there was a hospital board, they approved certain things, that person was really reporting directly to the vice president. I looked at a lot of models around the country and felt that this was right for Ohio State. And then once the board bought into that, which was something I did pretty early on in my administration, and then we started the search for this person to come in and be this czar over the medical school. That was a very difficult search. There were a lot of cross-current and intrigue within the medical enterprise, and a lot of favorite internal candidates. A lot of community pressure for some of these internal candidates to be appointed into this new position. So I was under a lot of pressure to move in certain directions. But I had this search committee. Out of this search process, this man Fred Sanfilippo arose. I knew he was at Johns Hopkins. I knew a lot about Johns Hopkins. And I was on one of my meetings, one of trips up to Washington to a meeting, I met him for lunch. I was very impressed. Very intelligent fellow who was driven, had energy, wanted to make a difference, build something great. Young, as these positions go. And
so he became one of the top two or three candidates. So then I called around about him and talked to people at Duke, talked to my good friend Bill Brody at Johns Hopkins. What I learned was that he would be a very, very effective change agent, but that I would pay a heavy price for it. He was very difficult to manage. Hard-charging guy, whatever he had was never enough. So I thought, “Well, I want to see something happen here. I want to make a difference. And I think this is a guy who can make these kinds of changes.” So I appointed him to the dissatisfaction of some donors who had some internal favorite candidates. And Fred was everything that he was advertised to be. I think he has been a change agent. He has been a hard charger and a hard driver. He’s, I think, rubbed some people the wrong way, perhaps. Maybe some felt he tried to move too quickly. But I just have no question that when his people looked back at his tenure, and I would say even now, they’re going to say, “This is a different medical school than when he came.” If you look at the facilities that have been built there, the kinds of people that have been recruited, it is, I think, a remarkable record of accomplishment.

Q. Would you like to talk a little bit about the Board of Trustees at Ohio State? Were they really firm and enthusiastic and well informed supporters? I’d like you to reflect a little bit about how they’re appointed, all done by the Governor. And of course the Governor has recently added two or three more to the Board. How does that system strike you as being compatible with the interest of the University?
A. First of all, without exception, the members of the Board were dedicated, deeply committed to Ohio State University, extraordinarily loyal. I think they had different perspectives on what should happen and how the institution should evolve and change and so on and so forth. But I think whatever it said about them, it has to be said that people consider this a high honor to be on the Board. The dedication and loyalty, commitment and belief in the institution was never, never a source of question. The Board is [made up of] very high-quality individuals [who] have been appointed. Alex Shumate, Judge Duncan, etc. It is such a highly sought-after position that I think, and now I’m talking about any individual, but talking about as a methodology for selection. It becomes such a plum to be appointed, that the Governor is going to pick people to whom he is very indebted. And that isn’t always necessarily the quality that would make the best board member. So I think that is a flaw. The other thing that I think was unfortunate, is unfortunate about the board structure, is they have this curious rule that you’re appointed in year one and then year nine, your last year, you’re chairman of the board whether or not you should be chairman of the board. And then you go off the board. And I just don’t think that is an effective way for a board to be organized and to operate. The chairman of the board has a very important role to play in committees, as a spokesperson for the board, as a partner with the president in trying to advance the institution. And so these nine people should select the most able person to carry out that role. And that’s not the way they operate now. Maybe they’ll change since the board has been added. But I thought that was a disadvantage at Ohio State, that that’s the way the board was
selected, the way the board operated. I think the board was supportive of me. I
think I had a good relationship with board members. The system in Maryland is a
different construct in that there is one board for 13 institutions and a chancellor
who oversees things. And the presidents report to the chancellor. So when I was
president of College Park, my interaction with the board were mainly as a
presentation to the board, social interaction, they’d come to football games, that
sort of thing. I didn’t work directly with the board as the chancellor. So it was a
different kind of interaction that I think I have gotten better at over time. I think
now that I’ve for some period been directly involved with the work of the board, I
think I’ve become more effective in managing the activities or suggesting the
activities of the board and interactions. I think there were, and I may be jumping
too far ahead, so we can wait until a later time, I was very disappointed in one
stage in my relationship with the board over this tuition issue. That had a big
impact on me. We can talk about that later.

Q. I’d like to ask you a little more about that later.

A. It also involves the Governor. I guess you read about that.

Q. Oh yes, it was in the newspaper too. When did you come on to the idea that it
was important to wed the fortunes of Ohio State to the larger fortunes of the Ohio
economy? I think this is an important moment in your own thinking.

A. Right. I think it had the origins in my experience in Maryland, because Maryland,
during the time I was president of College Park and more sense, Maryland, the
State of Maryland, has gone from being, particularly the metropolitan Washington
area, has gone from being sort of a bureaucratic government driven economy.
Lots of government employees working in these big large bureaucracies, to a very rich and indeed knowledge-based economy. It probably would surprise you to know that Maryland has the largest R&D [research and development] investment per capita of any state in the union.

Q. I didn’t know that.

A. And part of it has grown out of the R&D activities in the federal government: NIH, NSA, Goodard Space Flight Center, FDA, all located here in our midst, all located here in Maryland. And the government has put a lot of emphasis on the creation of intellectual property, and so this is a huge churn of activity. And industries have grown up around this. And you can’t sustain this kind of economy without very fine research universities as partners, as producing smart graduates, engaged in intellectual property development, commercialization, and so on and so forth. Mid to late ’90s was a very exciting time in Maryland in this regard. Lots going on. Ohio State had made a commitment to build its science park, and actually when I went out, that famous visit, before taking the job, one of the things I asked was, “I want someone to go take me this place that you’re trying to build here. I want to see it. I want to look and see what you’re really doing with this.” And so I just felt back then, I came to Ohio with the notion that the future really was in the knowledge industries, and universities have got to be the catalyst for that to happen. Then when I get to Ohio, I really came to understand the deficit in Ohio around sort of the R&D and knowledge industries, its overdependence on manufacturing. But Columbus, I think that sort of the three C’s make up Ohio in many ways – Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati.
Cleveland is in sad shape in terms of its economic issues. Cincinnati as well is doing okay, but Columbus had never been part of this, never been part of this manufacturing sort of production line manufacturing, and not had that character. It was a more white-collar professional services community, big powerhouse large university. And there was some of the significant early telecom information technology companies, actually grown out of Columbus. So there was, I felt, Ohio State, the Board made a commitment to moving in this area, there was the potential it seemed to me to start to make something happen in central Ohio.

Q. Felt that cutting in.

A. Not well. Shortly after I was there, yes. I made that assessment. There is a very well-known entrepreneur, at least in these parts, he actually has Ohio connections, by the name of Mario Morino, is a charismatic, new-economy sort of guru who made a fortune starting in selling a company, but has a very strong social conscience. And he has dominated this area. And I was part of an entity called the “Potomac Knowledge Way,” 12 of us, business leaders, and I was the one academic on this. It sort of encompassed the District of Northern Virginia and the metropolitan Washington area. And Mario was from Cleveland. So he was helping this area sort of get its legs and attention and focus on building the knowledge economy. So I got out to Ohio State and I began asking, “Who are some of the leaders in the new economy, what are the industries, and what not.” And David Allen was working for me. I said, “You know what, David? We’re going to have a dinner at the President’s house. We’re going to invite all of these people.” I had been used to having technology councils that would bring the
industry leaders and higher education to work together and develop common
agendas and provoke them in the state capital. Nothing like that in Ohio. So I
said, “David, we’re going to invite all of these, get a list of all the heads of
technology companies and we’re inviting [them to] the house. And I’m going to
bring Mario Morino and I’m going to have Mario talk to them.” So we had this
dinner. Mario comes and he’s as charismatic as ever. And he gets everybody
excited about what can happen in Columbus. So out of that dinner we put
together about 12 people that created something called the Technology
Leadership Council. I think it’s evolved into something else at this point. And I
had more fun working with that than you can imagine. But we really built this
into something, to create a voice for sort of a new economy, technology-driven,
knowledge economy sort of an entity. And we’d meet regularly.

Q. Were most of the people drawn in from the Columbus area?

A. Yes, it was the Greater Columbus Technology Leadership Council. We hired a
brilliant young man from McKenzie, Todd Ritterbusch. I think he’s still in the
Columbus area. But he became the first president of it. So then I really made a
huge, and I don’t know whether it even has legs, but I just felt that this whole
science and technology part, sci-tech, incubator, this had huge, could have huge
implications for the State of Ohio, in sort of helping it transfer from being sort of
rust belt to high tech. We tried very hard to sell Bob Taft on this idea of
promoting and supporting this. What I learned from Taft is he is a very cautious
individual. The rhetoric was good, but the effort I think was too timid. And the
State didn’t make the kinds of investments that needed to be made, at least in my
view, at the pace they needed to be made. Now, I think progress has been, and I’m sure is continuing to be made in this area. I don’t think, without a real commitment from the State, as many states have done to sort of decide what their niche is and to invest to become world class in that niche.

Q. So you think, and this is a most important question then, so you think that what’s missing in Ohio that wasn’t missing in North Carolina, might have been in part that the State never caught the vision.

A. Absolutely not, absolutely not. I definitely think that’s the case, and I feel like, I’m just giving my perspective obviously that, in a way, Taft missed an opportunity to build a legacy. A new governor can come in and maybe make a difference. But to be the governor that moved Ohio from a 20th-century economy to the 21st[-century], that had been his vision and real teeth behind that vision. I think the time was right to do that, but he didn’t pick that up.

Q. [How would you describe your management style?]

A. This is always my least favorite question. I’ll tell you why, because I think people see themselves maybe the way they ought to be seen in a different way, so it’s hard to … I think I’d rather, well, it sort of answers it, to talk about the values that I hold dear as a leader. Because I think it touches on style. Let’s see. Here’s what I think in terms of governance style, that I am inclusive. I believe in consensus building. I’m into collaboration. Openness. I believe very strongly in what we call shared governance. That is, heavy consultation before decisions are made. But I also don’t believe organizations can be a democracy; that is to say, leaders after seeking input and through well-structured governance bodies, have
to be in a place to make decisions, explain them, and move on. So in terms of values, integrity, quality, inclusiveness, diversity. I’m a believer in meritocracies.

Q. You’ve answered that question very well.

A. All right, good, good.

Q. I don’t think you have to worry about the first part of the question. It’s been answered. So many have spoken of your commitment to diversity at all levels within the University. Will you explain the philosophical and experiential basis of your belief in diversity?

A. Yes. Well, I think I touched on it when I was talking about my parents. I think I was raised well in this regard by my parents. And I think it goes back to that. There was an experience I had growing up that really stuck with me, that I think also was at the root of my strong feelings on the subject. One summer, I worked in a rock quarry in high school, senior in high school. And in this rock quarry were a lot of young folks who had to be reasonably strong because it was hard work. There was a lot of African Americans working in this rock quarry. Not exclusively African Americans obviously. Over the course of the summer, there was a young man who was a senior in high school just like I was. An African-American kid who went to a segregated school. And we became very good friends over the course of the summer. And so we would eat lunch together and talk and spend time together when we had breaks and what not. So, we decided that we needed to get together sometime after work, for just a social occasion. And so once we decided that, we realized this presented a bit of a problem, because most places that I would go were segregated and he couldn’t go into. The
movie theatres in Lexington, the first two floors whites could sit on, the third floor blacks could sit on. Blacks could not sit on the first two, so the movie theatres were segregated. So it became clear that the only place we could go was to a restaurant or bar or something like that in the black part of town. So we met and we went there. And I went into this crowded place, and I was the only white in the establishment. And the looks I got, the sort of discomfort, not from him of course, but from other people like, what was I doing there. And it suddenly dawned on me that this is what a black must experience every time they go into a situation in a white establishment or a white community or whatever. This sense of isolation in not belonging made a huge impression on me. I always thought about that as we were trying to increase the level of diversity at the University here at Maryland. So I was, diversity was something I championed in College Park in a big way. I’ll never forget when I came to Ohio State, the first event was in January, when they announced me as President, they had a press conference in the Fawcett Center. There was a big room in there where the board used to meet once upon a time. So they had this all set up. Of course, Ohio State means the biggest story in town. They had television cameras and what not. I got introduced.

Q. I thought about what I was going to say and I thought to myself, “Well, I’m going into this community and they’re announcing me as President, and I think I owe it to the community to tell them what my hopes and aspirations are for the University, and what values I hold that would drive my actions and plans and thoughts and so on and so forth.” I sort of mentioned the same things we talked
about right here, but I mentioned diversity and didn’t think anything about it because it seemed so perfectly natural to me. But several people later told me, they said, “We couldn’t believe you mentioned diversity.” I was stunned, that this would even cause any ripple. Anyway, I felt when I got to Ohio State there was an awful lot of sub-surface tension around the issue of diversity and low participation rates of African Americans on the faculty and administrative positions. One thing I’ve said in previous interviews, maybe even in the book, was that, and I don’t know, I think that in Maryland, maybe because it’s a small state with a very high percentage of African Americans, well over 20 percent, it’s much lower in Ohio. And [in a] small state, I always say about Maryland, “Everybody’s 30 minutes away.” Baltimore is 30 minutes from Washington. Washington is 30 minutes from Annapolis, and all the action is right in between. You’re interacting with people all the time. There is a very substantial and strong black caucus in the legislature, many high-level positions held by African Americans in the legislature and congressional areas. And Maryland was a segregated school [system], apparently, believe it or not. It didn’t secede from the Union, but was it was a slave state.

R. It was a border state.

A. It had many segregated schools. University of Maryland was segregated. So the whole issue of diversity and affirmative action has a certain passion and intensity, maybe more so on the east coast than elsewhere, but it was the environment I grew up in. These were big issues.
Q. But there was something else that made you different, in that you did not necessarily propose affirmative action and these kinds of things because of equality. Your argument was that it contributed the high quality of the education. That was a rather different concept.

A. Right, right. By having the different perspectives from different races and cultures actually improved the learning that took place at an institution. But I felt, and maybe this is only in comparison to sort of the more intense atmosphere in Maryland, that in Ohio [there] was a certain complacency around the issue of diversity. And so carrying this issue is one of my passions. It embarked on creating this, what we called the Diversity Action Plan, which was a very important, I thought, companion piece to the academic plan. And the Diversity Action Plan is very much reflected in the academic plan. So I was, I think, a very visible, outspoken champion on these issues. I think [it] got some attention at least on the campus and maybe in the larger community.

Q. So let’s move and let me ask you, because people at Ohio State have difficulty understanding this. Why is it so difficult to recruit and retain African Americans as administrators, as faculty members, when the University has had in some ways an admirable record of training graduate students particularly, of African Americans.

A. That’s a very good question. I had marveled at that myself over the fact that Ohio State was, I think, in fact when I became Provost at Maryland, I asked people, “Who’s doing the best job of recruiting African-American graduate students in the country?” And I saw recruitment into graduate programs as really what we
should focus on if we were able to address the faculty. So the answer that came back to me was, “Ohio State.” So as a relatively young Provost I went out to Ohio State, met Frank Hale, met Jennings, tried to learn what was going on. And I learned about this program with these partnership with HBU’s in the south and they had these recruitment days on the campus. Well, I had shamelessly imported that same strategy to Maryland. And so I was a bit surprised when I got out there and thought about it a lot after I was there, with this wonderful record … I go around the country and I see African-American faculty members. So often they come up to me and say, “I got my Ph.D. at Ohio State.” I just have to believe that it is somehow Columbus as a community is not as welcoming for African Americans as other places in the country. Relatively small, I don’t know what the percentage of African Americans in Columbus is.

Q. It’s probably around 20 percent.

A. Is it that high? Okay. But that’s the only thing I can think of, because all of the elements are there for Ohio State to be a leader. Another thing I’m very proud of at Ohio State is the Institute. I think its creation, assuming it succeeds as I believe and do believe it will, it could help change this. My perception is that a lot of fairly high-level work is going on in that Institute, at least when I’ve interacted with them several times, I’ve been very impressed by some of the studies they’re doing and research that’s going on there. In any case, its creation was, in some ways, I think it was an important area to build excellence, when you think about important issues in the 21st century for someplace for Ohio State to make a name. But as a sub-rationale, it would be to help make finally Ohio State the kind of
diverse, a step toward making the kind of diverse institution that the success of the graduate studies would indicate it should be.

Q. One person said to me that they thought you had grown more in your role as a fund raiser at Ohio State than almost any other role that they had observed you in. They thought you had become a highly effective fund raiser at the University. Was this something that came easily to you?

A. We had launched, Ohio State was much more advanced than the University of Maryland in the area of fund raising. When I was president of College Park, we launched the first effort, campaign. So I appointed the first-ever vice president for development at College Park. We founded the first ever University of Maryland capital campaign and had to put together a campaign reach. It was not part of the tradition at Maryland that it obviously was at Ohio State. And so we were pretty fledgling in this area, and didn’t have the kind of infrastructure and sophistication in this particular area that Ohio State had. I had some experience in this area and had been asking for big gifts and got two $15 million gifts in a row. I wasn’t foreign to fund raising, but I inherited a campaign that was, I think, at the $800 million level. And I remember the first thing I said to Jerry May, “Jerry, we’ve got to bump this up to $1 billion. We can not stop at $800 [million], but we’ve got to get ______.” And he said, “Yeah, yeah, we’ve been thinking about this.” But anyway, when I walk into Ohio State, it was a magnificent infrastructure for fund raising, and one of the best vice presidents for development in the nation is Jerry May. He was just superb. And he and I just hit it off. We really clicked. I really liked working with him, being around him. I think the
feeling was mutual. I’ll never forget that the, early on in our meetings together, Jerry said to me, “You know, Brit, I’m only going to come to you to go to a donor if it’s at least $5 million. The dean or I will take care of anything else.” And I’d come out of an environment, to get a $1 million gift was a big deal. And I was there __________. And I suddenly realized, “Whoa, this is a machine here, a well-oiled machine.” So I think it’s fair to say that, coming from a much more immature fund-raising apparatus at Maryland I did learn a lot at Ohio State. I think I got to work with such an incredible pro in Jerry May. I think I learned a lot from him. I think fundraising comes fairly easily to me in the sense that I like people, I like being around people, I like to talk with people. I can get passionate about things. And so, I think I needed more experience and infrastructure, which certainly Ohio State provided.

Q. And so you ended up enjoying it?

A. I did. Yes, even here I’ve enjoyed the fund raising. But I don’t think we were as sophisticated about it as I learned to be at Ohio State because it was much more of a tradition.

Q. Do you think, just kind of looking at the profession of university presidents, has it become an essential skill?

A. Yes, absolutely. If you’re about making the institution better you can’t do it in this day and age unless you raise money. It’s become the margin of excellence, as people like to say. So it is an absolutely essential characteristic I think of for presidents.
Q. Say something about your work with Faculty Senate. Did you find it useful in helping you reflect on policy?

A. I did. I thought it was a different senate structure than the one I had been used to at Maryland. I believe so strongly in shared governance. In fact, when I became President at the University of Maryland, one of the first things I did was appoint a faculty committee on shared governance. And I gave them a budget to travel around the country and find the best-shared governance models out there and bring it back here. And we would implement it. Now at Maryland, there is a chair of the Campus Senate, a faculty member who is chair of the Campus Senate. And that person chairs the meetings. And conducts, if the President goes to the Senate meetings, makes his opening comments, answers questions, gives a statement of the campus address periodically. But the Senate is really run by the faculty, and is chaired by the faculty. I was quite surprised when I got to Ohio State to find out that I was chair of the Campus Senate. And as I think about these things, I’m not sure that’s the best model to have. I guess people think it’s bringing the Senate together with the president. But the Faculty Senate ought to have a certain independence of the administration, which in a way is hard to achieve when the chair of it is itself the president. So, I felt the structure was a little, I thought, in my view, was not as good as what I had been used to and what I think is more common around the country. Secondly, so much of the work of the Senate was done in committees. So when the Senate met and the President was there, there was sort of, there wasn’t for the most part a level of discussion of issues that I thought would have been healthy for the shared governance and the
institution. I was used to a model where, when the Senate met, it’s where ideas were put on the table and debated and chewed over and so on and so forth. I found the Senate meetings to be somewhat sort of pro forma, because the debates had all occurred in other forums, which the President was. I thought it would have been a healthier sort of environment for debate and ideas in a different model. Now I did go to committee meetings when invited and was frequently asked to come and listen and talk and so on and so forth. But I worked very hard to have a good relationship with Senate. I used to meet with the Senate leadership at College Park once a month. At Ohio State there was no forum to meet with the Senate leadership. I said, “Well, we’ve got to have this.” So we started a regular lunch, where I would meet with the chairs of the committee. So that brought in some discussion and interaction. I thought I had a good relationship with the Senate. The long-time chair of the Secretary of the Senate, Jerry from education.

Q. I know who you mean, I know him. I can’t think of his name.

A. We’ll find his name for the official transcript. He left right after I … he wasn’t there long. But then Susan Fisher became Secretary, and I worked, I thought, very effectively with Susan and with, was it Carol Whitacre? Yes, Carol Whitacre and Alan Randall. They were stalwarts in the Senate that I worked with, I thought very effectively. I suggested to the Senate that they not meet on Saturday. I thought it would create more of part of the academic [environment], if they would meet during the week, and I think they actually changed that. So they started meeting during the week. I certainly valued my relationship with the Senate, thought we had good communication, and saw it as an important part of
my responsibility and life there. As I say, I thought it might have worked more effectively under a different model, but it was fine.

Q. Yes, all right, good. Well we talked a little bit about the budget process just a little bit earlier. Why don’t you comment about the budget process and your interaction with members of the legislature, whether you felt they understood the needs of the University. Were they sympathetic to the University? How does the Governor fit into this process of determining in part allocation? I know about the Board of Regents. You mentioned it. But what was your experience in having to work downtown so to speak?

A. It was such a different environment than in Maryland, where as I say, Maryland is such a small state, it’s much more built on personal relationships. I’d go to the legislative hearings. I knew most of the legislators well. And there were regularly scheduled events where I would come in contact with the legislators. And that just didn’t happen in Ohio. I’m speaking on the record and candor is important here. I think I came to realize, I don’t think I was served well by the governmental relations person at Ohio State, Bill Napier. Bill had very good contacts down in the State House. He worked with that scene extremely well. He had been around, I guess, for a period of time in various capacities. And it was his sort of responsibility to orchestrate the interactions with the legislature. I don’t think he got me as engaged with the legislature as I should have been. I developed some very strong relationships with some legislators, but I just don’t think, for whatever reason, this interaction with the legislature was something that Bill wanted to guard very jealously, and he was the contact with the legislature,
and he was the filter through which all of the interactions took place. I think in retrospect that didn’t work as well as it should have.

Q. You discovered that the legislators felt that they would like to talk to the top guy.

A. Absolutely. But I think the greatest frustration really was something that we talked about a little bit earlier, that for all of its importance to the State, there seemed to be, there was no structured mechanism for really addressing Ohio State’s needs with the Governor and the legislature. It was all done so formulaically through a huge bureaucracy. And nothing was going to happen for Ohio State that didn’t happen for everybody else. There was no mechanism for the State to invest in priorities. I thought that was really unfortunate and obviously, ultimately, very frustrating.

Q. I hadn’t really thought about that, but I see what you’re saying. And Governor Taft then, as you indicated, was a kind of conservative figure, not bold, not willing to step out and speak up for the University or any particular area.

A. Right.

Q. All right. Well, maybe we’ll talk about sports here for a little while.

A. Sure. There’s another path that I want to discuss at a certain point, but it doesn’t have to be right now.

Q. If you want to say something about that, go ahead. It might be a good point.

A. There’s no point in my, unless you want me to, repeating, I was really going to get into the tuition issue. We’ll get to that later. I felt that Governor Taft was a fine person. We had a very good personal relationship. But I just came to believe that he had no real vision for where Ohio should move to become. There was no,
I didn’t sense a real strategy for advancing the State. He was personally warm and friendly, and on a one-on-one basis a very supportive, but I feel too timid in his strategies for building a brighter future for Ohio. I remember going to his inaugural address when he was made Governor. It took place in the Ohio Theatre, I think. And I went and thought, “Well, here’s a chance to see the Governor laying out his vision for Ohio.” And he announced as his big initiative a program called “Ohio Reads,” which is a very admirable goal. The idea was that, by the time a kid gets to the 5th grade, they’re going to read at the 5th-grade level. This was going to be done through a massive volunteer program, with business leaders and educators. And people were going to volunteer, citizens were going to volunteer to go into the classrooms and tutor kids to learn to read. Very well intended but also very impractical. I mean, you can do that for a year or two, but you’re not going to sustain that. So I remember there was a huge effort in Columbus, and we were expected to produce 300 volunteers to go into the school and so on and so forth. And I thought, “This is a fine and admirable program, something very appropriate for a Governor to promote as an initiative.” But to make this a centerpiece of an inaugural address about what I’m going to do as Governor of the State of Ohio, I thought it was a missed opportunity.

Q. Let’s talk a little bit about tuition wars as they were called at the time, the tuition wars. Of course, this involves the Board of Trustees, all the faculty, it involved people downtown, it involved the Governor. As you look back on that episode, what are your reflections?
A. What I came to realize was that Ohio State was trying to achieve something very difficult to achieve with two hands tied behind its back. One hand was tied behind because the State wasn’t investing in the University. The other hand was tied behind its back because the State wouldn’t let Ohio State charge tuition at an appropriate level for a research university that wasn’t getting state support. I think we were fourth or fifth from the bottom. Research universities, everybody knows, they’re the most expensive to operate. So we were under-funded from the State side, and our tuition was held down lower than Ohio University, [University of] Dayton. There were only three or four universities in the State with lower tuition. As I say, you had both hands tied behind your back. In order to advance the academic plan, we had to generate revenue. Faculty salaries were falling, we were benchmarking them against the Big Ten. Faculty salaries were falling in relation to other schools. We didn’t have the revenue to move the Academic Plan forward. So we put together what I thought was a very creative proposal on tuition, to over a period of three or four years, to ratchet tuition at Ohio State up significantly, not to be highest in the State, but among the top three. And we were going to do it by phasing in the tuition increase for incoming freshmen. The others would get an inflationary increase. This didn’t threaten any existing … in other words, the students who were already at Ohio State, it didn’t impact. The students who came to Ohio State with this new tuition would do so knowing what the tuition was. It was truth in advertising. Moreover, we put together with Tally [Natalie] Hart and others’ great work, Bill Shkurti, I’ll talk more about him later. But Bill Shkurti, we put together a very rich financial aid program to take care of
the neediest students. And we tied this revenue directly to the Academic Plan, which had been blessed by the Board of Regents, praised by The Columbus Dispatch, the Governor had said goods things about it, and so on and so forth. So we were taking this, not only that, we had this billion-dollar campaign, but we were going to generate our own resources to make this Academic Plan go. With the way the Board operated, you had to do something in two [steps]: You presented a plan at one meeting and then you came back and they acted on it the next meeting. So before the first meeting I [went] down to see the Governor and I said, “Governor, before this becomes public I want you to know where we’re headed.” So I laid out this plan. He says, “I can support it. This plan works for me.” He had some people on his staff that said, “Well, Governor, you’ve got elections coming up.” But he said, “We can support this.” So then I went to the Board and laid out this plan in public as we had to do. And the Board, although they didn’t take a vote at that meeting, they said, “Wonderful, we’ve got to put a stake in the ground. This is what we’re going to do. The State won’t support higher education. We’re taking care of the neediest students.” Meanwhile, so then I guess six weeks go by and I’m walking down in the legislative office building, the Vern Riffe Center, I’m walking down there in the basement and along comes the Governor. This is now two days before the second Board meeting. Along comes the Governor and [he] said, “Oh Brit, come here.” So I go over and he says, “You know I’ve been thinking about this tuition thing and I don’t think I can support this.” And I said, “Governor, I’ve already announced it. We’re going to vote on it in two days.” I of course let the Board know, so the
Board had a conference call by telephone and they were beginning to back away from this plan. And to his credit, David Brennan, they weren’t going to endorse this plan. I was just so devastated by this. I said, “You’ve got to let me try to work this out with the Governor and try to see if we can’t salvage something from this.” So to his credit David said, “We owe this to Brit. We’ve got to let him work on this with the Governor.” So we eventually salvaged some very watered-down version of this plan and the Board said, “The Governor will never let you do anything special at Ohio State,” and lo and behold, I did work that out with the Governor. I took some satisfaction in letting the Board know that this had happened. It weighed heavily on me.

Q. I’m sure it did.

A. Yes, because I felt like so much had been invested in building this Academic Plan. We had a strategy to do at least a good portion of it with this tuition plan, and I just felt with a lot of support, and then I felt that support was pulled out from under me.

Q. Of course.

A. It certainly weighed on me for my remaining time there.

Q. All right.

A. I also had observed that the, and I think to some extent this was at the heart of the whole Kellogg Commission effort, was that some of the practical rationale for creating the land-grant mission had evolved and changed over time. Land-grant universities, for the most part, had not broadened their mission, changed with the times, so that we had reached a point where the land-grant philosophy, which had
very wide, which it sort of was at the root or the core of the land-grant institution, was still too focused on agriculture. Really the modern application of the land-grant philosophy, we’re not going to forget agriculture, there’s still an important role for land-grant universities, but really it was the outreach, the engagement of the University in economic development and technology transfer, in partnership with the school. Land-grant universities had become too locked, too rigidly locked into their historical outreach responsibilities, and needed to broaden them to be as relevant in the 21st century as they had been in the 20th century. So I found this very exciting opportunity, and I think this report was a real catalyst for change with land grant universities. Having been part of that report, part of the team that put that report together, I thought it was our obligation at Ohio State, which is one of the quintessential land-grant institutions, to show the leadership. And that’s why I created this position for Bobby Moser who knew more about the outreach, how you become an engaged institution, to broaden his mantle so that he bring his great expertise and help other areas of the campus engage in the outreach. And to really think of the land-grant mission now in a much more broader 21st century context.

Q. And [Moser] came out of the College of Agriculture.

A. He did. I thought it was important because he had the knowledge and expertise about how the outreach is done. [If] You brought somebody who wasn’t familiar with that tradition, I don’t know they would have been as successful in the role.

Q. And he was very successful.

A. Very successful, terrific person.
Q. But when you’re thinking about him and outreach, Campus Partners was part of the outreach. And I think I read where you were interested in developing a certification program for teachers in the public [schools]. Would you tell me something about that idea? I haven’t really seen it spelled out, so that I understood what you had in mind.

A. I’m not sure of the specific initiative that you’re referencing there, but I think universities have not met their responsibility to play the role they should play in addressing the problems we face in K-12 education. I think the whole teacher preparation effort within higher education has not met its obligations and responsibilities. By that I mean we have, we’ve allowed our colleges of education to basically carry this responsibility by themselves. We don’t have the disciplines that is engaged in the preparation of teachers as we’ve should. And so I feel that this is an area where we need to see some change in our colleges and universities. And so I was very interested in seeing the development of new kinds of teacher preparation programs that insured that our teachers had both the disciplinary background and knowledge to be effective teachers in the schools, but that we had the enrichment programs at Ohio State, more generally in higher education, that the in-service teachers could enhance their skills that they needed to have in order to be effective classroom teachers. One of the things we did while I was President was in partnership with the State Board of Education, which created a Principals Institute, and this was an academy, an institute, where principals from around the State could apply to attend and they would come and get some instruction in how to be more effective leaders and managers, to learn some of the modern
techniques of business and management, to learn how to develop strategic plans, to hold people accountable, to evaluate personnel. I really don’t know what the legacy of that Principal Academy was but I do know that from a lot that I’ve read and research that I’ve seen, is that the quality of the principal is the single biggest, the leadership skills and the abilities of the principal, is the single biggest factor in determining the quality of the school.

Q. Well, just move on up one level, isn’t that true? One level up at the University? Leadership is ________________.

A. Right.

Q. One thing about the technology part, you’ve had some experience here working at Ohio State, is there an incompatibility between a university culture and business culture that creates some difficulty in working out a cooperative relationship.

A. There are incompatibilities. There are different cultures. But I don’t think they are insurmountable. There are too many examples around the country of where universities have become very successful. I mean, the Silicon Valley was really built based on the intellectual activity coming out of Stanford and Berkeley, and MIT has spawned the [technology corridor along] Route 128. Boston and North Carolina State and Duke and Chapel Hill, (the Research Triangle,) things going on in Austin, Texas. When you read the story of the great growth in Austin, Texas, the role of the University of Texas was absolutely crucial in this flowering of that city. So I think it takes a lot of work, and it takes persistence, a word we talked about. And it’s not for every faculty member. I think one of the interesting facets of our time is, that there are areas of research that are very close to the
marketplace. Let me say what I mean by that. You think of theoretical physics. There are sort of research that people work on in theoretical physics. If it has any commercial value, it’s ten or fifteen years down the pike or maybe even longer. The concept of laser came about in the ’50s and ’60s, but it didn’t really become commercially applicable until much more recent times. But this isn’t true of certain areas in the bio-sciences. Pharmacology, information technology, computer.

Q. Manufacturing science.
A. Manufacturing science. The areas of activity that are important and of interest to faculty are much closer to the marketplace in these disciplines. And so I think it does create the potential if the place has the right kinds of investments and policies, etc., that the University can be a real catalyst for economic activity. There’s a great quote that I use all the time from Bill Gates. He says, “There is no example in the country of a burgeoning economy that doesn’t have a great research university in its environment. There just isn’t an example. You can’t have a modern knowledge-based economy without the synergy and catalyst coming out of great university.”

Q. Do a few of those faculty members have to be entrepreneurs?
A. Absolutely, absolutely. One of the things that I have regrets about, that there wasn’t more time to work on, is I think the unrealized potential of Ohio State next door to Battelle. People talked about for a long time, but I think some things got started, partnerships got created with Battelle, that if they continued, the fellow that came in as the President of Battelle about 18 months before I left and formed
a real bond and partnership. I worked with him to develop a $20 million venture fund, the so-called Battelle Fund. I was very involved in that. We put some teams together to sort of develop areas of collaboration and partnership. And there’s just, if the intellectual power of the University can be successfully knitted together with the entrepreneurial product capabilities of Battelle, I think there is the potential there for a hugely positive economic development for Central Ohio.

Q. One would hope so. I think we understand why you came back to Maryland. It’s a lovely state; you’ve were widely admired. There’s always a push-and-pull. But I understand that you gave an address, a paper of a sort, to the search committee, for the next President in which you outlined an enormous range of the duties you had as President. I heard people raising questions about whether the President must perform in so many areas. Don’t they need a different kind of training than most people would have coming through the normal academic process? What are your reflections about the future University Presidents, and what they need to be as successful as a person like you?

A. I don’t want to set myself out of this. These are very demanding jobs. I’ve often thought about the fact that, to be an effective University leader, the kind of talents and skills one needs, are probably really quite different than what is needed, say, in the private sector. To be a CEO, people talk about Presidents as a CEO, but when you think of the qualities of a corporate CEO, I’m not sure that those qualities are what would work in the University environment and vice versa. I’m not sure a successful University leader would necessarily transfer into a successful corporate leader. Universities, I think to be a successful University
leader, there can always be exceptions. But for the most part, these have got to be people who are grounded in the academy. They have to be people who understand, who have grown up in the University environment, who understand how Universities work, who understand shared governance, who understand the role of the faculty. And so I just think as demanding as these jobs are, I think major universities, great universities, as far as I can see into the future, the leadership is going to come within the academy. Now, it takes from within that universe of people, I think it takes individuals who have certain qualities. They’re good communicators; they’re good listeners; they can build consensus; they can develop strategies and hold people accountable. I think there are some personal characteristics that one needs to have to be successful as a University President. But I think the other aspect is, and it certainly was the case at Ohio State, in this day and age, I think, a successful President has to be at least 50 percent an external person. I keep saying that can’t be so external that you’re not visible and seen to be engaged on the campus. But you can’t be so engaged on the campus that you’re not building friends and developing the resources, the non-state resources, that an institution needs to be successful. So there’s a very delicate balance between the on-campus and presence and the external presence. And finding that right balance is very, very important. A President who is too external loses the connection and the trust of the faculty, and a President that’s too internal can’t build the connections that a University must have in this day and age to be successful. And so I think that is, there’s a very fine line there and a very important balance to strike. But it does mean that there’s got to be a very strong
capable administrative team that is all on the same page, so that the President can spend time off the campus. I felt very blessed, as I’ve mentioned to people, I had an exceptionally talented group of individuals and it was not easy to leave them. You mentioned my coming back, I think there were two things. I really was not ready to leave Ohio State.

Q. Good.

A. I did not, in many ways, it was just an unfortunate set of events. I have to confess that we always knew we were going to move back to Maryland when I left Ohio State. Our kids were here and by then grandkids were here. And we spent most of our life here. So we were definitely going to move back to Maryland. But things arise in life that you can’t control the timing, and so this position came open. I think there was this pull of knowing we were coming back and we now had three grandchildren, soon to have four, all living in this area. And the kids weren’t going to go anywhere. And so that was a huge pull. But I have to also say, and we talked about this earlier, I was very disappointed in the incident regarding the tuition issue, and I felt, as I said before, that I’d been somewhat undercut in that. It made me wonder, “Where can I have the greatest impact in the time that I have left and play a leadership role in higher education?” So I think all of that sort of, there was a confluence of timing events that led to this decision, which was one of the most wrenching I’ve ever had. I think it was a decision where I was going to have severe regrets no matter how I decided. If I didn’t I would always wonder as I got older, “Why did I pass up the time to be
near my kids and grandkids,” on the one hand. But having come back I also have these pangs of regret of leaving work undone. That’s also weighed on me.

Q. Well I guess there’s always work left undone.

A. That’s true, no matter where you live.

Q. Would you in conclusion like to say something maybe about what you might have read in the Perry book, to add to or give a little different view of, the way he presented any particular episode?

A. No, I think he did a very good job with the book. I think the book had a lot of integrity in the following sense, that he did talk to a lot of people and he quoted people. I think he did an intellectually honest job with the book. When you look back over my experience in Ohio, [it] meant so much to me. I still wear my Ohio State ring. I didn’t just put this on for this occasion. I have such great respect for the institution, the people there. I can honestly and genuinely say that I wish somehow life could have worked out differently, that I could have spent more time at Ohio State. We’ll always have some regret that I wasn’t there longer. There was one incident that I noticed was on the questions that we didn’t talk about, that was a very difficult issue and caused me a great deal of anguish. And that was the fact that we had fairly early on in my tenure the strike.

Q. Yes, the Communications Workers.

A. Right. And we had not had a union in Maryland; we do now. It happened after I left Maryland. I had never really dealt with a union before. And one of your questions was, did I learn anything? It was a very difficult, wrenching experience for me because I have always prided myself in being able to get along with
people, even those with whom I have had disputes. I think we maintained good and cordial relationships. But I just had never been in something where the sides became so bitter, and the vilification. The big-time politics of union somehow was thrust into this. In looking back at this, I think there were a number of things that I learned. First of all, we were very unfortunate in the leadership of the union on the campus. This was a person who later was removed, during the negotiations, toward the end of the negotiations, was asked to step down, because he had been such a terrible communicator, both with the rank and file and the University administration. I also think that, in retrospect, the University did not get prepared for these negotiations as well. There was a huge obstacle and, as I said, the person they were dealing with was not a very effective individual. But I think the University got caught off guard a little bit and did not get prepared for these negotiations as well as they should have. And one of the things we decided, that we insisted on, as we came out of this, and finally we settled it, is that there had to be a much better mechanism for communication, so that we never got to a point where we were so apart when the deadline for the contract came. We had to be able to give each other signals much further in advance, so there was a lot more time to work on these issues and not let them reach the depth of division and bitterness that they did reach. I can remember going to some meetings in the Student Union building where the union wanted, I wasn’t involved in the negotiations, but wanted to have an exchange and dialogue. These were bitter, bitter. I just [never] had been in anything [like that].

Q. I understand that you received a little personal vilification.
A. Oh, absolutely. It was awful. I think we initially did not have a good way of
telling our side of the story, that the union were sort of throwing out their
positions and what not, not always based on fact. This would get in the
newspaper. So I think we lost early on the public relations war. Fortunately, we
got not too far into it, we got a team working together, developing our own
messages and I and others started going out and speaking to reporters and being
interviewed on television, trying to tell the other side of the story, which I think in
the end helped. But what was also a lesson in this was, once the agreement was
signed, you would have thought we had never been in a hot debate. People one
day could be saying these awful things about you and then all would be sweetness
and light. I certainly learned, was sort of thrust into the firing line about how
union politics works. It was a real education.

Q. Well, let’s just reflect on something more pleasant now. The Kirwan Institute for
Race and Ethnicity in the Americas. Tell me how it got started, how you gained
support.

A. We developed this Academic Plan, which was very ambitious. We had developed
a strategy for funding it, and it depended upon this tuition strategy. And then
suddenly, this was pulled out from under us and we were left with a lot less
revenue. A lot less ability to make the kind of targeted investments of the
Academic Plan. I pulled together a day-long session with all of the vice
presidents. What are we going to do now with this Academic Plan? We sat
around the table, had different thoughts about strategies. I sort of at one point
said, “Here is a list of initiatives.” I think there were about five of them. We can
afford to do [these things]. If you look at these initiatives they really touch on the breadth of the University, that we can see that this is truly making an impact on the quality of the institution. One of these initiatives was the creation of this Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in the Americas. I think there were these five initiatives. All of the five had cross-cutting features. This was an initiative that dealt with an important social issue, that drew upon the expertise of three or four colleges. It just seemed exactly the kind of thing with our more limited resources we should be doing because we could engage a broad swath of the campus in these initiatives. So this had been a favorite of mine from the early stages of development of the Academic Plan. I insisted that it be included in this more limited agenda that we could embark on at this time. So it got funded and we began a national search. I was just thrilled by the quality of the candidates that got into the pool. We had somebody from Stanford; we had someone from one of the University of California institutions; we had of course John Powell from [University of] Minnesota. He ultimately was our first choice and he took this job. I’ll never forget, sort of the Regents had this big outgoing dinner for me when Patty and I were leaving, very, very nice event. At the dinner, the Chairman of the Board announced that they were going to name this Institute in honor of me, and I just lost it at this moment. I was just totally overwhelmed by that recognition, but also because it was something that I cared so much about. I don’t know if there’s anything at the University I would rather have my name associated with than this Institute. It will always be a source of great pride to me.

Q. Well thank you very much, Dr. Kirwan. Anything else?
A. I’ll think about it and when I read the transcript if I have some other thoughts, I’d like to add to, with your permission I will do so.

Q. Why not? That will be fine.

A. Okay.