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In 2018, the first year of the University of Michigan’s “third century”, the Duderstadts will complete their 50th year as members of the University. During this half century they have served in a variety of roles and seen the University and its surrounding community from an array of perspectives.

From the academic perspective, Jim’s rise through the ranks as a faculty member in Engineering was rather traditional, at least until he began to descend through the various levels of Dante’s inferno of academic administration: dean, provost, and finally president of the University, only to be reincarnated once again as a faculty member—albeit mostly unseen and unheard on the Michigan campus as a has-been president. Anne rose more rapidly to leadership roles in the University, both through organizations such as the Faculty Women’s Club and then as “deanette”, “provostess”, and “first lady” of the University, and as institutional advancement officer, managing hundreds of events, several major facilities, and hosting thousands of faculty, students, alumni, and guests of the University. Anne also found “life-after” productive, by continuing her strong efforts to document the remarkable history of the University of Michigan through a series of books and websites.

In part for the record, in part for their family and colleagues, and in part just for their personal catharsis, they have sought to chronicle this journey into the depths of academic administration and their escape back again to the joy of faculty life through five decades of service to the University of Michigan. Although many of their experiences were characterized by the expected degree of seriousness and solemnity, they have chosen to describe them in a more humorous tone. They certainly hope that the reader will excuse this spirit of humor, amusement, and occasional wonder. Certainly no disrespect is intended, either for the University they have served for so long or the hundreds—indeed thousands—of people who have made similar commitments to Michigan. Rather, they prefer to view these experiences, both good and bad, both successes and failures, through the rose-colored glasses of humor and good intentions. Besides, this perspective seems to help in making sense out of the complex array of experiences and happenings characterizing a modern university presidency.
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To our family, friends, and colleagues
In December of 1968, the Duderstadts moved from Southern California to Ann Arbor, Michigan. It was a hot, sunny day in Pasadena—a Santa Ana condition, in fact—when we loaded our furniture and our VW on a moving van. We packed up our kids, who had never even seen snow, much less Michigan, and flew to Detroit, arriving in subzero cold and heavy snow. Despite the climatic shock, we found ourselves very much at home, both in Ann Arbor and at the University of Michigan. So much so, that we have resisted occasional temptations to move west again to remain in Ann Arbor. We have long considered ourselves Michiganders, maize and blue to the core.

For almost five decades, we have enjoyed being members of the Michigan family, serving in a variety of roles and seeing the University and its surrounding community from an array of perspectives. From the academic perspective, my rise through the ranks as a faculty member in Engineering was rather traditional. I became involved in broader campus issues as a campus politician actively engaged in faculty governance. I finally descended through the various levels of Dante’s inferno of academic administration: dean, provost, and finally president of the University, only to be reincarnated once again as a faculty member—albeit mostly unseen and unheard on the Michigan campus as a has-been president.

Anne, the other member of the Duderstadt team, rose even more rapidly to leadership roles in the University community: first as chair of the Faculty Women’s Club Newcomers group, then later as president of the entire Faculty Women’s Club organization; as a member of other campus and community groups; as “deanette”, “provostess”, and “first lady” of the University, and as institutional advancement officer, managing hundreds of events, several major facilities, and hosting thousands of faculty, students, alumni, and guests of the University. Anne also found “life-after” productive, by continuing her strong efforts to document the remarkable history of the University of Michigan through a series of books and websites.

We both enjoyed the experience of raising a family in Ann Arbor and within the University community. Although born as California girls in Pasadena, our daughters grew up in Ann Arbor. They were infected with the Ann Arbor syndrome of over-involvement in activities ranging from music and theater to swim clubs and gymnastics teams to high school athletics and college admissions pressures. We even finally managed to become Michigan parents, as both the Duderstadt daughters eventually returned to the University for advanced degrees after their undergraduate studies in the East.

Hence, we began our years in Ann Arbor in University Family Housing and returned again to University housing some twenty years later, this time to reside in the President’s House. Unlike most university presidents, we decided after our presidential role that we would remain at Michigan, returning to the faculty and the community. We would continue to serve as best we could—if only as ghosts of the University past.

This latter decision was unusual in higher education. Most university presidents are itinerant—they move from university to university, as they progress through the academic and administrative ranks, and usually leave the institution when they step down as president. The two of us were unusual not only in spending our entire careers at a single university, but in being determined to remain at our university following our service in the presidency—although some of our friends have referred to this determination as evidence of being “mobility-impaired”. In a sense, we regarded the Michigan presidency as yet another University assignment—clearly both important and consequential—
but drawing us temporarily away from our long-standing role as members of the Michigan faculty and Ann Arbor community. We were determined to return to these earlier roles, although there have been times when this has not been easy.

In part for the record, in part for our family, and in part just for our personal catharsis, we have sought to chronicle our journey into the depths of academic administration and our escape back again to the joy of faculty life for over almost 50 years of service to the University of Michigan. Although many of our experiences were characterized by the expected degree of seriousness and solemnity, we have chosen to describe them in a more humorous tone. We certainly hope that the reader will excuse this spirit of humor, amusement, and occasional wonder. We certainly do not intend any disrespect, either for the University we have served for so long or the hundreds–indeed thousands–of people who have made similar commitments to Michigan. Rather, we prefer to view our experiences, both good and bad, both successes and failures, through the rose-colored glasses of humor and good intentions. Besides, this perspective seems to help in making sense out of the complex array of experiences and happenings characterizing a modern university presidency.

The two of us view our years at Michigan as very much a team experience. Indeed, we, like most other families thrust into these complex roles, find it difficult to imagine how the myriad roles and responsibilities characterizing university leadership could be addressed by a single individual. To be sure, each of our roles was different, yet both were comparable in challenge, responsibility, and importance.

Ann Arbor, Michigan
Fall, 2014
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Inauguration Day, October 4, 1988, dawned as one of those extraordinary Michigan fall days. The sky was a brilliant blue. The yellows and reds of the fall colors provided the perfect backdrop for the colorful robes of the academic procession marching across the Ingalls Mall toward Hill Auditorium. The Baird Carillon in Burton Tower rang out with the familiar academic themes.

But instead of academic pomp and circumstance, we could swear we heard the refrain of Berlioz’s “March to the Scaffold” as the academic procession marched through the Central Campus to my inauguration that fall morning. Perhaps it was an enhanced awareness of just how challenging the Michigan presidency had become, blending the challenges of leading one of the most complex institutions in modern society while surrounded by a bewildering array of complex political issues. Perhaps it was the lingering stress of the long process that led to my selection as president, all the while trying to keep the University on track in our dual roles as provost and “provostess”. Or perhaps it was just a sensory overload, because of all of the activities of inauguration week.

Earlier in the week, Michigan’s graduate school had celebrated its 50th year with a symposium on the University’s impact on graduate and professional
education. A day later, I had given my first “State of the University” address at the annual faculty awards ceremony. Both my and Anne’s families had arrived for the ceremonies and were spread out in hotels all over Ann Arbor. The day after the inauguration, Michigan would face its traditional rival, Michigan State University, in a football battle that would lead eventually to a Big Ten Championship for the Wolverines and a victory over USC in the Rose Bowl. And, in a most fitting display of irreverence—fitting, at least, for Michigan—a small group of activists staged a protest at the inauguration ceremony on an array of issues that have long since faded into the obscurity of their 1960s antecedents. One student in the platform group even joined in the festivities by displaying a large sign stating, “Duderstadt is illegal!” This referred to the fact that the Regents had refused to open the presidential selection process to the prying eyes of the media, triggering suits under the state’s Open Meetings Act. (I responded to the sign by noting that since my parents were in the audience, I would ask them afterwards if I was truly legitimate.)

So What Is a University President?

There is a well-worn definition of the modern university president as someone who lives in a large house and begs for a living. And, to be sure, many presidents do live in large, stately houses on their campuses, and all presidents are expected to be actively involved in fundraising.

Of course there are many other roles: In a sense, the president and “first spouse” are the first family of the university community, in many ways serving as the mayor of a small city of thousands of students, faculty, and staff. This public leadership role is particularly important when the university is very large. The University of Michigan has over 43,000 students, 7,000 faculty members, and 35,000 staff on its campus in Ann Arbor, a rather small city with a population of about 116,000—except on football weekends, when it doubles in size. As the university’s most visible leader, the president must continually grapple with the diverse array of political and social issues and interests of concern to the many stakeholders of higher education—students and parents, state and federal government, business and labor, the press and the public-at-large, and, of course, most significantly, the faculty.

The president of a large university also has a significant role as its chief executive officer, responsible for the management of a diverse collection of activities, ranging from education to health care to public entertainment (e.g., intercollegiate athletics). The University of Michigan has an annual operating budget of $7 billion; more than 35 million square feet of physical facilities; almost $16 billion of funds under active management; and people, programs, and facilities scattered about the globe. If the university was a business—and, of course, a president would never suggest this, at least within earshot of the faculty—Michigan would rank roughly 370th on the Fortune 500 list as an unusually complex global conglomerate.
However, unlike the corporate CEO, who is responsible primarily for shareholder value, the university president-as-CEO is accountable for everything that happens in the university—at least, everything bad. The old expression “The buck stops here!” is chiseled in the cornerstone of the university administration building. Anything that happens, whether it involves the president—or, indeed, whether it is even known by the president—from student misbehavior to financial misdeeds to town-gown relations—eventually ends up on the president’s desk. Presidents even find themselves blamed for the misfortunes of athletics teams, as I learned in 1995 after the famous last second, 70-yard touchdown pass thrown by a Colorado quarterback that beat Michigan in the football “play of the decade”.

Universities are very complex social organizations with a variety of different intellectual neighborhoods, each characterized by unique cultures and needs. Hence, perhaps it is not surprising that academic leadership positions, usually beginning at the level of deans and continuing through executive officers and the president, frequently become two-person roles in which the spouse plays an important role in building and sustaining relationships with each of these communities, including students, faculty, staff, alumni, and, of course, donors.

This is particularly the case for the university presidency. Although unwritten in the university contract for a president, there has long been an expectation that the president’s spouse will be a full participant in presidential activities. Much like the presidency of the United States or the governorship of a state, a university presidency is really a two-person job, although generally only one partner gets paid and recognized in an employment sense. At many universities, such as Michigan, the “First Lady” of the university is expected to play an important role not only as the symbolic host of presidential events—and perhaps also as the symbolic mom of the student body—but in actually planning and managing a complex array of events, facilities, and staff. These responsibilities include hosting dignitaries visiting the campus; organizing almost daily events for faculty, students, and staff; and managing entertainment facilities, such as the President’s House or the hospitality areas of the football stadium.

Furthermore, unlike most corporate CEOs, the
The president and spouse are expected to play an active role generating the resources needed by the university, whether by lobbying state and federal governments, seeking gifts and bequests from alumni and friends, or clever entrepreneurial efforts. There is an implicit expectation on most campuses that the president’s job is to raise money for the provost and deans to spend, while the chief financial officer and administrative staff watch over their shoulders to make certain they all do it wisely. So, too, the spouse is expected not only to host but to cultivate key donors, perhaps turning to them at dinner with the discrete inquiry, “Have you thought lately about where the University would fit into your estate planning?”

The president is also expected to be the “defender of the faith”, both of the institution itself and the academic values so important to a University. I sometimes thought of this latter role as roughly akin to that of a tired, old sheriff in a frontier western town. Every day I would have to drag my bruised, wounded carcass out of bed, strap on my guns, and go out into the main street to face whatever gunslingers who had ridden in to shoot up the town that day. Sometimes these were politicians; sometimes the media; at still other times special interest groups on campus; even occasionally other University leaders such as deans or even Regents. And each time I went into battle to defend the University, I did so knowing that one day I would run into someone faster on the draw than I was. In retrospect, it was amazing that I managed to perform this particular duty of the presidency for almost a decade with only a few scars to show.

The final role of the presidential family is a pastoral one. In a very real sense, both Anne and I were to become the “mom and pop” of the extended university family. Students looked to us for parental support, even as they emphasized their rejection of in loco parentis (actually, by digging holes in the front yard of the President’s House to “bury student rights” during a particularly imaginative demonstration). Faculty and staff also sought nurturing and understanding care during difficult times for the university. To both those inside and outside, the President and First Lady were expected to be cheerleaders for the university, always upbeat and optimistic, even though we frequently shared the concerns and were subject to the same stresses as the rest of the campus community.

In view of these multiple roles, all important, yet together far more than any couple could possibly fulfill, it was not surprising that we approached the inauguration with considerable apprehension—regarding it as less a celebration than as an execution. Indeed, the very term used to describe inaugurations, the “installation” of a new president, suggested bolting us into the leadership chair of the University for the ordeal ahead.
Although we had spent almost twenty years at Michigan prior to moving into the white house at 815 South University, our route prior to arriving in Ann Arbor crisscrossed the nation. The path to Ann Arbor led from a small farm town in Missouri to Yale University in the East, then back to a top-secret nuclear research laboratory in the mountains of New Mexico, then on to Pasadena, and finally back across the country again to Michigan.

Carrollton, University of Missouri, and Yale

Both of us had grown up in Carrollton, a small farm town (population 5,000) in central Missouri about 70 miles northeast of Kansas City. Carrollton was located on the Missouri River, in the heart of some of the richest farmland in the world. Most of its residents were involved in farming in one way or another. Anne (then Anne Marie Lock) was raised on a farm. Although my father was a highway paving contractor, my grandfather owned working farmland.

Anne’s ancestors were Swiss and German farming families who immigrated in the mid-19th century to the United States to settle along the Missouri River in towns with names such as Hermann and Frankenstein. In contrast, my ancestors were the usual mix of European nationalities, English (Johnson and Bramhall from the Mayflower days), Scotch-Irish (McCleary from the 19th century), and a dash of German immigrants in the early 20th century. The name Duderstadt comes from an ancient 1,100 year old walled village just east of the university city Goettingen in central Germany. When translated, Du-der-stadt becomes “you, the city”, with one medieval legend suggesting the name arose from the argument between two brothers about who should name the city, finally resulting in letting it name itself!

Although both of us were the same age, I attended the public elementary school and Anne attended the Catholic school. We didn’t meet one another until we entered Carrollton High School. Even then, although Anne was a cheerleader, and I played football, basketball, and baseball, we never knew each other well until we both left for college.

Actually, we didn’t begin to date until the first summer after leaving for college. We had both returned to work in Carrollton during the summer, Anne in the local flower shop while I worked on a highway construction crew for my father’s company. Summer social life in Carrollton, as in many small Midwestern towns, revolved around the local Dairy Queen (…quite literally, since just as in the movie, American Graffiti, young people would drive around and around the Dairy Queen looking for something to do). It was there that we first noticed one another, then began to date, and eventually continued the relationship at a distance.
through frequent letter writing while separated at college.

Anne attended the University of Missouri in Columbia, working her way through college and receiving a B.S. in Home Economics in 1964. In her last year she served as a residence hall advisor for undergraduate students. During her college years, Missouri was a nationally ranked football power, with coach Dan Devine at the helm. Some years later, after we had married and moved to Ann Arbor, Anne’s Missouri roots became apparent. In 1969, Devine led a powerful Missouri team into Ann Arbor that proceeded to soundly thrash a Michigan team led by a new young coach named Glenn “Bo” Schembechler. As Missouri scored its last touchdown in what was to be the worst beating a Schembechler-coached Michigan team was ever to experience, Anne stood up and cheered. Not a good thing, since we were seated at the time among many of the Michigan faithful, including some of the senior faculty in my new department. (It might be noted that one of Anne’s classmates at Missouri in the 1960s was none other than Lloyd Carr!)

For college, I headed east to Yale, oddly enough because of the opportunity to play college football. Actually, when I graduated from Carrollton High School, few in our town had ever considered going out of state to college—in fact, I was the first ever to take the SATs. Largely at the encouragement of my family, I decided to apply to several of the more popular national universities, with a particular interest in Stanford (rather, California). However, since I suspected the odds of acceptance were long, I also applied to several other schools, including Northwestern and Michigan. When I learned that blue-blood schools like Yale and Harvard were located in New England rather than England (where I thought they belonged with Oxford and Cambridge), I also decided on a whim to apply to Yale, knowing absolutely nothing whatsoever about it. Surprise, surprise, when not only did I get an early acceptance to Yale (and Stanford, as it turned out), but I also received a telegram (the first I had ever seen) from the Yale football coach encouraging me to attend Yale and play football. The thought of playing football at an exotic institution like Yale was just too enticing, although one of Dan Devine’s coaches also called later in an effort to recruit me to Missouri.

So, sight-unseen, I was put on a plane the next September—my first airplane trip—flew to New York
(again a first), and managed to find my way to Grand Central Station to take the train up to New Haven to enroll at Yale–and to start freshman football practice.

The old saying, “You can take the boy out of the country but not the country out of the boy!” strongly applied in my case. Despite the prep school, blue-blood nature of Yale at that time, it had relatively little impact on my social sophistication, although it certainly shook my academic confidence to the ground. After a shaky start, I managed to adjust to both the intellectual and social rigors of Old Blue–although football lasted only two years. In 1964, I graduated summa cum laude in electrical engineering and accepted an Atomic Energy Commission fellowship to attend graduate school at Caltech (turning down Stanford for the second time).

An academic note aside here: A Yale “engineering” degree is a bit of an oxymoron. In fact, all undergraduates at Yale were required to take not only a broad liberal arts curriculum, but they were also required to select a minor area of concentration in addition to their major. Since the minor and major concentrations had to be in different areas, I selected psychology as my minor area, with a specialization in child psychology. Many years later I realized just how critical this choice of a minor concentration was in my later assignments in academic administration–not so much for understanding students, but rather for understanding the faculty (stimulus, response, reward, reinforcement…).

During the summers, while Anne and I were working in Carrollton, we began to date more regularly. After I was accepted for graduate studies at Caltech, we decided that a distance romance back and forth from Missouri to Connecticut would become even more problematic in California, so we became engaged during our senior year and were married shortly after our college graduations in June of 1964. After a short three-day honeymoon, we loaded up my VW and headed for New Mexico, where I had a summer job working as a physicist at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.

Los Alamos

In the mid-1960s, atomic energy was still shrouded in secret security classification. In fact, I was required to qualify for an A.E.C. top-secret “Q” security clearance even to receive an Atomic Energy Commission Fellowship. Needless to say, security was an even higher priority at Los Alamos, where the town adjacent to the Laboratory housing the families of lab employees had only been opened to the public the year before. Families of visiting scientists like us lived in WW II vintage barracks dating from the days of the Manhattan Project. The only commercial establishments in the entire town were a Safeway store, a Basken-Robbins ice cream shop, and the ABC Liquor Store. Not much for culture, although since it was the summer of the Goldwater-Johnson presidential campaigns, politics...
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provided some entertainment. However, Los Alamos was located high in the mountains of New Mexico in the alpine setting of a national forest, so outdoor life provided some diversions.

Even though we spent only a summer at Los Alamos, it did have some important later consequences. I worked in a technical group supporting the Rover nuclear rocket program. The Rover Project was intended to develop and test rocket engines powered by nuclear fission reactors that would be required for a manned mission to Mars. During the mid-1960s, it was felt that the Mars mission would likely follow rapidly after the successful completion of the Apollo program to land a man on Mars—perhaps as early as 1980. Los Alamos was successful in designing, building, and static-testing a sequence of nuclear rocket engines at their Nevada test site—the Kiwi engine rated at 1,000 megawatts and the Phoebus engine rated at 5,000 megawatts (five times the power of a nuclear power plant). I worked on the test programs for these engines, and through this gained a strong interest both in nuclear power and spacelight.

Since the nuclear rocket project was classified as secret, I was required to record all of my work in bound notebooks, which were then locked in a safe each evening when I left the Laboratory. This habit of recording my work—and my thoughts—in bound notebooks became a habit that I continued throughout my research as a faculty member and then later as an academic administrator. Today, the shelves in our home are filled with these notebooks, continuing to accumulate at a rate of several each year.

There was another consequence of the Los Alamos work. During the 1960s, as the United States became more heavily drawn into the Vietnam War, the conditions for deferment from the draft became more and more restrictive. First I was deferred as a student; then this was replaced by a deferment due to martial status; then parental status with the arrival of our two daughters. Finally, in the late 1960s, even parental deferments disappeared. However, because I had held a top-secret clearance and had access to classified nuclear technology at Los Alamos, I eventually received a deferment because of critical skills. In fact, after another summer research assignment at the AEC’s other nuclear weapons laboratory at Livermore, even my international travel became tightly restricted—one of the many reasons we avoided overseas travel until the 1980s.

Caltech

After our summer experience at Los Alamos, we returned to Missouri to pile the rest of our belongings in our VW, and then off we went again across the country to Pasadena where I had an AEC fellowship to study at Caltech. Like many Americans, our image of Pasadena and Caltech had been formed by the television broadcasts of the Tournament of Roses Parade and the Rose Bowl, when the skies were blue and the San Gabriel Mountains ringed the city. It was quite a contrast when we arrived in late August in the midst of a smog alert that continued for weeks, blotting out the mountains and trapping the heat.

I entered my PhD program in engineering science and physics at Caltech, and Anne accepted a position as a manager at the J.W. Robinson’s department store in Pasadena. We rented a small apartment in northwest Pasadena, only to find later that this was in the neighborhood where Pasadena’s version of the Watts riots occurred in 1964. We moved after a year to an apartment complex close to the Caltech campus, where we would have our two daughters. (Ironically, our new apartment was located one block from S. Michigan Ave. in Pasadena and only ten blocks from a small party store named Trader Joes...the birthplace of today’s national phenomenon.)

Although Pasadena was an important chapter in the Duderstadt history—Anne’s job, my M.S. and Ph.D. degrees, the birth of the two Duderstadt daughters, Susan and Kathy, and my AEC Postdoc—it was a remarkably short period of only four years. Part of the reason was the Vietnam war; the threat of the draft always lurking in the background provided strong motivation both for graduate students and faculty to complete their degrees as rapidly as possible. But it was also a time of ample job opportunities, with the space and defense programs in high gear and universities ramping up their research in science and engineering.

Of course, it was a rather threadbare existence, particularly after the arrival of our daughters that required Anne to step down from her job. After paying the rent, my generous AEC fellowship left us with $25
Our new places of work: Caltech and Robinson’s

Susan and Kathy arrive

Graduation and our last home at Caltech
per week! Yet, with prudent cost management, e.g., shopping at the Fedco department store for federal employees, we managed to survive. Most of the graduate students faced similar financial challenges, spreading out over Pasadena in the cheapest apartments they could find, so there was little interaction between graduate students and faculty at Caltech.

Taking advantage of the highly interdisciplinary character of Caltech by earning my degrees in subjects spanning a range of topics in physics and mathematics, I managed to complete my M.S. and Ph.D. in three years. My dissertation advisor suggested that I might want to spend an additional year as a postdoctoral fellow, broadening my research interests—and taking the next step toward a faculty position at Caltech. To this end, I applied for and won an AEC Postdoctoral Fellowship for the year 1968, with a generous stipend of $1,000 per month, roughly three times that of my graduate student stipend. Fortunately, the medical burdens for our two daughters were covered by a Ford Foundation loan that would be forgiven if I taught at the university level for a few years. We felt so flush that we rented a small house right across the street from Caltech with wonderful gardens (including two large avocado trees that would periodically rain fruit on the roof of the house).

Although I was interested in completing my postdoctoral appointment before considering more permanent employment, I did agree to two job interviews at the request of my Caltech dissertation advisors: UC-Berkeley and Michigan. The Berkeley interview was hosted by the chair of their Department of Nuclear Engineering, Hans Mark, who was later to become Secretary of the Air Force and then President of the University of Texas.

The Michigan interview was more problematic. To be sure, Michigan’s Department of Nuclear Engineering was not only the first such program established in this country, but also it ranked among the top such programs in the world. Despite this, I was not particularly enthusiastic about visiting Michigan to explore the opportunity. I agreed to do so as a favor to one of my thesis advisors, who told me that Ann Arbor was “nirvana,” although not on the cold, gray, drizzling day in March when I visited. While I was lying back to California after the interview, the department chairman, Bill Kerr, called Anne and told her they were going to make me an offer. Anne responded without hesitation. She had had enough of Southern California. When I arrived back in Pasadena, I was informed that the Duderstads were headed to Michigan. (I had learned that on such weighty matters, Anne was usually correct.)
Although Anne had accepted Michigan’s offer in spring, 1968, I still felt obligated to finish the year at Caltech as an A.E.C. Postdoctoral Fellow, since this had been an honorific award. In November I was able to stop by Michigan on my way to Washington to receive the Mark Mills Prize for the outstanding dissertation in nuclear science (presented to me by Glenn Seaborg). While in Ann Arbor I learned that the University was just completing some new housing units for married students where new faculty families were occasionally permitted to rent some of these townhouse apartments until they found more permanent residences. Actually, this solved one of our first challenges, since the University’s offer of the princely sum of $12,000 was unlikely to permit us to acquire a house, particularly after four years of poverty at Caltech. This seemed like the simplest solution to the housing question, and so, in a sub-zero blizzard in December 1968, the Duderstadts moved into the Northwood IV housing complex on the University of Michigan’s North Campus.

Since we had packed up the moving van in Pasadena in the midst of a Santa Ana heat wave (loading our VW in the van), our first exposure to Michigan winter was quite abrupt. Although the Northwood housing units were new, they were quite austere without landscaping. Although I was only a short walk from my department’s laboratories on the North Campus, we felt quite isolated in this new cold climate and began to wonder just how long we could last.

Actually, we were not alone. There were other faculty families in the Northwood complex, all facing the same financial challenges and adjusting to the shock of a
new climate and a very complex institution. Although the winter weather kept us isolated, as soon as the spring thaw appeared, the hordes of children began to appear, sweeping through the housing complex each day, leaving the adults with the challenges of searching each evening for their children’s toys and tricycles. Yet, ironically, the living challenges of Northwood provided a certain bond among the faculty families, and to this day we continue to have strong friendships with several families who not only survived the experience but have remained at Michigan as long as we have.

The First Signs of Community Life

Fortunately, within a few weeks after our arrival, Anne encountered the first signs of the strong social network that had developed within the University through the women of the faculty. She was contacted by the leaders of the Newcomers Section of the Faculty Women’s Club and invited both to join and to meet other new arrivals at a series of social get-togethers for the several hundred women joining the University faculty community each year.

Here it is important to stress just how important this community organization was to new faculty families. As noted earlier, the University is a very diverse and complex organization, broken up into smaller social groups usually aligned with academic departments or work areas. One can image the differences among academic units such as Law, Medicine, Engineering, and LS&A, or among the diverse departments and programs in each of these units. While most of these
organizations made some effort to welcome and orient their new faculty members, their families were generally ignored.

In contrast, the Faculty Women’s Club spanned the entire university, hosting an unusually broad set of activities and interest groups both for faculty wives and more broadly their families. In fact, since being launched by President Marion Burton’s wife, Nina Burton, in the 1920s, it had become the primary social organization for pulling together faculty members and their families across the University. While many of the women in the Faculty Women’s Club would remain active throughout their lives (including many of the wives of senior university leaders such as presidents and deans), the FWC Newcomers group played a particularly important role both in welcoming new arrivals to the University and providing them with opportunities to become engaged in its broad range of activities, both as members and as families.

Anne immediately joined the group and soon found herself not only with a host of new friends from other arriving faculty families, but also developing relationships with many of the women leaders of the University, including Sally Fleming and Alene Smith (both president’s wives) and the spouses of leading faculty members such as Phyllis Wright, Sue Yohe, Betty Richart, and Florence Crane. Her participation in various Newcomers interest groups such as International Cooking, Parenting and Child Care, and Book Reviews gave both of us an immediate opportunity to meet other faculty families and make new friends across the entire breadth of the University.

In fact, I was almost overwhelmed when at one of Anne’s events I found myself seated directly across from President Robben Fleming!!! Needless to say, for a brand-new assistant professor, this was a bit terrifying, until I learned just how warm and gracious the Flemings were. (As I will describe later, Robben Fleming was to become my primary tutor in learning the art of the university presidency during the brief several-month period when he became Interim President, just before I was elected as the successor to Harold Shapiro.)

Of course, there were other opportunities for faculty members to come together, such as family events (school programs, summer activities), cultural events (performing arts), or “cosmic athletic events” (UM football and basketball), which usually appealed to particular interests or periods in family life (e.g., school-age children). Unfortunately, over the years, many of these important community experiences of the University have disappeared (e.g., the May Festival of the University Musical Society or the degree to which the commercialization of Michigan athletics has largely priced athletic events beyond the capacity of faculty and staff families). Yet the Faculty Women’s Club continues to play a truly unique and essential role in the life of the University. Both Anne’s early strong engagement and leadership in Faculty Women’s Club activities and her unusually strong support of the organization in her various leadership roles over the years at Michigan have played an unusually important role in preserving the community spirit of the University.
Early Faculty Life

My own early faculty experience was somewhat different, in part because I was as young as most of the graduate students in my department (e.g., mid-20s). While I rapidly developed professional relationships with the faculty, my closest colleagues were actually graduate students. Because I was recruited to fill the position of a senior faculty member who left behind several Ph.D. students, I immediately picked up these abandoned souls, although the relationship among us was less one of “master and student” and more one of “brothers-in-arms”. Much of my social life within the department was with graduate students, joining them in basketball games, late-night poker matches, or just having an occasional beer together (usually at the parties that dissertation chairs would hold for graduate students who had completed their Ph.D. degree).

This was also important because my department in the 1970s was small, research-intensive, highly interdisciplinary, and almost totally focused on graduate education, offering M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in nuclear science and nuclear engineering. Hence it was almost ideally suited to the generalized approach of a Caltech education. Its reputation allowed it to attract both outstanding faculty and graduate students of unusual breadth and ability. Hence, it was well-suited to my roving interests, which evolved quite rapidly across the fields of physics, mathematics, and engineering. In fact, the breadth I had acquired at Caltech enabled me to encourage each of my graduate students to select their own topic of interest rather than working on particular problems I proposed, thereby attracting some of the most able students in the department.

One of the great challenges faced by most young faculty members is the practice of most academic units in providing only 9-month faculty appointments. In some units, there were summer programs that provided teaching opportunities. However in engineering, faculty members were expected to obtain research grants that would provide both support for their summer salaries (as well as 20% of their academic year appointment) as well as their graduate students (research assistantship stipends) and equipment needs. Hence even before I arrived at Michigan, I was encouraged to write a proposal to the National Science Foundation to obtain a grant for my first two years. Fortunately, this was successful, and we were able to obtain full 12-month support for this period (along with the support of several graduate students).

However, a gap in research grants created a lapse the following year in summer support. I was only able to line up summer support through off-campus research appointments in California. Hence we loaded up the car and off we drove, family and all, back to California, first for a brief period where I served as a visiting faculty member at Caltech, and then for several months when I served as a Visiting Research Physicist at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory.

The Livermore experience was interesting from...
several perspectives. I was working in the top-secret Q Division, a group trying to develop the new technology of laser-driven thermonuclear fusion. Ironically, a small company in Ann Arbor, KMS Fusion, was also trying to develop this technology, in direct competition with the A.E.C. scientists at Livermore and Los Alamos. Both the classified and competitive nature of the work led to some bizarre situations. For example, I found myself forbidden to discuss my research with several Michigan colleagues who were consultants with KMS Fusion.

Needless to say, although this continued need to support not only one’s summer salary but as well 20% of their academic term support was accepted as a fact of life by most faculty members in engineering, although it was a source of major irritation that would later put pressure on both department chairs and the dean.

While many university faculty members focus on teaching only a few courses closely related to their area of expertise, I rarely taught the same course twice in a row. I enjoyed creating new courses and curricula, including one of the first courses taught at the University on microcomputers—the Apple II! For most of the 1970s, I remained actively involved in research (with a steady stream of research grants), graduate education (chairing 22 dissertation committees by 1980 and serving as a member of hundreds of others), and winning several University and national awards for both my teaching and my research. This level of activity was sufficient to propel me rapidly through the academic ranks, with promotion in 1972 to Associate Professor (with tenure) and full professor in 1975. I began to realize, however, that the traditional faculty role, while enjoyable for the moment, would probably not hold my attention for the long term. Indeed, I always had great envy and admiration for my more senior colleagues who had been able to maintain both scholarly interest and momentum through the several decades of their careers. Perhaps it was my field of theoretical physics and mathematics that frequently led to burnout at an early age, or perhaps it was just a character flaw. In either case, I soon found my concentration and attention beginning to wander to other activities in the University.

Since I usually produced copious lecture notes for each of these courses, I soon shifted to writing textbooks to expand my pedagogical efforts. The first of these, Nuclear Reactor Analysis, was written with another junior faculty member, Louis J. Hamilton, and covered most of the material required for both the B.S. and M.S. in nuclear engineering. It turned out to be wildly successful, soon becoming a dominant textbook in the field. In fact today (2014), almost 40 years later, it remains one of the most important textbooks in this field. (I’ve always suspected that the fact that it has remained at the top of the list, even though it has never been updated, reveals just how stagnant the progress in nuclear reactor engineering has been since Three Mile Island!)

This led to a series of other textbooks, usually written with faculty colleagues or former graduate students, as indicated by the book covers in the illustration below.

The great interest in nuclear power during the 1970s pulled me into other areas, including a major television series, Nuclear Power and You, produced by the University of Michigan Television System for nationwide broadcast. Unfortunately, it was scheduled to first appear on WABC in New York the week of Three Mile Island, so we had to do a last-minute retaping of the program on nuclear reactor safety.

This television experience led to another major project in the 1980s where I led an effort to develop an entire undergraduate degree program for the nuclear power industry utilizing studio-produced videotape.
ten courses with 40 hour-long lectures for each course, along with problem sets and other references. Here I might note today that this unusual effort would be identified as a MOOC, a “massively open online course”…actually ten courses in this case. However, with the sensitivity about the proliferation of nuclear technology to rogue states seeking to develop nuclear weapons technology, we have decided not to circulate our online curriculum on a global level.

Early University Leadership: First by Anne

Anne moved even more rapidly up the ladder in her areas of interest. Within a few months after arriving in Ann Arbor, she was selected as chair of the Faculty Women’s Club Newcomers Group. This was a particularly important assignment, since during the 1970s, the Faculty Women’s Club was the principal University organization that wove new faculty and their families into the community life of the institution. In this role, she rapidly developed friendships with the spouses of many campus leaders, including Sally Fleming, the First Lady of the University. In 1983 Anne served as president of the Faculty Women’s Club with Sally Fleming as vice president, after the Flemings returned to campus. Anne remained a prominent participant in FWC activities during our years in the role of dean, provost, and president of the University. She was to continue this strong support later with efforts to sustain the organization in the face of the changing character of the University. Anne established the core of a University-managed endowment to support the service activities of the FWC. She led FWC into the digital world, implementing the tools of the Internet and database software both to manage and communicate its activities to the members. She was also instrumental
in efforts to protect the fundamental purpose of the FWC by serving the University community. And she continues to serve today as a powerful force to protect the history and character of the club as one of the few remaining organizations aimed at introducing new faculty families to the University and sustaining a sense of community throughout the institution.

Serving as president of the Faculty Women’s Club, was probably the ideal preparation for her later role as First Lady of the University, since she developed strong friendships with faculty and spouses across the University. In the process, she developed a strong sense of what was necessary to glue the campus together as a community. And it goes almost without saying that she also developed an exceptional ability to design and manage complex events.

At the same time, Anne was determined to continue her studies. After taking several courses at Michigan, she decided to enroll in graduate studies in home economics in clothing and textiles at Eastern Michigan University and earned her M.S. degree in 1974.

However, as she became more involved with the University through an array of service activities, her interests became captured by the extraordinary faculty of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. She joined a small group of women auditing the core arts and humanities courses of the College, from leading faculty members such as Ted Buttrey, Diane Kirkpatrick, Sharon Herbert, Marvin Eisenberg, David Huntington, Don Cameron, and Ralph Williams. During these years, she augmented her earlier studies at the B.S. and M.S. level in professional fields with a truly liberal
education, with both deep appreciation for the liberal arts, as well as a love for reading the classic literature. This strong interest, particularly in history, was to manifest itself later when as First Lady of the University, she was influential in actions taken to better archive, analyze, and disseminate the remarkable history of the University of Michigan. She would continue these efforts following our presidency by authoring a series of books on the history of the University and creating a series of web-based digital archives in areas such as campus evolution, faculty and staff histories, and a major web “portal” that has proven invaluable in celebrating the Bicentennial of the University in 2017.

Ironically, through her leadership experiences in various University community organizations such as the Faculty Women’s Club, her friendships with many of the women leaders of the campus, and her deepening love and respect for the liberal arts of the University, she was probably better prepared for service in the presidency than her husband!!!

Captured by the Vortex of Administration

Because most faculty members were loath to become involved in University service activities, I soon found myself not only appointed to but also chairing numerous faculty committees. Like most younger faculty, I tended to approach each assignment with an activist agenda. For example, when I chaired the curriculum committee for the College of Engineering, I eliminated half of the courses in the College catalog on the grounds that they were rarely taught. When I chaired the faculty advisory committee to the provost (first Frank Rhodes and then Harold Shapiro), I led the charge to improve the environment for research on campus. And when I served on the University’s Budget Priorities Committee, I participated in the effort to downsize or eliminate a number of University departments and programs. In fact, I became sufficiently visible as an activist faculty member, that I was elected to the leadership committee of faculty governance, the Senate Assembly Committee on University Affairs (SACUA). At that time, I probably would have considered eventually chairing that body as the high point of my career. But fate was to intervene before I could serve in this role.

The new Dean and Deanette of Engineering
One evening in the spring of 1981, while I was minding my business as a budding radical in faculty governance, I received a phone call at home from Provost Billy Frye. I was offered a Faustian bargain to become Dean of the College of Engineering, an academic unit with over 300 faculty, 5,000 students, and a budget of over $100 million. At that time my administrative experience was essentially zero. I had never been a department chair. I didn’t even have my own secretary, and I had never supervised anybody other than Ph.D. students. I was also only thirty-seven and relatively unknown inside the College. However, I was also brash and naive enough to view this as an opportunity to correct all the deficiencies I had been complaining about for years as a faculty member. After some discussion, we decided that this was something I had to do, and I accepted.

There was an interesting aspect to this offer and acceptance that was to occur again in the future. Most senior appointments involve long negotiations, in which the candidate tries to negotiate both the best possible personal situation as well as resources for the unit to be led. In fact, one of the most important responsibilities of a dean, provost, and president is to conduct these negotiations successfully and land the candidate, much like a big fish on a light fishing line. However, when Frye made the offer to me, I simply responded with, “Yes, I’ll do it. I trust you, and I know you will help later when I need it.” This approach threw Billy Frye off balance, but as he was later to learn, I would indeed be back seeking his support many, many times.

We really didn’t know what to expect with this new role. Actually, Anne had more experience than I did in the “upper reaches” of the University administration. But sometimes naiveté can be useful.

Like most of my new jobs, the Dean’s role started almost immediately. I was introduced to the Engineering faculty the next day, and two weeks later I moved into the Engineering Dean’s office. Shortly after arriving early in the morning, I received a phone call from a vice president informing me that my first job that morning was to fire two 20-year employees who had been caught falsifying their travel vouchers. Ah, the fun of academic administration started immediately.

Throughout my first weeks, I met with each of the leaders of the college: the department chairs, associate deans, and key faculty. It was fortunate that I assumed the ability to select my own team, surprising each of the associate deans by thanking them for their service and offering to help them return to the faculty. I then was able to talk several other young faculty members into joining the new administration, including Chuck Vest, who was later to become president of MIT, and Dan Atkins, later to become dean of Michigan’s new School of Information, and Scott Fogler, one of the leaders in chemical engineering education.
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In my meetings with the department chairs, two of the most powerful chairman, who had also been candidates for the dean’s position, attempted the usual power play by threatening me that they would step down if they didn’t get their way. I thanked them for their service and asked them for help in searching for their successors, leaving both a bit stunned when I left their offices.

Bill Frye had taken a chance by turning the leadership of the College over to the young faculty. In a similar spirit, my colleagues and I moved rapidly to restructure and rebuild the College. We first overhauled the salary program, then based primarily on seniority and rank, and instead moved to compensation based on merit. In the process we shocked the College’s assistant professors by doubling their salaries over a two-year period, stressing that we believed that they deserved it. We launched an aggressive effort to complete the move of the College to the North Campus through a combination of building renovation, privately funded facilities, and a major state funded facility. In fact, Chuck Vest and I were allowed to go to Lansing to lobby directly for a badly needed engineering facility, thereby gaining the experience that would serve each of us in our later roles as provosts and presidents.

Anne played a very important role in this effort. Her friendship both with the associate deans’ wives (Becky Vest, Monica Atkins, and Jan Fogler) was key to knitting together the team. She also had good relationships with the spouses of both the department chairs and the members of the College of Engineering Executive Committee. Her judgment from her own leadership experience was an invaluable source of advice both in rebuilding the quality of the College and taking on massive efforts such as moving it from the Central Campus to the North Campus.

Yet, because of the rather conservative culture of the College of Engineering and the presence of several longstanding staff members who were determined that the practices of earlier deans would not be taken over by these youngsters (all of us were under the age of 40), there was little opportunity for innovation and creativity in social events. The Dean’s staff still served what the faculty called “gunky punch” (a mixture of orange sherbet and ginger ale) rather than the more potent brew we would have preferred.

However, although constrained somewhat within the College, Anne’s long-standing friendships with the spouses of the deans of Michigan’s other schools and colleges provided a wonderful opportunity to build bonds with these units. She used her presidency of the Faculty Women’s Club in 1984 to strengthen these relations, forming a network of these women leaders that would prove invaluable as we moved up the ladder to more senior positions in the University.

During the brief five-year tenure in the Dean’s Office, our deans’ team was able to rebuild and re-energize the College. We completed the thirty-year-long effort to move the College to the University’s North Campus, recruited over 140 new faculty, doubled Ph.D. production, tripled sponsored research support, and boosted the reputation of the College from an also-ran
to one of the top five engineering schools in the nation. (By the time Chuck Vest moved on, in 1990, it had risen to 5th in the nation for undergraduate studies and 4th in the nation for graduate studies.) We also established strong ties with industry, including the effort to build one of the most advanced computer systems in the nation, the Computer Aided Engineering Network or CAEN, with the help of industry leaders.

Working with such a young, energetic, and talented team to rebuild the College of Engineering was an exhilarating experience, but by the mid-1980s, our leadership team was beginning to wonder what we would do for an encore. Indeed, the College had undergone such dramatic change, that my colleagues and I worried that the solidification of its gains might require a different leadership style than the “Go for it” approach of the Duderstadt years.

Of course, there had been probes from elsewhere: a provost position at Virginia, a dean position at Caltech possibly leading to its presidency, even a probe about the Yale presidency (amusing for a gearhead). There also had been inquiries from industry about senior executive positions, such as the head of Ford Scientific Laboratory or Los Alamos. But, in the end, Anne and I both believed that our home was Ann Arbor, and our institution should remain the University of Michigan.

Provosting

Once again, fate seemed to intervene. Following Provost Billy Frye’s decision to return to his alma mater, Emory University, as its provost, President Harold Shapiro launched a search for a new provost that eventually found its way to my doorstep. This experience should have served as a warning of what was to come on the next rung up the ladder of academic administration. The selection of a provost was usually a tightly guarded prerogative of the president, since the two must serve as a tightly knit team in leading the University. But Harold Shapiro decided instead to launch a major consultative process, complete with a broad-based search committee assisted by an executive search consultant or headhunter, Jerry Baker, of Lamalie and Associates. For almost a year, this committee met with members of the University community, and with Jerry’s assistance, interviewed a number of candidates both internal and external.

As the search wound down, it became increasingly clear that the selection would be made from among internal candidates, and almost certainly be a dean. Among those mentioned were Terry Sandalow (Law), Gil Whitaker (Business), and John D’Arms (Rackham). Actually, high on Shapiro’s list was Chuck Vest, then associate dean of Engineering, but it would have been difficult politically to pass over the other deans (including me).

A final decision was made during the week of spring break in 1986. Anne and the girls had already left for a week at Walt Disney World, while I attended a meeting of the National Science Board in Washington. I was called out of the meeting for a phone call from Susan Lipschutz, Shapiro’s assistant, informing me...
that I would be offered the provost position and asking me to fly back to talk with Shapiro. Hence, rather than flying on down to Orlando, I flew back to Ann Arbor to accept the offer (again, without any negotiation). When I called Anne about the position, she was not happy, since she knew all too well how difficult the role of provost would be. Her vast experience with University leaders led her to conclude that the position of dean was the best administrative job in a university, and that moving into the central administration would be stressful. How right she was!!!

Looking back, we both realized that this last assignment was probably our downfall as a member of the faculty family. Even as dean, one still retained considerable credibility as a faculty member. I was still able to do research, direct research projects, and supervise graduate students—although I usually met with them during noontime while jogging through the University’s arboretum. Anne was able to maintain her network of friends while serving on various University advisory boards.

We tried to bring the same energy, excitement, and confidence about the future to our new activities in the provost’s role that we had brought to the leadership in the College of Engineering. Within a few months I had not only launched a major set of planning activities involving every school and college of the University, but also launched a series of initiatives that would later define my presidency: a major effort to increase the racial diversity of the campus community (the Michigan Mandate), a series of initiatives designed to improve the undergraduate experience, an aggressive plan to improve the capital facilities of the University, a far-reaching effort to achieve leadership in the use of information technology, efforts to rebuild the natural sciences, the restructuring of several key professional schools (including Dentistry, Library Science, and Education), and a major effort to modernize the University’s technology infrastructure (that would eventually lead to the Internet).

At the same time, Anne launched a similarly wide array of events for students, faculty, and staff to draw together the campus community. Within a few weeks following my selection as provost, Anne had already established a new University tradition to honor newly promoted faculty each spring.

One of Anne’s early efforts involved a series of monthly dinners held at Inglis House to bring together 10 to 15 faculty couples from across the University. Here the intent was to provide faculty with new opportunities to reach beyond their disciplines, to meet new people, and develop new friendships. It also provided us with
a marvelous opportunity to understand better what was on the faculty’s mind. However, the logistics in designing and conducting the Provost faculty dinners, which were to become a University tradition, were considerable. This not only involved working with catering and clerical staff to design and conduct these events, but also developing a database capable of supporting the invitations to these monthly dinners.

Anne also took the lead in developing an array of events for other constituencies. For example, there was growing concern about the vast separation that existed between the Athletics Department and the rest of the University. This separation was depriving student-athletes of many of the important experiences that should have been part of their education. So too, it placed coaches in the awkward position of being decoupled from the rest of the institution. Since the Athletic Director, Don Canham, was approaching retirement age, it was clear that building new bridges of cooperation and respect between the Department and the rest of the University could be of great benefit to achieving a smooth transition in leadership.

Anne decided to take on as a personal challenge the task of “mainstreaming” Michigan athletics. She began by arranging a series of events where student-athletes and coaches were brought together in various academic settings—museums, concert halls, and such. The goal was to stress that student-athletes were students first, and that coaches were, in reality, teachers. In the process of arranging and hosting these events, we began to realize that the isolation among sports programs was just as serious as the chasm between the Athletic Department and the rest of the University.

Students and coaches enjoyed the opportunity to meet participants from other sports programs. And we began to build relationships with coaches and Athletic Department staff, both through attending sports events and by getting to know them personally.

Anne also launched a series of events for the deans and executive officers of the University, including a kickoff potluck in September, a holiday reception, and a spring “thank God we made it through the year” dinner. Anne made a point of scheduling each of these events in a different part of the University, to introduce the University’s leadership to its remarkable diversity, e.g., the Museum of Art, the Museum of Natural History.
“Dine with the Deans and the Dinosaurs”), the Law Club, the Music School, the new Chemistry Building, the new Solid State Electronics Laboratory, and the Clements Library.

Acting President

As the activities of the Provost Office accelerated, we were also asked to take on additional responsibilities. Even during normal times, the provost position at Michigan was a particularly challenging one because of its broad range of responsibilities, since the provost not only serves as the chief academic officer of the University but also as the University’s chief budget officer. In this sense, the provost was also second-in-command and thereby empowered to serve as acting president in the event of the president’s absence. Such a situation arose late in 1986 when Harold Shapiro took a brief sabbatical leave, spent partly in England and partly in New York, working at the Ford Foundation. During this period, I served both as Acting President and as Provost.

The responsibilities in the role of acting president began almost immediately, after only six months as provost. In late November, Michigan upset a heavily favored Ohio State team to win the Big Ten Conference championship and a trip to the Rose Bowl. Ironically enough, we were attending “The Game”, Yale vs. Harvard, when the Michigan score was announced. We suddenly realized that we would have the opportunity not only to attend our first Rose Bowl but to lead the expedition to Pasadena in the Shapiros’ absence. In late December, we were plunged into the weeklong series of events that swirl about the Tournament of Roses experience. Part of the difficulty was that nobody knew what was expected of us—or, indeed, of anybody else. Perhaps the only experienced hand was Don Canham himself, and he was not sharing his information.

For example, I was told to show up to make a few remarks to a small Kiwanis luncheon in Pasadena. The address turned out to be in the Pasadena Civic Auditorium, and the “little luncheon” turned out to be a televised affair for several thousand, with each speaker introduced by cheerleaders and marching bands. Then, I found myself scheduled as a speaker at a similarly large affair at the Hollywood Palladium—sandwiched between Bo Schembechler and Bob Hope. I learned an important lesson here: Just be brief, since no one will pay attention to the president amidst such celebrities anyway! (By the way, Hope introduced me as just another “acting president”...like the other currently in the White House at the time.)

There was a certain homecoming character to the trip, since we were back in Pasadena. But, during our Caltech years, the closest we had ever been to the Rose Bowl was avoiding the Rose Parade traffic on New Year’s Day. To actually be involved as a participant in the Tournament of Roses activities was quite a new experience. Since the Rose Bowl was to be a frequent duty during our presidency (five trips), the Pasadena folks began to adopt us as former natives. I was even introduced once as the ultimate Caltech Rose Bowl
prank: a former Caltech student who actually managed to infiltrate a Big Ten university, rise to the position of its president, and bring it back to Pasadena to lose in the Rose Bowl at frequent intervals. Of course, this introduction ran out of gas when we soon learned how to win the Rose Bowl.

The Rose Bowl trip was a harbinger of things to come. We learned that as long as we were in the leadership position at Michigan, we would never again have a normal Christmas holiday. Every year, the Michigan football team was destined to be invited to a bowl game somewhere. And, as part of the contract between the bowls and the Big Ten Conference, the president was required to attend a series of promotional events in the days preceding the bowl. So, like the football coaches, each Christmas holiday we would pack up our daughters—if we could convince them to go along—and trek off to bowl country somewhere.

Our first Rose Bowl was very much in the Michigan tradition. Michigan scored early and took a lead over Arizona State, only to lose by a touchdown in the final moments. As we walked out of the stadium in the gathering gloom of winter twilight, we felt the depression of yet another Michigan Rose Bowl defeat, which had been so characteristic of Michigan football during the Schembechler years.

However, once we had been trapped in the immense gravitational pull of the black hole of the central administration, it was impossible to escape. Within a few months after descending into the depths of the provost’s office, Harold Shapiro announced his decision to leave for Princeton. Looking back, we realize now that we were probably doomed to sink to the bottom of the academic ladder—to the presidency itself.

The Duderstadt Family

However, before moving on to the ultimate test of university leadership, it is important to provide a more intimate view of family life at a university like Michigan.

Like most faculty families, much of our time during the 1970s and 1980s was spent in the all-consuming task of raising children in Ann Arbor. In 1970, we moved out of Northwood housing into a small house in south Ann Arbor, which was to be our home for the next 25 years. Our two daughters were first enrolled in the Gay-Jay Montessori School and then in a sequence of public schools: Lawton Elementary School, Slauson Middle School, and Pioneer High School. Our home was selected, in part, because it was next to Lawton School. It was also next to the site where the buses picked up students for middle and high school, although their extracurricular activities usually kept Anne and me in the taxi business.

The Duderstadt daughters, Susan and Kathy, suffered from the “Ann Arbor Syndrome”, an over involvement in extracurricular activities. While they were young, they were involved in athletic activities, such as competitive swimming and figure skating, and in music, playing piano, violin, and flute. However, as they grew older, their interests began to diverge.
Susan and Kathy followed the usual Ann Arbor trajectories: Counting to 1,000 at Montessori, playing musical instruments, joining in theater and sports, and finally trying out science.
Although Susan continued to swim competitively, she became increasingly interested in theater and vocal performance. She took voice lessons and appeared in a number of musical theatre productions in junior high school. Kathy went in a different direction, becoming involved in an ever-widening range of athletics including gymnastics, cross-country, and track. While the Ann Arbor community encourages a broad range of interests while children are young, activities become intensely competitive as they approach the high school level. Susan focused her interests on theater and chorus. Kathy, however, continued to try to do it all: cross-country, gymnastics, track, marching band, concert band, and piano. In fact, at one point I had to visit the Pioneer High School principal to negotiate just how Kathy would divide her fall time among cross-country (she was team captain), the marching band (she was first flute), and AP chemistry lab.

The broad interests of our daughters necessitated strong involvement on our part. Beyond transportation, there were the hours spent at various athletic or performing events. In fact, I once suspected that my sudden flurry of book writing in the late 1970s coincided with the hours spent waiting between events at swimming and gymnastics meets.

Both daughters were also strong students, graduating at the top of their classes in both middle school and high school. Both won numerous awards—National Merit Scholarships, Westinghouse Science Talent Contest, and varsity letters. And both decided that they wanted to leave Ann Arbor for their undergraduate educations, since so many of their high school classmates would be enrolled at Michigan (and, of course, their parents would be nearby).

Susan eventually ended up at Yale University, majoring in molecular biophysics and biochemistry, and becoming a stalwart in the Yale Glee Club. Kathy went to Harvard, initially majoring in astrophysics and competing in track (the heptathlon) and crew, but later switching to English Literature after a term abroad in Italy taught her that “a Harvard education was too valuable to waste on science”.

Fortunately, both daughters decided to return to the University of Michigan for graduate work. Susan returned for a joint program in Michigan’s Medical School and School of Public Health, leading to an M.D. and an M.P.H. Kathy took a somewhat more complex route back to Ann Arbor. She joined the Peace Corps after Harvard, and she was accepted as part of the first group to go to Eastern Europe, to Hungary, to establish an English language-teaching infrastructure in Hungarian high schools. After two years in the Peace Corps, she decided to switch back to science, and she enrolled in a Ph.D. program at Michigan in atmospheric chemistry. Like Susan, she decided against living in the President’s House, and instead rented an apartment in

Our daughters began to move in different directions.
Susan and Kathy continued on an upward slope: top in their classes at Pioneer High School, one to Yale and the other to Harvard, and then both returning to UM for graduate study, Susan for an M.D. and M.P.H. and Kathy for a Ph.D. in atmospheric chemistry.
Ann Arbor while she worked on her PhD.

One of the perks of university faculty positions is international travel, usually associated with sabbatical leaves. However while our children were young, we believed that it was important to keep the family in the stable Ann Arbor environment, and we passed up sabbatical leave opportunities. As our daughters reached high school age, we did begin to travel more extensively in Europe during summer vacations. One of the most unique experiences was a month we spent as a family in a fortified French chateau near Chartres, while I gave lectures to scientists from the French atomic energy agency. The Duderstadt daughters were given a room in the turreted tower of the chateau—good preparation for their later roles as University princesses.

During the 1980s we began a pattern of taking the family to Europe for a few weeks each summer, just to travel around and see the sights. We would generally fly over on a cheap fare such as Icelandic Airlines, then rent a car, and drive our daughters on the Grand Tour. These trips provided quite an education for all. And it was to be one of the experiences we would very much miss with our more constrained schedules in academic administration.
As graduate students, our daughters not only had the opportunity to travel with us, but to get married and start their families!
While serving as Acting President, the Provost staff selected Big Al, our large teddy bear, as Acting Provost. I was told that Al did such a good job that he should have been selected as my successor (but fortunately I chose Chuck Vest instead!!!)
When Harold Shapiro offered me the position of provost at the University, he also asked me to commit to serve for at least five years. After all, Michigan provosts frequently have been lured into university presidencies (e.g., Roger Heyns to UC-Berkeley, Frank Rhodes to Cornell, Harold Shapiro to Michigan and Princeton, Chuck Vest to MIT, Bernie Machen to Utah and Florida, Nancy Cantor to U Illinois and Syracuse, Terry Sullivan to U Virginia, and Phil Hanlon to Dartmouth). I agreed, but with the understanding that Shapiro would also stay for that period. Imagine our surprise in 1987, when the day before Spring Commencement—and the completion of my first year as provost—Harold pulled me aside at a reception to reveal that he and Vivian had accepted the presidency at Princeton. This not-altogether-unexpected announcement set off a chain of events that were eventually to sweep us into the Michigan presidency. But the period from Harold’s announcement in spring, 1987 to my inauguration in fall, 1988, was one of the most challenging of our lives. Anne describes the period best: “It was as enjoyable as a fourteen month pregnancy...”

Welcome Back Home!

When Harold and Vivian Shapiro returned from their brief sabbatical in London and New York, racial tension on the Michigan campus was running high. For several years there had been increasing racial tensions on campuses across the country, and racial diversity and climate had once again become an important element of student activism at Michigan. The University had placed affirmative action issues high on its agenda during the 1970s. But it was clear that the University’s focus on this agenda had been distracted by a number of other priorities during the 1980s, not the least of which was the extraordinary erosion in state support and the University’s efforts to deal with this situation. Throughout the 1970s and early 1980s most quantitative indicators of the progress of affirmative action objectives were declining. Minority student enrollments had dropped, and key minority faculty had left. Although there were occasional expressions of concern about the lack of University progress on these fronts, these were not sufficient to reorder University priorities until the late 1980s.

By the late 1980s this had coalesced into a movement known as the Free South Africa Coordinating Committee, or FSACC, led by a small group of graduate students in the social sciences. The group built most of their activism around the case for divestment of University holdings of stock in corporations operating in South Africa. But there were other issues including demands that the University establish Martin Luther King Day as an official University holiday, that it re-evaluate the manner in which tenure was provided to minority faculty, and that it discard the normal admissions requirements such as the use of standardized test scores. Although such activism continued at a fairly vocal level, it was stable, and it did not escalate until a series of racist events occurred in early 1987. This activism was generally manifested in occasional rallies on the Diag, angry testimony to the Regents at public comments sessions, or letters to the editor of the Michigan Daily. But the decline in minority enrollments (with black enrollments at only 4%), coupled with the loss of several key minority faculty members, was driving a growing sense of concern and frustration on the part of minority students, faculty, and staff.

Smoldering racial tensions broke into flames with
the Shapiro’s return. The trigger event used by student activists was an incident in which an inexperienced disc jockey on the student-run closed-circuit radio station invited callers to tell their most offensive jokes, and a series of racially and gender offensive jokes were told on the air. Minority students and faculty were outraged. Hardly a week went by without a hostile newspaper article or an attack by a legislator. Due to widespread media coverage, the events on the Michigan campus were receiving broad national coverage. It was clear that it was only a matter of time before constituencies off campus were drawn directly into the campus activities. And sure enough, Jesse Jackson, who was then running for president, seized the opportunity provided by the Michigan unrest to visit the campus, bringing with him a new list of demands that coalesced in a major rally in Hill Auditorium on March 17, 1987.

As if this series of emotional incidents were not enough, an even more tragic event occurred the next day when one of the most prominent Regents of the University, Regent Sarah Power, fell to her death from Burton Tower. It was the last straw. The events of the winter term—the Legislative hearings on campus, the disruption of the Regents meeting, and the Jackson visit—had already put great pressure on Harold and Vivian Shapiro. The Sarah Power tragedy was a particularly harsh blow, since Regent Power had been a very close friend of the Shapiros.

Earlier in the year, Shapiro had been approached by Princeton University, first about the leadership of the Institute for Advanced Studies and then concerning the presidency of the university itself. He had responded on both occasions that he was not interested in leaving the University of Michigan. However, after the events in March, Princeton approached once again and Shapiro agreed to begin discussions with them and eventually reached agreement to accept the Princeton offer. In late April, shortly before University Commencement, Shapiro informed the Regents and Executive Officers of the University of his intent to leave.

Leading Behind the Scenes

When Shapiro’s announcement became public, two things happened almost immediately that dramatically changed our lives. First, there was a very rapid transfer of power from Harold Shapiro to me. Although Shapiro was determined to serve until the end of the year—in part to see through the completion of the current fund-raising campaign—it was also clear that he immediately was seen not only as a lame duck, but one destined to fly off to another pond. Anyone either on or off the campus who needed a decision or a commitment that would last beyond Shapiro’s final months came to me, as not only the second-ranking officer, but also one who would be in place to honor the commitment after Harold’s departure.

An aside here: We were to experience a different
situation following our own decision to step down from the Michigan presidency and return to the faculty in 1996. Although we had expected that we would almost certainly experience some erosion of power during my last year in the presidency as a lame duck, in reality I continued to experience the full authority of the presidency until my last day in office. Indeed, any difficult issue or decision continued to find its way to my desk for resolution until the end. In retrospect, I believe that this sharp contrast with Shapiro’s loss of power was due to the simple fact that the University community knew that we were committed to staying at Michigan. Hence, they continued to have full confidence in our leadership. The moment Harold and Vivian announced they were intending to leave Michigan for Princeton, they were immediately viewed as outsiders, no longer part of the Michigan family.

The second major change in our lives was the recognition, both on our parts and on the part of the University community, that we were now viewed as leading candidates to replace Harold and Vivian—whether we believed this would actually happen or not—and whether we wished it to happen or not. To understand this, it is useful to take a brief detour to describe the general character of the search for a university president.

The Presidential Search

The search for and selection of a university president is a fascinating process. Considering the growing importance of the university in a knowledge-based society and the complexity of this leadership role, one would expect that a rigorous and informed process would be used to select a university president. This is certainly the case for most other academic leadership positions (e.g., department chairs, deans, or executive officers), whose occupants are typically selected by experienced academic leaders, assisted by faculty search committees, and driven by the recognition that the fate of academic programs—not to mention their own careers—rests on the quality of their selection. Yet, at the highest level of academic leadership, the selection of a university president is the responsibility of a governing board of lay citizens, few with any appreciable experience in either academic matters or the management of large, complex organizations. This board is aided by a faculty advisory committee with similarly limited knowledge concerning the role of the contemporary university president.

The contrast of a presidential search with the selection of leadership in other sectors of our society, such as business or government, could not be more severe. In the business world, the search for a corporate chief executive officer is conducted by a board of directors, composed primarily of experienced business leaders who understand the business and make their selection in full recognition of their legal and fiduciary responsibility and their liability for shareholder value. In government, leaders are chosen by popular election, with candidates put under extensive public scrutiny by the media and voters. Yet the selection of a university president is conducted in relative secrecy, by those quite detached from academic experience, fiduciary responsibility, or accountability to those most affected by the decision—namely, students, faculty, staff, patients, and others dependent on the welfare of the institution.

Actually, the selection of a university president is most similar to a political campaign. The search is surrounded by an unusual degree of public interest, both within the university community and beyond. Various constituencies attempt to influence the search with their particular political views and agendas. While some view the most important challenge of selecting a new president as sustaining or enhancing academic quality as top priority, others are more concerned with the implications of new leadership for peripheral activities (e.g., the university’s athletic program), service activities, or perhaps even the university’s stance on controversial political issues (e.g., affirmative action or gay rights). Local news media frequently treat the search as they would a political race, complete with leaks and speculation from unnamed sources. The search is generally long—frequently at least a year—and often distracted by legal issues and constraints, such as sunshine laws. But the selection of a university president has one important distinction from a political campaign: those most affected by the outcome have no vote.
Meanwhile, Back in the Provost’s Office

Two new facts of our life—that we would, in reality, be playing the role of both provost and “behind-the-scenes president-in-effect”, and that we would be continually under the microscope as a presidential candidate—made for a very stressful period indeed. In fact, we later concluded that if we had known the trials and tribulations we would face during the extended interregnum of the presidential search, we probably would have decided that the best course would have been to simply make a Sherman statement and pull back from the search.

But, again, this too posed a problem. It rapidly became apparent that there would be only one internal candidate in the search—Jim Duderstadt. In fact, the search process itself essentially consisted of comparing one external candidate after another against me to see if I could be bested. Perhaps this was good training for the “western sheriff” character of the modern presidency, but it was also a bit unnerving. Nevertheless, within a very short period, we concluded that we were into the search process far too deeply, and that to withdraw would likely harm the University. We felt we had no choice but to stick it out until the end.

Part of the problem was the hapless nature of the search itself. The Regents were quite disorganized and spent the first several months skirmishing among themselves as to just who would lead the search and how they would organize it. They felt it important to educate themselves about the key issues in higher education and identify the leading candidates by traveling about the country talking with other university presidents. While this was a perfectly reasonable—indeed, laudable—objective, the personalities of several members of the board rapidly proceeded to turn off most of the qualified candidates. By mid-fall, the search was in a shambles.

As the faculty search committee became more and more frustrated with the behavior of the board, they were finally able to persuade the Regents to retain a search consultant, none other than Jerry Baker, who had conducted the earlier search that ended up selecting me for the provost. I was delighted. Jerry was a professional of extremely high standards and was quite familiar with the University. The fact that I knew Jerry quite well led to my hope that I would be able to track the progress of the search while paying most attention to my job of leading the academic programs and budget planning of the University.

Leading the University during this period was quite a challenge. Aside from an occasional phone conversation with Jerry Baker, I was quite cut off from the search and the Regents. The last months of the Shapiro administration were complex, consisting of efforts to hold together the executive officer team and maintain the University, without undercutting Harold and Vivian. And swirling about it all was the endless speculation as to whether I would succeed Harold Shapiro. Each of my decisions or actions was analyzed by others from this perspective.
Fleming Returns

By early fall it became apparent that the search process was simply not moving ahead rapidly enough to have a new president selected and ready to go by the time Shapiro left for Princeton. The Regents turned their attention to the selection of an interim president, and they—and the University—were fortunate in being able to convince Robben Fleming to return for a few months. We were delighted by this choice, since we had great respect for the Flemings. Fleming was identified as the interim choice in the fall, which gave him an opportunity to come up to speed on the many issues affecting the University. It also provided me with ample opportunity to work with him and develop a close relationship that would be essential to operating smoothly through the transition.

While it was a duty above and beyond the call, I had the sense that Fleming was actually rather excited to be returning to the fray. He was wise enough to realize that there was no way that he could master in such a short period the many complex issues involving the University or the many details required for its management. Fleming decided at an early stage to focus his personal efforts on a few issues that aligned with his strengths, and then rely on his executive officer team to handle the other details. Key among these were resolving the racial tensions that had developed during the last years of the Shapiro administration, the issue of a student disciplinary policy, and two key searches: athletic director and chief financial officer.

While Fleming recognized that in many ways I would be running the University behind the scenes, our relationship was such that if he felt that I was headed in the wrong direction, he would tell me immediately so that we could re-evaluate, and if necessary, make course corrections. Working with Bob Fleming also gave me an opportunity to learn from his extraordinary people skills, particularly in handling adversarial situations.

However, the fall was a very exhausting period for us. When the Christmas break came, and the Shapiros packed off for Princeton, we were not at all disappointed to hold down the fort in Ann Arbor and let Bob Fleming lead the Michigan delegation to the annual bowl trek. Instead, after Christmas, we took our own break to California to spend several days in Carmel.

Crunch-Time

While we enjoyed working with Bob and Sally Fleming, the first half of 1988 continued to be very difficult for us. The task of maintaining the momentum of the University during the transition period was difficult. The newspapers carried continual speculation about the presidential search, including various rumors about the list of candidates.

During the search process, both of us were asked to participate in a series of interviews for the presidency. I first met with the joint faculty-student-alumni committee. Then we both were asked to dine with the Regents comprising the search committee at Inglis House. We understood that several external candidates were undergoing a similar process. But there were some unusual aspects of being an internal candidate. At one point Paul Brown, who as senior Regent was chairing the search, asked me if I would be willing to meet independently with Regent Deane Baker. He said that Baker had grown increasingly hostile to me, in part because of my strong stance on affirmative action, and it was Brown’s hope that having the two of us meet together could iron this out. I agreed, and a clandestine meeting between Baker and me was held in the Campus Inn—in the Ohio State suite, no less. The meeting was bizarre, with Baker stressing his belief that the Regents were, in effect, the University of Michigan, and the rest of University community—faculty and staff—were simply hired hands. It was clear from the discussion that Baker was manipulative, and he wanted to assure himself that he could control me if I ended up as president. (I doubt if he found much support for that influence from our conversation.)

As the search approached its final stages in late spring, the papers became more active. And, ironically enough, the Regents began to isolate their search consultant, Jerry Baker, from their activities so that he was increasingly in the dark. We knew the Regents had narrowed the search to five candidates: Vartan Gregorian, head of the New York Public Library; Walter Massey, vice president at the University of Chicago and director of Argonne National Laboratory; Steve Sample, President at SUNY-Buffalo; James Baker, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury (and an ultra-conservative Republican that the Regents had agreed
One colleague thought he knew the outcome...

to leave on the list to humor Deane Baker); and me. However, in reality, it was also clear that the search had actually narrowed to Gregorian and me. Gregorian was flamboyant and charming—although without either the experience or management skills to handle an institution of Michigan’s size and complexity. But it was also clear that his conversational skills and his jovial sense of humor had mesmerized several Regents. He was about as sharp a contrast with my style as one could imagine.

During the final days of the search, the rumors were running rampant that the Regents had made their decision to go with Gregorian and were in the process of negotiation. At the time, we were at our daughter Susan’s graduation at Yale, and phone calls back to Bob Fleming and Jerry Baker did not do much to clarify the situation. We were completely in the dark. Fleming felt that the Regents failure to keep me in the loop—both as provost and the lead internal candidate—was inexcusable. But he also said that his own dealings with the Board convinced him that many of the Regents tended to overlook the impact of their activities on members of the University community.

These were rather depressing times for us. It was not that we had any real desire for the presidency. It was rather the recognition of our vulnerability. We had played a highly visible role in leading the University and sustaining its momentum since Harold Shapiro’s announcement of his resignation. If another candidate was selected—particularly one as profoundly different as Gregorian—there would be strong pressure on us not only to step down from the Provost position, but probably even to leave the University. We had long realized that one of the hazards of moving up the pyramid of academic administration was that there was less and less room as one moved toward the top. We had been fortunate in being able to stay at Michigan as we made the ascent (descent?) from faculty member to dean to provost, but now that Harold had left, there was only one position left for me in the University: the presidency.

Of course, we had been approached about leadership roles in many other institutions since the early days as Dean of Engineering. But we felt for many reasons, including the stability we wanted to provide our family, that we should stay at Michigan. By the time we approached the presidential transition, we realized that the best way to make certain we stayed at Michigan was for me to become president.

But from the rumors reported in the newspapers and the total silence from the Regents, we concluded that this was probably not in the cards. Then, the Sunday afternoon after we had returned from our daughter Susan’s commencement in New Haven, I received a mysterious phone call from Regent Paul Brown, asking if I could meet him the next day at Inglis House. But there was absolutely no indication of the reason for the meeting. I called Jerry Baker that evening, and he too was totally in the dark. Both decided that the odds were about equal between two possibilities. Either I would...
be offered the presidency or told that Gregorian would be the next president.

So the next day, Monday, I went out to Inglis House, prepared for either possibility. I was met by Paul Brown and Tom Roach. After about 15 seconds of chitchat, they said that they were authorized by the Board of Regents to offer me the presidency. Not being one to beat about the bush, I replied immediately that Anne and I had made a personal commitment that if I were going to remain in the search until the end, it would be with the understanding that if offered the position, I would accept it. But then I also said that there was another party that had to confirm this decision—Anne—since the presidency was a two-person position. I felt it important that they make a similar request to Anne. They agreed, and I then called Anne.

Anne had also realized that the Inglis House meeting could go either way. When I asked her to come out to join me, she expressed some relief—but also some anxiety. Nevertheless, she went over the Inglis House, and together, we agreed together to accept the presidency. We really had no choice!

However, there was a technicality here. In an effort to comply with the state’s Open Meeting’s Act, the Regents had utilized a process of forming a sub-quorum subcommittee to conduct the actual search. They believed that to comply with the Act, it was best to conduct a public meeting of the full Board, in which I would be interviewed, then the search subcommittee would submit its recommendation, and the formal vote would be taken. In accordance with the Regents’ Bylaws, they would have to post the announcement of this formal meeting 48 hours before it could occur. So the earliest this process could be concluded would be on Thursday.

Amazingly enough, we were able to keep a lid on this until the day of the Regent’s meeting. In fact, the only potential leak might have been just that. The day before the meeting, a plumber fixing the kitchen sink in our house overheard me having a phone conversation to confirm details of the Regents’ meeting. He assured us that plumbers fix leaks—even “presidential leaks”—not spread them.

The next day, just prior to the Regents’ meeting, I pulled the staff of the Provost’s Office together and briefed them on the matter. There were probably more sighs of relief than sad farewells, since they too understood the alternatives all too well. The Regents’ meeting itself was relatively non-eventful. As Tom Roach said, the interview itself consisted largely of tossing me a few softballs, e.g., “What do you think the largest challenges facing the University are?” Each Regent had the opportunity to ask a question, and then Paul Brown, as chair of the search committee, introduced a resolution to appoint me as the 11th president of the University, and the Regents approved it unanimously.

Since the Regents’ meeting was public, there were enough folks in attendance to require the use of the anteroom. Beyond our daughters, Susan, and Kathy, there were a number of our friends on the faculty. There were also a number of University personalities, such as Bo Schembechler. ( Needless to say, Bo stole the headlines with statements such as, “He was my choice!”).

In general, there was a very positive reception to the selection, both on the campus and in the media. We were well known to the University community, and there seemed to be a sense of confidence in the direction that we would lead.

Back to the final stages of the search, for a moment, however. There had been a great deal of speculation as to whether the Regents did decide first to offer the position to Vartan Gregorian before falling back to me. It is known that Deane Baker, in his typically maverick fashion, called Gregorian and threatened him with lack of support. Gregorian soon afterwards accepted the presidency of Brown University. In a conversation
with me years later, Gregorian told me that Deane Baker tried to discourage him from considering the position. In fact, after Baker threatened Gregorian over the phone, he also asked to speak to his wife to threaten her as well. But Gregorian’s decision to pull out of the search went beyond Baker and involved his own assessment of the intensely political nature of the Michigan Board of Regents and the difficulty he would have working with them. He felt that it would be very difficult to provide the strong leadership necessary for the presidency of a University as complex as Michigan with a board that viewed their role more as politically elected “governors” of the University rather than trustees supporting the institution and its president. He was also concerned by the deep divisions on the Board and its wild oscillations with each election of new Regents.

Gregorian’s view was not unlike that of many others both within and external to the University. Indeed, shortly after I had been selected as president, I was visited by an editor of the Detroit Free Press, Joe Stroud. Stroud was a long time resident of Ann Arbor and a good friend of Bob Fleming and Harold Shapiro. He told me that his greatest fear for the University concerned the dangers posed by its Board of Regents, and he felt that this would be my biggest challenge. This concern was shared by most of the deans and executive officers of the University. Although most members of the board were dedicated public servants committed to the welfare of the University, because of its small size, one maverick could easily destabilize it.

Tinker, tailor, soldier, sailor; rich man, poor man, beggar man, thief,...and university president!

In an effort to better explain how we saw the commitment we had made in accepting Michigan’s offer of the presidency, it is useful to review briefly the nature of the job itself...actually for both of us, since it was clearly a two-person job, for both the president and his or her “significant other”, the politically correct term used at the time for the spouse.

Many people would probably regard a university presidency as the ideal career, where one is highly admired, heavily pampered, and leads a life of luxury comparable to that of an English lord. To be sure, university presidents have many exciting experiences and meet some fascinating people. However, those contemplating such careers for the perks and luxuries should take caution, because not only are these few and far between, but they are accompanied by some serious drawbacks.

True, a university president may live in a large mansion, but for many presidents, this is more a place of work than a pleasant residence. With the increased public scrutiny of such roles, many presidential families have found themselves assuming roles of caretakers and even servants in the presidential residence, in addition to their responsibilities as hosts for university events. What about all of those perks like a box at the football games and center-row orchestra seats at concerts and theatrical events? To the president, an athletic event is a working assignment with the primary objective of
raising money from donors or lobbying politicians for the university’s interests. Who had the time to watch the game while entertaining, persuading, and cajoling potential donors or lobbying politicians?

To be sure, a university presidency can be a very satisfying assignment. You get to meet lots of interesting people, and you are working on behalf of an important social institution. But the presidency is certainly not a lifestyle for the rich and famous, as Chapter 10 will demonstrate.

Universities, like other institutions, depend on strong leadership and effective management to face the challenges and opportunities posed by an ever-changing world. Yet in many universities, the tasks of management and even leadership are held in very low regard, particularly by the faculty. To both students and faculty alike, the term university administration has a sinister connotation, like federal government or bureaucracy or corporate organization. Although many outside academe view a university president as the top rung in the academic ladder, many faculty members would rank it near the bottom, suggesting that anyone aspiring to such a position is surely lacking in intellectual ability, good judgment, and perhaps even moral integrity. In fact, one occasionally hears the suggestion—usually from one of the more outspoken members of the faculty—that any strong academic, chosen at random, could become an adequate university president. The argument is that if one can be a strong teacher and scholar, these skills should be easily transferable to other areas, such as institutional leadership. Yet, in reality, talent in leadership is probably as rare a human attribute as the ability to contribute to original scholarship. There is little reason to suspect that talent in one characteristic implies the presence of talent in another.

There are actually several decidedly different flavors of university president. Most commonly, we think of the role as that of the leader of a university campus. But such a campus may be a component of a larger university system, in which case the campus executive is usually entitled a “chancellor” and reports to a system chief executive officer known as the “president.” The campus president/chancellor has a complex array of roles, involving not only executive responsibilities for the academic programs, business, and service activities (e.g., hospitals and football teams) of the campus but also important external roles, such as private fund-raising and public relations. In contrast, the president of the university system usually focuses on managing the relationship with political bodies (e.g., state government and the university governing board), along, of course, with bearing the responsibility for hiring and firing campus chancellors.

Michigan is a bit of an oddity here, since the president is both leader of the Ann Arbor campus and head of a system including campuses at Flint and Dearborn, both of which also have chancellors. While this dual role as president of the UM system and chancellor of the Ann Arbor campus greatly enhances the authority of the position, it also doubles the headaches, because the president is responsible for national, state, community,
and regent politics; fund-raising; student and faculty concerns; and intercollegiate athletics.

University presidents are expected to develop, articulate, and implement visions that sustain and enhance their institutions’ academic quality and reputation, an activity that involves a broad array of academic, social, financial, and political issues that envelope a university. Through their roles as the chief executive officers of their institutions, university presidents have significant managerial responsibilities for a diverse collection of activities, ranging from education to student housing to health care to public entertainment (e.g., intercollegiate athletics). Since these generally require the expertise and experience of talented professionals, the president is the university’s chief recruiter, identifying talented people, recruiting them into key university positions, and directing and supporting their activities.

In fact, one of the most common causes of a failed presidency arises from an inability to build a strong leadership team or an unwillingness to delegate adequate authority and responsibility to those more capable of handling the myriad details of university management. Unlike most corporate chief executive officers, however, the president is expected also to play an active marketing role in generating the resources needed by the university, whether by lobbying state and federal governments, seeking gifts and bequests from alumni and friends, or launching clever entrepreneurial efforts. There is an implicit expectation on most campuses that the president’s job is to raise money for the provost and deans to spend, while the chief financial officer and administrative staff watch over their shoulders to make certain this is done wisely and prudently.

The university president also has a broad range of important responsibilities that might best be termed symbolic leadership. In a sense, the president and spouse are the first family of the university community, in many ways serving as the mayor of a small city of thousands of students, faculty, and staff. This public leadership role is particularly important when the university is very large. As the university’s most visible leader, the president must continually grapple with the diverse array of political and social issues and interests of concern to many stakeholders of higher education.

Moral leadership is also an important responsibility. Although it is sometimes suggested that the moral voice of the president died with the giants of the past—Angell (Michigan), Eliot (Harvard), and Wayland (Brown)—it is clear that the contemporary university continues to need leadership capable and willing to address moral issues, such as integrity, social purpose, and the primacy of academic values. Moreover presidents must understand and respect the history of their university, its long-standing values and traditions, if they are to be successful.

Finally, the president is expected to be a defender of the university and its fundamental qualities of knowledge and wisdom, truth and freedom, academic excellence and public purpose—an advocate for the immense importance of higher education to society. The forces of darkness threatening the university are many, both on and off the campus. Whether dealing with an attack launched by an opportunistic politician, the personal agenda of a trustee, a student disruption, or a scandal in intercollegiate athletics, the president is expected to take up arms and defend the integrity of the institution. Needless to say, this knightly role carries with it certain hazards. The buck always stops at the president’s desk.

So where does one find candidates with the skills to fit such an unusual position? Although the early leaders of American colleges were drawn primarily from teaching or religious vocations, one finds today’s university presidents drawn from almost every discipline, profession, and career. They include not only academics but also leaders from government and business. Law professors were popular in the 1960s, with the need to mediate student disruptions and handle the complex relationships with state and federal government. Economists are particularly in vogue these days, perhaps because universities are once again under considerable financial stress. In these times of technological change and a knowledge-driven economy, one also finds an increasing number of university presidents drawn from the ranks of scientists and engineers. University presidents from professional disciplines, such as business and medicine, are less common, perhaps because these professional schools are usually so wealthy and powerful in contemporary research universities that the faculty is afraid to “put a
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The many roles of the university president
cat into the canary cage” by supporting the appointment of a dean of a medical or business school as university leader. Presidents of major universities are also rarely selected from education schools, because these programs are generally viewed as focused primarily on primary and secondary education.

As one looks more broadly across the landscape of American higher education, it is increasingly common to find governing boards selecting presidents with nonacademic backgrounds, such as business, government, or politics. This might be explained, in part, by the increasing financial and management complexity of the contemporary university or, in the case of public universities, by complex relationships with state and federal government. But cynics could also suggest that the selection of presidents from beyond the academy may reflect the increasing discomfort of many governing boards with “academic types” who stress academic values, such as academic freedom and tenure, rather than cost-effectiveness and productivity. Generally, however, the most distinguished institutions still demand that those considered for presidential leadership have demonstrated achievement within academic circles. Otherwise, the university faculty is unlikely to take their leadership seriously.

Fortunately, my earlier experiences at the University of Michigan had prepared me well for most of these duties. As a faculty member, I had been fortunate to have joined an academic program, the Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering, generally ranked #1 or #2 (to MIT) in the world. My achievements as a teacher, scholar, and author had been awarded numerous national awards and propelled me rapidly through the faculty ranks. As a dean, I had been responsible for one of the largest academic units in the University, its College of Engineering. And as provost, I had not only served as both chief academic officer and chief budget officer for the University, but I had also had the benefit of having as mentors two of the most able university presidents of the 20th Century, Robben Fleming and Harold Shapiro!

The President’s Spouse

Although unwritten in the university contract for a president, there has long been an expectation that the president’s spouse will be a full participant in presidential activities. Much like the presidency of the United States or the governorship of a state, a university presidency is really a two-person job, although generally only one partner gets paid and recognized in an employment sense. At many universities, such as Michigan, the First Lady of the university is expected to play an important role not only as the symbolic host of presidential events—and perhaps also as the symbolic mom of the student body—but in actually planning and managing a complex array of events, facilities, and staff. These responsibilities include hosting dignitaries visiting the campus; organizing almost daily events for faculty, students, and staff; and managing entertainment facilities, such as the President’s House or the hospitality areas of the football stadium.

Throughout the University of Michigan’s history, the spouse of the president has played an important role. Julia Tappan provided strong leadership for the frontier community of Ann Arbor and was affectionately called “Mrs. Chancellor.” Sarah Angell was strongly supportive of women on campus and was instrumental in launching the Women’s League. Nina Burton started the Faculty Women’s Club and served as its first president. Mary Hutchins, Florence Ruthven, Anne Hatcher, and Sally Fleming all played key roles in building a sense of community on campus—hosting students, faculty, and visitors. In addition to her role as a faculty member in the School of Social Work, Vivian Shapiro provided important leadership for the university’s fund-raising activities, taking the lead in raising funds to expand Tappan Hall.

This partnership nature of the university presidency continues to be important in today’s era of fund-raising, political influence, and campus community building. Yet the spouse’s role is rarely recognized formally in terms of appointment or compensation—at least in public universities—although participation by the spouse is clearly expected by governing boards and university communities alike (just as the American public expects of the spouse in the Washington White House). The role of the presidential spouse is an archaic form of indentured servitude that goes with the territory at most universities.

Looking across the higher education landscape, there are several approaches that presidential spouses
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can take to this challenge. Perhaps the simplest approach is a passive one—to just sit back and enjoy life as royalty. Here, the idea is to simply show up when you are supposed to, smile politely at guests, and let the staff take care of all the details, while you enjoy the accoutrements of the position. Of course, since the perks of today’s university presidency are few and far between, such a royal lifestyle has become a bit threadbare on many campuses. Moreover, giving the staff total control over presidential events can sometimes lead to embarrassment, if not disaster. But the laissez-faire approach is certainly one option.

The other extreme would be a take-charge approach, in which presidential spouses decide that rather than accept a merely symbolic role (with their calendar and activities determined by staff), they will become a more active partner with the president. Not only do these spouses assume major responsibility for planning, managing, and hosting presidential events, but they also sometimes become important participants in institution-wide strategy development in such areas as fund-raising and building the campus community.

A third approach that is increasingly common today is simply to reject any involvement whatsoever in presidential activities (as if to say, “A pox on you! I’m not a ‘first’ anything!”) and pursue an independent career. Although this is understandable in an era of dual-career families, it also can be awkward at times in view of the long tradition of university presidencies. In reality, many spouses with professional careers do double duty, participating fully in the presidency while attempting to maintain their careers, at considerable personal sacrifice. This may be particularly true, for example, of a First Gentleman, since many universities are now led by women. While many male spouses have independent careers, some have joined in partnerships with their presidential mates in advancing the interests of their university.

Fortunately, in our case, Anne and I had long approached university leadership positions, whether as dean, provost, or soon as president, as true partnerships. To be sure, Anne faced a formidable challenge of being thrust into the role as the university’s First Lady, responsible for the myriad of events, facilities, and staff associated with the president’s role in institutional development. Beyond the responsibility for creating, designing, managing, and hosting the hundreds of presidential events each year, Anne would manage several major facilities—the President’s House; the Inglis Highlands estate, and the reception and hosting areas at Michigan Stadium—as well as a large number of staff. Fortunately, her earlier university experiences as president of the Michigan Faculty Women’s Club and through our roles as dean and provost had prepared her well for such a role. Through these efforts, she had developed considerable experience in designing, organizing, and conducting events and gained an intimate knowledge of both university facilities and staff. She also had developed a keen sense of just what one could accomplish in terms of quality and efficiency within the very real budget constraints faced by a public university.

Anne believed that since the image of the university, as well as the president, would be influenced by the quality of an event, it was important that the hosts (i.e., the president and First Lady) be involved in key details of planning the event. Furthermore, she realized that running these many events on automatic pilot would inevitably lead to significant deterioration in quality over time, a rubber-chicken syndrome. She also realized that by raising the expectations for quality at the presidential level, there would likely be a cascade effect in which other events throughout the university would be driven to develop higher quality standards. The challenge was to do this while simultaneously reducing costs. In effect, Anne launched one of the university’s early total quality management efforts in the arena of presidential events. While she was able to recruit and lead a talented staff, she also participated in all aspects of the activities, from planning to arrangements, from working with caterers to designing seating plans, from welcoming guests to cleaning up afterward. No job was too large or too small, and her very high standards were applied to all.

While Anne’s direct involvement in all aspects of presidential events was perhaps unusual, there remains today an expectation that the presidential spouse will be a partner in advancing the interests of the university. There is a certain inequity in the expectation of such uncompensated spousal service, and this expectation is an additional constraint placed on those seeking to serve as university presidents. But it is important to
understand that even in these times of dual careers and the ascendency of women to leadership roles, the university presidency remains a two-person job.

The Search Is Finally Over! What’s Next?

Several months earlier we had been invited by Bob Forman, Director of the UM Alumni Association, to accompany a group to the Michigan Alumni Camp in Switzerland in late June. Hence, a week after the selection as president, the Duderstadt family was able to get away from the aftermath of the search and trek off to the high Swiss Alps surrounding Crans-Montana and Zermatt. In fact, the only formal communication with the University during this trip was a fax reporting that the Michigan Court of Appeals had ruled against the Ann Arbor News and the Detroit Free Press challenge of the process the Regents used in the presidential search and concluded that they had had indeed fully complied with the Open Meetings Act.

The difficult task of leading the University through a transition between presidents had come to an end. And despite the long and somewhat confusing presidential search, we took pride that we had not only been able to keep the University on track during the transition, but also actually made some significant progress on an array of issues ranging from race relations to resource allocation to intercollegiate athletics. There was a certain personal toll, since we both entered the presidency a bit weary from this task. But our relief in being able to stay at Michigan and our excitement about the challenges and opportunities ahead, kept us in high spirits. (Perhaps, our blissful ignorance about just how challenging the months ahead also played an important role in helping us to approach our new roles with a spirit of optimism.)
Fortunately, we had arranged early in the year with Alumni Director Bob Forman to attend his Swiss Camp in Crans-Montana. It gave our family a much-needed break after the search.
Chapter 5

The First Year

The first year of a new presidency is always characterized both by excitement and unpredictability. Since we had been at the University for almost 20 years and furthermore had been serving in key University leadership roles for some time, Anne and I faced far less of a challenge in making the transition to the presidency. We were well steeped in the traditions and values of the University. Furthermore, since we had long standing relationships with the executive officers, deans, faculty, and staff, there were relatively few personnel decisions to make at the outset—aside from the important selection of a new provost.

After discussing the matter with Bob Fleming and the Regents, I set September 1, 1988 as my official start date, with October 4th selected for the inauguration. This would give us the summer months to get ready for the presidency, while finishing off the year’s remaining responsibilities as provost.

Preparing for the Transition

The summer was a busy one. I still had to complete the preparation of the budget in my role as provost. In this effort, Bob Fleming and I also had to beat back an effort by the governor to freeze the University’s tuition levels. Bob tried to be as helpful as possible in the transition. After consulting with me, he took the lead (and the heat) in putting into place during his last Regents’ meeting the “speech code”. While there would be relatively few personnel changes at the outset, both Bob and I realized that some changes needed to be made. Although Bob was willing to be the bad guy, I
felt it more appropriate that as incoming president, I should assume the responsibility for these actions.

The two most significant appointments would be a new provost and a new chief financial officer. Fortunately, the search for a VPCFO had moved ahead during Fleming’s interim presidency, with my strong participation, with an outstanding result: Farris Womack, an experienced CFO from the University of North Carolina. Since I had been involved in the search, Farris was comfortable with my selection as president, and he moved to Michigan to assume his new role at the same time that I started my presidency. The second key position, that of provost, would require an extensive search and consultation with the faculty. Hence I asked my Associate Vice President, Bob Holbrook, to wear the hat of interim provost during the search, although both of us (and the rest of the University) knew that I would be doing both the job of the president and much of the provost until the search was completed. During the course of the fall term, a faculty search process led me to select my old colleague, Chuck Vest, as provost. (Unfortunately, Chuck was only to serve for a year before being named president of MIT.)

Anne faced a different set of transition challenges for the summer months. A decision had been made to renovate the mechanical systems in the President’s House between presidencies, although both of us (and the rest of the University) knew that I would be doing both the job of the president and much of the provost until the search was completed. During the course of the fall term, a faculty search process led me to select my old colleague, Chuck Vest, as provost. (Unfortunately, Chuck was only to serve for a year before being named president of MIT.)

Anne faced a different set of transition challenges for the summer months. A decision had been made to renovate the mechanical systems in the President’s House between presidencies, and much of the house was torn apart during the summer as contractors installed new heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems. The house was also scheduled for a series of modifications to make it handicap-accessible: a new side entrance ramp and a new handicap-accessible bathroom next to the library. Finally, a small amount had been budgeted to replace the carpet in the house, under the control of the interior design staff in the Plant Department. Although Anne entered the project too late to correct the design flaws in the HVAC and handicap-accessible projects—which were considerable and later to cause significant problems—she was able to capture control of the interior design effort and redirect it away from simply replacing the carpet and some of the furnishings.

She also faced a significant challenge in staffing presidential activities and events. This had long been a problem in earlier years, with constant turnover in the staff for the President’s House and Inglis House. During the Fleming interim period, the decision had been made to simply let the Plant Department handle the custodial duties. Both houses had full-time managers, full-time cooks, and other staff for maintenance, gardening, and events. In addition, one of the secretaries in the President’s Office had been assigned responsibilities for supporting the president’s spouse. The cost, efficiency, and quality of this operation left much to be desired, and Anne faced the challenge of developing a new system.

During August, I disappeared to my old North Campus office to begin to put together my strategy
for the University. A word here about this North Campus retreat. Shortly after I had moved over to the Fleming Building in the role of provost, the College of Engineering had moved the Engineering Dean’s office from its temporary space in the Chrysler Center to grander quarters in the new Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Building. Since my old dean’s office—consisting of two small rooms and access to a conference room—was vacant, I persuaded Chuck Vest to let me continue to use this space as my “faculty office” in Engineering. Since the office was adjacent to the College of Engineering computing center, it had very strong computer support and network connectivity. This office was to prove invaluable as backup command center when the Fleming Building was under siege, e.g., from student protests or media attention. It provided the perfect retreat for my effort to plan the early stages of my presidency.

During the month of August, I used the office to lay out the key elements of my presidency. I wrote the key speeches I would be making during the year ahead to introduce my agenda, including my inauguration address. The walls of my office were covered with ideas and outlines for the themes for the years ahead and my vision for the future of the University.

In the meantime, Anne played a key role in the design of the Inauguration itself. Although many presidents, including me, would prefer to skip the formalities altogether, universities have long recognized the wisdom of inauguration events. Not only did they provide a new president with an opportunity to lay out a vision for the future, to set the tone, but inaugurations also provided the university with visibility, attracting leaders from other universities, government, and business.

My inauguration fell during a particularly busy period in early October. During the week, the Rackham School of Graduate Studies held its 50th anniversary events, with a major conference on Michigan’s scholarly tradition (kicked off by an address on innovative scholarship by me). It was also the week of the annual faculty awards ceremony and the State of the University address given by the president.

And it was the week prior to the Michigan-Michigan State football game, ensuring that most of state government would be in attendance at the inauguration.

I wasted little time in setting out my vision for the University during the week of inauguration activities.

The Early Agenda

Fortunately, much of my activity as provost had involved leading broad planning efforts within the University. In countless meetings with faculty, students, and staff on campus, augmented with numerous discussions with external constituents, I began to focus on three themes for the future: knowledge, globalization, and diversity. Knowledge was becoming increasingly important as the key to growth and change. Information and telecommunications technologies were quickly breaking down barriers between nations and economies, producing an increasingly interdependent global community. As barriers disappeared and new groups entered the main stream of life, particularly in America, isolation, intolerance, and separation had to give way to pluralism and diversity. A new, dynamic world was emerging. If the University wanted to maintain the leadership position it had enjoyed for close to two centuries, it had to not only adapt to life in that world, but to lead the effort to define the very nature of the university for the century ahead.

I was aware of the long-held belief that each of the earlier presidents of the University seems to have been chosen—or perhaps was molded—by the challenges
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of the times. The 1950s and 1960s had been a time of dramatic growth, and Harlan Hatcher had led the great expansion of the University as it doubled in size and added two regional campuses. The late 1960s and 1970s were a time of great unrest in America, and Robben Fleming’s wise and experienced leadership had protected the University and its fundamental values during these difficult times. While Harold Shapiro had positioned the University to adapt to a future of declining state support, his most important impact was in a different area. As both Vice President for Academic Affairs and then as President, Shapiro’s commitment to academic excellence was intense and unrelenting. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to state that during Shapiro’s era, the University first committed itself to serious academic excellence and developed a determination to compete with the finest universities in America for the very best faculty, students, and programs.

But we sought something beyond excellence. We embraced the University’s heritage of leadership, first as it defined the nature of public higher education in the late 19th century, and then again as it evolved into a comprehensive research university to serve the latter 20th century. I became convinced that to pursue a destiny of leadership for the 21st century, academic excellence in traditional terms, while necessary, was not sufficient. Beyond this, true leadership would demand that the University would have to transform itself once again, to serve a rapidly changing society and a dramatically changed world. And it was this combination of leadership and excellence that I placed as a vision and challenge to the University.

The challenges to this vision of leadership were great. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, state support of the University had deteriorated to the point where it provided less than 20% of the University’s academic resource base. The Ann Arbor campus, ranking then as the nation’s largest with over 26 million square feet of space, was in desperate need of extensive renovation or replacement of inadequate facilities. Although the fund-raising efforts of the 1980s had been impressive, the University still lagged far behind most of its peers, with an endowment of only $200 M, clearly inadequate for the size and scope of the institution. There were an array of other concerns, including the representation and role of women and minorities in the University community, campus safety, and student rights and responsibilities. So, too, the relationships between the University and its various external constituencies—state government, federal government, the Ann Arbor community, the media, and the public-at-large—needed strengthening. And all of these challenges would have to be met while addressing an unusually broad and deep turnover in University leadership, in which many executive officer, dean, and director positions throughout the institution would change.

A Philosophy of Leadership

There are numerous approaches to university leadership. Some presidents adopt a fatalistic approach, believing that the university is basically unmanageable. They instead focus their attention on a small set of issues, usually tactical in nature, and let the institution essentially evolve in a nondirected fashion in other areas. For example, they might pick a few things to
fix every few years or so--state relations or private fundraising or student life. This laissez faire approach assumes that the university will do fine on its own. And most institutions can drift along for a time without strategic direction.

Over a longer period of time, however, a series of tactical decisions will dictate a de facto strategy that may not be in the long-range interests of the university. At Michigan, for example, a sequence of such tactical resource allocation decisions during the 1960s led to an investment in a number of programs, e.g., dentistry, education, natural resources, that were to experience major enrollment losses in the 1970s. Because the University did not have adequate mechanisms in place to adjust resources as enrollments dropped, these led to serious problems by the 1980s when resources became more limited. While these decisions leading to selective growth in these units may have responded to the tactical situation at the time, they were not guided by a broader strategic vision of the future of the University.

I believed that a far more strategic approach to leadership was necessary for the last decade of the 20th Century. I also preferred a far more opportunistic approach to leadership. To this end, I aimed at developing flexible strategies that avoided rigid paths (“deep ruts”). These would best position the University to take advantage of windows of opportunity to pursue well-defined objectives. In a sense, we utilized an informed dead-reckoning approach, in which my leadership team selected its strategic objectives (where the University wanted to go) and then followed which ever path seemed appropriate at the time, possibly shifting paths as strategic plans were updated and as additional information and experience indicated.

Perhaps, because of my background as both a scientist and an engineer, my leadership style had an additional characteristic. I never assumed that the planning framework was rigid. Rather, I believed that what might appear first as constraints could, with skill and cleverness, frequently, be transformed into opportunities. The key was to begin with the challenging question of asking what one could do to modify the planning environment, to never accept the status quo as limiting the University’s options.

I realized that it was not appropriate (or possible) to manage centrally an institution of the size, complexity, and diversity as the University of Michigan. But I did believe in the importance of establishing institutional priorities and goals and instituting a process that encouraged leadership at all levels of the University to move toward these objectives. I sought an organization with strong decentralization of authority, but strong central strategic direction and information.

My approach to leadership involved three quite distinct phases of consultation, positioning, and transformation.

Phase I: Consultation

The early phase involved setting the themes of challenge, opportunity, responsibility, and excitement. During this phase, we spent much of our time meeting with various constituencies both on and off campus--with students, faculty, and staff, with alumni and friends, with people throughout the state, the nation, and the world. We listened carefully to their aspirations and concerns, challenging them, and attempting to build a sense of excitement and optimism about the future of the University, in hundreds of meetings both on and off campus. This was a period of listening, learning, and thinking.

We sensed the extraordinary quality and excitement “out in the trenches”, among the faculty staff, and students of the University. We found individuals deeply committed to quality teaching, scholarship, and service. And we began to understand more clearly the very special nature of the University of Michigan, of its extraordinary intellectual breadth and the diversity of teaching and research.

Phase II: Positioning

The second phase of the Duderstadt leadership, while not so public, was far more proactive. Together with dozens of groups, comprised of hundreds of faculty, staff, and consultants, a strategic plan was developed to position the University for a leadership role. This plan, given the code name Vision 2000, was then executed through a broad array of initiatives.

During this period some of the most important strategic directions of the University were established: e.g., the Michigan Mandate, rebuilding the University,
financial restructuring, the Campaign for Michigan, state and federal relations strategies, the research environment, the undergraduate experience, and student life. Associated with these initiatives was the recruitment and appointment of key leaders at various levels of the University, from executive officers and deans, to chairs and directors.

Largely as a result of these efforts, the University would grow rapidly in strength, quality, and diversity during the early 1990s. One by one, the various goals of my strategy began to be achieved. Yet, even as the strategy was executed and the university moved ahead, there were growing concerns. To be sure, it would be possible to take great pride in what the Michigan family—faculty, students, staff, alumni, and friends—would accomplish during the early years of the Duderstadt administration. Working together, Michigan would be positioned as one of the leading universities in the world. But increasingly I realized that the University had been strengthened within a 20th Century paradigm, and that this century was rapidly coming to an end.

Hence, I began to challenge the University, to question whether the university that had been built, the paradigms in which it had so excelled, would remain relevant in a rapidly changing world. The America of the twentieth century was a nation characterized by a homogeneous, domestic, industrialized society—an America of the past. Our students would inherit a far different nation—a highly pluralistic, knowledge-intensive, world-nation that would be the America of the twenty-first century.

It was during this second phase that I became increasingly convinced that higher education was entering a period of significant change. Hence by the early 1990s, I began to shift the University into a third phase, evolving from a positioning effort to a transformation agenda.

Phase III: Transformation

I became increasingly convinced that the University faced a pivotal moment in its history, a fork in the road. Taking one path could, with commitment, preserve the University as a distinguished—indeed, a great—university, but only one among many such institutions. However I believed there was another path, a path that would require great vision and courage in addition to dedication and commitment. By taking this second path, the University would seek not only to sustain its quality and distinction, but it would seek to achieve leadership as well.

I believed the University could—and should—accept its heritage of leadership in public higher education by taking this second path. I saw the 1990s and beyond as a time similar to that extraordinary period in the late 19th century when the University of Michigan was a primary source for much of the innovation and leadership for higher education. I became convinced that the University had the opportunity to influence the development of a new paradigm of what the university would become in 21st Century America, a new model capable of responding to the changing needs of both the state and the nation. But this would require clear vision, an unusual commitment to excellence, and strong leadership.

Hence the strategic focus shifted from building a great 20th Century university to transforming Michigan into a 21st Century institution. A series of key initiatives were launched that were intended as seeds for a university of the future. Certainly highly visible efforts such as the Michigan Mandate and financial restructuring were components of this effort. However, beyond these were a series of visionary experiments such as the Media Union, the new School of Information, the Institute of Humanities, the Institute for Genetic Medicine, the Global Change Institute, and the Office of Academic Outreach that were designed to explore new paradigms for higher education. Since several of these initiatives were highly controversial, such as a new form for decentralized budgeting that transferred to individual units the responsibility both for generating revenues and meeting costs, it was important that the president return to a more visible role. In a series of addresses and publications I began to challenge the University community, stressing the importance of not only adapting to but also relishing the excitement and opportunity of a time of change. In the process, I also learned the wisdom expressed centuries ago by Machiavelli:

"There is no more delicate matter to take in hand, nor more dangerous to conduct, nor more doubtful of success,
than to step up as a leader in the introduction of change. For he who innovates will have for his enemies all those who are well off under the existing order of things, and only lukewarm support in those who might be better off under the new.”

An Active Fall

In late August, I moved officially into the Office of the President. Actually, my “move” consisted of carrying my computer down one floor from the provost’s office to the president’s office. I had learned long before that in highly public positions such as a university presidency, it is best that one avoid making any major—and expensive—alterations in the office of one’s predecessor. In fact, a cardinal rule among long-serving presidents is never to spend significant resources in renovating the president’s office, the president’s house, or the president’s box at the football stadium. Too many presidents have foundered on these rocky shoals.

The fall term started off with a barrage of activities. In addition to major events such as the inauguration, we faced a packed calendar of receptions, dinners, trips to visit with alumni and donors, meetings with students, faculty, and staff, in addition to an intense schedule of events we were expected to plan and host ourselves. It was almost as if the University had awoken after the 18 month hibernation between presidents, and it was now hungry and anxious to get on with the hunt.

The first year was an exceptionally active one. My inauguration was only one of many highly visible events for the University. The Rackham Graduate School celebrated its 50th year with a major symposium on Michigan’s impact on higher education—an opportunity I used to address the issue of intellectual change. The football team won the Big Ten championship and then beat USC to win the Rose Bowl. In the winter term CBS News chose to broadcast its entire morning news program live from Ann Arbor. The men’s basketball team, led by an interim coach, Steve Fisher, won the NCAA championship. The Alumni Association introduced the Duderstads as the new first family of the University to thousands of alumni across the nation in a live television broadcast via satellite to over 50 cities. And I continued my themes of leadership and change in commencement addresses at both Michigan and Caltech.

My leadership team was both action-and results-oriented. Hence, even as we were setting the key themes that would characterize my leadership of the University, key initiatives were being launched to move the University in these directions. One of the earliest such efforts was the Michigan Mandate, a bold, strategic effort to change the University in such a manner as to enable it to more faithfully reflect the rich racial and ethnic diversity of American society among its students, faculty, and staff. But, beyond this, the Michigan Mandate was based on the premise that academic excellence and quality education in an increasingly diverse world would demand that the University itself embrace diversity as one of its highest priorities. Through an extraordinary series of actions, including the deployment of considerable resources,
the University embarked on a course that would double the number of underrepresented minorities among its students, faculty, and staff over the next five years and rapidly place it in a position of leadership in higher education in its effort to build a multicultural learning community.

Led by Provost Vest and Vice President Womack, the University also launched a series of cost containment actions, including a major total quality management effort in the University Hospitals that, together with the completion of the new Adult General Hospital, was to position it as the most financially successful medical center in the nation in the 1990s. A series of strategic efforts to improve both the environment and incentives for sponsored research, coupled with an aggressive federal relations effort in Washington, stimulated rapid growth in the University’s research grant activity. During the next three years it rose from 7th to 1st in the nation in its success in attracting research grants, surpassing MIT and Stanford, and earning the accolade as the nation’s leading research university. And, even though the fund-raising campaign of the 1980s had just ended in 1987 with the completion of its $180 million goal, the Duderstadt administration quietly prepared to launch a new campaign in the 1990s that would aim at raising $1 billion—an amount unprecedented for public higher education and matched by only three private universities.

Of course, all was not complete calm. There was still considerable activism on campus concerning racial issues, although my swift and energetic launch of the Michigan Mandate began to rapidly build support for this more positive agenda. Led in part by partisans of Wayne State and Michigan State, the Legislature launched another of its regular attacks on outstate enrollments at the University. And Governor James Blanchard attempted, unsuccessfully, to force the University to freeze its tuition levels even as he dropped state support even further in an effort to salvage the Michigan Education Trust, a “pre-paid tuition plan” that was seriously underpriced in order to gain political support.

Yet, it was also clear that the University was building on the momentum of the Shapiro years, gaining strength and moving rapidly toward the compelling vision set out by the Duderstadt administration.

One of my first formal athletic duties occurred the day after my inauguration at the annual Michigan-Michigan State football game. It had been a long-standing ritual for the presidents of both institutions to meet in the center of the field just prior to kickoff, and to exchange the game ball, which had been run from East Lansing to Ann Arbor by university fraternities to raise money for charity. At the reception prior to the game, MSU President John DiBiaggio suggested that to spice up the ceremony, he would throw me a pass rather than hand me the ball. I groaned, since as an ex-tackle, I was never very adept as a receiver. I could imagine that my first official act as president would be to drop a pass in front of over 100,000 Michigan fans.

Fortunately, I was able to take advantage of some excellent consultation. That weekend, the great Michigan
team of 1942 was being honored, and whom should I
find myself sitting next to on the sideline prior to the
ceremony but the great Tom Harmon. He provided the
best possible advice: “Just relax!” It worked. I caught
the pass. And Michigan went on to thrash Michigan
State on its way to a Big Ten championship and a trip to
the Rose Bowl.

Some Winter Surprises

Although winter is usually a relatively quiet time
in “good, gray Michigan”, our first winter in the
presidency did have some special moments. Early in
the year, CBS Morning News selected the University as
the site for a live broadcast for one of their two-hour
morning programs. CBS was intending to visit several
campuses throughout the year, and as a highly visible
public university, Michigan seemed like a good place
for one of their first programs. In fact, they began the
broadcast by noting that the University of Michigan
was “an institution that simply competes in a different
league than most of its peers in higher education”. While the University enjoyed the publicity, there were
also concerns about student demonstrators using the
live broadcast to push their particular agendas to the
world.

Fortunately, the weather came to our rescue. On
the day of the broadcast, the temperature dropped
below zero, and the campus was frozen solid. Student
protesters were nowhere to be seen. CBS decided to
spice up the program with various on-location visits
e.g., a student residence hall room, the Michigan
Marching Band playing a frozen version of the Victors
in front of Burton Tower) and live interviews with
Michigan personalities such as Bo Schembechler, Tom
Haden (former founder of the SDS), and Roger Smith
(then CEO of General Motors). I was also interviewed
at the beginning of the program by co-host Kathleen
Sullivan. As I faced the live cameras, I realized that I
had a rare opportunity to destroy an entire career with
a mis-statement. Sullivan did her part to make things
even more exciting by suggesting in her first question
that the Michigan campus was plagued by racism!

One of the major surprises in the spring of 1989
was, of course, the Cinderella story of Steve Fisher and
the Michigan basketball team’s success in winning the
NCAA championship. The climax of the NCAA men’s
basketball season, the Final Four, was one of those
cosmic events that becomes a command performance
for the president. However, unlike a bowl trip, in
which one has a month or more to prepare, the Final
Four descends on one at the very last minute. The inal
games sending teams to the Final Four occur the week
before. Hence there was always a certain spontaneity–
and almost panic–surrounding the event.

We had an interesting television experience later
in the term, when we hosted a live satellite broadcast
from the President’s House to UM Alumni clubs in 50
cities across the country. The President’s House was
crammed with equipment–lights, cameras, and cables–
and a large satellite dish was set up in the driveway.
Although the broadcast came off smoothly, the house
was a shambles afterwards. Fortunately, however, Anne had already developed her plan for renovating the interior of the house, and this was scheduled to begin after the broadcast.

Springtime and Commencement

We finished off our first year in the presidency with a series of commencements: at Michigan, Harvard, and Caltech. Of course, the president was always the master of ceremonies at Michigan commencements. However there has been a long tradition that a new Michigan president also gives the commencement address at his or her first spring commencement. This was not something I was looking forward to, since during the recent years of commencement exercises held at Michigan Stadium, the students had become increasingly poorly behaved. In fact, the year before, the graduating students had embarrassed the commencement speaker by launching the chant, “Boring, boring, boring, ...” during his speech.

To avoid this, I crafted a flexible speech that could be drastically shortened on the fly should the attention of the graduates wander. Since Michigan spring commencement is generally on the first weekend in May, the weather can be unpredictable. In this case, although it was dry, it was also quite cold, and everyone appreciated a relatively short speech.

Several weeks later, we found ourselves on the other end of a commencement ceremony when we attended our daughter Kathy’s commencement at Harvard. Since we had close ties at Radcliffe—Linda Wilson, former UM VP-Research was the Radcliffe president and Robin Jacoby, my former assistant was Radcliffe’s vice president for development—we had excellent seats, right behind German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, whose son was in Kathy’s class.

The finale of the commencement season occurred at Caltech, where I was the commencement speaker. I gave a somewhat more serious version of the address I had prepared for Michigan, and since Caltech students tend to be more attentive at such events, they listened and appeared to appreciate my remarks.
Step One: The first step: listen, listen, listen!!!
Step Two: Then lay out the vision.
Step Three: Getting to know the VIPs.
Some early surprises: a Rose Bowl victory and a NCAA championship!
Entertaining thousands...
Personal escapes...and family pride!
Bahooga...Bahooga...Bahooga!!! What is that racket? And at 3:00 in the morning, no less! Gad. The burglar alarm again. Well, let’s check it out. Ah, the intrusion alarm has been triggered in Sector 12. Let’s see now, that’s the back study—just about as far from the bedroom as you can get in the President’s House. And isn’t that where the alarm triggered last month, all because a spider walked across the sensor?

Now the phone is ringing. Probably Public Safety. “Yes, this is the President speaking. And, yes, Anne and I are OK. Probably just another spider. You want to come over and check it out. At three in the morning? It’s required by your procedures? Oh, well, I’ll get dressed and come down to let you in. “ Another sleepless night in Ann Arbor’s White House!

Legend has it that in the good old days, university presidents were treated as royalty. They were provided with presidential mansions staffed with cooks and servants and were driven about by chauffeurs in limousines; they traveled to exotic locations and spent their summers golfing, reading, and relaxing in their comfortable summer homes. While there are presumably still a few presidents of private universities who enjoy such perquisites (although this, too, may be a myth), the lives of today’s public university presidents are far more austere.

Particularly in these days of concern about the rising costs of a college education, university presidents can be swept away by public perceptions of luxury or privilege. The list of presidential casualties from excessive expenditures on residences, offices, entertainment, or stadium boxes continues to lengthen. Because Anne and I were bathed in a public spotlight in which the local newspaper routinely led attacks on the president for excessive salary, (my salary was $129,000, Anne’s work was voluntary) it was clear that we needed to be creative in how we handled our personal lives. Far from being pampered residents, we served more in the roles of the butler, maid, and cook.
First Impressions

Like many universities, Michigan requires its president to live in the President’s House. This ancient facility, located in the center of the Michigan campus, is the oldest building on the university campus, built in 1840 as a home for professors and later enlarged and modified over the years by each of Michigan’s presidents, until it became one of the largest and most distinguished-looking houses in Ann Arbor. Like most residents of Ann Arbor, Anne and I used to drive by the stately Italianate structure at 815 South University and wonder what it must be like to live there. From the outside, it looked elegant, tranquil, and exactly like what one would expect as the home for the university’s First Family—the “White House” for Ann Arbor.

Yet, as we were soon to learn after accepting the Michigan presidency, the external appearance of the house was deceptive, to say the least. Indeed, our first visit to the house after being named as Michigan’s next president was during the course of a massive renovation project. The front yard looked like a battlefield, with trenches all around. As we entered the house, we noticed a large toilet sitting quite prominently in the dining room. The interior of the house had a rather threadbare look. The plaster walls were cracked and stained by the not-infrequent leaks in the roof and plumbing. The carpet, drapes, and furniture dated from the 1950s. The wallpaper was taped together in many places. While earlier presidents had decorated the house with some of their own art and furniture, this had been largely replaced by rented furniture during the interregnum between presidencies. The age of the President’s House posed a particular challenge, since rare was the day when something did not malfunction or break down. This disruption by repair projects turned out to be a perpetual characteristic of living and working in a house designed for the mid-nineteenth century but used as if it were a modern conference center.

The President’s House at Michigan is one of the original four houses constructed to house faculty when the University moved from Detroit to Ann Arbor in 1837. While the other three houses were used in various ways and eventually torn down, the house at 815 South University became the residence of the University’s first president after moving to Ann Arbor, Henry Tappan. It became a custom for the president to live in the house, and over the years the house expanded in all directions.

For example, James Angell refused to move to Ann Arbor until the University installed indoor plumbing. President Ruthven, an enologist, added a conservatory room that could house the cases for his collection of snakes. The rather simple two-story structure acquired additional rooms, wings, and even a third story. By the 1980s, the house had grown to a 14,000 square foot complex. As we were fond of telling dinner guests, you could find comfort in any direction, up or down, since the house had nine bathrooms!

But this random expansion led to challenges. First, the house had never been designed as a family home...
but rather as a public facility. Indeed, essentially all of the first floor of the house was public space—living room, dining room, dining porch, sunroom, library, and kitchen. Most of the personal living of the President was in a rather small apartment on the second floor (bedroom, sitting room, and bath). Several other rooms on the 2nd and 3rd floor were used as family/guest bedrooms, studies, and laundry facilities.

The house had evolved to accommodate the imperial presidential style of a time long past. At one time live-in staff had served the President. Prior to our presidency, the house continued to enjoy an extensive staff including a facilities manager, a full-time cook, an upstairs maid, cleaning staff, and gardening staff. Yet this was a pattern that could simply not be continued in the more egalitarian atmosphere of the 1990s.

Hence, when staff turnover between presidencies allowed restructuring, we believed it more consistent with the time to shift to the use of part-time cleaning help (actually provided one day per week by Inglis House staff), gardening staff (again provided by the Inglis House gardeners), and the use of caterers for all entertaining. In essence, we chose to live in the house alone, accepting full responsibility for maintaining the private space in the house, cooking for ourselves, and arranging for whatever special maintenance was necessary, which was an ongoing challenge.

Renovation

The age of the house posed a particular challenge, since rare was the day when something didn’t malfunction or break down. This was complicated by the fact that during earlier presidencies, the University had attempted to modernize the house by adding air conditioning, modern appliances, and such, but without a major overhaul of the mechanical and electrical infrastructure. In fact, during the interim period prior to our presidency, the University tore into the house to install a very complex air-handling system, along with a fire protection sprinkler system and handicap access. Unfortunately, these systems were not only far too complex (since one of the design objectives had been to provide individual temperature control for each room in the house), but they resulted in a total overload for the stately 150-year-old structure. When inspecting the stucco surface on the exterior of the house several years after we had moved in, workmen noticed with alarm that the massive weight of the HVAC equipment installed in the attic was overloading the house structure and causing the walls to shift. We had several delightful weeks as dozens of construction workers roamed about the house, jacking walls back into place and installing braces.

While well intentioned, the installation of handicap access facilities was also a disaster. The doorway for the first-floor handicap bathroom was designed in such a way that the first wheel-chair visitor who used it got trapped inside. The handicap access ramp to the side door rapidly became one of Ann Arbor’s most popular skateboarding areas.

But there was one positive result to the extensive work done in the house prior to our presidency. Since so much of the house was torn up for the new HVAC and sprinkler systems, the University had budgeted funds to patch things back together again after the heavy construction. In fact, the members of the University’s Interior Decorating staff were having a field day, picking out not only new carpets but ornamental items such as silver tea services and custom fireplace screens for the house.

At this point Anne, as First Lady of the University, stepped in and brought the restoration project to an abrupt halt. For it was apparent that the University staff were simply going to renew the existing interior of the house, which essentially dated from the 1950s. Since Anne had a strong interest in historic preservation, she wanted to first assess the opportunities to return the house to a more elegant and timeless design.

Actually, this turned into one of those “teachable moments” that educators so enjoy. First, it provided a case study in how University staffs relate to the First Family. “Don’t you worry about these things. We’ve maintained the President’s House for decades, and we know just how it should look. So why don’t you folks take a long trip someplace, and when you return it will all look just like new!” Well-intentioned paternalism. Coupled with a good dose of “Well, I told you so...” and “Mrs. Duderstadt is not going to get her way with ‘our’ house!”

However, this event also gave us an opportunity to demonstrate the Duderstadt style: “Just because it isn’t.
broken, it doesn’t mean that it’s right!” “Humor us. Let us try it a different way, and see if we can improve things.”

With the help of some of the Plant Department people—the carpenters, electricians, painters, and plumbers who were to become some of the our best friends through their frequent visits to the house—Anne stripped the old carpets and wallpaper and exposed the true majesty of the house. Original quarter-sawed oak floors. Hand-crafted trim and molding. And, interestingly enough, when all the new designs were complete and bids were received, the cost of this restoration was actually less than the amount budgeted originally simply to replace the carpet.

The restoration project was greatly enhanced by the efforts of several of Michigan’s leading furniture manufacturers. A century ago, Michigan was the nation’s leading source of quality furniture, and many of these fine old companies were still in existence. Anne persuaded several of them to donate furniture for the public spaces in the President’s House.

Of course, one is never completely finished in the renovation of a residence as old as the President’s House at Michigan. The vibrations from each new construction project on campus would cause cracks to appear in the plaster walls. The plumbing and electrical equipment would frequently fail. An unusually cold winter or hot summer could cause havoc. But the renovated interior of the house was both elegant and welcoming. In fact, long-time visitors to the President’s House told us that it had never looked so good!

Perhaps the best way to understand the renovation of the President’s House is through a comparison of views before and after the renovation on the following pages.

Working in the White House

At Michigan, we were expected—indeed, required by contractual obligation—to live in the 14,000 square foot President’s House in the center of the campus, the “White House” to the rest of Ann Arbor. But in a public spotlight in which the local newspaper routinely led attacks on the president for excessive salary (although the Michigan president’s salary ranked at the bottom of the Big Ten and below almost 100 of the University’s faculty), it was clear that we needed to be creative in how we handled our personal lives.

The first problem was staffing. Certainly there was no shortage of staff or funding associated with presidential events and facilities. In fact, the staffing pattern Anne inherited was the following:

- Assistant to the President for events
- Secretary to the First Lady
- Facilities and Grounds Manager
- Manager, Inglis House
- Cook, President’s House
- Cook, Inglis House
- Housekeepers, President’s House (2)
- Housekeeper, Inglis House
- Gardeners (4)

in addition to staff in the Office of Development who did much of the events planning and management. Although it took several years of natural attrition and job redefinition, Anne rebuilt this team as follows:

- Events and Facilities (Barbara Johnson)
- Consultant on Catering (Judy Dinesen)
- Housekeepers (both houses): (Inge Roncoli and Kurt Szalazy)
- Gardeners (Joan Kibrinski and staff)

By merging the management of the President’s House, Inglis House, and presidential events, Anne cut the number of staff in half and the operating budget even further. Key in this strategy was the use of local caterers to handle most of the events. By developing close working relationships with the best caterers in Ann Arbor, but then also having them compete against one another in terms of quality and price, Anne and her team were able to get exceptionally high quality at highly competitive costs.

The range of size and complexity of events was unusual. Anne planned and managed events ranging from small, intimate dinners for donors to receptions for hundreds in the President’s House or a bowl game to weekly football tailgate events for many hundreds of guests every home game. After each season, she would carefully go over all of the expenses and see where cost could be cut without sacrificing quality.
The University decided to update the HVAC system in the house by tearing it apart; Anne stepped in to supervise the renovation of the interior - a year later
The President's House - Before and After
The President’s House - Before and After
The President’s House - Before and After
The President’s House - Before and After
We soon realized that the only way we could walk this tightrope between cost containment and quality of events was to accept personal responsibility for many of the roles that had been handled earlier by staff. We shopped for our own groceries and cooked our own meals, so that we could dispense with a cook. We did our own laundry and cleaned our living areas in the President’s House, so we could reduce housekeeping expenses. We used our own furniture for those areas where we lived and augmented University furniture in public areas of the house with our own items to make the house a home. We drove our personal car for most of our trips. And I stopped using the University driver for trips about the state and began to drive myself. In fact, we even paid for our own moving expenses when we moved into the President’s House and once again when we moved out eight years later.

Needless to say, this parsimonious style did impose additional time, labor, and financial burdens on us. It also led to a rather strange life, in which we lived alone in a gigantic house that had been maintained throughout most of its existence by professional staff—a manager, cook, servants, gardeners, etc. Yet, in this way we managed to reduce very significantly the operating expenses of the house. And, perhaps more important, we removed any possibility that we could be targeted for living a life of luxury at the expense of the public (although that didn’t stop the local newspaper from trying to create the false impression that we did). 

Knock, knock!...Who’s there?...

One of the running jokes at the President’s House concerns who shows up at the door. As indicated earlier, we lived quite alone in the house—all 14,000 square feet of it. Rarely were any staff members available to answer the doorbell. We were the maid and the butler.

Actually, it is more correct to say “doorbells”, since that was part of the problem. Three different doors were routinely used by visitors. But these were used almost randomly, with University maintenance staff coming to the rear side-porch door, friends to the front side door, and the curious (or distinguished guests) coming to the front door. Although each doorbell had a characteristic ring, even after eight years, it was hard to remember which ring was for which door. Frequently, when expecting guests, we would find ourselves running from door to door, trying to see whether anyone was there.

The second difficulty had to do with the size of the house. If we were in our upstairs living quarters, it was very difficult to get down to the first floor to answer the door in a timely fashion—particularly in the evening. In fact, it was sometimes difficult to even hear the doorbell in some parts of the house, particularly in the rear study.

But the most serious challenge was safety. Since the house was so visible—similar to the White House in Washington—people with an ax to grind with the University or just mad in general, would be drawn to the house as a symbol of their anger. All too frequently, those showing up at the house posed some security risk. And one need only note the dangers experienced by presidents at other universities...UC-Berkeley, Iowa, Minnesota...to realize the hazards posed by unexpected visitors.

Hence, we adopted the practice of simply ignoring most doorbells in the evening, unless we were expecting someone or could determine who was at the door. For example, if a group of students dropped by singing Christmas carols, or a group of students would appear at the front door to celebrate an important athletic victory, we would generally go down to greet them. But if it were an unknown caller, we reasoned that anyone who really had a need to see us would know enough to call first—or contact Campus Safety and have them alert the House. It is likely that many callers went away disappointed or frustrated. But in these days of public risk, it was only prudent to be safe.

Because we did not answer the door in the evening, and because most of the lights on the ground floor were dark—unless we were entertaining—a myth developed that the President didn’t really live in the house at 815 South University. In fact, one of the first questions we would inevitably be asked when meeting with students would always be “Do you really live in the President’s House?” “Yes, Virginia, we do indeed. After all, as ‘Mom and Dad’ of the campus, we couldn’t very well leave 35,000 students all alone at night, now, could we?” ...

During the daytime we were a bit more venturesome in answering the door, since we were usually on the ground floor working. We could also see more easily
who was at the door. Yet, here too, we had surprises.

Every once in awhile a student would ring the doorbell to ask if he or she could tour the house. In fact, one year the Michigan Daily published a short article saying it had been a long tradition that the President and First Lady would be happy to give any student a personal tour. All a student had to do was ring the doorbell...

From time to time alumni attending various reunions would show up at the house. Sometimes it was to remember a tea they had attended there during their undergraduate years. On other occasions, they just wanted to visit the house they had never managed to see when they were students. They were always very nice, but we rarely had the opportunity to do more than greet them and explain the situation.

The President’s House also attracted its share of the curious. For example, one afternoon a polite man appeared at the side door to ask whether we had ever thought about listing the house for sale. He was from out-of-town, and while he was driving through he noticed the house and was interested in buying it. While we were at first tempted--it had not been a good week--we instead graciously explained that, no, it is indeed owned by the people of the State of Michigan, and we did not think the University would be interested in parting with it.

Of course, there were some more delicate situations. One afternoon in the spring we found a young woman who had handcuffed herself to the ironwork on the front porch in order to protest the grade she had received in a class. Although it was a delightful, warm spring day, we were a bit nervous by this highly visible protest, because it was Commencement weekend. Anne made certain she was comfortable, and then had some University counselors see if they could put her at ease. Eventually, Public Safety officers sawed off her handcuffs. But, a short time later, she appeared with her small child across the street, to continue the protest. After a few hours she eventually left.

While protesting students rarely targeted the house directly, there were occasions when demonstrations against one tyranny or another would show up on the doorstep. Since many of the protest marches were down South University, right in front of the house, it was common for groups to stop to give the President a few blasts as well. Perhaps the most annoying such incident occurred during the protests over establishing a campus police and a student disciplinary policy. Chanting “No cops, no code, no guns!” several hundred students marched up to the front porch, installed a podium, complete with sound system, and then began a series of speeches about how the president was trampling all over the student body. As was typical in such newsworthy events, television camera crews from the Detroit stations set up shop right across the street from the house so that they could film every fascinating minute. Then, the students decided to demonstrate their anguish by symbolically “burying” students’ rights on the front yard, digging up graves, and placing crosses. (The next day the Grounds Department came to the rescue and repaired the sod.)

Finally, as night approached, about one hundred students set up tents on the lawn and spent the night. Needless to say, this was one of those times when we were delighted to have the refuge of our personal home in Ann Arbor. In fact, the only people that were in the President’s House during this fascinating series of events were two campus safety officers, to make certain the house was protected.

On a more jovial note, the house sometimes became the focal point of the celebrations following cosmic athletic events. For example, when Michigan kicked a last second field goal to beat Notre Dame down at South Bend, there was an explosion of thousands of
The president and spouse as hired help: organizing events, preparing meals, cleaning up, refinishing furniture, baking the presidential pies—whatever it takes.
undergraduate students out of the dormitories and into the streets to celebrate. This surging mass of singing humanity first worked its way down South University to the commercial area—where the bars were located. But since most of these students were underage, there wasn’t anything to do there, so they surged back and massed in front of the President’s House. When we went out to greet them, several grabbed me in their joy and began to bounce me around on top of the crowd, much like “passing students up” in Michigan Stadium. A bit scary, but understandable.

On other occasions of similar out-of-town athletic victories—winning the NCAA Hockey Championship or making the NCAA Basketball Final Four, thousands of students would show up in front of the house. Sometimes they would chant with great respect and awe for the presidency, “Come on out! We know you’re in there, Dude!” And, while perhaps it was not the most distinguished way to respond, going out and leading them in a chorus of “The Victors” seemed the thing to do.

This is reminiscent of a story of far earlier times concerning President Harlan Hatcher—told by both President Hatcher and a former Regent, Tom Roach, who was one of the students involved. The situation occurred just prior to exam week, during the 1950s, when a large group of male students decided to take an evening study break by staging a raid on the women’s dorms to steal underwear. Yes, indeed, this was another Michigan first—the first “panty raid”. After their successful raid, a large crowd gathered on the lawn of the President’s House to show him their spoils. President Hatcher, in his robe, opened the door, went out onto the porch to greet the crowd, and said in a loud, distinguished voice: “Men, it is late, and I believe you should return to your dorms and go to bed!” And they did. (Ah, times were so different back then...)

Fortunately, we decided early in the presidency to keep our own house as a refuge for those times when we needed an escape from the headaches of living in the President’s House. We not only kept our house fully furnished and operational, but we actually maintained it as our official residence (for mail delivery and such) throughout our tenure in the presidency. The peace and quiet and simplicity of our old home was very reassuring—and only ten minutes away.

The Plant Department

As first family, we had the opportunity to meet a great many wonderful people working for the University. However, the one group that we developed a particular respect and fondness for were those folks, who like us, helped take care of the President’s House.

This was not an easy task. The age of the house, coupled with the fact that it had evolved over the years into something far beyond its original design, meant that it continually surprised its residents. Rare was the month when some element of the complex heating and cooling system didn’t break down, despite the fact that Plant Department staff checked the systems on a regular basis. And, one could depend that on the coldest day
of the year the heating system would malfunction, just as would the cooling system on the hottest day of the summer. Once I remember going into the bathroom adjacent to the rear study on a cold winter day and finding that the sink had frozen over with ice.

But there were other surprises. One day in the winter, just before we were to take an extended trip, I went down into the basement early one morning to exercise and found about a foot of water covering the floor. Upon further inspection, I found a flood of water gushing down the rear stairway to the outside from a broken irrigation pipe. Fortunately I had caught the problem within an hour or so after the pipe had broken. But, had we left on the trip before finding the break, the entire basement would have flooded.

But we were used to floods in the President’s House. Once a leaking pipe required tearing out most of the pantry wall. Another time, misplaced lawn sprinklers flooded the music room, although sparing the piano.

But, on each occasion, the Plant people–Bill, the plumber; Bob, the painter; Louie, the alarm man; Craig and Mark, the HVAC team; Steve, the computer guy; even Rosemary, the bug lady (...the exterminator...)–appeared promptly on the scene and handled the problem. Indeed, they took as much pride in maintaining the house as we did, and Anne developed a warm friendship with them.

One of the most dedicated, talented, and creative teams was the gardening staff led by horticulturist, Chuck Jenkins, Joan Kobrinski, Rose Abercrombe, and a group of talented women students. Although the house was in the center of the campus, it did have relatively extensive grounds. And because it was so visible, the maintenance of its grounds and gardens was important to the University.

We encountered a situation with the house grounds very similar to the renovation of the House itself during the interregnum between presidents. The Grounds Department developed an elaborate plan for the grounds–Italianesque gardens, a gazebo, walkways—all very elegant, and all VERY expensive. Fortunately, Anne caught this before they moved ahead with it. Not only was it quite inconsistent with our approach to the house—just as the original renovation plans of the University interior design staff had been—but it would have exposed us to great criticism. Indeed, university presidencies have been toppled because of excessive expenditures on the president’s house.

Instead, Anne asked the very talented team of Inglis House gardeners, under the direction of Joan Kobrinski, to come up with an alternative plan that would be more consistent both with our own tastes and modest expenditure limits. The gardeners came up with a wonderful plan, at a very modest cost (...almost nothing...). Later, this same team rebuilt the elaborate English gardens on the Inglis House estate, again at almost no additional cost.

In summary, we always had wonderful experiences in working with the University staff who were responsible for maintaining the President’s House and

Joan Kobinski

Rose, Inge, Joan, and students
Inglis House. Perhaps our only frustration was with the layers of bureaucracy and management that sometimes smothered the best intentions of the tradespeople. On many occasions the house would suddenly be surrounded by a dozen cars and trucks and supervisors, usually to inspect a rather minor problem. We had to be particularly careful that such minor repair problems didn’t mushroom into gigantic construction projects—and costs—because of the well-intentioned but overzealous efforts of staff. Some examples illustrate.

When Anne was interested in reactivating the ornate water fountain at Inglis House, she was first told that this would necessitate a several thousand-dollar project to dig up the fountain and replace the plumbing. She felt it best to defer this expenditure. Fortunately, later Joan Kobrinski found that a 5-cent washer accomplished the same task.

The relatively simple-sounding task of repairing some of the stucco and then repainting the exterior of the President’s House threatened to mushroom into a $300,000 summer long saga. Not a good thing. This one we deferred to the next presidential transition.

The heating for the President’s House, like for most of the central campus buildings, was provided by steam directly from the University power plant. The pipes carrying this steam crisscrossed the campus in an elaborate network of tunnels, connecting every building. These tunnels, decades old, were sometimes the focus of student hijinks, since they were large enough to accommodate people. Years earlier, the steam tunnel to the President’s House had been sealed off with an iron grate for just this reason. However, during our last years in the presidency, we were told that the steam tunnel running to the rear of the President’s House was about to collapse, and that since it was lined with asbestos, it would be better to construct a new tunnel from the street and rebuild the piping in the basement of the house. Yet another major expenditure that required not only digging up the front yard of the house, but taking the basement out of commission for two months. Not surprisingly, this was another project left for the next president...

Anne and Jim and the Three Bears...

Although the President’s House has evolved over the decades into an elegant public space suitable for the many formal events associated with the presidency, it is also the home of the president’s family. Each family has added its own special touches to make the house their home.

As noted earlier, we lived in the President’s House alone, without regular staff, we provided for ourselves much as we had in our “real home” in Ann Arbor. We shopped for our own groceries, cooked our own meals, cleaned our own quarters...and furthermore, spent a good deal of personal time and energy maintaining the President’s House itself.

One of the wisest decisions we made early in our presidency was to maintain our own house in south Ann Arbor just as it was prior to moving to the President’s House. After all, we had lived in this house for almost 20 years. We had raised our daughters there. And although small and cozy—it was less than one-seventh the size of the President’s House—it was just right for us. Hence, we decided to continue to keep the house fully operational, even as we moved from it to the President’s House. We kept it fully furnished. We maintained our personal mail delivery to the house and picked it up every day. We contracted for yard and snow maintenance and installed a sophisticated security system.

As a result, our old house was warm and waiting as a refuge, whenever we wanted—or needed—to escape from the President’s House. This proved to be a godsend. Whenever we needed to get away from the stress of the presidency, which was only intensified by
living in the “public housing” of the President’s House, we only needed to hop in our car and drive over to our old home for a few nights. The peace and quiet and simplicity of our own little house was very reassuring and only ten minutes away.

Of course, there were some complications. Since the private living quarters in the President’s House were essentially unfurnished, and since we didn’t want to move the furniture out of our own house, we had to buy enough furniture so that we could live at 815 University—at personal expense. This meant duplicate beds, living room furniture, as well as all of the other essentials of life—televisions, stereo systems, and such. Later this duplication was to prove a particular challenge when we left the presidency—and left behind the challenge of maintaining two houses.

But there were also other complications. Since we spent most of our time in the President’s House, we rarely had food in our own house. So whenever we would escape from the President’s House, we first had to stop by the grocery store—or live on fast food for awhile. We also had a challenge with clothing. We could always throw enough clothing together for a weekend in our own house. However, over time, clothing would gradually migrate back and forth from the President’s House to our house, so that soon we became totally confused about just where the suit or dress someone needed was located.

But, despite the expense of duplication and the occasional confusion of finding food and clothes, maintaining our own residence as an escape was absolutely essential to our ability to tolerate the public life of the presidency. It would have been very difficult, if not impossible, for us to live only in the President’s House, with no refuge, as did the Shapiro’s, the Fleming’s, and many of the other Michigan presidents who preceded us.

Many other presidents at other universities share these views. Most believe that the stresses of the modern presidency are simply too intense today to add the burden of requiring the president and family to live in a University house—and therefore be on duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week. In fact, most universities are moving away from requiring presidents to live in a “president’s house”, and instead allowing them to purchase—and, in some cases, actually helping them to finance—their own home, a short distance from the campus. This gives the president’s family some measure of privacy. It also allows them to maintain equity in the rapidly inflating real estate marketplace.

But there is one more reason for moving the president off campus. From time to time, the Internal Revenue Service has attempted to claim that living in a University-provided residence is a taxable benefit. For a number of years, universities have depended upon an earlier ruling that if living in the residence was a requirement of the position—as explicitly stated in the appointment letter of the president as necessary to the performance of his or her role—it was not considered taxable. However, in recent years, the IRS has been conducting both institutional and personal audits on several university campuses that are raising this issue once again. Since the personal financial exposure to the president would be staggering if the earlier ruling were reversed—imagine the estimated rent on a 14,000 square foot mansion—it seems most prudent to abandon the presidential residence. And most universities and presidents are rapidly doing so.

But during our tenure, we were still required to make the President’s House our home, and so we did. We moved over many of our personal things—clothes, books, knick-knacks, and such. And we added another personal Duderstadt touch by scattering a variety of stuffed animals at strategic points about the President’s House, including three very large, stuffed bears.

This family tradition requires some explanation. Unlike most other families, we had never had pets in the house. Although I had been raised in a house filled with dogs and cats, I had developed serious allergies. Hence, instead of real animals, we always had lots of stuffed animals scattered about the house. In fact, it became almost a family joke that each birthday or Christmas, Anne and I would buy one another outlandish stuffed animals—a menagerie that grew larger and larger with each passing year. Since these were a part of our environment, we invited many of these stuffed beasts to move with us over to the President’s House.

The king of the jungle of stuffed animals was a gigantic teddy bear—Theodore Sebastian Eli Aloysius AKA “Big Al”. Al had appeared on the scene many years earlier—in fact, long before I descended into academic administration. Passing by the Middle Earth
gift shop one holiday season, I noticed in the window a gigantic stuffed bear advertising those funky bear claw slippers that used to be popular. But I also noticed a “for sale” sign on the bear. So, in one of those fateful moments of inspiration, I decided to provide a new warm home for the lonesome looking bear. The store was sorry to see the bear go, but they helped me load him in my Volkswagen—I had to poke his head through the sunroof—and off we went.

Since that time, Al has always been an important part of the family. He was a bear of many talents. But Al was lonely in such a big, old house. So it was only logical that one Christmas, a second bear would appear—even a bigger bear—but this one was female—Victoria. Finally, a year later, a third large bear appeared—Edward. So, for much of the Duderstadt presidency, these three, large stuffed bears held court back in the study. At Christmas receptions, they would frequently greet the University campus. During one Christmas holiday, when there had been a power outage, who should the University electricians prowling through the dark house encounter but three large bears, sitting there quietly there in the dark.

Eight Years of Life at 815 South University

We lived in Ann Arbor’s White House for the eight-year period of our stint in the presidency. And while we never really felt at home in the house, we did everything we could to restore and maintain the elegance of the facility.

When we finally moved out of the President’s House on July 1, 1996, we made certain that it was left in spotless condition for the next president. Despite the inevitable repair projects that would continue, we were confident that we had left the President’s House in perhaps the finest condition of its long history (just as we hoped we had left the university). We personally took an extensive series of photographs to record the interior and exterior of the house.

Of course, without someone to watch over the estate, changes occur. And within a week after we moved out, the Plant Department had moved a backhoe in, excavated the entire front yard to install a new steam tunnel, and torn the basement apart. Fortunately, we had returned our keys to the President’s House to the University by that time, and our only memories of the house are those of the elegant, pristine condition as we left it. And since we were rarely invited to visit the house by subsequent presidents, memories would have to suffice...

Been there...done that...no need to return...
A Matter of Style

Each presidency is characterized by a distinctive style that, over time, tends to affect—or infect—the rest of the institution. The way one approaches the challenge of leadership, the nature of working relationships with students, faculty and staff, the spirit of teamwork among other University leaders, even the character of events, all contribute to this perception of style.

Since both Anne and I had grown up in a small, Midwestern farm town, we generally tended to approach our roles in an informal, unpretentious, and straightforward fashion. In fact, we both realized that we came from essentially peasant stock, and we viewed ourselves very much as commoners thrust for a time into the complex and demanding roles of public leadership.

Of course, we brought our own quirks and patterns to our roles. I tended to be one of those folks who always had to have lots of balls in the air, although from time to time I would drop a few. Perhaps a more appropriate circus metaphor for my management style was the performer who started a whole series of plates spinning on a table, jumping quickly from plate to plate, just to keep them spinning together. I would launch a series of activities, assigning the responsibility for each to a member of my leadership team. For example, I might initiate a project to secure capital outlay funding from state government or an effort to better integrate academic learning with student housing or a scheme to go after a major federal research laboratory. Once launched, I would generally move ahead to another activity, only checking back from time to time to see how things were going. I rarely strove for perfection in any particular venture. Rather I felt that, at least for a large, diverse, and complex institution like Michigan with tremendous faculty and staff, it was better to keep lots of things going on than to focus on any one agenda.

Anne, on the other hand, planned her projects very carefully, taking on only a few matters at a time, and was not satisfied until they had met her standards. Whether it was a major renovation project such as the President’s House or Inglis House, or a major University event, or the documents and websites she created to portray the University’s history, Anne’s standards were very high. And just as my spinning plate style kept the University in high gear, the quality Anne achieved in her projects had a major impact on the standards for activities across the campus.

The Leadership Style

We both realized how important it was both to acknowledge and build upon the accomplishments of our predecessors. Compared to other universities, Michigan had had relatively few presidents—11 over its 150 years. Each Michigan president seems to have filled a particular leadership role for the University, perhaps less because of how they were selected than the degree to which the institution and its needs shaped their presidency:

Henry P. Tappan (the founder), the visionary, providing strong leadership to establish Michigan as one of the nation’s first research universities. Of course, Tappan was also the first and last UM president to be dismissed by the Board of Regents, demonstrating the hazards of being ahead of one’s time...

Erastus O. Haven (the stabilizer), who calmed the University community and largely carried out policies of Tappan.

Henry Frieze (the great teacher) who served twice as interim president and created the secondary school system of America.

James B. Angell (the dynasty), who built Michigan into a truly national university. The longest serving
president (38 years), he presided over enormous growth and set the course of the university by proclaiming its mission as that of providing “an uncommon education for the common man”. He also insisted that a water closet be installed in the President’s House and started intercollegiate athletics at Michigan.

Harry B. Hutchins (a scholarly lawyer), who consolidated progress made during the Angell years and created the University’s alumni organizations

Marion L. Burton (the builder), who oversaw the largest expansion of the physical plant in UM’s early history, building much of the Central Campus as it exists today.

Clarence C. Little (the martyr), innovative, energetic... and controversial...who pushed important initiatives such as the University College. His tenure was short, not for lack of vision, but rather because of his controversial stands on social issues such as prohibition.

Alexander G. Ruthven (the general), a leader during the crisis years, the Great Depression and WWII. Ruthven created the “corporate” University, with an administrative structure that remains to this day.

Harlan Hatcher (the emperor) led a period of the most dramatic and sustained growth of the University, with enrollments doubling and new campuses added (North Campus, Flint, Dearborn).

Robben W. Fleming (the mediator), a consensus builder and skillful conciliator, who maintained the University’s strength and autonomy during a decade of unrest.

Harold T. Shapiro (the navigator) who piloted the University through perilous economic times while raising the bar for the quality of its academic programs.

Which of these earlier presidents most resembled our administration? There are many in the University who probably regard me as the barbarian from the North (campus, that is), an engineer. (Although, in reality I was a “Yale engineer”, which is a bit of an oxymoron!) To be sure, I was a builder, like Burton, leading a successful $2 billion construction effort to rebuild all of the University’s campuses. While bricks and mortar do not make a great university, it was difficult to conduct high quality teaching and scholarship in the dismal facilities that housed many of Michigan’s programs prior to my presidency.

Some on the faculty regarded me as a corporate type, a CEO, who completed Harold Shapiro’s effort to financially restructure the University. The success of the $1.4 billion Campaign for Michigan, increasing endowment from $200 million to $2.0 billion, fighting the political battles to build Michigan’s tuition base to compensate for the loss of state support, providing the environment and incentives to make Michigan the nation’s leading research university, reducing costs through efforts such as M-Quality and Responsibility Center Management—all were components of this effort to become a “privately-supported, but publicly committed university”. And all would have been important accomplishments, regardless of whether an engineer or a humanist was president.

It was certainly true that I was a driver, with a relentless commitment to completing the ascension on academic quality launched during the Shapiro years. Yet, by the end of our years in the presidency, the quality and impact of the University, when considered across all of the University’s academic disciplines and professional programs, clearly ranked Michigan among the most distinguished universities in the world. Like Shapiro, my academic roots were with institutions committed to the highest academic standards–Yale and Caltech–and I was determined that Michigan should strive for similar quality. In fact, during my tenure, the University became the nation’s leader in the magnitude of its research funding. Furthermore, in a 1998 ranking of “highest impact” research universities, based on a survey that measures importance rather than volume of research activity, the University of Michigan ranked fifth behind Harvard, Stanford, Caltech, and Yale, and ahead of MIT and UC-Berkeley.

It was probably not surprising that a scientist as president would develop, articulate, and achieve a strategic vision for the University that would provide it with great financial strength, rebuild its campus, and position it as the leading research university in the nation. But many were surprised by a deep commitment to diversifying the University through initiatives such as the Michigan Mandate, the Michigan Agenda for Women, and the revision of Bylaw 14.06 to prevent discrimination based upon sexual orientation. Further, the broad effort to improve undergraduate education and campus life were far beyond what one might have
expected from one who had spent his academic career in graduate education and research.

However, if I were to choose my own descriptor to characterize my tenure, it would be that of a *visionary*, providing leadership during a time of change. In a sense, I aimed at serving as both a prophet and a force for change, recognizing that to serve a rapidly changing world, the University itself would have to change dramatically.

**Advancing the Institution**

Anne faced a formidable challenge when she was thrust into the role as First Lady, responsible, in effect, for the myriad events, facilities, and staff associated with the president’s role in institutional development. She inherited an important legacy from the contributions of early first ladies of the university. Each had brought to the University a unique style, but all had been totally committed to this important role.

However, because of the long interim period between the Shapiro and Duderstadt presidencies, presidential events and activities had been largely on automatic pilot, assigned to staff but without strong supervision or standards. As a result Anne had to rebuild the capacity of the University to support the quality necessary for supporting major initiatives such as the Campaign for Michigan, and to do so with a close eye to cost-effectiveness.

An earlier chapter discussed how Anne took over the project to renovate the President’s House, not only restoring its elegance but also reducing significantly its operating costs. She sought these same objectives—excellence and efficiency—in a broad range of other
Hosting guests at the President’s House: faculty groups, athletic teams, distinguished visitors, governors, presidents, and even a god (the Dalai Lama)
The annual Christmas reception at the Clements Library, with many University leaders including Robben and Sally Fleming, Harlan and Ann Hatcher, Deans John D’Arms, Peter Steiner, Joe Johnson, Chuck Vest, Bob Warner, and Marge Levy, and other leaders such as Doug Van Houweling, Paul Spradlin, Bob Kalmbach, and family members including Kathy, Susan, and Big Al...
projects: presidential events, Inglis House, football weekends, bowl events, fund-raising, etc.

Anne actually began many of these efforts while I was in the provost role. She launched a broad array of events to draw together the University community: a monthly series of faculty dinners at Inglis House, receptions for honor students, student-athletes, and student leaders; dinners for groups such as the deans, athletic coaches, and women’s groups. Through these efforts she had developed considerable experience in designing, organizing, and conducting events, but she also had an intimate knowledge both of University facilities and staff. She also had developed a keen sense of just what one could accomplish in terms of quality and efficiency.

The Inglis Highlands Estate

The Inglis Highlands estate had been given to the University in the 1950s, originally for the purpose of serving as the president’s residence. But, since most presidents continued the tradition of living at 815 South University, the estate was used as a guesthouse for distinguished visitors and important events.

The estate comprises eight and one-half acres north of Geddes Avenue adjacent to the University Arboretum. The house, built in the style of an English country mansion, was constructed in 1927. The ground floor of the House consists of the principal entryway, a large library, restrooms, and service facilities. The first floor contains a combination living and dining room, kitchen, pantry, breakfast room, and a three-car garage. The master bedroom, two guestrooms, and maids’ quarters are on the second floor; and on the third floor is a two-bedroom suite. The property also includes a caretaker’s cottage, a greenhouse workshop, and extensive English gardens.

Although the manor house and grounds were regarded as one of the most elegant estates in Michigan, over many years of University use with inadequate funding, the facility had deteriorated quite significantly. The furnishings had become dilapidated, and the carpets threadbare. (In fact, the house had been carpeted with leftovers from the Holiday Inn company, courtesy of one of the regents.)

During a routine inspection of the facility in 1989, staff determined that the slate roof of the house was near collapse. When the University decided to launch a $300,000 project to replace the roof, Anne suggested that they add into the budget another $200,000 to renovate the interior, in the hopes that the house could be used more frequently. When the Regents approved the project, Anne began work with the same team that had helped renovate the president’s house.

Once again, the aim was to return the manor house to its original grandeur, with beautiful oak floors, wood paneling, and tiles. Since it was important to convey a sense of the history of the estate, Anne collected and displayed photographs of the original owners, the James Inglis family, in the public areas of the house.

A parallel project was launched with Joan Kobrinsky and the gardening staff (mostly students) to rebuild the formal English gardens and other landscaping on the 8-acre estate. Although the personal effort was considerable, Joan Kobrinsky and her team were able to bring the project in, under budget, and with a quality standard that remains exceptional to this day.

In fact, after a weekend at the estate, Mike and Mary Wallace wondered if Anne might be interested in consulting with some of their friends in New York facing similar renovation challenges. (Anne declined, noting that two mansion renovations were enough for one life...)

Anne became involved in a number of other such projects. When the decision was made to build an enlarged hospitality area and renovate the president’s box in the Michigan Stadium pressbox, she worked closely with Athletic Director Jack Weidenbach to make certain that these areas were appropriate for a broad array of institutional advancement activities. Working with the Bentley Historical Library, a major photographic montage on the history of Michigan football and Michigan Stadium was developed and displayed in the pressbox entertainment area. Since the tailgates were such an important part of football weekend, Anne worked with Jack Weidenbach to renovate areas of the Michigan Golf Course Clubhouse so that it could be used for these football events.
James and Elizabeth Inglis, with their children, Jim and Betty, and their estate, The Highlands
Inglis House in the 1950s, 1970s and 1990s after the renovation
Inglis House in the 1970s/1980s and 1990s after the renovation
Inglis House in the 1970s/1980s and 1990s after the renovation
The Inglis Highlands Gardens 1990s
The Inglis Highlands Gardens 1990s
A well-deserved thank you!
University life revolves around the calendar, changing with the seasons. After the hot, humid doldrums of a Midwestern summer, excitement begins to build in late August as students begin to return. The fall is a time of renewal, as new students and faculty arrive on campus bringing the excitement of new beginnings. The energy and activity level are high with community celebrations such as football weekends, alumni reunions, Homecoming, and fall traditions such as apple picking and trips to the local cider mills.

Winter brings the clouds, the cold, and the rain and snow—the phrase “good, gray Michigan” is an apt one. The focus is on more serious matters: classes, research, politics, and, at least at Michigan, dissent. Yet there are also basketball, hockey, and a number of other indoor sports. And, on not infrequent occasions, the joy of a holiday season concluding in the warm sunshine of a Rose Bowl. There are also hundreds of performances by the students and faculty of the School of Music, Theatre and Dance, as well as concerts and other cultural events sponsored by the University Musical Society.

In contrast to the rest of society, the university approaches spring with mixed enthusiasm. Certainly, the end of winter and the transition from gray slush to green growth is welcome. Yet, spring also signals the approaching end of the academic calendar, commencement, and the departure of students and faculty. Academic administrators turn to the serious business of budgets and state politics.

Summer is a strange time on university campuses, with most students and faculty gone, many campus facilities closed, and campus life in a dormant state.

Fall: A Time of Beginning

A hot summer day in late August. Still air under the wide, timeless branches of the tree canopy shading the University of Michigan Diag. A moment of quiet, before Ann Arbor begins to fill once again with returning students and faculty for the fall term. The only premonition of impending change, the muffled thunder of an approaching summer storm.

As Labor Day approaches, streets become crowded, parking disappears, and one of the most traumatic moments in a college education begins: “The Great Dropoff.” Parents bring their young students to the University, moving them into residence halls and away from home for the first time. I always made it a point to address the parents of new students, to reassure them that their sons and daughters were academically very talented and would be carefully nurtured by the University. Both Anne and I would participate in welcoming activities such as hosting a Good-Humor ice cream wagon in front of the dorms for excited students and tired parents moving in, a freshman convocation to convey a few words of advice to new students—usually ignored, of course—and an array of welcoming events.
Through the seasons: fall, winter, spring, summer…
events for new graduate students and new faculty. I used to tell the parents that there was only one college event more traumatic than the Great Dropoff. It was that moment, following commencement, when just as parents swell with pride, their graduating student happens to mention their intent to move back home until deciding what to do next.

Universities are places where tradition is important, and there are always many traditions during the beginning of a new academic year. In our roles as dean and provost, we had long been accustomed to hosting a fall kick-off event to get the new academic year underway. Anne had been particularly creative in designing novel ways and interesting venues to get the new academic year off to a good start—a dinner hosted on the stage of the MacIntosh Theater at the School of Music, a new facility in the College of Engineering, the Museum of Art, and the new Chemistry building. Now, in our presidential role, we felt such events were extremely important to build the necessary spirit of teamwork among deans and executive officers. We started the tradition of a fall kickoff potluck in the Inglis House gardens.

I used this as the opportunity to demonstrate a rare culinary talent: baking apple pies. Each year I would spend the Saturday before the Sunday kickoff event baking pies, usually during an out-of-town football game. Since Michigan is famous for its apple orchards, a quick trip to the Ann Arbor Farmers’ Market early in the morning provided the necessary ingredients, and I would spend the rest of the day making and baking pies (while, according to Anne, the kitchen was demolished). In later years, I was challenged to pie-baking contests by the mayor of Ann Arbor, Ingrid Shelton. Finally I was persuaded to share my secret recipe for a Faculty Women’s Club cookbook (see Appendix to this chapter).

The spectacle of college football is a celebration of the joys of fall. In a sense, a football weekend has become an American holiday for its participants. It provides an excuse to join with others (thousands of others) in the enjoyment of fall color and weather. In a sense, a football Saturday is a community experience, drawing tens of thousands together in a festival that seems more designed to celebrate the wonders of a fall weekend than the game itself. In fact, while most of those attending the game probably draw some excitement from the game, most are probably not fans, at least in the intense sense which one finds in sports like basketball and hockey. Some come to enjoy the spectacle, the tailgates, the bands, and the crowds. Some have a more social interest in seeing friends. Still others are there simply because it is the thing to do on a fall weekend. After all, how else can they participate in conversations later in the week if they have missed the game?

Fall was always a very busy time at Michigan. In part this was because of the unusual nature of the academic calendar, which attempts to schedule a complete academic term between Labor Day and the Christmas holidays. But it also had to do with the very many events that were always scheduled for university presidents at this time. Beyond the usual
array of on campus receptions, dinners, speeches, and meetings, many of the national organizations such as the American Association of Universities (AAU), the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the Big Ten Conference, and the Michigan Presidents’ Council would all hold multiday meetings during the fall. In fact, during our second year in the presidency, we faced the challenge of hosting the fall AAU meeting of the presidents of the nation’s top 60 universities at Michigan. (These events were scheduled far in advance, and since the Shapiros had committed to this years earlier, even though we were relatively new to the presidency, we were obligated to host the event.) Fortunately the weather was perfect—crisp and clear, with blue skies and bright fall colors.

Several weeks later, the University hosted the annual meeting of EDUCOM, the primary organization for computing in higher education. Hundreds of faculty members, corporate leaders, and technologists descended on the campus, and were treated to a more typical Michigan weather experience—rain, sleet, snow, and ice. Each of the major computer corporations took over a University facility for a large reception, which created a three-ring circus character on the campus. Ironically enough, during the first day of the conference, there was a major earthquake in San Francisco, and the University offered the use of its computer networks to the 700 participants from Northern California so that they could communicate with their families.

Everything was always too busy in the fall, particularly for the President’s Office. Activities that had been suspended for the summer would come alive once again, demanding time and attention. No matter how much time one spent getting ready for the new term, it never seemed enough to cope with the demands and the challenges. Although it usually took several weeks for the first crisis to develop, sometimes it was earlier. Perhaps the end-game of the summer budget process in Lansing would have gone amiss, requiring days of follow-up effort with state government to repair the damage through last-minute negotiations. Sometimes Washington would spring a new surprise on the University—a new scheme for cutting the amount of research grant support or a Congressional inquiry. With new students came new issues that could rapidly dominate the agenda for campus activism. Even the Regents would occasionally pitch in, returning to their first meeting after the August recess with new demands or accusations, particularly in an election year when positions on the board were at stake.

Even with all of the activity, fall was a good time at the University. Michigan falls are glorious, with bright blue skies, the color of the turning leaves and moderate temperatures. There was always a sense of optimism, the excitement of returning students and faculty, the hope of a winning football season (since Michigan always did well during its early non-conference season), the enthusiasm of returning alumni and friends.

However, as the skies turned gray and the leaves disappeared, more serious matters began to take hold. Student activists would have defined their agendas and developed their strategies, and campus demonstrations would begin. One could always depend on a crisis developing in one academic unit or another—a faculty revolt against a dean, the raid of an outstanding scholar by a competing university, a serious budget problem. The local newspapers would run out of national or regional news to report, and turn their attention to stirring up controversy about (or within) the University. And, perhaps most demoralizing of all, the football team would sometimes be upset by Michigan State or Northwestern.

Perhaps one of the most traumatizing annual events was my birthday, occurring right after Thanksgiving, known by most of the University community, and generally celebrated with an office surprise party (particularly on the completion of my 50th orbit about the sun):

Anne faced a somewhat more awkward birthday situation. Since her birthday fell on January 2, it usually had to be celebrated at a bowl event. In fact, on two occasions, the Rose Bowl was actually played on her birthday. In celebration of her 50th birthday—and Michigan's win over Washington—the team gave her an autographed game ball, which became one of her most treasured birthday presents.

The Holiday Season

By the time the Christmas holidays approached, like many other members of the central administration, we
were ready to collapse. Yet, even during the holiday season, we still had little respite. From Thanksgiving to Christmas was the season of holiday events. Anne was always particularly busy, since she was responsible for a host of activities associated with the holiday season. She first had to decorate both the President’s House and Inglis House for the countless events scheduled for the month of December:

Here Anne had to steer a careful course between creating an appropriate spirit of the season—and yet not having “the season” labeled as any particular religious experience. She was finally reduced to explaining that trees and wreaths were, in reality, pagan symbols of the winter solstice from prehistoric times (although my electric train under the tree in the President’s House was a pagan rite of more recent origin).

As First Lady, she was also responsible for designing and hosting an array of events, from large receptions for groups such as the Faculty Women’s Club or the University administration, to more intimate dinners for the Regents, the Executive Officers, the Deans, and other University guests.

The last event hosted by us each holiday season would be a dinner at the President’s House for the Executive Officers, who, like us, were exhausted and in desperate need of both TLC and R&R. Fortunately, Santa always appeared at these events bearing presents for each of the executive officers and their spouses, although for some strange reason, the President was never at the table when Santa appeared.

I also suffered from overload during this period.

December was crammed with an array of standing commitments such as the Big Ten Conference meetings in Chicago or National Science Board meetings in Washington or key fund-raising activities. And, when Christmas finally did arrive, and we would get to spend time with our family, it would always be short-lived, because the day after Christmas we usually had to take down the Christmas tree, pack our bags, and lead the Michigan expedition to a football bowl game.

Winter: Good, Gray Michigan

Winters in Michigan can be rugged. Temperatures drop below freezing by Thanksgiving and rarely surpasses this threshold again until March. Storms sweeping across the Great Lakes can be ferocious. But more typically, a Michigan winter is wet and overcast. The phrase “good, gray Michigan” is apt. It is just the kind of season when one wants to stay home, and curled up in front of a warm fire with a good book.

One could depend on at least one giant snowstorm, 20 inches or more, each year. In fact, we used to attach these memories to other cosmic events. For example, the snow began to fall in 1973 the Sunday after the famous UM-Ohio State tie. As we were watching the weather bulletins that afternoon, predicting more and more snow, there was an even more alarming bulletin: the Big Ten athletic directors had voted to send Ohio State to the Rose Bowl rather than Michigan, with the tie vote being broken by Michigan State.

However, the real impact of winter on life at the
University set in when students and faculty returned after New Years. Since Michigan is high in latitude and on the western edge of the Eastern Time Zones, days were not only very short but also darkness would fall in mid-afternoon. Although Michigan’s proximity to the Great Lakes prevented long periods of sub-zero weather, it was usually wet and the skies were always overcast. Winter sports provided some distraction, but trudging through the snow to a basketball game or hockey match on a bitterly cold night was still a challenge.

Not surprisingly, after a few weeks, there would be the first signs of cabin fever—or perhaps sunlight-deficiency syndrome. People would become more irritable. Complaints would increase. The newspapers would become more hostile. And much of this would eventually find its way to the Office of the President.

One could be certain that February and March would also be the peak times for student activism. Usually it took several weeks for campus politics to regain momentum after the holidays. But by February, protest leaders would have created a fever pitch in concerns—although, of course, the issues would change every year. This would generally peak during the February Regents meeting, since this usually provided the opportunity for maximum public visibility. Fortunately, the week of spring break would follow in early March. But after break, even though the weather was not as bitterly cold, Michigan remained in winter’s grip, the campus remained irritable, and protest movements
could be easily re-ignited.

There were usually several distractions that kept such politics from coalescing into a crescendo. First, if the basketball or hockey team was nationally ranked, then students could look forward to the NCAA tournaments, March Madness and the Frozen Four. Second, Michigan’s unusually short Winter Term left very few weeks for building major political movements before exam period and commencement. In fact, it is sometimes rumored that the reason the University shifted in the 1960s to a trimester system in which the term ends by May 1 is that they wanted to get students out of town before warm weather, with the potential for real disruptions. Not a bad idea...

Fortunately, my national and corporate board activities would sometimes get us into a warmer climate for a few days during the winter. We would sometimes get a weekend in Florida or California. However, I was never more than a pager away, and sometimes I tended to spend more time in airports than warming up in vacation resorts. Furthermore, these were sometimes hectic experiences for me, since my board meetings frequently lasted from early morning until late at night.

Spring

Spring is a very brief season in Michigan. In late April the thermometer finally moves above freezing … and then keeps right on going into the 70s and 80s, so that by early May summer has arrived. The tulips bloom, leaves appear on the trees, and students graduate and leave. All in the space of a few weeks.

Hence, spring memories are few and brief. The blooming of the peony garden in the Arboretum. Dance performances and Shakespeare in the gardens. The May Festival (although after a century of performances, it was discontinued in the late 1990s). Commencement. That’s about it.

Summer “Vacation”

For most university faculty members and students, summer is a welcome break from the hectic pace of the academic year. Many faculty scatter to the winds, traveling about the globe, combining scholarly work and traveling vacations. Even those who stay in Ann Arbor to work on their research, generally slow their pace a bit, and try to take a few weeks of pure vacation.

Once, summers were also a time of rest and relaxation for university presidents. Many had summer places, to which they would retreat to read, write, and relax during the summer months. It was also a time to travel abroad, to fly the University flag in far-flung locales and be wined and dined by local alumni.

It was hard for us to imagine that such peaceful summers had ever existed for University presidents. In the high-paced world of state and federal politics, summertime in the 1980s and 1990s was the time when the critical phase of the budget process occurred. May, June, and July involved nonstop negotiations, with governors, legislators, and Regents to pin down University funding and determine how this would be distributed. During times of limited resources, this period was particularly stressful. Many were the long days spent pleading the University’s case in Lansing for an adequate appropriation or attempting to persuade contrary regents about the importance of charging adequate tuition levels to sustain the quality of the institution. The Detroit-to-Washington shuttle also became a familiar experience for me as Congress and the Administration worked their way through appropriations and authorization bills with major implications for leading research universities such as Michigan.

This was an intense effort, involving long hours and seven-day workweeks. It also required constant vigilance, since a slight shift in a legislative conference committee vote or an inane comment to the press by a maverick Regent could blow the strategy all apart. As a result, by the time the July Regents’ meeting was completed, the executive officers were usually on the verge of collapse and looked forward to the month of August for a well-deserved break–usually as far away from Ann Arbor as they could get.

Unfortunately, the same was not true for the president. Indeed, August was always a traumatic month, since we were frequently left quite alone in Ann Arbor to protect the university from the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. For example, early in my presidency the challenge was an ongoing political struggle to prevent the Governor, James Blanchard, from eroding the University’s autonomy by attempting
Commencement, the important symbol of academic ceremonies, but not an intimate affair at a large university.
The peony garden in full bloom in the Nichols Arboretum
The Arboretum is a wonderful venue for performances.
to control its tuition levels. Ironically enough, I had
developed an excellent working relationship with
the Governor early in his administration on a range
of technology-driven economic development issues.
But I also realized that I had to resist the state’s effort
to dictate tuition, since these resources represented
the only real alternative to maintaining the quality
and health of higher education in Michigan during a
time in which state support was declining. In fact, as
chair of the President’s Council of Public Colleges and
Universities of Michigan, it was my role to lead a bitter
yet successful struggle to resist the governor’s efforts
to control tuition. And this fight usually came to a head
in August, following the Legislature’s approval of the
appropriation bill, when the Governor’s staff would
begin to pressure the presidents and governing boards
to roll back tuition increases. Hence I would spend
much of my time in August coordinating the efforts of
the other universities to stand up to this intimidation.
And much of the time, I was the only one in the fort
carrying on the fight...

This was a lonely battle, but one in which defeat
would have seriously damaged the University. In the
end, Michigan managed to win each time—much to
the consternation of the Governor and his staff. For the
next several months staff would convey subtle threats
of “We’ll get even one of these days.”

August was also a silly time in the political season,
since every other year the state’s political parties would
hold their conventions to nominate candidates for the
fall election slate—including the nomination of Regents.
While both parties played games in the selection of
Regent candidates, the Republicans were by far the
worse because of the deep divisions within their party.
As a result, the interplay between party politics and the
press would always attempt to draw universities into
the fray.

On the Road … and on an Electronic Tether

Compounding the calendar complexity of leading
the University were a number of other commitments.
It is customary for presidents of major universities to
serve on a variety of public and private boards. Such
service activities not only benefit a university through
the contributions their leaders make to such efforts,
but they also add to the experience and ability of the
president.

I served on a number of such bodies: the Big Ten
Conference, various committees of higher education
organizations such as the American Association
of Universities, the National Association of State
Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the Presidents’
Council of State Universities of Michigan, the Executive
Council of the National Academy of Engineering,
and so on. I also served as a director of two major
corporations, Unisys (which had formerly been
Burroughs, a leading Michigan company) and CMS
Energy (the holding company for the state’s largest
electrical utility, Consumer’s Power).

But my most significant and demanding service
activity was the National Science Board. The NSB
consists of 24 leading scientists and engineers,
appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate,
that oversee both the National Science Foundation and
the development of broader national science policy. I
had been appointed to a six-year term on the NSB by
President Reagan while I was Dean of Engineering,
and I was in the presidency when I was appointed to a
second six-year term by President Bush.

The National Science Board had a demanding
schedule, holding two or three-day meetings eight times
a year, usually coordinated with the federal budget
process. In addition, its various subcommittees took
on major assignments to develop key federal science
policies in a wide range of areas of scientific research
and education. During my first term on the NSB, I had
the additional responsibility of chairing one of the two key subcommittees of the Board, the Education and Human Resources Committee. During my second term, I was elected chairman of the National Science Board, and I held this position for three years.

This is one of the more important science roles in the nation, and for a variety of reasons, I felt it quite important to take on this assignment. (Interestingly enough, even though this was quite an extraordinary honor for the University, a senior Regent, Deane Baker—as usual—objected and tried to persuade other Board members not to let me serve!) In this role, I was not only responsible for the operation of the Board, but as well for the supervision of a staff of roughly two dozen. Furthermore, I was in the unusual position of having the Inspector General of the National Science Foundation and her staff reporting directly to me. In a very real sense, I had a second complex and demanding job, beyond the myriad responsibilities of the Michigan presidency.

Hence, for several years, our schedule was even more complex than usual. I had to balance campus responsibilities with federal politics. It was always an interesting mental transition to shift from the issues swirling about the campus or Lansing when I set aside my Michigan president’s hat and donned my federal hat to worry about Congressional committees or White House policy or international relations. While life was never dull, it was also very complex, and no doubt balls were dropped from time to time.

Despite this, Washington service did provide an occasional break in routine. During those years in which the NSF was located two blocks from the White House, we would stay in the J. W. Marriott on Pennsylvania Avenue, also adjacent to the White House. Since this hotel was also the center of much of the action in Washington—the National Governors’ Conference, numerous fund-raising events, and such—one was swept along by national issues. Thanks to electronic mail, faxes, and cellular phones, we were never out of touch with Ann Arbor. In fact, rare was the time when I could go more than a couple of hours in a Washington meeting without my electronic pager going off—or a fax coming in. But just being several hundred miles away was a relief at times.

Throughout my 12 years on the NSB, there was an ongoing challenge of coordinating my NSB calendar with that of my various University roles as dean, provost, and president. It was clear that my service on the NSB greatly benefited the University. In fact, during my presidency, the University of Michigan rose from 7th place to 1st place in the nation in the magnitude of its research activity. While my role as one of the leaders of American science was understood in Washington and across the scientific community, it was sometimes not well appreciated on the campus.

Unfortunately, in 1993, after Clinton succeeded Bush, the National Science Foundation was moved out into new quarters in Arlington, Virginia—more specifically, adjacent to the Ballston Commons, a low-end shopping mall on the Beltway. The NSB tried to resist the move, but the Virginia Congressional delegation was very effective in working with developers to build new buildings and raid federal agencies from the District of Columbia to fill them. They managed to persuade a newly elected president to go along with this hijacking, and as a result, National Science Board members had to trade the excitement of the Smithsonian Mall for the blandness of a shopping mall. Washington trips ceased to be much fun...Yet, I managed to persevere and serve both the University and the nation in these multiple roles, albeit with even less sleep and exercise...

Beyond presidential duties and the National Science Board, I also had a series of personal interests and obligations that stretched me even further. I had been elected as a member of the Executive Council of the National Academy of Engineering. Normally this would not have been a great time demand. But during my term as a counselor, a maverick candidate managed to get elected through a write-in ballot—although how responsible people ever voted for him was hard to understand since his track record for disrupting organizations was well known. As he then proceeded to dismantle the operations of the National Academy of Engineering, there was no choice for the Council but to undertake the unpleasant task of arranging for a recall action—difficult, but in the end successful. But it was a very time-consuming and troubling activity for many on the Council.

As mentioned earlier, I served as a director on two corporate boards—Unisys and CMS Energy. Actually, this was quite common for Michigan presidents. Hatcher
and Fleming had served as directors of Chrysler, and Harold Shapiro served as a director of Dow, Burroughs, Kellogg, and the Sloan Foundation. Such service provided one with an interesting perspective of the corporate world. It also helped develop relationships with key corporate leaders. And, not inconsequentially, it provided an important salary supplement that made the relatively low compensation of the Michigan presidency during our years somewhat more bearable.

These corporate boards would typically meet 6 to 8 times a year. However, there were important committee assignments that took more time. Further, each board generally had a 2-3 day planning session that did require out-of-town travel. Thus, they too added to the presidential overload.

My final additional responsibility was the Big Ten Conference. During the early phase of my presidency, I found my primary role was just protecting the University from Conference actions, since I did not yet have sufficient seniority to be in a leadership role. As indicated elsewhere, this was sometimes a challenge. In later years, my seniority increased to the point where I became a member of the Executive Committee of the Big Ten Conference, first as Vice-Chair and Chair of its Finance Committee, and then finally as Chair of the Board of Directors. In these latter roles I found myself spending a great deal of time on Conference matters—restructuring the NCAA from an association into a federation, representing the Big Ten during its Centennial Year, and negotiating with the Pac Ten over the Rose Bowl relationship. While the day-to-day management of Conference activities rested with its very able Executive Director, Jim Delaney, I did have the fiduciary responsibility as chair to keep on top of matters. Again, another overload—unseen and certainly unappreciated by most.

Escape

Although our many obligations made it impossible for us to ever take an extended vacation during our presidency, as did our predecessors, we sometimes were able to escape for a few days. On these rare occasions, we generally opted for one of two places: Carmel, California or Walt Disney World in Orlando, Florida.

Escaping to Carmel is easy to understand, since it is one of the most beautiful places in the world. We had discovered it during our years in California, and whenever the rare opportunity for a few days away arose, we generally looked to the west. Fortunately, the microclimate associated with the Monterey Peninsula gave Carmel wonderful weather essentially any time of the year. So, whether it was an escape from the heat and humidity of Michigan for a few days in late August or a quick break in early January after a stressful Rose Bowl trip, it provided a reliable refuge. The presence of my brothers in San Francisco added a family incentive for trips to Northern California.

However, one August when we were totally exhausted and had not made plans to get out of town, we put together a last minute trip. Our usual hotel,
the Highlands Inn, was booked so we decided to try the Post Ranch Inn in Big Sur. It had just opened and in those days was affordable. No cars are allowed on the cliffs, so we walked up to the registration building. Since we were early and the room was not ready we waited in the library. Soon a young man came in and said “President Duderstadt, we have all been looking forward to your visit.” A former owner of an Ann Arbor restaurant had relocated to the Post Ranch Inn and had employed several Michigan students for the summer. Once again, you just can’t get away from Michigan. We had a great time and did get some rest!

The second refuge, Walt Disney World, requires a bit more explanation. For many years we had made the trek south during the March spring break to the Magic Kingdom with several other Michigan families.

Our children and their friends had all grown to accept several days in the “Mouse House” in early March as part of the annual tradition. Later, as Susan and Kathy moved away from home and into their own professional careers, they could always be relied upon to give top priority to joining their parents for a few days at Walt Disney World.

While a Disney World vacation doesn’t sound particularly restful, it must be recognized that over the years, this has developed into one of the most complete resorts in the world. While the various theme parks can sometimes be frequently crowded and confusing, the resort areas are beautiful, restful, and relaxing. Hence we found Disney World a place where we could get away from things, while our children went their own way at a somewhat more hectic pace.

Yet, even in Carmel or Walt Disney World, we were only a phone call—or an electronic mail message—away from the demands of the University. Many were the times when I had to fly back to handle a quick emergency.

In fact, during our ten years in the central administration as provost and president, we never really had a true vacation. We did manage to get away on several trips—better yet, expeditions—to exotic places such as China and Eastern Europe. But even on these trips, we were representing the University and usually working on institutional agendas. Rare, indeed, was the day when we could set aside University problems or demands.

Always Some Doubts

Sometimes Anne and I would wonder whether we had taken on too much, whether there was any way to reduce the number of our commitments, whether we could simplify our presidential calendar. In the end, we concluded that streamlining was probably impossible, as much due to the nature of the presidential position as to our own personalities. Over time, a university president accumulates roles and responsibilities much like a ship accumulates barnacles. As one becomes more visible as a university leader, opportunities arise that simply must be accepted as a matter of responsibility. Our experience was that the number of new roles put before us always seemed to outnumber the number of
old roles that we managed to complete.

Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the tenure of the modern university president has become so short. The inevitable accumulation of the barnacles of multiple roles so weighs down the presidential ship that it eventually sinks. Eventually, it must be replaced by a fresh president, a clean ship, unencumbered as a relative unknown by the array of obligations and duties that build up over years of service.

Even when we were able to get several days’ distance away, the time was frequently filled with phone calls, e-mail messages, and faxes. Rare indeed was the day when we could set aside university problems or demands. This inability to decouple from the university, to regain our strength, eventually played a key role in our decision to step down from the presidency.

So, what was the personal life of a university president like? Once, after a long discussion of the past year’s wear and tear by the presidents of the Tanner Group, Neal Rudenstine of Harvard passed me a note with a quote from Robert Frost that perhaps best expresses it: “Happiness makes up in height for what it lacks in length.”

Both of us were coming off rough years.
Chapter 8 Appendix

Michigan-at-Notre Dame Apple Pie

Apple Pie Mixture:

- 7 or 8 tart apples
- 3/4 cup sugar
- 2 tablespoons flour
- 1 teaspoon cinnamon
- 1/4 teaspoon nutmeg
- 1/4 teaspoon salt
- 2 tablespoons butter
- lemon juice

1. Get up early on Saturday morning and go to the Farmer’s Market. Ask your favorite farmer: “Whatchagot that’s good for apple pies?” Follow his/her advice and buy a bunch (8 apples per pie).

2. Use your handy-dandy mechanical apple peeler (or your children) to peel the apples, slicing them, and then sprinkle with lemon juice to keep them from browning.

3. To a bowl of 8 sliced apples, add 3/4 cup sugar, 1 teaspoon cinnamon, a dash of nutmeg and salt, and then stir together with a large spoon.

4. Pour mixture into pie-tin lined with pastry shell. (Prepare per instructions below.)

Pastry Ingredients:

- 2 cups unsifted flour
- 1/2 teaspoon salt
- 1 cup white shortening (chilled)
- 5 to 6 tablespoons water (ice-cold)
- 1 Fifth Jack Daniels (for the cook)

1. Empty 2 cups flour and 1/2 teaspoon salt into foodprocessor and pulse briefly to mix. Then add 1 cup white shortening. Pulse foodprocessor several times until mixture becomes uniform but coarse. Finally, add 5 to 6 tablespoons water and pulse foodprocessor several times until the mixture clumps together into a single

Anne’s story about the Apple Pies...

One day Jim brought me a recipe for apple pies that he had cut out of the New York Times. I told him if he wanted apple pies he should make them himself. This was probably one of the most regrettable things I have ever said!

Since Jim never does anything in a small way, he proceeded to make dozens of pies. He would freeze them and when he wanted a pie he would take one out of the freezer and bake it. The freezer was full of nothing but pies.

I could never make a good pie, and I must admit that he had a way with the pie crust and his pies were always delicious.
lump of pastry dough. Remove from foodprocessor and shape by hands into a ball. Place dough in refrigerator and chill.

2. When ball of pastry dough is chilled, remove it from the refrigerator and cut in half. Place first half on a chilled surface, sprinkled lightly with flour. Start rolling with a chilled rolling pin, taking care to always roll away from the center of the pastry dough. When the pastry has been rolled to a circle of 6 to 7 inches in diameter, turn it over and continue rolling until it becomes a circle 11 to 12 inches in diameter (about 1/8 inch thick).

3. Fold pastry over rolling pin and then lay carefully into pie pan. Using a knife, trim the pastry rim flush with the rim of the pie tin.

4. Fill pastry-lined pie tin with apple mixture. Then add 6 slices of butter (two tablespoons) spaced uniformly on top of apples.

5. Repeat the process of rolling out the second half-ball of pastry into a circle. Again, fold pastry over rolling pin and lay it carefully on top of filled pie tin. Trim the top pastry about 1/2 inch from the edge of the pie pan. Then, using a dinner knife, fold the edge of the upper pastry crust under the edge of the lower pastry shell.

6. Using thumb and forefinger, crimp edges of pastry around pie to bind upper and lower shells together. Using a knife, slice six evenly spaced slits in the top of the pie. Finally, brush a beaten egg mixture on the surface of the pie to give it a brown color after baking.

7. Preheat oven to 425 degrees. Bake pie 50 to 60 minutes, or until pastry surface browns and fluid bubbles out of pie.

For mass production (6 pies or more), prepare pastry and chill in morning. At gametime, begin rolling out pastry, lining pie tins, preparing apples, and finishing and baking pies. You should be able to make 2 to 3 pies per quarter. If game is close, add one jigger Jack Daniels per Michigan turnover—to the chef. Your productivity by the fourth quarter will slow a bit, but by that time you will have several pies baking at any one time. Since you probably will be sufficiently distracted by the game...or the Jack Daniels...that you will forget about what time you put them in the oven, you should try to watch them carefully, or just keep alert for the first signs of smoke.

If Michigan wins, you should have a number of wonderful apple pies for celebration. If Michigan loses, then send a pie to the head football coach and the team to cheer them up.
Chapter 9

Hail to the Victors

There is an old saying in presidential circles that the contemporary university might be viewed as a very fragile academic organization, delicately balanced between the medical center at one end of the campus and the athletic department at the other. The former can sink it financially—the latter can sink it through public gaffs.

But I remember another caution appropriate for the University of Michigan. My predecessor, Robben Fleming, imparted these words of wisdom that apparently had been passed along from one Michigan president to the next: The best way to keep from being consumed by Michigan athletics is to make certain that you win most of your football games—but never, ever, win the last game. By winning consistently, you keep the alumni, students, and fans interested and supportive. But by never winning the last game, the teams never become so highly ranked that folks take Michigan sports too seriously.

Apparently President Fleming had great skill, because this is precisely what he managed to do during his years as president. With Bo Schembechler at the helm, the Michigan football team won Big Ten championship after Big Ten championship. But it rarely managed to win its last game, which frequently occurred in the Rose Bowl.

We were not so fortunate. We began our tenure with not only a Rose Bowl win, but a NCAA basketball national championship as well. It was all downhill from there...

College Sports and the President

Mention Ann Arbor, and the image that probably comes to mind is a crisp, brilliant weekend in the fall: walking across campus through the falling leaves to Michigan Stadium; gathering at tailgates before the big game; the excitement of walking into that magnificent stadium—“the Big House”—with 110,000 fans thrilling to the Michigan Marching Band as they step onto the field playing “Hail to the Victors.” Intercollegiate athletics provide some of the very special moments of college life. The excitement of a traditional football rivalry such as Michigan vs. Ohio State. Or, perhaps, special events such as a Rose Bowl or a NCAA Final Four. Intercollegiate athletics programs at Michigan are not only an important tradition at the University, but they also attract as much public visibility as any other University activity. They are also a critical part of a university president’s portfolio of responsibilities. As any leader of a NCAA Division I-A institution will tell you, a president ignores intercollegiate athletics only at great peril—both institutional and personal.

Although it is perhaps understandable that a large, successful athletic program such as Michigan’s would dominate the local media, it also has more far-reaching visibility. Michigan receives far more
ink in the national media—the New York Times or the Washington Post or even the Wall Street Journal—for its activities on the field that it ever does for its classroom or laboratory contributions. This media exposure is due in part to the University’s long tradition of successful athletics programs of high integrity. It also stems from the increasingly celebrity character of college sports: successful and quotable coaches such as Bo Schembechler, flamboyant players such as the Fab Five or the extraordinary scale of Michigan athletics, with a football stadium averaging 110,000 spectators a game.

The popularity of Michigan athletics is a two-edged sword. While it certainly creates great visibility for the University—after each Rose Bowl or Final Four appearance, the number of applications for admission surges—it also has a very serious potential for instability. Every college athletic department, no matter how committed and vigilant its leadership, nevertheless can depend on an occasional misstep. After all, most college student-athletes are still in their teens; the great popularity of college sports attracts all hangers-on to key programs, some well-intentioned, some not; there is intense pressure from the sports media; and the NCAA rulebook is larger and more complex than the United States Tax Code. When mistakes occur, the president is generally expected to shoulder the blame, even when he or she rarely has any direct knowledge much less involvement in the incident.

The role of the president in Michigan athletics has been complex and varied. Although the president and first lady of the University have always had an array of formal, visible roles associated with athletics (e.g., entertaining visitors at football games and representing the University at key events such as bowl games), they have other far more significant roles. The concerns about scandals in college sports have led to a fundamental principle of institutional control at both the conference and NCAA level in which university presidents are expected to have ultimate responsibility and final authority over athletic programs. Although previously there had usually been a formal reporting relationship of the athletic department to the president, in many cases powerful athletic directors had kept the president and the institution at arm’s length. However, by the 1980s, it became clear that the days of the czar athletic director and independent athletics department were coming to an end. These activities were simply too visible and their impact on the university too great for college sports to be left entirely to the direction of the athletics establishment, its values, and its culture.

Furthermore, in the late 1980s, the Big Ten Conference became incorporated, with the university presidents serving as its board of directors. This new corporate conference structure demanded both policy and fiduciary oversight by the presidents. It also demanded a great deal of time and effort, since the operations of the Big Ten Conference are more extensive than those of the professional sports leagues. Many was the day spent in meetings at O’Hare, or elsewhere about the country, working—or jousting—with other Big Ten presidents on Conference matters.

There is yet another presidential role, certainly more enjoyable and perhaps even more important but far less visible: that of providing a sense of caring for and involvement with the coaches, student athletes, and athletics staff. Ironically, at Michigan, the Athletic Department is the only major unit that reports directly to the president, through the athletic director. (Other units report through vice-presidents.) Both Anne and I felt a particular responsibility to provide both strong interest in and support for the various programs. We tried to attend as many athletic events as our time permitted—particularly the less visible “non-revenue” sports. We hosted a variety of events and activities for the Department. We developed personal friendships with many of the coaches and staff. And we tried to be as supportive as possible, during both good times and bad.

Michigan athletics is, in reality, very much a family affair, with coaches, staff, players, and families forming a tight-knit community. We felt very much a part of this Michigan family, and we developed a deep appreciation for the trials and tribulations of the people who guided and participated in varsity athletics. While we always thought of student-athletes as students first—and of coaches as teachers—we nevertheless also regarded them as our family, with an increasing sense of responsibility for their welfare.

Early Years

Like most of the Michigan faculty, we had long been
distant spectators of Michigan athletics. During our early years on the faculty we joined most of the rest of Ann Arbor in attending football games, sitting in the same seats near the end-zone year after year with other faculty. We had moved from California to Michigan in late 1968—arriving the same week, incidentally, that Bo Schembechler moved to Michigan, albeit without the same fanfare. Bo’s first football season was also the Duderstadts’ first. We cheered Michigan on as it upset Ohio State in 1969 to win a trip to the Rose Bowl, and then we agonized along with the rest of the University as Bo had his heart attack and Michigan was defeated in the 1970 Rose Bowl by Southern California. We were enthusiastic fans, but no more closely involved with Michigan football than hundreds of thousands of others in the stands or in front of the television.

Basketball was more of a random experience for us. During the years when Johnny Orr was coach, we shared season tickets with some friends for a few years, remotely situated in the upper reaches of the Crisler Center under the scoreboard. But as our children grew older and became involved in their own sporting activities—and as the trek across bitterly cold parking lots to Crisler Arena made television a more comfortable alternative—we became armchair fans.

Coming from warmer climates (California and Missouri) made it difficult for us to understand hockey, the other revenue sport at Michigan. Although women’s athletics were not yet on the Athletic Department radar screen, there were other sports such as swimming, baseball, and gymnastics. But these were never given high visibility by either Michigan athletics or the media and hence did not enjoy the intense fan interest of football and basketball.

Yet we certainly could be regarded as interested and loyal Michigan fans. We enjoyed Bo’s success with Michigan football, and we suffered as did other Michigan loyalists when Michigan lost year after year in Pasadena. We followed Michigan basketball with great interest. But we were not personally involved beyond the level of common fan interest.

At least we weren’t until we became members of the central administration when I became provost of the University in 1986 . . .

Mainstreaming

Change was the order of the day in intercollegiate athletics during our years in the presidency. Just prior to my selection as president, Don Canham retired. Although this was no surprise, since Canham had reached the University’s then mandatory retirement age of seventy, it was nevertheless a difficult moment, both because of his reluctance to step down and the problems in selecting a successor. Due to the high level of visibility of the position, Regarded as one of the leading athletics directors in the nation, Michigan’s Don Canham had built an independent empire, in which coaches, staff, and athletes were perceived as something apart from the University. Further, there was
little understanding and respect between the Athletic Department and those folks “up on the hill”—a reference to the central administration. More serious was the considerable administrative and cultural separation that had evolved within the Athletic Department and among its staff, coaches, and students, and the rest of the University. While some of this gap was due, no doubt, to the strong and independent personality of Don Canham as Athletics Director, there were other factors. Michigan had long taken pride in the fact that its Athletic Department was prosperous enough that it required no University subsidy, largely because of the gate receipts from the largest football stadium in America. This financial independence contributed to the isolation of the department.

This vast separation between Michigan athletics and the rest of the University posed a real challenge. It was depriving student-athletes of many of the important experiences that should have been part of their education. So too, it placed coaches in the awkward position of being decoupled from the rest of the institution. Indeed, the Athletic Department itself was highly compartmentalized, with coaches and athletes in one program having little interaction with those in others. Both Anne and I decided to take on as a personal challenge the task of “mainstreaming” Michigan athletics. This was probably a more natural effort for us than many realized. We had both been actively involved in sports. Anne had been a cheerleader in high school—the only “sport” available for girls in our small country school. And I had played football at Yale. Furthermore, our daughter Kathy had been a varsity athlete at college, competing in the heptathlon and crew. Hence we had an appreciation for both the importance of sports to the education of students and the importance of athletics to the University. It also seemed to us that there was an important symbolism associated with the Provost, the chief academic officer of the university, taking on this role; it made a strong statement that athletics should be strongly related to the academic nature of the university.

We began by arranging events that brought together student-athletes and coaches in various academic settings—museums, concert halls, and such. We wanted to stress that student-athletes were students first, and that coaches were, in reality, teachers. In the process of arranging and hosting these events, we began to realize that the isolation among sports programs was just as serious as the chasm between the Athletic Department and the rest of the University. Students and coaches enjoyed the opportunity to meet participants from other sports programs. We also began to build personal relationships with coaches and Athletic Department staff, both through attending events and by meeting with them individually. For example, even while I was Provost, we began to attend the annual Football Bust held to honor the football team following each season, an event we would continue to attend regularly throughout our presidency.

Our efforts to strengthen relationships with student-athletes, coaches, and staff of the Athletic Department led to some strong friendships, among them Bo Schembechler. In fact, Bo made it a point to show up at my public interview for president. When the papers reported my selection by the Regents the next day, whose picture should be on the front page but Bo’s, with the quote: “He was my choice!”

Athletic Director Musical Chairs

Harold Shapiro wisely asked former president Robben Fleming to chair a search committee to find a successor to Don Canham. Not only did Fleming have great credibility within and beyond the University community, but he also had very considerable skills
and experience in dealing with complicated political situations. It was truly a thankless job, but Bob was willing to help out. Ironically enough, shortly after Fleming began the search, he was also tapped by the Board of Regents to serve as interim president for a brief period between the time that Shapiro left for Princeton and I was selected as his permanent successor.

Bob Fleming conducted the search with careful attention both to process and integrity. From the beginning it was clear that Bo Schembechler would not only be an important factor, but that he also must be considered as a serious candidate himself. However, the search began with the premise that it would be very difficult for any mortal to hold both the jobs of head football coach and athletics director. Fleming was able to negotiate an ingenious compromise. A long-serving and well-liked stalwart of the University, Associate Vice President for Business and Finance, Jack Weidenbach, was asked to serve as associate athletics director and handle the detailed management of the Department while Bo was involved in coaching duties. Jack was an outstanding choice. He had long served behind the scenes as the link between the University and the Athletic Department, watching over its physical plant and its finances. Moreover, he had a strong personal interest in athletics. A marathon runner himself, he had long been involved as a volunteer in women’s sports. Since he was in his mid-60s, such a move would not harm his career. And most important, he had an excellent relationship with Bo Schembechler and the other coaches.

After the first football season, it became apparent to Bo that carrying two jobs was far more difficult and stressful than he had imagined. His first year was spectacular—a Big Ten football championship, a Rose Bowl victory over USC, and then the surprise of the NCAA basketball championship with a substitute coach, Steve Fisher. There were also downsides, such as the investigation of serious violations in the baseball program. But Bo began to realize that, even with Jack Weidenbach as backup, there was simply too much personal stress in handling both jobs.

Bo had another tremendous football team in our second year in the presidency, once again winning the Big Ten championship and earning the opportunity to play in the Rose Bowl. Shortly after the season ended, however, Bo called and asked to come over to talk with me about an important matter. I had a hunch what was on his mind. Sure enough, Bo stated his intention to retire as football coach. Bo said that he and his wife, Millie, had decided that it was time for him to step down from coaching. I strongly urged him to stay on, but he declined, explaining that while he loved coaching, the other demands of the job—long recruiting trips and such—were just too stressful for his health. When Bo decided that he wanted to step down from the
athletics directorship, I faced the challenge of selecting and getting regental approval for his successor. I was concerned about further unrest among the Regents if the University had to go through the process again so soon after selecting Bo. The haste of Bo’s decision proved a certain advantage, since there was no time to conduct a full search. I asked Jack Weidenbach to serve as athletics director, with the support of the Board of Regents. During the eighteen months of the Bo-Jack team, Jack and I had developed a close relationship, and I had full confidence in Jack’s leadership of the department. I also believed there were a number of objectives that Jack could accomplish as interim AD that might be very hard for a permanent AD to handle. For example, there was the enormous task of rebuilding Michigan athletics facilities. As former head of the University plant department, Jack was ideal for this role. The University faced another major challenge in establishing the priority and the quality of women’s athletics programs. Jack’s deep commitment to women’s athletics made this a natural.

Both Jack and I believed that college athletics were facing a period of significant change at the national and conference level. We believed a close relationship between the athletics director and the president was critical if Michigan was to play a leadership role during this period. I also was convinced that Michigan would be at some risk if it had to endure the uncertainty and loss of momentum associated with another search for an athletics director.

In retrospect, I remain convinced I could not have made a better choice. While Jack was not the public figure of Bo Schembechler, he was outstanding in managing the department. Furthermore, he had a strong understanding of both the University’s and the Department’s values and tradition. Jack and I worked closely together on a number of critical fronts: renegotiating the distribution of football gate receipt revenue policies in the Big Ten, opposing major expansion of the Big Ten Conference, building the number and quality of Michigan’s women’s programs, and stressing the importance of the non-revenue sports.

The Weidenbach era experienced years of both extraordinary success and great progress for Michigan athletics. There is no other five-year period in the history of Michigan athletics programs with more conference championships, bowl wins, Final Four appearances, and All-Americans—both athletic and academic. In addition, the financial structure of Michigan athletics was stabilized, its physical plant was rebuilt, and the coaches and student-athletes were more clearly integrated into the broader life of the campus community.

Unfortunately, Jack was already close to retirement when he agreed to provide leadership for the Athletic Department. Although a marathon runner, he believed it
important that he step down before age seventy. So once again I faced the challenge of selecting a new athletics director. In this case, it seemed appropriate to conduct a thorough national search, totally consistent with the personnel policies and practices of the University. I asked the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Farris Womack, to chair a search committee comprised of faculty, students, and staff.

Although there were several candidates with Michigan backgrounds considered by the search committee, none of these had the experience or credentials to make the short list, which contained several of the top athletic directors in the country. Following the search committee’s recommendations, I began discussions with the top two candidates on the list, who were both quite interested in the position. Unfortunately, some of the booster crowd got wind of the possibility that a “non-Michigan man” would be selected and began to apply pressure on the Regents to force the administration to look inside the Department for a successor.

I finally concluded that it was simply too dangerous to the University to continue the external search. Instead, with the support of the search committee, I asked an insider, Joe Roberson, then Director of the Campaign for Michigan, to accept an appointment. Joe’s name had been considered early in the search, but his role as the director of the University’s billion-dollar fund-raising campaign was felt to be more important.

Roberson’s appointment was a surprise to outsiders. He was, however, a former college athlete and professional baseball player. More important, he had served as both dean and interim chancellor of the UM-Flint campus. He was an individual of great integrity, with a strong sense of academic values. Although there was some opposition from one of the Regents, the others supported Roberson’s appointment, and the situation was rapidly stabilized. Joe had served the University of Michigan well in an extraordinary array of assignments, and he was to do the same as Michigan’s new athletics director.

Beyond his strong and wise leadership of the department, his long experience with students and academic life as a faculty member and academic leader enabled him to elevate the importance of students as students first and athletes second, in priority, even in a highly competitive program such as Michigan. Certainly Joe Roberson had a better understanding of the mission and culture of an academic institution than any athletic director of his era.

Football Weekends

Much of life in Ann Arbor during the fall—social, commercial, and University—revolves around football weekends. This is as much the case for the University president as for the football coach. Most of the University’s “development” events (read fund-raising) occur around football weekends. Alumni reunions, visiting committees, major fund-raising events, cultivation of politicians—you name it—all occur on the Thursday through Saturday of football weekends. The reason is simple: everybody appreciated an opportunity to visit Ann Arbor and attend the pageantry and spectacle of a Michigan football game.

Although most armchair fans see such an event as simply another televised football game, it is much, much more to those who came to Ann Arbor. The town is alive with activity, student pep-rallies, fraternity and sorority parties, retail events, concerts, plays, rallies, and much more, during the days leading up to the weekend. The “game” itself generally starts early in the morning as thousands of cars, vans, and mobile homes gathered about the stadium for tailgates. In fact, there are certain areas set aside, such as the Victors Club parking area adjacent to the stadium, where those who are sufficiently supportive of Michigan football
(in a financial sense) have reserved parking to set up their tents, tables and chairs, barbecue grills, and other necessities of tailgating life. Many groups have special tents set up around the stadium, some in parking areas, others on the Michigan golf course. Others arrive in specially designed vehicles, mobile homes and the like, all equipped for the tailgate experience.

The experience of a football weekend is quite different for the president than for other fans. Since these weekends were one of the University’s most important development events, Anne and I hosted hundreds of guests at various events throughout the weekend. When we were first sentenced to the presidency, we found that it was customary for the president to host a sit-down luncheon for thirty or forty guests in two seatings in a small dining area in the pressbox—generally serving something rather dreadful like meatloaf or lasagna—just the thing before an intense football game in generally inclement weather. A few select guests were then invited to sit with the president, although the president’s box could only accommodate a dozen guests.

Working with the Athletic Department, the Office of Development, and various caterers, Anne completely redesigned these efforts. She created a major tailgate function, capable of entertaining several hundred guests. During the early part of the season, while the weather was still decent, these were held in a tent on the golf course grounds adjacent to the stadium. Since November in Ann Arbor can become rather grim, she worked with the Athletic Department staff to redesign the Golf Course Clubhouse area so that this could serve for entertainment later in the season. For certain games, such as Ohio State or Michigan State, tailgate
was hosted in the Chrisler Center. The staff from the Plant Department and the Athletic Department worked to double the hospitality area below the pressbox and provided windows and an entrance directly to several hundred seats in Michigan Stadium which could be used for invited guests. The president’s and athletics director’s boxes were also renovated to handle the large number of guests invited to sit in these areas. Since the University had launched a major fund-raising effort aimed at generating over one billion dollars in gifts, these facilities were invaluable.

Gametime in the president’s box was always a bit of a zoo. While we had advance knowledge of most of our guests—indeed, we had personally selected and invited them from a list proposed by deans and development staff earlier in the summer—there were always surprises. Sometimes folks had simply gotten lost and wandered into the box by mistake. Other times we had gatecrashers. We were almost certain to have surprise visitors—guests who had decided at the last moment to drive over to Ann Arbor to attend the game and who expected to be accommodated personally by the president. And we would occasionally have visiting delegations, for example, from various holiday bowls seeking Michigan as a participant. Thank heavens for Anne’s political skills, since handling the unpredictable took great tact and adaptability.

Our box was generally filled with various types of VIPs. We sent standing invitations to the CEOs of GM, Ford, and Chrysler. We would occasionally have people from the media or entertainment world—e.g., Mike Wallace (an alumnus), Charlie Gibson, or Joan Lunden. But most of our guests were alumni and friends of the University, people who provided much of the support to make Michigan such a special place. Although we worked hard at these events to sell the University, it was an enjoyable experience as well because many of those folks became personal friends whom we would look forward to seeing every year.

After the game ended and our guests left, we would drop by the press-box hospitality area for a few minutes to wait for traffic to clear. Since this area had TV monitors mounted on the walls, we could catch up on other games. But most of the time was spent in a post-mortem of the Michigan game with guests—along with some additional opportunity for fund-raising, of course. After the rest of our guests left, we would walk back to our car and drive back to the president’s house, following a less-trafficked route, which we had discovered from twenty years of post-game driving experience. Once home, we would collapse—unless, of course, we had to go to another event that evening!

The Rose Bowl

On five different occasions during our presidency, we had the opportunity to lead the Michigan expedition to the Rose Bowl for New Year’s Day. While each Rose Bowl was a different experience, there were certain similarities.

The Tournament of Roses and its Rose Bowl are, in reality, a weeklong circus of events: promotional press conferences, black tie dinner dances, luncheons, and other activities. Beyond this, the team itself has a number of events: special luncheons and banquets, trips to places like Disneyland, pep rallies, and press conferences. Finally, because of the large turnout of alumni and friends, Anne and I viewed the Rose Bowl as a major development opportunity, and always scheduled a number of special events for donors. As a result, we spent much of our time on Rose Bowl trips driving about the Los Angeles freeway system from one event to another.

The Rose Bowl is all about tradition. For many years the Big Ten Clubs of Southern California hosted a huge dinner show to honor the team and to raise money for their other projects. Although this was held
for years at the Hollywood Palladium, eventually the seedy condition of this facility and the awkwardness of its location resulted in moving the event to the headquarters hotel, the Century Plaza. The event itself was always the same—a dinner followed by a series of old guard entertainers “volunteering their time and talents,” in return for a block of Rose Bowl tickets. Bob Hope was always the headliner, although as he got on in years, his appearance was briefer, and his jokes more predictable. Other headliners included Pia Zadora and her daughter, an assortment of circus acts and several dreadful Las Vegas nightclub comedians.

Of far higher quality was the elegant black-tie dinner dance hosted by the Tournament of Roses Committee, generally at the Huntington Ritz in Pasadena. Since there was a standing tradition that the presidents of the Rose Bowl universities would sit at the same table with the Grand Marshall of the Rose Parade, Anne and I got to meet some interesting folks...Pele, John Glenn, Angela Lansbury, Shirley Temple Black, and Cristobol Colombo (the many, many times removed descendant of Christopher Columbus) who was paired with Ben Nighthorse Campbell for historical correctness. The crowd consisted of many of Pasadena’s old guard, so my Caltech jokes were always very much appreciated. In fact, toward the latter days of my presidency when Michigan football fell on harder times, the representatives of the Tournament of Roses would frequently tell us how much they missed the Caltech jokes and how we needed to try harder to get Michigan back to Pasadena.

In an effort to link together the various elements of the Michigan delegation, Anne and I started the tradition of having brunch with the football team the day before the game. We also would visit the band at one of its practices on each bowl trip. Since we started...
this tradition during one of our rare winning Rose Bowl trips, it soon joined the list of sporting superstitions, and we found ourselves invited back every year.

Another Rose Bowl tradition was to invite the governors of the states of the Rose Bowl teams as official members of the bowl parties. Although this was always a busy time of year for governors, sometimes even overlapping with their inauguration after being elected, Michigan did manage to get the governors to attend on two occasions. In 1989, Governor Jim Blanchard flew out for the game itself. Then in 1993, Governor John Engler and his wife Michelle came out to California for a number of the bowl events. Each of the two years the governors attended, Michigan won the Rose Bowl, and on each occasion, the governors went with me to the locker room to sing “Hail to the Victors” along with the team.

The Final Four

Our first experience with the Final Four was totally unexpected. Prior to the NCAA tournament, Michigan had had a rather mediocre season—lots of talent on the team, but certainly not dominant in the Big Ten. The team was selected among the 64 that would play in the NCAA tournament, but nobody expected them to get very far. Indeed, just before the tournament began, Coach Bill Frieder announced that he had accepted another coaching position at Arizona State, and so the team would be led by the unknown assistant coach, Steve Fisher (as Bo put it, “Only a Michigan man can coach a Michigan team!”)

There was mild surprise when Michigan won its first two games to go on to the regionals in Lexington, Kentucky. But everybody knew Michigan would run into a strong North Carolina team, and, just as in previous years, it would be lights out. And so it was, but rather for North Carolina. Michigan tore through the regional, upsetting both North Carolina and Virginia to win the trip to the Final Four in Seattle. It was a shocking turn of events, but, again, most suspected the team would go no further. After all, both Duke and Illinois (a team which had already destroyed Michigan twice) were also in the Final Four.

We hurriedly rearranged our schedules so that we could fly out to Seattle for the first game. It was complex, because we had commitments the night before in Kalamazoo, and we would have to fly out on the Saturday of the game. There were no direct flights available, but we did manage to get a connection through Kansas City that would get us to Seattle in time for the game. While we were sitting on the connecting flight in Kansas City with about a dozen other Michigan fans—all also taking the only available flight—and waiting for the last passengers before taking off, a woman boarded the plane with a small boy in tow. When she saw the small group of Michigan fans, she yelled: “Stewardess, change my seats to sit with my people over here. I’m Rumeal’s mom!” And she was indeed, Helen Ford, the mother of Rumeal Robinson, who was destined to make the two free throws in overtime to win the national championship. She proved to be a wonderful addition to the Michigan contingent. When someone asked her how Rumeal could jump so high, she responded, “Honey, if I was your mom, you would jump high too!”

The Final Four itself is almost anticlimactic for the participants. It is an event designed for television and for the corporate fatcats that the NCAA officials want to stroke. At Seattle the games were played in an indoor football stadium, in which most people were seated miles from the court. This was made even worse by the NCAA decision to seat row upon row of press around the court, so that the true spectator seating began even farther back. The teams and their schools are treated almost as an afterthought—usually placed in hotels on the outskirts of the city, given a small number of poor tickets, and otherwise essentially ignored, except for the frequent and mandatory press conferences.

We then learned the next quirk of Final Fours. You can only purchase tickets—if you can find them—and hotel reservations in blocks for the entire Final Four series, both the semifinals and final. Since the semifinal is played on Saturday, and the championship final is not played until Monday night, that leaves you with Sunday and the better part of Monday without much to do. This is bearable for winning teams looking forward to the championship game. But it is a dismal experience for those teams and fans that lose on Saturday, since they are required to stay through Monday or lose enormous amounts of money.

Of course, many of the losing fans just want to get
out of town, and immediately after the semifinal games, there are large numbers of scalpers waiting by the exits where the losing fans are seated, offering to buy their unused tickets to the championship game. Incidentally, this is the reason why tickets to the semifinals are scalped at hundreds of times face value, while those to the championship round sometimes go begging.

Fortunately, I had a long-lost relative living in Seattle whom we visited on Sunday. On Monday, we had another pep rally, and then left for the game with Bo and Millie Schembechler. This was an interesting experience, because even though Bo was athletics director, he was still regarded as a celebrity. In fact, the interim coach, Steve Fisher, was so unknown that he had difficulty being admitted to the stadium prior to the championship game. Since Bo had been hiding from the crowds, he needed something to eat before the game. They had arranged for a big, white stretch limousine to take them from the hotel to the Kingdome, so Bo suggested they just pull into the drive-thru window of a MacDonalds on the way so he could get some Chicken McNuggets. Unfortunately, the stretch limo wouldn’t fit, so one of the Athletics staff, Jeff Long, had to run in to get the order. A new definition of traveling in style!

The championship game itself was another cosmic event, with the now famous overtime win over Seton Hall. After a seesaw battle, the game went into overtime. Trailing by one point with only a few seconds to play, Rumeal Robinson was fouled. He calmly stepped to the line and made both free throws to give Michigan an 80 to 79 victory and the national championship.

After the bedlam and celebration at the Kingdome, Anne and I returned to the hotel in another limousine, this time with Alumni Director Bob Forman and his
wife Patti, and Judge Geraldine Ford, alumni president. Judge Ford explained that she had her “mo-jo” working the entire game. That was the trick. (But we still think that Rumeal’s mom was the key.)

Quite an experience. Indeed, perhaps a once-in-a-lifetime experience, anywhere else but Michigan. As fate would have it, three years later we found ourselves back at the Final Four, this time with the Fab Five, probably the most talented class of freshman basketball players in history.

Although it took awhile for the team to jell—and for Steve Fisher to get enough nerve to play all the freshman at once—by the end of the season they had developed into a national powerhouse. In their last game they took apart a strong Indiana team and earned a berth in the NCAA tournament.

Nobody expected very much of Michigan in the tournament since the team was so young, but, again, Michigan was full of surprises. The Fab Five proceeded to knock off each opponent, including Big Ten champion Ohio State in the Regionals, to earn the trip to the Final Four. Ironically, Michigan followed much the same route through the regionals to the Final Four as it had three years before, including playing its early games in Atlanta. Since most coaches are superstitious, Steve Fisher took no chances, and the team stayed in the same hotel and went on the same tours that the 1989 team had on its march through Atlanta. The next night, Michigan came very close to beating Duke, leading at the half, but Duke finally wore them down. The trip back on the team plane wasn’t as enjoyable as the flight back from Seattle. But the team was young, and the chant was “We’ll be back!”

And indeed they were. The next year, they once again beat a series of very good teams in the tournament to make it to the Final Four in New Orleans. This particular Final Four was even more show-biz that the first two, being played in the gigantic Superdome. The other teams were all traditional powers: Kentucky, Kansas, and North Carolina. Again, nobody gave Michigan much of a chance, particularly playing number-one ranked Kentucky in the semifinals. But in perhaps the greatest game a Michigan team has ever played, they beat Kentucky in overtime. The championship game against North Carolina was evenly matched, with the lead seesawing back and forth throughout the game. Although Michigan held a 5 point lead with two minutes left, North Carolina took the lead again on two long 3-pointers. The ending was one of those unforgettable moments: Michigan struggling back, only to have its star player, Chris Webber, become confused and call an illegal timeout which iced the game for North Carolina. Although it was a disappointing ending, it again demonstrated, as did our earlier experiences, that the
Final Four—who makes it and who wins it—is largely a matter of fate.

This was to be the last Final Four for this team. One by one, the precocious young players of the original Fab Five were lured into the pros, and the team withered away.

The demise of the Fab Five was probably not a bad thing for the University. One of the unusual features of this team was its flamboyance and bravado—and its popularity. It was this Michigan team that introduced a new fashion wave to college basketball: long baggy pants—black socks and shoes. This was the team that suggested in their first year they were so good they could win four NCAA championships. The press was drawn to them like flies to honey.

Some believe that the Fab Five caused longer-term damage to Michigan athletics. In a sense, these precocious athletic talents challenged every tradition of the old guard, both among the fans and the sports boosters. Their street culture style, their arrogance, and, perhaps most of all, their success triggered a bitterness among some in the college sports establishment which continues to this day.

Yet those close to the team knew these were not only talented athletes, but several were strong students (particularly Jalen Rose). They dramatically changed the nature of college basketball from the dominance of power coaches such as Adolph Rupp of Kentucky to the joy and free spirit tolerated by Steve Fisher—and, in our opinion, a change for the good.

While television has turned the Final Four into the showy spectacle of March Madness, those who experienced it as participants developed a more cynical attitude. It represented the extreme of what can happen when one allows the media to transform college athletics into show business.

Coaches

Coaching a modern college athletic program is a demanding and intense profession. The rigors of recruiting, coaching, working with student-athletes, handling the enormous public attention—particularly that from the media—and adhering to the complex rules governing athletes and athletics are challenging. Coaching requires extraordinary commitment, long hours of work, and demanding travel schedules; it often yields frustration and disappointment.

While the celebrity coaches in highly visible football and basketball programs are paid at astronomical levels, at least at universities, their colleagues in other sports programs receive only modest compensation. The same is true for assistant coaches, whose salaries are sometimes almost a factor of ten less than the total compensation of the head coach in the revenue sports. For the majority of coaches in intercollegiate athletics, the real compensation lies not in the income but rather in the enjoyment of working with talented student-athletes, of seeing their progress, and watching them succeed, both on the field and in the classroom.

Although Anne had been close to a number of coaches wives from the earliest days at the University through organizations such as the Faculty Women’s Club, I really had never met any of the coaches until I became provost. We worked to strengthen the bonds not only between coaches and the University but also among the coaches themselves. Each year we would try to host some kind of an event for coaches and their spouses, although in the first year they had to seek permission from their boss, Mr. Canham.

In the presidency, Anne and I had many more opportunities to interact with Michigan’s coaches, and we began to develop a deeper sense of appreciation both for their dedication and skills, as well as their challenges. It was clear that there was a world of difference between the lives led by the head coaches of the football and basketball programs and the coaches of the other athletics teams. While the football and basketball coaches were exceptionally well compensated, they also led public lives that placed great stress on them and their families.

We first experienced the family pressures when we got to know Bo and Millie Schembechler. Bo appreciated our efforts to build stronger links between his players and the University, and we certainly came to respect his remarkable leadership ability and his deep commitment to his players. Millie was also a warm and wonderful member of the Michigan team. One Rose Bowl she even taught Anne the Schembechler side step. That is, when you are walking with Bo, and you see the press ahead, you take a quick step to the side to avoid the photographers. Anne learned well.
Anne’s involvement with Michigan athletics deserves a note here. Although she had never been a big football or basketball fan, as she got to know the coaches, staff, and players on a personal level, she became quite emotionally invested in Michigan athletics. In part, it was probably akin to a parental attachment, since in a sense, one of the roles the president and spouse of the university is to act as surrogate “mom and pop” to the students. Anne also developed a very deep appreciation for the wives and families of the coaches, the stresses and challenges they faced, and the importance of providing some visible support. Usually before major football and basketball games, Anne would make a point to visit briefly with the coaches’ wives. And, over time, she probably became as nervous as the wives during the games themselves—as excited by victories and as disappointed in defeats. It was largely at her urging that we did our best to attend at least a part of an event for each of the teams throughout the year—although the calendar sometimes made this very difficult. Anne became particularly attached to the rapidly evolving programs in women’s athletics at Michigan.

We developed a deep affection and empathy for the coaches and staff of the athletic department. Perhaps it was because we, too, felt many of the public pressures and the frustrating lack of understanding of their roles by the media and the fans; we had a sympathetic understanding of the sacrifices made by the coaches and players, and their families. Beyond this, there was a refreshing simplicity of values among most of Michigan’s sports programs, an absence of politics, and a deep concern for the welfare of the student-athletes, which was usually missed or ignored by those outside the department.

Student-Athletes and Families

In our presidential role, Anne and I frequently attended athletics events, but we rarely had any direct interaction with players. Of course, there were occasions such as receptions or bowl events when we met their families. But the players were generally sufficiently occupied with other activities—athletics and academics—that more than a brief conversation with the president was difficult. Furthermore, they were restricted by NCAA rules in the level of contact, e.g., through events such as receptions.

Although I always found the time if asked, I rarely became involved in recruiting student-athletes. Most often, I would simply greet them if they were brought up to the president’s box during the halftime of a football game, or meet with the parents to assure them that their son or daughter would get a good education. Perhaps the relative inactivity in recruiting was due to my remarkable lack of success.
For the purpose of both physical and mental maintenance, Anne and I would try to make it over to the University’s track for an early morning hour of walking and jogging—the outdoor varsity track during good weather, but more frequently in the Michigan climate, the indoor track during the winter. This gave us yet another opportunity to meet coaches and athletes throughout the season. Usually in mid-August the various fall sports varsity teams would begin to appear on the track for pre-season conditioning. Usually first in the morning would appear “the dawn patrol,” those football players who were required to run a couple of miles at 6:30 am, under the supervision of some very sleepy assistant coaches or trainers. Usually these were players who had not met certain standards such as weight loss or a given two-mile time. But sometimes there were also injured players, the walking wounded, who struggled around the track a few laps. Cruel and unusual punishment? No. Just football.

Later in the morning, we would see other teams running laps together. Once, very early when it was still dark, we came across a body lying on the track. As we approached, worried about what we might find, up jumped a sleepy basketball player to explain that her alarm had gone off an hour early by mistake, so she had just decided to get another hour of sleep, right in the middle of the track! Well, it was a very soft track.

Jogging indoors was even more of a spectator sport, since generally there were lots of athletes working out. The women’s crew had an array of rowing machines, which they would use in unison, generally to very loud rock music. Then they would run timed laps around the track. Sometimes there were track or cross-country athletes, although they would generally only warm up indoors and then go out into the dark cold for longer runs. In the winter term, the ROTC units would appear very early in the morning for workouts: first, loud exercises, then timed runs around the track, coupled with various exercises such as rope climbs or bar pull-ups along the way. The marines were the most enthusiastic, wearing T-shirts proclaiming “Semper Fi” as they lapped everyone. In fact, one year they even gave me my own T-shirt so I could run along with them, although after a lap or two, I gave up. However their spirit and teamwork was infectious, and something our athletic teams admired.

Signs of Strain

Michigan’s athletics achievements during the Schembechler, Weidenbach, and Roberson years were both stunning and unprecedented. For the first time, Michigan began to compete at the national level in all its twenty-three varsity programs, as evidenced by the fact that it finished each year among the top institutions nationwide for the national all-sports championship (the Sears Trophy). During these years, Michigan went to five Rose Bowls (football), three Final Fours— including a NCAA championship (men’s basketball), four hockey Frozen Fours (ice hockey) and a national championship, won over 50 Big Ten championships, dominated the Big Ten in men’s and women’s swimming (including winning the NCAA championship), men’s and women’s cross-country, women’s gymnastics, men’s and women’s track, and women’s softball. And it provided some of the most exciting moments in Michigan’s proud sports tradition—Desmond Howard’s Heisman Trophy, Steve Fisher’s NCAA championship, the Fab Five, Mike Barrowman’s Olympic gold medal, Tom Dolan’s national swimming championships, and on and on.

The success and integrity of Michigan’s athletics programs, coupled with their extraordinary popularity through both the electronic and print media, positioned Michigan as the model for college sports. The Michigan insignia dominated the sales of athletic apparel worldwide and eventually led to a controversial marketing agreement with Nike which later set the standard for similar agreements in the years to come with other leading universities.

Yet at another level, the increasing public exposure of Michigan athletics was causing serious strains. Each misstep by a student-athlete or a coach, the inevitable defeats that characterize every leading program, resulted in a torrent of media coverage. Rare was the month when a Michigan athlete or coach was not being either celebrated or attacked by the media. The coaches, particularly in the more visible programs, came under increasing pressure from both the media and the fans, which had developed an insatiable appetite for success.

The heightened public visibility of Michigan athletics, particularly in the marquee sports of football and men’s basketball, accompanied by the
ever-increasing expectations on the part of Michigan fans put great pressure on both coaches and players alike. After five Big Ten championships in a row—and the entrance of Penn State into the conference—the football team experienced a series of mediocre seasons (although “mediocre” for Michigan means an 8 and 4 season, with only a secondary bowl appearance). Although Steve Fisher managed to continue to recruit top basketball talent after the Fab Five, his teams never were able to win the Big Ten championship or return to the Final Four. The sports media, which had been strong Michigan boosters during the championship years, were now viciously critical of these same programs and coaches as they struggled through mediocre seasons.

The stresses on Gary Moeller finally became unbearable for him. I remember the incident well, because it occurred the weekend of the Spring Commencement. I learned of it just after we had returned from the Saturday commencement exercises, memorable in part because three of the Fab Five, Jimmy King, Ray Jackson, Juwan Howard, were in cap-and-gown. Within minutes of our return, the phone rang, and sports information director Bruce Madej told me, “Coach Moeller is in trouble.” An understatement. The night before Gary had had too much to drink at a local Detroit restaurant, becoming unruly and getting into a tussle with several police officers who were attempting to restrain him and get him in a car headed home. The media coverage was intense, even more so when the police released an audio tape capturing Gary’s behavior in full. After a few days, it became apparent that Gary needed at least a temporary respite from the pressures as UM football head coach. Both Joe Roberson and I tried to convince him that he should take a leave, get some help for the obvious stress he was under, but stay with the program. However, Gary’s pride would not let him take this route, and he announced his intention to step down.

Another one of the coaches who lived in the limelight was Steve Fisher. Steve had first burst onto the scene in the Cinderella story of winning the NCAA championship as a substitute coach following Bill Frieder’s departure for Arizona State. Steve had a way with the media with his folksy, sincere, Midwestern style. And, while there were always a cadre of sports writers out to prove that Steve did not belong at the helm of Michigan basketball, Steve’s skill in recruiting and his game coaching got Michigan back to the Final Four two more times. Of course, both of these experiences were with the Fab Five, probably the most precocious and certainly the most flamboyant basketball team in Michigan history. The very audacity of the team gave Steve years of headaches. Sports writers were continually after the team, trying to criticize the player’s character, their backgrounds, their style of play—but never their raw talent.

As the team quickly unraveled in the face of NBA opportunities, Michigan basketball fell on hard times. Although Steve continued to recruit top talent, the team never rose to a level sufficient for fans and sports writers. Again, the pressure on Steve and Angie Fisher was intense. It reached a climax in a sensational series of newspaper articles claiming that, unknown to Fisher, a Detroit booster had been slipping cash to several of Michigan’s players over the years. The University was pressured to hire a top-flight law firm, specializing in intercollegiate athletics, to investigate the allegations. The firm was unable to substantiate any of the claims, although they were also unable to completely disprove them, leaving Steve and the program in limbo. Hence, in early fall of 1997, just prior to the start of basketball season, a new athletic director, Tom Goss, fired Steve Fisher, although without any evidence of wrongdoing.

It was only several years later that an indictment of a Detroit gambler, Eddie Martin, revealed that he had loaned Chris Webber and two later Michigan players substantial funds, presumably to be paid back from their later professional careers. Although there was no evidence that any of the Michigan athletics staff were involved or aware of this, a new administration decided to penalize the program by stripping away their NCAA banners and forfeiting their records, despite the fact that only one member of the Fab Five had been involved.

Concluding Remarks

We found our personal involvement with the students, coaches, and staff of the athletics programs a refreshing alternative to other presidential roles both within and external to the University. During our latter years, students and coaches from various sports began to attend and cheer on their friends in other
programs. This was particularly evident as more and more male athletes began to attend the athletic events for Michigan’s emerging women’s programs.

Jack Weidenbach, athletics director during the early 1990s, once confided to me that his job was the best in the University because he had the opportunity to work with such outstanding students. Although the media tends to portray college athletes as academically marginal, in reality, across all the programs, most student-athletes are outstanding students, performing at the highest level both in the classroom and on the field, the court, or in the pool. The model of the true student-athlete is alive and well in most college sports, in programs such as swimming, hockey, gymnastics, and track where students train to world-class levels while excelling in some of Michigan’s most difficult academic programs. I once asked one of the women swimmers how she managed to train for several hours a day while pursuing an intense pre-med academic program. She said the secret was “power napping,” the ability to use odd moments of time to catch up on sleep-debt. Talk about optimizing one’s time...

Jack was right about his job. But Anne and I would go beyond the students to highlight the coaches and athletics staff as well. While the coaches had to manage highly competitive athletics programs, recruiting star athletes, developing game strategies, and dealing with the media, their most important roles were as teachers. Even a cursory involvement with college sports soon reveals that successful coaches demonstrate a deep commitment toward their student-athletes, developing relationships that remain strong for a lifetime. We always found the coaches concerned for the total welfare of their students, beyond simply their athletic performance, quite remarkable.

It is this perspective, of college athletes as students and of coaches as teachers, that most clearly reveals the true goal of college sports. At its best, college athletics provide an opportunity for students to learn and develop more fully the values necessary for a meaningful life, values such as determination, sacrifice, courage, and teamwork, perhaps more easily learned through athletic competition than in the classroom. Nothing could be more important to college sports than aligning college sports with the academic mission of the university.

Oh, yes. There is one more postscript!
One of the most fascinating aspects of a major university presidency involves the people that one meets...and, indeed, hosts on behalf of the University. During our presidency, we entertained several U.S. presidents, numerous distinguished guests from the academy, corporate leaders, celebrities, and even a god.

The responsibility for creating, designing, managing, and hosting hundreds of presidential events each year fell to Anne as First Lady of the University. Fortunately, her experience both as a leader of the Faculty Women’s Club and as “deanette” and “provostess” prepared her for these roles. Nevertheless it was a considerable challenge, after over a year of transition, to upgrade the quality of events while reducing their costs. It was also a challenge to change the expectations for the role of the president and first lady in these events. During the transition period, the development staff had essentially taken over total control of events in both the President’s House and Inglis House. The president and first lady were expected to appear to host events, to greet guests, and to make a few remarks, but they were not included in the planning or design of the events themselves.

Yet Anne believed since that image of the University—not to mention the president—would be influenced by the quality of the event, it was important that the hosts, the president and first lady, be involved in key details of the event. Direct intervention would be necessary to raise the quality of the presidential events. She also realized that by raising the expectations for quality at the presidential level, there would be a cascade effect in which other events throughout the University would develop higher quality standards.
The President’s House

The first image that many distinguished visitors to the University have is the President’s House. As noted in earlier chapters, Anne spent very considerable time in renovating and restoring this house, the oldest building on the campus. While perhaps a difficult place to live, the house was a very impressive place to visit.

Usually on special occasions, we would fly flags at the front door to greet guests. In the front entryway, guests were sometimes invited to sign the guest book, although usually this would occur at the end of the event. At large receptions or events, the guest book would be placed in one of the side rooms. A quick glance through the book indicates the remarkable variety of guests to the President’s House.

The President’s House was very large, 14,000 square feet, but it was also very constrained in the types of events it could accommodate. By using the entire first floor area, receptions of up to 200 people could be hosted, typical of holiday receptions and student receptions. However, the layout of the house limited formal dining events to groups of 18 in the dining room, with perhaps an additional 10 on the rear dining porch for less formal occasions. Usually, when Anne and I entertained a group for dinner, we would greet each guest at the door and usher them into the living room for refreshments and conversation.

Dinner would be served in the formal dining room, with the two of us typically seated at the center of the table so that we could interact with as many guests as possible. After dinner, the group would be invited...
into the living room for more conversation. Finally, we would accompany guests to the door to wish them on their way.

This sounds simple, but the logistics of these events were usually far more complex. Each event took a great deal of planning and preparation, from invitations to menus and caterers to preparation of the house. Since Anne believed that our guests were being invited to our home, she gave each event her special attention.

There were always some special challenges. Parking was always a real problem in the Central Campus area. Although we usually arranged for parking on South University in front of the President’s House, if the permits were put up too early, students rapidly filled up the street. During times of student unrest, the President’s House was also a prime target for student demonstrations, particularly if an event was underway.

The large receptions were also a particular challenge, since among the crowds of a hundred or more, there would sometimes be uninvited guests that floated in with the crowd. We always tried to be gracious in these situations, but it could sometimes be awkward.

After each event, Anne would stay downstairs, working with the catering staff, until the house had been cleaned and everything had been put away. Needless to say, most events in the President’s House led to very late evenings for her.

Hosting events in Inglis House was a far easier matter. Although these events took just as much personal planning and preparation, since they were not in our home, we could limit our participation. We would usually arrive 30 minutes or so before the first
guests, to check the preparations, table settings, and other details. We would host the event as if the guests had been invited to our home (as, indeed, Inglis House was originally intended to be). After the last guest left, Anne would check with the staff to make certain everything was in order, and then leave to return to the President’s House.

A word here about entertaining Regents in both the President’s House and Inglis House: Although Inglis House was usually reserved for Regent activities during the week of a Regents meeting—both to accommodate regents traveling from farther distances and the Thursday evening dinner—there was always a bit of sensitivity. Several of the regents developed a personal sense of ownership for the estate, occasionally insisting that the University put their family up in its rooms or host parties for their personal friends. This was always a delicate matter, since while the Regents were indeed the governing board of the University and technically could demand such services, the risk to the University—and the Regents—could be significant if it was learned that they were using University facilities and staff for personal activities. Since we believed that the president might also be subject to such criticism, in our eight years in the presidency, we never utilized Inglis House for personal purposes.

Interestingly enough, several of the Regents had the same attitude about the President’s House. In fact, early in my presidency I had to put my foot down when two Regents insisted that they be served breakfast in the President’s House each morning before the monthly Regents meeting. Since the house had no cook, this would have meant that Anne would have had to cater and host these events. From time to time, one Regent or another would demand that a special event be hosted in the President’s House, regardless of the overload this would cause on its occupants.

Hence, even though the President’s House was intended to be the home for the family of the president, both the needs of the University and the demands of its governing board frequently made it more a place of servitude.

VIPs in the House

The President’s House was also an important place for University ceremonies. Here we hosted numerous dinners and receptions for distinguished guests of the University. For example, the evening before Michigan retired Gerald Ford’s football jersey number, we had a small dinner for President and Mrs. Ford, attended by Governor John Engler and the real celebrities, Bo Schembechler and Steve Fisher.

We occasionally had luncheons and dinners to honor or cultivate important donors, including many leading corporate CEOs. From time to time we would also have small, informal dinners, such as when we invited John Engler down to Ann Arbor just for a get-acquainted visit prior to his run for the governorship.

We also had visits from numerous celebrities. For example, we had a reception for Leonard Bernstein following his “70th birthday concert” with the Vienna Philharmonic. Bernstein would only agree to a post concert reception on the condition that it would be a small affair with about 30 students. Anne was just recovering from bronchitis and a hacking cough that prevented her from attending the concert. However she was on hand to host the reception at the President’s House. The guests, mostly from the School of Music’s conducting program, began to arrive around 11:00 pm. Bernstein held court for a bit backstage after the concert and kept inviting people to the reception, and the guest list grew to about 60. Anne ended up pulling everything she could find out of the freezer and cupboards to feed the extra guests.

Bernstein didn’t arrive until 12:30, and after a couple of large Scotches, he warmed up to the students (who were drinking punch, of course). At one point he went to the piano and began to play some of his Broadway compositions, singing along with lyrics a bit more bawdy than one is used to hearing. At about 2:30, Bernstein decided to go out on the town, and off he went, followed by a dozen students, looking for a bar.

We hosted a number of other musical performers. After a May Festival concert featuring the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra, we hosted a reception and presented its conductor, Kurt Mazur, with both a sweatshirt and a basketball from the recent NCAA championship.

Many celebrities were key volunteers for the Campaign for Michigan. Mike Wallace agreed to be one of the co-chairs of the Campaign, and he played
From left to right: Kurt Masur, James Galway, Leonard Bernstein, Andre Previn, James Earl Jones, Leonard Bernstein with Students, Jonas Salk, Hillary Clinton, President Clinton, President and Mrs. Ford, Bill Cosby, the “60 Minutes” crew, Mike Wallace, Charles Moore, Toni Morrison, William Seidman, and Joyce Carol Oates.
Tea with His Holiness, the Dalai Lama, at the President’s House.
a critical role not only in the New York fund-raising efforts, but also in hosting the major kickoff events for the Campaign. He also made a tremendous contribution to fund the residence housing the Michigan Journalism Fellows program, named Mike and Mary Wallace House.

James Earl Jones was an important leader of the efforts on behalf of Michigan’s School of Music, while the Countess Albina Duboisvouvray and Margaret Towsley were among the most generous donors.

In 1994, the University had the privilege of hosting Dr. Jonas Salk, in recognition of the 40th anniversary of the announcement of the successful tests of the Salk vaccine. Many of Salk’s former collaborators visited the campus for the event, sponsored in part by the March of Dimes, along with a large number of polio survivors.

One of the more interesting events hosted in the President’s House was a reception for the Dalai Lama, who was visiting the campus to receive the Wallenberg Medal. Of course, the Dalai Lama is the most revered figure in Tibetan Buddhism, regarded by the faithful as the 14th reincarnation of Siddartha and as a living god. This visit was particularly meaningful to us, since the year before we had led a delegation of alumni and faculty to China and arranged to spend several days in Tibet on the trip. We had seen first-hand the extraordinary importance of the Dalai Lama. Yet even with this background, we were still overwhelmed by his humble, kind, and humorous nature-and his wisdom, of course.

The visit itself required some careful planning, since the Dalai Lama does not eat or drink after noon. Anne arranged for a small “tea ceremony” offering a choice of tea or hot water, so that we could first meet and chat with His Holiness for several minutes before introducing him to the many guests. He was charming, and the discussions ranged from theoretical physics to Tibetan flowers.

He presented us with the traditional Tibetan silk scarves, and then, after a receiving line, Jim rode with him to Crisler Arena for the Wallenberg Lecture. It was quite an occasion.

Presidential Commencements

Because of Michigan’s prominence as an institution, not a year passed without numerous “command performance” events, involving distinguished visitors. Many of these involved commencements in which the University awards honorary degrees to famous leaders. On some occasions, these took on national importance, such as when the University gave honorary degrees to President George H.W. Bush and Barbara Bush and to First Lady Hillary Clinton. In both cases, the honorees actually spent only a short time on campus–arriving just before and leaving just after the commencement ceremony. However, preparing even for this short visit was a Herculean task.

The Bush Commencement was a particular challenge. The University routinely invited sitting presidents of the United States to deliver commencement addresses, but since so many other universities did the same, we rarely received a positive response. In fact, in modern times the only other “presidential” commencements were Lyndon Johnson’s “Great Society” speech in 1964 and Gerald Ford’s speech in the late 1970s. However, in March, 1992, the day after the president addressed Congress to signal the end of the Gulf war, I received a call from the White House saying that President and Mrs. Bush would be delighted to receive a honorary degree and that the President would also give the commencement address.

Beyond the fact that this was less than 60 days prior to the commencement, Michigan faced another challenge. The only venue large enough to accommodate such a presidential commencement was Michigan Stadium, and it was in the midst of a massive renovation. In fact, the University was in the process of installing natural turf and lowering the field by eight feet to improve sight lines. At the time of the White House call, the field was a large hole in the ground.

But University staff stepped forward as if this were their own version of Operation Desert Storm. They ordered enough plyboard to cover the field, and with the efforts of thousands of people, managed to have the stadium ready by the May commencement. The security logistics were also complex, since Secret Service folks took over Ann Arbor a couple of weeks before the event. Ironically, there was an incident the week before commencement in which a disturbed former employee methodically shot out all the windows of the Fleming Building with an M-15 assault rifle in the
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middle of the night, just missing a security guard. But the Secret Service concluded that this was a random event unrelated to the president’s visit and allowed us to proceed.

The commencement itself was quite an event. Over 70,000 attended, under blue skies. (When the White House staff was asked what to do in the event of rain, they responded with “He gets wet...and YOU get wet!”...)

Everything went as planned, and we all breathed a sigh of relief as the presidential cavalcade drove off afterwards. However, later that afternoon after President Bush returned to Camp David, he went for a short jog and experienced heart palpitations—the first sign of what was later diagnosed as Graves syndrome. Ironically enough, when he gave the Michigan commencement address his popularity, following the Gulf War, was at an incredible 92%.

The University was well experienced for such command performances when Hillary Clinton accepted Michigan’s invitation in 1995. Again it was a marvelous day with 50,000 in attendance. When the First Lady approached the podium and saw the size of the crowd, she soon set aside her prepared remarks and gave one of her campaign trail talks on health care reform and other issues of the administration. But the students loved it, and again everything was a success.

Commencements were always a three-ring circus–make that a 17-ring circus, since each of Michigan’s many schools and colleges also had individual ceremonies, frequently with their own distinguished speakers. Anne and I usually hosted a luncheon or dinner just prior to the spring and winter commencements for the honorary degree recipients. During our presidency, we had the opportunity to honor—and to meet–some of the great figures of our times.

There were a variety of other presidential experiences of note. Periodically the Gerald Ford Library would host a major policy seminar, sometimes in cooperation with the Carter Center in Atlanta.

Dining with the Queen

Actually, there were occasionally pleasant surprises and enjoyable experiences associated with being the president of a major university. Anne and I had such an experience in spring of 1990, just after we had honored President and Mrs. Bush at Spring Commencement.

We were attending a National Science Board meeting in Washington, just prior to traveling on to Boston for the inauguration of our friend and former provost, Chuck Vest, as president of MIT. My secretary, Nona Mustard, called the hotel to inform us that the White House had called Ann Arbor with an invitation to dinner with the Queen and Prince Philip the following Tuesday. My first response: “What queen? THE queen?” “Yes.” Anne asked, “What do we wear?” Nona said that the copy of the invitation the White House faxed her said “Black tie with decorations”...Wow!...(Nona was a Scot, so she was not impressed...)

We both decided that this was truly a command performance, so we asked Nona to pull together whatever information she could on protocol at such state affairs. We also realized that we were probably substitute invitees. The state dinner with the Queen was the hottest ticket of the year in Washington, and to be invited with less than a week remaining meant that someone else had canceled out (...probably Secretary of State James Baker who was on an emergency trip to the Middle East...), and we had been substituted in part out of appreciation for the Spring Commencement.

The next challenge was dress. Jim’s part was easy. He did have a black tie–but no decorations. Anne’s was more difficult, since this affair required a floor length evening gown—not part of the normal president’s spouse wardrobe. This was made more difficult by the fact that we were headed up to Boston for Chuck Vest’s inauguration and would not be back in Ann Arbor until Sunday. But surely Boston must have places where one could find such a gown.

While we went on to Boston, Nona began to gather protocol material. For example, when greeting the Queen, you never look at her unless she looks at you. You address her with “Your majesty”...and the Prince with “Your royal highness”.

The MIT inauguration was fun, with lots of Michigan folks in attendance. In fact, someone (they blamed me, but I hadn’t been so imaginative) hung an enormous banner over one of MIT’s buildings overlooking the inauguration reception saying “The University of Michigan at Cambridge”.

All of the Boston bigwigs were there–Ted Kennedy,
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Bill Weld—since, as the Vests were told later, they were essentially being coronated as “the king and queen of Boston”.

The next day Anne and I started our shopping rounds for the evening gown. After trying several of the more obvious places—Nieman Marcus, Saks, etc.—we finally found a small dress shop in Copley Place that had a gown that Anne thought would work. However, like most evening gowns, it would require extensive alternation, and the shop said we could have it ready in a couple of weeks. Anne explained the situation, the royal affair just four days away, and that we would be leaving for Ann Arbor early Sunday morning. Amazingly enough, the store believed us and said that we would have the dress ready the next morning. And sure enough, they kept the schedule, Anne picked up the dress (and the bill—which was a bit of a shock to one who primarily shopped with the Lands End catalog), and headed back to Michigan.

The next couple of days were spent reviewing whatever we could find out about protocol and such. I had a prior commitment to speak at a Detroit Alumni Club luncheon on Tuesday, so we were not able to fly down to Washington until that afternoon. As we boarded the plane, whom should Anne spot in first class but Governor John Engler and his wife Michelle. She started to say, “Are you going to...” and they said, “Yes, would you like to ride along with us? We have a limousine.”

That solved the next problem. Although we were staying at the J. W. Marriott, only two blocks from the White House, attending such an affair requires making a certain entrance. Somehow it didn’t seem right just walking up the drive to the West Wing entrance. Fortunately, the Englers had experience, and they had already arranged for the use of a limousine. They were staying in the same hotel, so this made it rather easy.

So at 6:30, off we went, in black tie (but without any decorations) and expensive evening gown, accompanying the Governor in his limo, to meet the Queen! After being checked through security, we entered the lower area of the West Wing and walked down the corridor. When we turned the corner, we ran into a large group of newspaper photographers who had been stationed to capture the famous. They started flashing away, but we soon realized it was not for us but rather Henry Kissinger who was right behind us. As we passed up the stairs to the East Room, a White House attaché handed each guest a dining card with their table number.

The other guests were gathering in the East Room, a large stately room designed for such occasions. There were roughly 100 people already gathered in the room. There were no nametags, but looking about the room we soon realized why. Everyone there—except the two of us—really needed no identification. We began to look around the room and whisper to each other “Isn’t that?”... and usually it was. It was a very eclectic collection of folks. Since the state dinner was billed in part as an opportunity for the Queen to honor the leaders of the recently completed Operation Desert Storm victory, there were several military leaders such as Generals Colin Powell and Norman Schwarzkopf. There were also a number of political leaders and Washington types—Speaker Tom Foley, the Governors of Michigan and Ohio, Henry Kissinger. Also present were several corporate CEOs—Red Poling of Ford and John Akers of IBM. The usual group of Hollywood figures were also there, e.g., Morgan Freeman, Bill Blass, and Jesse Norman. And then some interesting new folks like Ken Burns, a former graduate of Pioneer High whose documentary on the Civil War had just appeared on television. We appeared to be the only university folks.

At precisely 7 pm, the doors opened, Ruffles and Flourishes was played, and the President and the Queen entered the room, followed by Mrs. Bush and Prince Philip. They quickly formed a receiving line, and everyone marched dutifully by with their carefully rehearsed “Your majesty” and “Your royal highness”. After the receiving line, the guests were then subtly herded down the hall to the state dining room.

Here there was a bit of surprise. The room was set with round tables of 8 to 10 guests, and Anne and I were each assigned to separate tables. I looked across the room and saw Anne motioning toward me. At first I thought something might be wrong with Anne’s dress (a typical male reaction). But instead, she walked over and said “I’m sitting at the table with the Queen and the President!”

When she had arrived at her table, she was first puzzled since there appeared to be no other guests.
Then, as she walked around the table looking at place cards, she realized why. Her table was indeed the “Royal Table”, with President Bush, the Queen, and then an array of guests including Arthur Annenberg, Angela Lansbury, and such. Anne was seated between Red Poling, CEO of Ford, and Arnold Palmer, directly across from the Queen! (Although she noted that the very large floral centerpiece prevented her from speaking directly to Her Majesty, even if it would have been allowable.)

The dinner itself was in the Washington style, with each course served from large silver trays, enjoyable, particularly, since at Jim’s table there was one of the Queen’s Ladies in Waiting who had a very relaxed and irreverent attitude toward such state occasions. Anne got a bit weary talking to Arnold Palmer about golf, but being seated with the President of the United States and the Queen of England kept the adrenaline levels high. The last course was an elegant royal carriage made of chocolate and filled with pistachio mousse. Anne’s head table ate their served portion of the mousse, but my table devoured the entire chocolate carriage.

After dinner the guests were escorted back to the East Room, which had been set up for a concert by Jesse Norman. We sat with the Governor of Ohio and talked about—what else—Michigan vs. Ohio State football! Following the concert, the guests gathered in the hall corridor to talk and listen to the Marine Corps orchestra, and then at roughly 10:00 pm, all of the guests were politely herded along to the exit and their cars.

The next day we flew back to Ann Arbor, to resume life as commoners. We did manage to make the list of guests printed in the New York Times, and the responses were predictable. Many of our presidential colleagues wondered why they had invited the president from MICHIGAN...and not Harvard or Yale. One of the Regents sent me a letter offering us the use of his fashion consultant, so that we could develop a wardrobe suitable for such occasions.

But the Duderstadtts returned to life as normal, at the bottom of the heap that represents the place of the president at a major university...
President to president:
Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, George Bush, Bill Clinton, and two national championship presidential ceremonies.
Chapter 11
If This Is Tuesday, We Must Be...Where?

There are times in a president’s life when one begins to feel as if each morning, when arriving at the office, the drill is to be handed an airline ticket and told that the car to the airport is waiting. To be sure, travel is no stranger to university presidents and their spouses. Whether it is fund-raising, or visiting alumni, or attending meetings, or simply flying the flag, the life of a president is always on the go.

I once suggested the hypothesis that there were, in reality, only about 500 people who traveled all the time. They always ran into each other at airports. And half were university presidents.

One good measure of travel mileage is platinum card customer status with airlines, generally 75,000 miles or more each year. I once earned this status simply traveling back and forth to Washington for National Science Board meetings (about 75 round trips worth!).

All In The Family...

One of the roles of the president and spouse is to serve as the official representatives of the institution for numerous organizations. Since the University of Michigan is generally regarded as a leader of public higher education in America (just as Harvard is regarded as the leader of private higher education), Anne and I generally were expected to play a significant leadership role in many of these organizations. While this provided us with many opportunities, it also imposed very significant responsibilities and time commitments on the president. Such was life...

The Association of American Universities (AAU):

This is the most important of the higher education associations, since it is a presidents/spouses only organization representing the top 60 research universities in the nation (and Canada). Since both presidents and spouses are involved together in its activities, it is also a very important mechanism in building personal relationships among the leaders of various universities.

AAU meets twice each year, on a university campus in the fall and in Washington in the spring. The fall meeting is probably the more interesting, since it gives one the experience of seeing other campuses. By late spring, when the Washington meeting occurs, most of the presidents and spouses are so tired and stressed out that not much gets accomplished—except for seeing who has managed to survive another year.

Since the fall meeting rotates among universities, the odds of it landing on one’s own campus are small. But, as it happened, Harold Shapiro had volunteered Michigan as the site for the AAU fall meeting before he left for Princeton. Hence, in only our second year of the presidency, we found ourselves hosting the AAU presidents. We had our AAU baptism-by-fire rather early. A bit scary for a new presidential team to know that the presidents and first spouses of the nation’s top universities will be visiting one’s campus and inspecting everything you do...

Fortunately, the AAU meeting hit a time when the students were relatively well behaved, the weather was perfect, and everything came off on schedule. The University appeared at its best. The first night’s dinner was in the Law Club, and Joan Morris and Bill Bolcum provided the entertainment...complete with an encore of “Marshmallow Lime Jello Surprise”. The next night, a special treat was arranged for the group. The dinner was held in the reading room of the Rackham School of
Graduate Studies, which was noted for having the seals of each of the founding members of AAU on its walls. All in all, it was a good show—and very important to convey a sense of the momentum of the University to others.

During my presidency we were entertained in similar ways at many other campuses—Tulane, Penn, Washington, Colorado, North Carolina/Duke, Indiana—but Michigan still stands out.

While the AAU meetings dealt with some important issues, their real value was to provide an opportunity for informal discussions of the trials and tribulations of higher education and to build a network among the presidents. Since the AAU was very concerned with research funding and policies, my role as chair of the National Science Board always kept me very involved in their activities.

Perhaps the only disconcerting aspect of the AAU was their tradition of publishing each year the names of the 60 presidents, ranked by longevity. The turnover in this group was quite extraordinary. By the time we stepped down, I ranked 8th in seniority among the AAU presidents. Furthermore, there were only three presidents left who had served more than 10 years.

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC)...Now renamed the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU)

This is the primary association of major public universities, with roughly 130 members. However, this involves many smaller institutions that are not UMAA peers. Furthermore, unlike the AAU, which was a presidents’ organization, NASULGC had strong participation by deans and others. Michigan has never given it the same priority as AAU. (Indeed, during the dark days of budget cuts, Harold Shapiro even considered withdrawing, which would have been a big mistake.) Since I felt it important for UM to stay involved and step up to leadership from time to time, Anne and I maintained some level of involvement. Furthermore I headed up its federal relations effort (with Tom Butts’ able help) and had a good working relationship with the President, Peter McGrath (now led by Peter McPherson, former president of Michigan State University, and also a good friend).

Its meetings were generally in the convention mode, more like three-ring circuses than the smaller, more intimate affairs of AAU. Hence we never really developed a particular attachment to the organization.

The Big Ten Council of Presidents

Although the Big Ten is generally thought of as an athletic conference, the organization also links together its members (including the University of Chicago) as an academic association. The Council of Presidents tends to spend most of its time as the Board of Directors of the Big 10 Conference, Inc. The Council members
generally met for two-day meetings each December, in the bitter cold of Chicago, and then in early June on the sweltering campus of one of their member universities. Although spouses sometimes participated in the June meeting, there was not the strong camaraderie of AAU.

Since the Council of Presidents is legally a Board of Directors, it has frequent meetings, usually in Chicago or in conjunction with AAU meetings. It also relies extensively on teleconferencing.

Like the AAU, the leadership of the Conference is determined by seniority, with the senior president in the conference serving as chair of the board. In my last year as president at Michigan, I was also chair of the board of directors of the Big Ten. It perhaps is also a sign of the times that after my eight years of service, only President Steve Beering at Purdue had served longer. In fact, there were no other presidents in the Big Ten who had served even five years. The casualty rate was unusually high.

The Business Higher Education Forum

This organization, founded by the American Council on Education, consisted of 40 presidents and 40 CEOs of major corporations. It met twice each year for three-day meetings, usually in Arizona or California in January and somewhere in the US or Europe in June. It was also an organization that involved spouses as well, so its meetings could be both informative and enjoyable. It also provided an opportunity to build important relationships with business leaders.

The problem was simply timing. The winter meeting generally occurred during the last week in January—a very busy time in higher education. Although it was generally held at the Ventana Canyon Resort in the mountains above Tucson, folks were always on the go.

However there were some interesting memories. One of the more interesting dinners was held at the infamous Biosphere II, with Art Buchwald as the speaker, no less. The tour of the Biosphere, led by the “biosphereans” themselves just prior to their being sealed in for a year’s habitation, lasted a bit long, so the group probably tried to make up for lost ground too rapidly at the cocktail hour. All it all, it was a rather irreverent dinner.

The summer meeting generally occurred the same week in June as the Tanner Group, so we rarely could make it. The exception was an unusual meeting held in Brussels with the European counterpart of the Forum to discuss the implications of the Common Market. Since this landed back-to-back with the Tanner Meeting at Oxford, we were able to do both and, over the weekend between the two meetings, drove down to Paris to experience the newly opened Paris Disneyland (a story for another time...and another book...)

The Tanner Group

Perhaps the most interesting and enjoyable higher education gathering was the Tanner Group. This group consisted of the presidents and spouses of the leading universities in the world: Harvard, Michigan, California, Stanford, Yale, Princeton, Oxford, Cambridge...and Utah (which was the home institution of the benefactor, O. C. Tanner). The presidents/spouses serve formally as trustees of the Tanner Trust, which sponsored the Tanner Lectures on Human Values at each of the institutions. They met for several days in late June, at either university campuses or world-class resorts.

In many ways the Tanner Group was similar to the AAU in being an organization of presidents and spouses. However, because the group was so much smaller, and the locations of the meetings more remote (e.g., a Grand Hotel in Bellagio, the Mauna Kea Resort in Hawaii, a great house near Oxford, a ski resort high above Park City), there was more of an opportunity for developing friendships and sharing the experience of the presidency. Obert Tanner, his wife Grace, and their daughter Carolyn watched over the group and provided the bond that kept it together year after year.

Although the group’s primary responsibility was to watch over the assets of the Tanner Trust and its associated Lecture Series on Human Values, there were many opportunities to get together to discuss important issues facing higher education. The group usually tried to set aside some time each meeting where presidents and spouses could sit around the table and chat informally with each other about trials and tribulations of the modern university presidency, usually launched with a question such as “Well, what kind of a year have you had, anyway?”

Since the group included presidents such as
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Donald Kennedy of Stanford, David Gardner of the University of California, Chase Peterson of Utah, and Neil Rudenstine of Harvard—all able leaders, but also presidents who had faced extraordinary personal challenges—the meetings were always very interesting—and sometimes actually quite moving.

Alumni Trips

Like most alumni organizations, the University of Michigan Alumni Association manages a very extensive travel operation. Each year the UMAA sponsors 30 to 40 international tours for alumni. On each of these tours, it is customary to invite a faculty or staff member to serve both as host and as a source of information about the University. It was also common for the Alumni Association to invite senior administrators such as deans or executive officers along on such trips, in part to serve as University resources, but also to cultivate these individuals. In fact, some deans and vice presidents end up taking UMAA trip somewhere almost every year.

Unfortunately, we never had the opportunity to participate in these activities while I was in the Engineering Dean role. Oh, after a last minute cancellation, we were invited to host a tour group to Katmandu in the middle of the fall term on two weeks notice (clearly impossible). But we never received a serious invitation. Finally, when we had moved into the provost role, we were invited personally by the director to participate in Camp Michigania in Switzerland, a favorite of the previous provost. We gladly accepted. But, as noted earlier, this trip occurred just after I had been elected as president of the University.

In the presidency, our schedule was so hectic that we had no time to consider such trips. However, there were two exceptions: a Michigan trip to China and an alumni trip on the Rhine and the Danube to Hungary.

The China Odyssey

Although our trip to China in 1993 involved an alumni group, it was organized apart from the conventional UMAA travel packages. The intent was to provide a number of key alumni with an in-depth exposure to China and exceptional access to China’s leaders and educational and cultural institutions, which would result in a strong base of commitment and support for the Center for Chinese Studies. Because of the unusual nature of the trip and the high level of anticipated interactions, it was felt important that the president should be a member of this delegation. This trip would represent the first time that the president of the University visited China since President Shapiro’s trip in 1981.

This trip was quite unlike anything we had experienced before. It combined high-level visits with government officials, interaction with the leaders of Chinese universities, and major alumni outreach activities. A number of alumni who had already made significant gifts to the University were invited to participate in a trip, which had been carefully arranged by members of the Center for Chinese Studies, under the direction of Professor Ken Lieberthal. Included in the faculty group leading the trip were Leonard Woodcock, Adjunct Professor and former Ambassador to China, and Marshall Wu, Curator of Asian Art at the University’s Museum of Art. The trip was quite extraordinary, visiting a number of key cities including Beijing, Xi’an, Shanghai, Changdu, and Lhasa, Tibet.

The arrangements associated with such an effort were complex, and planning for the trip started over a year earlier. Because there was last-minute capacity on the trip, Anne and I decided to provide our daughters, Susan and Kathy, with a belated graduation present by inviting them on the trip as well. It was planned from the beginning that the trip should be self-funded, and all of the alumni involved were asked to pay not only their own travel expenses, but also the travel costs associated with the faculty leaders and development support. We paid personally for the full cost of our daughters, of course.

While the travel schedule demanded of a university leader can be hectic, it did provide the opportunity to visit some fascinating places, as the photographic collages on the following pages demonstrate.
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China and Tibet 1993
Japan, Nagoya, and Kyoto
France, Paris, and Giverny
France, Sarlat (Dordogne), Chenenceau, Villandry Gardens, Normandy & Utah Beach
France, Mont St Michel, Bayeux, Carcassone City, Roen, Honfleur & Rocamadour
England
Oxford
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The Michigan Families

The contemporary university is much like a city, comprised of a bewildering array of neighborhoods and communities. To the faculty, it has almost a feudal structure, divided up into highly specialized academic units, frequently with little interaction even with disciplinary neighbors, much less with the rest of the campus. To the student body, the university is an exciting, confusing, and sometimes frustrating complexity of challenges and opportunities, rules and regulations, drawing them together only in cosmic events such as fall football games or campus protests. To the staff, the University has a more subtle character, with the parts woven together by policies, procedures, and practices evolving over decades, all too frequently invisible or ignored by the students and faculty.

In some ways, the modern university is so complex, so multi-faceted, that it seems that the closer one is to it, the more intimately one is involved with its activities, the harder it is to understand its entirety. It is easy to become lost in the forest for the trees. Clark Kerr once portrayed the community of the multiversity as connected only by a common concern for parking.

The University of Michigan is also a diverse community of many families: faculty, staff, and students; but also deans and executive officers and office staff and former presidents. As president and first lady, Anne and I were not only members of all of these families, but we were also expected to support and protect them, to understand their concerns and their aspirations, and to advance their causes. Although the diversity in needs and expectations pulled us in many directions, it was these families, these people, who made the University such a wonderful community and sustained our efforts. This pastoral role is among the most important and challenging, yet also the most rewarding, aspects of university leadership.

Students

In the early days of American higher education, many college presidents played a direct role in student life, knowing each student by name and following their progress, much as would the headmaster of a preparatory academy. Yet from its earliest days, Michigan’s presidents followed a different path. They sought to build not simply a college but instead a great university where faculty scholarship and professional education would be placed on an equal footing with the training and socialization of young adults. Both Henry Tappan and James Angell were strongly opposed to such college traditions as dormitories and rigid discipline. They believed that students should be treated as adults, living independently in the community, rather than subjected to a common and carefully prescribed living experience. Later attempts to impose the collegiate model at Michigan, such as those by C. C. Little, met fierce resistance from both faculty and students alike—and continue to do so today.

Beyond this striking difference in educational philosophy, the size and diversity of such large universities as Michigan, with tens of thousands of students spread across hundreds of different disciplines and professional majors, dictates much of the presidential role with respect to students. Certainly, the president may have significant impact on the student body through involvement in key policy areas, such as admissions, student conduct, and student extracurricular activities (including, of course, intercollegiate athletics). But much of the president’s direct interaction with students involves symbolic activities—for example, presiding over such student events as convocations, honors ceremonies, and, of course, commencement.
Some university presidents still attempt to teach a regularly scheduled course and hold office hours for students. Others maintain research programs—even laboratories—and advise graduate students. Yet first as provost and then as president, I soon became convinced that the complexity, unpredictability, and importance of presidential duties and responsibilities outweighed any substantive or symbolic value to taking on the additional burden of regularly scheduled courses (although I did spend much of my time educating legislators, trustees, alumni, and even the faculty on the intricacies of the contemporary university). Instead, I used other methods to keep in touch with students and student issues, including regular visits as a guest lecturer (sometimes unannounced) in a wide array of undergraduate and graduate classes; frequent meals with students in residence halls; regular meetings with leaders of various student groups, such as student government and the student newspaper; and a series of events Anne would arrange at the President’s House for various student groups throughout the university year.

Although our calendar was always kept overloaded by the usual responsibilities of the presidency, University leadership, Washington and Lansing representation, fund-raising, etc., Anne and I tried to find opportunities to meet students and listen to their concerns and their ideas. Usually at least once a month we would have meals with students in residence halls or attend their receptions. Although the days of open student receptions in the President’s House had long since ended in the face of unpredictable student activism, we did host a large number of special events for students: receptions for honor students, student leaders, and student-athletes; dinners to honor special accomplishments; graduation events, etc. One of the most enjoyable events each year was an elegant dinner hosted each summer at Inglis House for the student leaders participating in Leadership 2017, Maureen Hartford’s effort to build a sense of teamwork throughout student organizations. Anne arranged the reception in the Inglis House gardens and dinner so that students were given the same treatment as wealthy donor prospects. Afterwards we let them have the run of Inglis House and then, by popular request, took a series of pictures of the group (including what came to the obligatory photo of students leaders trouncing on the president.)

We also took a great deal of interest in other student activities. For example, because of my role in the College of Engineering, we worked with Michigan students competing in the National Solar Car Race. On one occasion, we traveled to the finish line in Minneapolis to cheer Michigan on to victory!

Faculty

Of course, as members of the Michigan faculty family for over three decades, it is not surprising that we would give these members of the University community high priority. In fact, during my inauguration address, I began with the statement: “It is
Student events with the President and First Lady (the campus “mom and pop”)
sometimes said that great universities are run by their faculties, for their faculties. Clearly the quality of our institutions is determined by the quality of our faculty—by their talents, their commitments, and their actions.”

The remarks above were addressed to the faculty of the University of Michigan in a particularly heartfelt manner. Unlike many university presidents these days, I had spent my entire academic career as a faculty member at the same institution where I was to be installed as president. Hence, in a very real sense, I regarded myself first and foremost as a member of the Michigan faculty, on temporary assignment as Michigan’s president. Anne, too, was a member of this family, working for the University through various faculty organizations such as the Faculty Women’s Club for all of her years in Ann Arbor.

Most of our friends were part of this faculty community. And most of our lives had been spent toiling in its vineyards. The public—and, in fact, many faculty members—tend to think of the faculty as a homogenous group, all engaged in similar activities of teaching and research, and all experiencing similar stresses of publish or perish, tenure or out. Yet there is as much diversity among faculty and their roles as across any other aspect of American society.

For example, there are indeed many faculty members in the “Mr. Chips” mode: dedicated classroom teachers, working closely with their students and writing an occasional scholarly paper. But contrast this with a professor of surgery, with long hours devoted to patient treatment and care, engaged in ongoing efforts to attract the research sponsorship to support a laboratory and students, with teaching in a one-on-one mode the next generation of medical students and surgeons, and perhaps trying to start a spin-off company to develop a new piece of medical technology. Or the professor of violin, working one day with students and performing the next on the concert stage. All are valued members of the university faculty, but their activities, their perspectives, their needs and their concerns are as diverse as can be.

So, too, the role and activities of a faculty member can change over the course of a career. Early attention is focused on building scholarly momentum and reputation and developing teaching skills. Then, once the early hurdles of tenure and promotion have been achieved, members of the faculty become more involved in service both within and external to the university. Some senior faculty members become involved in what are referred to as “deeper games,” where they use their intellectual power to shape their field of scholarship. Others become campus politicians, representing their colleagues in faculty governance. Still others take on administrative roles as chairs, deans, or perhaps even presidents.

But there was a certain dilemma here, since the further I rose up the administrative ladder, from dean to provost and eventually to president, the more suspect we became to our faculty colleagues. Yet this was not surprising, since faculty resist—indeed, deplore—the command/control style of leadership characterizing the traditional pyramid organizations of business and government. In fact, many sought careers in academe in part because they knew here they would have no “supervisor” giving direct orders or holding them accountable. Faculty members could do what they wanted, when they wanted. They had total freedom, as long as they were capable of strong teaching and scholarship in their field.

Faculty members are usually offended by any suggestion that the university can be compared to other organizational forms such as corporations and governments. Pity the poor administrator who mistakenly refers to the university as a corporation, or to its students or the public at large as customers, or to its faculty as employees. The faculty takes great pride in belonging to a creative anarchy. Indeed, faculty members look down upon those who get caught in the trap of academic administrators. Even their closest colleagues become somehow “tainted,” unfit, no longer a part of the true academy, no matter how distinguished their earlier academic accomplishments, once they succumb to the pressures of administration. All presidents, provosts, and deans have heard the suggestion that any one on the faculty could do their job, but scholarship and teaching were higher priorities. In reality, talent in management is probably as rare a human attribute as the ability to contribute original scholarship.

Yet the faculty also seeks leadership, not in details of its teaching and scholarship, but in the abstract, in providing the visions for its institutions, in articulating fundamental values, in stimulating a sense of optimism
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and excitement. It also seeks protection from the forces of darkness that rage outside the university’s ivy-covered walls: the forces of politics, greed, anti-intellectualism, and mediocrity that would threaten the important values of the university—knowledge, wisdom, excellence, service—truth, justice, and the American way. Hence those members of the faculty sentenced to roles as administrators, while never really trusted, were nevertheless expected to support, protect and defend the interests of the faculty.

To be sure, in reality the university is very much a bottom-up organization, a creative anarchy, a “voluntary” enterprise. Nevertheless, leadership plays a critical role even in the university, just as it does in other social institutions. If one examines major accomplishments of the institution—the excellence of a program, its impact on society—invariably one will find a committed, forceful, visionary, and effective leader. Perhaps it is a principal investigator, or a department chair, or even a dean. Indeed, in some cases—as astounding as it may sound, the leadership may even be provided by a member of that most sinister of all academic organizations, the dreaded “central administration.”

The Deans

The University of Michigan is known throughout higher education as a “deans’ university”. Because of our size and our highly decentralized organization, deans of our many schools and colleges have unusual freedom and authority, albeit with considerable responsibility and accountability. Most of the progress made by schools over the years can be traced to the leadership of their deans—although, of course, the same can usually be said for the consequences of any shortcomings.

Although some academic units such as the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts or the School of Medicine rival major universities in their size, financial resources, or organizational complexity, for most University of Michigan schools and colleges, both the size and intellectual span is just about right to allow true leadership. To be sure, a dean has to answer in both directions, to the provost from above and their faculty from below. But their capacity to control both their own destiny and that of their school is far beyond that of most administrators.

In an interview as we were stepping out of the presidency, I remarked that both Anne and I viewed being Dean of Engineering as the best role we had in the University. In part this was because of the great talent and energy of our faculty colleagues and the close bond among members of the faculty family. But it was also due to the simpler nature of the agenda, the ability to get to know most faculty members and many students, to have an immediate and observable impact. But, perhaps most of all, it was enjoyable because a dean is relatively free from the intense politics that swirl about and sometimes dominate the central administration.

The deans themselves form another family, occasionally in competition with one another, but more frequently working together. A good provost and president make it a point to provide many opportunities for deans and their spouses to socialize together, to build friendships and bonds, since these, in turn, glue together the University. Both Anne and I look back with considerable fondness at the friendships and experiences we had with fellow deans.

Since the University is so heavily dependent upon the quality of its deans, most presidents and provosts make great effort to attract the very best into these important positions. Hence the cadre of deans is usually quite remarkable. To be sure, there is always a pecking order among deans, with the “big dogs”—LS&A, Medicine, Engineering, Law, and Business—sometimes standing apart from the “little dogs”—Music, Art, Architecture, Social Work, Education, Pharmacy, Dentistry, Nursing, Natural Resources, and Public Health. The Rackham Graduate School is usually an anomaly and, in fact, can sometimes serve as an intermediary between the superpowers and the nonnuclear states.

Although the deans generally meet regularly in a large council with the provost—once called the Academic Affairs Advisory Council but more recently called the Academic Policy Group—the size of this body mitigates against substantive discussion. In the late 1970s, when Al Sussman, former dean of the Graduate school, was serving as interim provost, he formed a clandestine group of deans known as the “SOUP” Group (for “Seminar on University Priorities”) for the purpose of breaking the deans into smaller discussion units.
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While this group, consisting of LS&A, Engineering, Law, Business, Social Work, Pharmacy, and Rackham was sometimes useful, it later evolved into an exclusive fraternity with members selected more for personality than priority of school (e.g., how could one possibly leave out Medicine while including Pharmacy). Nevertheless, for the most part, the family of deans was remarkable for the quality of its members and their commitment to the University.

It is my belief that great universities have great deans. Hence, it is important for the president and provost to work closely together not only in the appointment and support of these key academic leaders but also to build a sense of community among them, establishing friendships and bonds, since these, in turn, glue together the university. Perhaps because of our own experience as members of the “deans’ family,” Anne and I were always on the lookout for new ways to involve the deans more intimately in the leadership of the university.

To be sure, there are many drawbacks to academic leadership roles, such as department chairs or deans. These positions rarely open up at a convenient point in one’s career, since most productive faculty members usually have ongoing obligations for teaching or research that are difficult to suspend for administrative assignments. Although an energetic faculty member can sometimes take on the additional burdens of chairing a major academic committee or even leading a small department or research institute, the time requirements of a major administrative assignment such as department chair or dean will inevitably come at the expense of scholarly activity and the ability to attract research grants. The higher one climbs on the academic leadership ladder, from project director to department chair to dean to executive officer, the more likely it is that the rungs of the ladder will burn out below them as they lose the scholarly momentum (at least in the opinion of their colleagues) necessary to return to active roles in teaching and research.

University of Michigan Professor Dan Moerman, an anthropologist by training and longstanding member of faculty governance, suggests a very interesting perspective of the role of a dean as a broker between the two cultures of the university: the faculty (collegial, center-periphery, colleagues, peer respect) and the administration (hierarchical, top-down, bosses, performance evaluations). Moerman observes that,
“When a president discusses things with deans, he calls a meeting; with the faculty, the president invites them to dinner. The dean is the mediator, the connecting link, between the two cultures. To be credible to the faculty, the dean must have scholarly credentials. But to relate to the administration, the dean needs to be competitive rather than collegial. This leads to a certain intentional ambiguity to the role. The dean is a broker, a middleman, betwixt and between—a trickster like Coyote or Janus.” Since deans must represent the views of the faculty and never be seen as losing, they must become quite conservative, seeking to minimize risk and maximize flexibility. A president who interacts directly with the faculty becomes very threatening to a dean. (“If man can talk to God, what need is there for a priest?”) What to do? As Moerman suggests, “Kick ass” says the administrator; “consult” says the faculty; “confuse” thinks the dean…

Executive Leadership

We took similar pride in the quality of the executive leadership team of the University, which I believed to be one of the strongest in the nation, both during my administration and throughout the university’s earlier history. The executive officers were also a family, although, but unlike the deans, they were characterized by great diversity in roles and backgrounds: some were line officers; others were in staff roles. Although many of the executive officers at most universities come from outside the academy (e.g., business and law), Michigan had a very unusual situation during my years as president since all of our senior officers had academic roots, most even with ongoing teaching and research responsibilities. This not only provided the leadership team with a deep understanding of academic issues, but gave us important flexibility in breaking down the usual bureaucracy to form multiofficer teams to address key issues, such as federal research policy, fund-raising, resource allocation, and even academic policy—issues that would be constrained to administrative silos in other universities.

The provost position at Michigan, one of the most challenging and important in the nation, typically attracted individuals with the potential for university leadership: Allen Smith, Frank Rhodes, Harold Shapiro, Billy Frye, Jim Duderstadt, and Chuck Vest (and later, Bernie Machen, Nancy Cantor, Terry Sullivan, and Phil Hanlon), all of whom eventually became university presidents themselves. So too, since the University’s Ann Arbor campus was not only the nation’s largest both in terms of operating budget and physical space, it attracted outstanding chief financial officers: Bill Pierpont, Jim Brinkerhoff, and Farris Womack. A similar situation existed in other key areas such as research, student affairs, medical affairs, government relations, development, and so on.

Surprisingly for one of the largest and most complex universities in the nation, the University of Michigan had a remarkably small central administration. In fact, it operated with only one-half to one-third the number of executive officers (vice-presidents) as most other universities. A comparison of administrative costs for the 60 AAU universities found Michigan ranking among the top three most efficient institutions in the nation. Such a lean administration could only succeed with outstanding people, and hence a premium was placed on developing or attracting the very best people into these key positions. They, in turn, recruited outstanding senior staff in each of their organizations.

To illustrate the quality of this group, there was general agreement across the nation that Michigan’s provost (Chuck Vest and Gil Whitaker), chief financial officer (Farris Womack), research vice president (Homer Neal), student affairs vice president (Maureen Hartford), university relations (Walt Harrison), development (Jon Cosovich and Tom Kinnear), government relations (Dick Kennedy), hospital director (John Forsyth), athletic directors (Jack Weidenbach and Joe Roberson), chief information officer (Doug Van Houweling) were arguably the very best in the nation at what they did. So, too, on each of their staffs were many others who were regarded as national leaders, e.g., Paul Spradlin in physical facilities, Bill Krumm and Randy Harris in administrative services, Norman Herbert in investment management, Lisa Baker in media relations, and on and on. Each of these individuals not only provided exceptional service to the University of Michigan, but they were widely sought for broader national roles on behalf of higher education more generally.

I had long had a tendency to surround myself with people far smarter and experienced than I was, from
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my days as dean, then provost, and finally as president. I realized that in an institution as complex as Michigan, only the most talented people could provide the necessary leadership. But, of course, these folks were not shrinking violets. They rarely hesitated to say what they thought, even if they knew it was not what the president wanted to hear. Furthermore, if the president was wrong, they told me so in no uncertain terms. Fortunately, my ego could tolerate criticism, and I was used to changing directions when a better idea was put forward.

Of course, it was sometimes difficult to hold together such a group of strong personalities. Teamwork was essential, but it was also sometimes a challenge when strongly held and differing views existed. Anne worked hard to develop social events to pull the executive officer team together. We always kicked off the fall term with a potluck, hosted a holiday dinner in the President’s House (complete with Santa Claus), and numerous informal dinners and gatherings throughout the year. Other opportunities such as football weekends, bowl events, and basketball tournaments were used to bring the group together.

Perhaps because of its size and complexity, but more likely because of its long tradition of leadership, Michigan has long been a source of leadership for the rest of higher education. In fact, Michigan is among the nation’s leaders in producing university presidents from its faculty or administrative ranks.

The Regents

The UM Board of Regents comprised yet another family requiring pastoral care by the president. Although most of our governing board members were dedicated public servants with a strong interest and loyalty to the university, there were among some members, as with any family, occasional disagreements—indeed, long-standing feuds—that might last months or even years. But this was not surprising for a governing board that owed both its election and its support to highly partisan political constituencies.

Although Anne and I tried to be attentive to the concerns of both current and past board members, our position was complicated by the fact that we were occasionally viewed by some regents as hired hands, totally subservient and submissive to their particular requests and occasional whims. Although every effort was made to treat the regents with respect, concern, and attentiveness, the great diversity among the attitudes of individual regents toward the role of the president and the first lady made the task extremely complex, as it had been for our predecessors over the years. Most presidents of public universities know these challenges well.

The Staff

Students and faculty members tend to take the staff of a university pretty much for granted. While they understand these are the people who “keep the trains running on time” and who provide them with the environment they need for teaching and research, most view staff as only the supporting cast for the real stars, the faculty. When staff come to mind at all, it is usually as a source of complaints. To many faculty members, such service units as the Plant Department, the Purchasing Department, and the Office of University Audits are sometimes viewed as the enemy.

Yet with each step up the ladder of academic administration, Anne and I came to appreciate more just how critical the staff was to both the functioning and the continuity of the university. It became clear to us that throughout the university, whether at the level of secretaries, custodians, or groundskeepers or the rarified heights of senior administrators for finance, hospital operations, or facilities construction and management, the quality of the university’s staff, coupled with their commitment and dedication, was actually just as important as the faculty in making Michigan the remarkable institution it has become. In some ways, it was even more so, since unlike many faculty members, who view their first responsibilities as to their discipline or perhaps their careers, most staff members are true professionals, deeply committed to the welfare of the university as their highest priority, many dedicating their entire careers to the institution. Most staff members serve the university far longer than the faculty, who tend to be lured away by the marketplace. This was impressed on me twice each year, when the president would host a banquet to honor staff with long-term service—20, 30, even 40
Entertaining the Regents
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years. In a very real sense, it is frequently the staff that provide, through years of service, the continuity of both the culture of the university and its commitment to excellence. Put another way, the staff perpetuate the institutional saga of the university as much as do the students, faculty, or alumni.

Beyond their skill, competence, and dedication to the university, there was also a remarkable spirit of teamwork among staff members. Indeed, Anne and I worked closely with the staff as our partners. In fact, we began to view our presidential roles as more akin to those of staff than faculty, in the sense that our first obligation was always to the welfare of the university rather than to our academic discipline or professional career.

While intensely loyal to the university, staff also require pastoral care from the president, particularly during difficult times, such as budget cuts—sometimes involving layoffs—or campus unrest. Anne and I always gave the highest priority to events that demonstrated the importance of staff to the university and our strong support for their efforts. Whenever launching a major strategic effort, such as the Michigan Mandate or the Michigan Agenda for Women, I would meet with numerous staff groups throughout the university to explain the effort and seek their advice and counsel. We made it a point to attend or host staff receptions, for example, to honor a retiring staff member or celebrate an important achievement. While we understood the central role of faculty in determining the quality of academic programs, we felt it was important that the president always be seen, in word and in deed, as committed to the welfare of the entire university community—students, faculty, and staff—in a balanced sense.

In the role of the president, Anne and I had the pleasure of serving with some quite remarkable folks who supported the activities of the president. At the top of the list in the Office of the President was Executive Secretary to the President, Nona Mustard. I regarded Nona as the best secretary in the University. Many others regarded her at times as the real behind-the-scenes president.

Although the Office of the President was always ground zero for the University, handling a complex and sometimes bewildering array of challenges, it benefited from a particularly competent and professional staff.

Anne also benefited from a remarkable team supporting presidential events and facilities. Barbara Johnson and Judi Dinesen handled the complex challenges of diverse events and facilities needs with skill and competence. Inge Roncoli and Kurt Szalay kept the President’s House and Inglis House running efficiently and provided hospitality to our guests. And first Chuck Jenkins and then Joan Kobinski and their team of gardeners made both the President’s House and Inglis House grounds showplaces for the University.

Beyond their skill, competence, and dedication to the University, there was also a remarkable spirit of teamwork. Both Anne and I had an usually close and informal relationship with the staff. In a very real sense, they were a part of the presidential family.

The Old Guard

It seems appropriate to mention another element of the faculty: the old guard. Every so often, all organizations undergo a transition in which one generation of leaders passes the torch to the next—or, on occasion, when the younger generation, fed up with the antics of their elders, simply revolts and seizes leadership directly. In our roles as dean, provost, and president, Anne and I seem to have been on both sides—and involved in both types of processes.

Back in the good old faculty days, I was drawn into the revolution mode when a number of young faculty members united to confront a dean who was leading the College of Engineering nowhere. Throughout the 1970s, the College slid backwards. It was unable to compete effectively for University resources, even as its enrollments surged. Its long-planned move to the North Campus was stalled, with not a single new building completed, despite a five-year long fund-raising campaign and, presumably, a University commitment to go after matching state funds. Many of its better faculty members were leaving, and few new faculty members were being hired.

Several of the younger full professors, faculty who were approaching key decisions about whether they should remain at Michigan for the rest of their careers or go elsewhere, finally got fed up with the aimless drifting of the College, and decided to meet with the
dean to lay their concerns on the line. This was an unusual group, consisting of folks like Chuck Vest (later dean, provost, and then president at MIT), Bill Powers (later head of the Ford Scientific Lab), Scott Fogler (later associate dean and chair of Chemical Engineering), Dave Sonstegaard (later chief technical officer of 3-M), and me. Behind us were dozens of other young faculty, frustrated and ready to leave the College. The group’s cordial but frank discussion was supportive of the dean’s decision to accept a position at another university.

Here I learned that a determined group of energetic young people could indeed accomplish a transition in leadership. But I also learned that one must approach revolution with great care or otherwise you could get in real trouble. This group of young Turks was eventually asked to take responsibility for leadership (...me as Dean...Chuck Vest and Scott Fogler as associate deans...)

The next experience with leadership transitions occurred in the roles of provost and then president. Harold Shapiro had inherited most of his senior leadership team, and with the exception of the appointment of Bill Frye as provost, Jon Cosovich as VP-Development, and Linda Wilson as VP-Research during his presidency, this team remained intact. But it was clear during the transition between presidents, that there would be a major turnover in this leadership team over time, just as there would be among the deans, as a great many University administrators approached the end of their careers. Hence, much of my early responsibility involved guiding this leadership transition, recruiting outstanding people to succeed those stepping down, and—in some cases—steering some of the old guard to greener pastures.

In this regard, it is important to stress that Anne and I did not view the University administration as one would a political administration in Washington. It was comprised of many people, talented and wise, who had served the University long and well. We believed it important that these continue in their roles well into our presidency to provide continuity. But it was also clear that transitions would eventually occur. While the role of providing firm, stable leadership during these transitions in the leadership team was time-consuming, it was straightforward, in part because of the unusually broad experience we had in our many university roles.

Hence as the old guard phased out and new people came on board, in many cases we were able to pick up temporarily their responsibilities until the next team came on board.

So, too, the recruiting of outstanding people was straightforward in most cases. Michigan is a marvelous institution, and it attracts marvelous people. I had always been a very effective recruiter, in part because of my oft-stated philosophy of “attracting outstanding people, giving them the encouragement and support to push to the limits of their ability, and then getting out of their way”.

Alumni

We particularly enjoyed our experiences with another Michigan family, the very large, 500,000 strong family of Michigan alumni. All university presidents are generally extensively involved in alumni activities, but at Michigan we had an array of special events such as Rose Bowls and Final Fours to add to these roles. Anne and I particularly enjoyed the close friendships we developed with the directors of the UM Alumni Association, Bob Forman and Steve Grafton, and the distinguished alumni who served as its president during our tenure: Judge Geraldine Ford, Verne Istock, Rick Rattner, and Bob Peterson.

Beyond our many meetings with Michigan alumni on campus at University events, we also enjoyed immensely those few opportunities we had to host alumni travel programs abroad.

A Heritage of Leadership

Anne and I were always very conscious of being part of another very important Michigan family comprised of former presidents and first ladies of the University. We were particularly fortunate in having several of the former presidential teams living in Ann Arbor—the Hatchers, the Flemings, and the Smiths—with the Shapiro only a phone call away. This gave us access to almost a half-a-century of experience and wisdom. This conscious effort to involve the former presidents in the life of the University was intended not only to take advantage of their experience and wisdom, but to better establish a sense of continuity. We realized that
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(including two “Presidents” Ford, Geraldine (of the UM Alumni Association, and Gerald (of the United States)
each presidency built on the accomplishments of its predecessors, and we wanted to make certain this was recognized throughout the University.

We made it a point not only to seek their advice and counsel whenever we could, but to also involve them as completely in the life of the University as they wished. We made certain that they were invited to all major campus activities such as dinners, receptions, commencements, and VIP visits. We followed the Shapiro’s lead by regarding the viewing area in the Michigan Stadium as the “Presidents’ box”, not simply the “President’s box”, and not only invited them, but actively involved them in football weekend activities. In fact, the Hatcher’s had not been to a Michigan football game since they retired in the 1960s, and they thoroughly enjoyed once again being part of the activities. We also invited the former presidents to make use of University facilities such as Inglis House whenever they were involved in University activities. We directed the staff of the President’s Office to always support their various activities, whenever this would be helpful to them.

Anne and I enjoyed immensely the friendship of the Hatcher’s, Flemings, Smiths, and Shapiro’s. There was a bond that only those who serve in these roles can understand. Even after Allen Smith passed away, we felt it very important to keep Alene Smith involved in University activities. And when we had the chance to honor the Shapiro’s by naming the newly renovated Undergraduate Library after them, Anne made a great effort to design events both for the Shapiro’s and their families to convey a sense of the University’s appreciation for their efforts.

In 1992, the University hosted a special event to mark its 175th year by inviting the past Michigan presidents to participate in a roundtable discussion in the Rackham Auditorium. The discussion was hosted by Bob Warner as University Historian. Following the public event held in the Rackham Auditorium, we hosted a private dinner for the presidents at the President’s House. It was quite a wonderful experience as they compared their experiences over a half-century of leadership. Anne and I felt privileged to be present at this remarkable event, which reminded us once again about how much we owed former presidents and first ladies in shaping the institution that we now led.

It also convinced us once again about just how important efforts were to capture, understand, archive, and make available the history of this remarkable institution.

The Duderstadt Family

Of course, there is yet one Michigan family of particular importance to the presidency: the president’s family itself. Although our daughters were away at Yale and Harvard during the early years and then later chose not to live in the President’s House when they returned for graduate school at Michigan, they were very much part of our lives during our tenure. Hence they are very much part of our story of the Michigan presidency.

We had always been an exceptionally close family. Both Anne and I took great interest in our daughter’s activities as they grew up. We rarely missed a parent’s orientation at school, a swim or gymnastics meet, a music recital or a theater production. We were thrilled by our daughters’ academic success, although there were times when we worried that they worked too hard and tried to do too many things.

Both were rather sophisticated from their own high-profile experiences at Yale and Harvard, and while they were proud and supportive of their parents in the presidency, they took things with a grain of salt. They put up with the press, although sometimes with tongue-in-cheek, as when Susan perched on the couch for their official cover photo in the President’s House for one of the local newspapers.

They also brought the same spirit of humor to lighten the stresses that sometimes characterized our lives. Not to say that these were not intense at times. Both faced major challenges at Yale and Harvard and then in their graduate studies and careers afterwards. But both had a good sense of humor and helped make the President’s House a home.

Anne and I actually learned a good deal from our experience as parents of college students that proved of use in our leadership role at Michigan. We certainly developed a sense of empathy for poor, struggling (not to mention broke) parents as they moved their new college students into their dorm rooms during the Big Dropoff. We learned to suffer through their
Anne and I had the very great fortune to develop strong friendships with earlier presidential couples: Harlan and Anne Hatcher, Robben and Sally Fleming, Allen and Alene Smith, and Harold and Vivian Shapiro.
We enjoyed immensely the opportunities we had to host events with the former Michigan presidents and to remain close friends long after our years of service.
mood swings as they adjusted to their undergraduate colleges—“I hate my roommates.”; “I’m sure they made a mistake in admitting me because I’m going to flunk out.”; “Every one else goes out every night, and I just sit home alone.”, and so on. We enjoyed traveling back East for parents weekends and commencements.

But we had an interesting perspective beyond that of many parents. We knew personally the presidents of each of their colleges: Benno Schmidt at Yale and Derek Bok (and Linda Wilson) at Harvard (and Radcliffe). We also had close friends in high places at both universities: my old roommate Terry Holcombe was senior vice-president at Yale, and my former assistant Robin Jacoby was vice-president at Radcliffe. Beyond that, my sister lived only a few blocks from Harvard Square in Cambridge. Hence there were plenty of folks we could call on if we really got worried about things. For example, once the ceiling of Susan’s dormitory room collapsed during a rainstorm, and I chewed out Benno for allowing such dilapidated student housing.

Although Susan was very social and involved in organizations such as the Yale Glee Club, she chose a particularly intensive academic sequence, beginning in Yale’s famous Directed Studies program and then later majoring in Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry. Following graduation, she returned to Ann Arbor to enroll in a joint five-year M.D. and M.P.H. program, since she was interested both in medical practice and policy. She also was rapidly captured by her interests in Michigan’s Gilbert and Sullivan Society, and was generally in the chorus in each of their performances throughout her Michigan education.

Although Susan chose to live across the street from the President’s House in the Martha Cook Residence Hall—in fact, with a five-year tenure, she was one of the longest surviving “Cookies”—she was frequently in the President’s House with her friends. As her M.D. program became more involved, we would frequently see her collapsed on the couch after an all-nighter in her clinical work. It was a great experience for me to participate in awarding Susan her M.D. at commencement.

Susan had long had an interest in children, and she chose to do her residency at Children’s Memorial Hospital in Chicago, a component of the Northwestern University Medical School. Living in Lincoln Park, however, was a bit like living in Ann Arbor, even from the perspective of all the Michigan alumni, and we tended to see her frequently. When she completed her residency, she began her practice in rural medicine by following her colleague and later husband, John Iskander to work in a small clinic in Albany, Georgia. Interestingly enough, the head of the clinic, Neil Schulman, provided the model for the popular movie, _Doc Hollywood_.

Kathy had an even more challenging academic experience than Susan. Because of her strong ability in science—she was both a Westinghouse Science Talent Contest winner and a National Merit Scholar—she began her studies at Harvard in astrophysics. Yet, even her AP work at Pioneer High School had not prepared her adequately for the intense pace of Harvard physics. After a couple of rough years, both academic and socially (although she continued her athletic interests by competing in varsity track—the heptathlon—and crew), she decided to take some time off her junior year to catch her breadth. Although she first thought about just taking a job for a term (e.g., a truckstop waitress in Texas), her parents convinced her to enroll in the fall program at Michigan’s campus in Florence. As it turned out, this was one of the best things that she could have done. She made some friends, thoroughly enjoyed a term of wandering about the art museums of Florence and later Europe, and learned about “life” from the Italians. She returned convinced that a Harvard education was too valuable to waste on science, and transferred into English Literature—and was thoroughly happy.

However, Kathy also had an intense social commitment, so it was not surprising when she signed up for the Peace Corps following graduation. She claims that one of the key questions asked in their interview was, “If we accept you as a Peace Corps Volunteer, and your parents object, what will you do?” Apparently she gave them the right answer, but she never would tell us what it was. When the Peace Corps notifies you, they send you a letter with your proposed assignment and give you five days to accept. In Kathy’s case, they assigned her as one of the first group of 30 to go to Eastern Europe, to Hungary, to build an English Language teaching infrastructure. In fact, just before boarding the plane to Budapest, Kathy participated in a White House Rose Garden ceremony (where President
The Duderstadt daughters, remaining active despite the occupations (and preoccupations) of their parents.
Bush mispronounced her name—but at least he tried).

The Peace Corps experience in Hungary was very challenging. Kathy likened it to parachuting behind enemy lines to set up a spy network. She was first assigned to a dismally polluted industrial city in eastern Hungary, near the Ukraine border, and a three-hour train ride away from any other American. After a year, the Peace Corps decided that her location was too dangerous, and she was relocated to a town on the Danube midway between Budapest and Vienna.

While Kathy was very glad she became a Peace Corp volunteer, she also found the experience quite stressful and lonely at times. But it accomplished the task of giving direction to her life. After experiencing first hand the incredible environmental damage in Eastern Europe, she decided to return to her earlier interests in science and do graduate work in global change. Since Michigan had one of the leading departments of atmospheric science, she applied and was accepted to its Ph.D. program.

Kathy experienced some of the usual Peace Corps problems in returning to American culture. She also faced the challenge of retraining herself in science, after several years as an English major. Fortunately, since she was close by, we could take her back under our wings while she readjusted.

We knew she was back on track when she passed her Ph.D. candidacy examination—and celebrated with a bottle of Chateau Lafite Rothschild. Kathy looks back on her Peace Corps experience as something she was glad she did, but that she would probably never do again.

We have many wonderful family memories of the President’s House—in addition to those more traumatic and stressful experiences in the presidency. As noted in an earlier chapter, the President’s House is really divided into two sections: the first floor is essentially all public space, with rooms for dining and entertaining guests. The president is expected to live in a small suite, including a sitting room, bedroom, and bath, on the second floor.

There are other bedrooms on the second and third floor that can be used for family and guests. We did a bit of reconfiguration and converted one of the bedrooms into an office for Anne. When Susan and Kathy were around, they stayed in bedrooms on the third floor, which also had a study space that they could treat like a student room (which they did!) They sometimes also used the basement area as a recreation room when there were rambunctious guests (e.g., students).

On those rare occasions when we could be a normal family, we had many of the usual family experiences. Christmas was always an enjoyable time—except that it came to an end the day after Christmas when we had to take down the tree, pack the bags, and head off for a bowl game. Anne and the staff would put up the tree and I would assemble my electric train. Susan and Kathy would usually be back—from college or their graduate work—so the house would generally have people in it. (Although on a couple of occasions they were in Europe over the holidays.)

Toward the end of our presidency, we actually had Kathy’s wedding in the house—more correctly, in the Clements Library, (only daughters of Presidents are allowed to marry in Clements) with the reception in the President’s House. This gave us one of the very rare opportunities to get the entire Duderstadt family together for a portrait. Although we had stepped down from the presidency when our daughter Susan was married the following year, she chose to use her beloved residence hall, Martha Cook, as the site for her wedding, right across the street from the President’s House.

Some Final Thoughts

Both Anne and I believed it important always to keep in mind the historical context for leadership. Such institutions as the University of Michigan have existed for centuries and will continue to do so, served by generation after generation of leaders. To serve the university, any Michigan president must understand and acknowledge the accomplishments of his or her predecessors and build on their achievements. Each president must strive to pass along to his or her successor an institution that is better, stronger, and more vital than the one he or she inherited. Indeed, this strong tradition of improvement from one presidency to the next has long been the guiding spirit of the university’s leaders.
While Michigan enjoys an intense loyalty among its students, faculty, and staff, it can also be a tough environment for many. It is a very large and complex institution, frequently immersed in controversial social and political issues. The Michigan campus culture has evolved to accommodate a tough political neighborhood. The president’s challenge is to provide pastoral care and leadership for a highly diverse campus community that, left to its own devices, could become highly fragmented—that is, to create community in a cold climate.

During my presidency, Anne and I sought to temper somewhat the university’s hardened character by stressing certain “c” words: community, communication, comity, cooperation, civility, caring, concern, and commitment—in contrast to the harsher “c” words competition, complaining, conniving, and conflict. (Anne suggested adding some other “c” words just for students, such as cleanliness and chastity, but she soon found this was a hopeless cause.) Particularly during a period of change, we believed that we needed to better link together the various cultures, values, and experiences that characterized our campus community. We also sought to build a greater sense of pride in and loyalty to the institution, pulling people together with a common vision and commitment to the achievement of excellence.

Some of the most important changes occurring at the university during the decade of our leadership affected the various family cultures of the university. The student culture evolved beyond the distrust and confrontation born in the 1960s to a spirit of mutual respect and trust with the administration. The university’s commitment to diversity through such major strategic efforts as the Michigan Mandate and the Michigan Agenda for Women would never have been possible without such a major change in the campus climate. So too, the staff culture became more tolerant of change, in part because of our efforts to recognize the staff’s loyalty and immense contributions to the university.

Changes occurred far more slowly in the faculty culture, because of its complexity and diversity. Fundamental academic values—academic freedom, intellectual integrity, striving for excellence—still dominated this culture, as they must in any great university. However, there seemed to be a growing sense of adventure and excitement throughout the university, as both faculty and staff were more willing to take risks, to try new things, and to tolerate failure as part of the learning process. While the university was still not yet where it needed to be in encouraging the level of experimentation and adventure necessary to define its future, it seemed clear that this spirit was beginning to take hold.
Chapter 13

Rebuilding the Campus

During the latter part of our presidency, there was an unprecedented level of construction activity on the campus. I once suggested that perhaps the University should temporarily replace the wolverine as its mascot by the crane—the building crane. A favorable alignment of the planets—low interest rates and construction costs coupled with state and private support—had provided the University with an opportunity to address a decades-long physical facilities need. During a brief five-year period, essentially every academic building on the Michigan campuses was either renovated or replaced. By the late 1990s, the University enjoyed not only the highest quality campus facilities in its history, but the quality of environment it was able to provide for teaching and scholarship was unequaled in the nation.

However, in the 1980s, this task looked daunting, indeed. During the previous several decades, the campus environment had declined significantly. A two-decade long freeze on state-funding for capital construction, coupled with the age and obsolescence of many of Michigan’s facilities, was having a serious impact on the quality of the University’s academic programs and the morale of faculty, students, and staff. Classrooms were dilapidated, laboratories were no longer adequate for state-of-the-art research, and major book and art collections faced serious risk. Even the appearance of the campus looked dismal, with trash littered everywhere, posters taped to any bare space, and chalked messages across the sidewalks and building walls. It was clear that many of the students and faculty had lost any sense of pride in the appearance of the campus, and they treated it like the slum it had become.

In the late 1980s, a carefully designed plan was developed to rebuild, renovate, and update all the University’s buildings. This massive campus renaissance, eventually amounting to almost $2 billion of facilities construction and renovation, was made possible by a combination of state support for capital improvements; gifts and grants; the reallocation of internal UM funds including contributions from the University’s auxiliary units; and student fees. Its tremendous success was due to the vision, commitment, and hard work of a great many individuals at the University. Of particular note here was the incredible effort of VP Farris Womack in leading the effort to finance the projects, Paul Spradlin in directing the projects, and Jack Janveja, Tom Schlauff, and Fred Mayer in the design, management, and execution of the complex effort.

By the conclusion of this massive effort, not only had academic buildings on all three campuses been renovated or replaced with modern facilities, but the infrastructure necessary for modern research and teaching was installed. Furthermore, this massive construction effort provided an opportunity to significantly enhance the appearance of the University’s campuses with exciting new architecture and new landscaping. Finally, by taking advantage of modern technology, the University was able to design facilities to lower lifetime operational costs.

The University of Michigan had moved rapidly from an aging campus to a leader in the quality of environment it was able to provide for its academic program. It would enter the new century, confident of working from a firm foundation of cutting-edge teaching, research, and support facilities.
Bricks and Mortar

While outstanding faculty, students, and staff are the key assets of a great university, the quality of facilities clearly influences the ability both to recruit outstanding people and to support their efforts to achieve excellence. Winston Churchill once stated: “We shape our buildings. Thereafter, they shape us.” Maintaining and enhancing the quality of the campus, buildings, grounds, and other infrastructure is a major priority of the university and must be a responsibility of the president. In most cases, the need for facilities and other campus improvements bubble up from the various programs of the university, and then the president takes the lead in acquiring the resources necessary to support these projects.

Although the needs of academic units should take precedence in capital improvements, any visit to a university campus will soon reveal that much of the activity exists in auxiliary units, such as the medical center, student housing, and intercollegiate athletics because of their independent capacity to generate funding (e.g., patient fees, rents, ticket income, television revenue, or gifts).

The majority of capital expansion at most research universities these days occurs in their medical centers, driven by the need for renovation or growth in clinical facilities, the desire for additional research space in the biomedical sciences, and the availability of substantial income from clinical activities. This is not surprising, considering that medical center budgets have typically increased at twice the rate of academic budgets throughout the past two decades (e.g., 10 percent per year for the medical center versus 5 percent per year for the rest of the university). The desire to increase clinical income drives the continual expansion of facilities, particularly in such lucrative areas as surgery and internal medicine, but also in satellite clinics designed to expand primary care activities that feed patients into university hospitals. Similarly, the extraordinary growth in federal support of biomedical research, now representing over 60 percent of all federal research and development on university campuses, has stimulated staggering investments in expensive new research facilities in the life sciences, such as molecular biology, genomics, proteomics, and biotechnology. There is a certain irony here: in contrast to pharmaceutical companies that tend to invest in “throwaway” research buildings because of the rapid obsolescence of research technology, universities prefer to hire expensive architects to design monumental facilities to last generations, even though these facilities will require several times their original capital costs for the renovations necessary to track technological changes.

In recent years, there also has been a comparable level of capital expansion in athletic facilities. The wacko culture characterizing intercollegiate athletics presumes that the team that spends the most—or builds the most—wins the most. Hence, there has been a costly arms race to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in expanding football stadiums and basketball pavilions, specialized training facilities, academic counseling centers, plush offices for the ever-expanding athletic staff, and even museums designed to impress recruits and fans alike with past athletic accomplishments. While much of this investment (e.g., in bigger and better training facilities or the most expensive artificial turf fields) is driven by competitive forces, some of the largest investments (e.g., skyboxes for wealthy fans and corporate clients, sophisticated television systems, or on-campus stores for marketing sports paraphernalia) have been made as a marketing device. Most athletic departments tend to borrow the funds to build such facilities, depending on future revenue from ticket sales, television contracts, or licensing to cover the debt, although most of these loans are actually secured with a university pledge of income from student fees. The debt load on several of the major athletic programs is considerable, ranging into the hundreds of millions of dollars for many institutions and requiring that new revenue be generated through clever and occasionally even coercive mechanisms, such as seat taxes and skyboxes (ironically given a highly favorable, if somewhat perverse, tax treatment by the Internal Revenue Service as “charitable donations for educational purposes).

Although the core activities of the university involve teaching and scholarship, capital investments in facilities for academic programs tends to lag far behind investments in auxiliary activities, such as medical care and intercollegiate athletics. In part, this has to do with constraints on the funding sources available for academic facilities (e.g., state appropriations, private
gifts, or debt financing based on student fees). But it is also due to the relative autonomy of most auxiliary units, portraying (at least in myth, if not in reality) their financial independence from the rest of the university. Most universities tend to be far more parsimonious when spending funds on new classroom or library space than when investing in major expansion of the football stadium or university hospital. As a result, the quality of academic space on many campuses, particularly in public universities, deteriorated quite significantly during the hard economic times of the 1980s.

From this perspective, the rebuilding of the University of Michigan’s academic campuses in the 1990s ranks as a remarkable accomplishment. There was also a substantial effort to improve the landscaping and appearance of the campus. Pride in place—on the part of students, faculty, and staff—is important in maintaining the quality of a campus. Once the quality of facilities begins to deteriorate, not only do people dread going to their working or learning environments, but they lose any sense of personal responsibility for maintaining the appearance of a campus. Students begin to trash the campus by tacking flyers everywhere and chalk sidewalks and buildings. Faculty and staff simply ignore the accumulating debris and graffiti. Each Sunday morning, Anne, and I would take a walk about the campus, pulling down posters, picking up trash, and noting where graffiti needed to be removed. But such efforts were simply fingers plugging the holes in the dike until the general quality of the campus was improved through the massive capital investments of the mid-1990s. A sense of pride in the campus was restored, and the campus community accepted a spirit of personal responsibility in keeping it in tip-top shape. The lessons learned from three decades of neglect should not be forgotten.

The role of the president in such projects was considerable, not so much in determining priorities or architectural design, but in acquiring the resources and smoothing the approval process. However, some caution is also warranted here. Perhaps because of the “edifice complex” (the desire to see one’s impact on a campus or to leave monuments behind), many university presidents become obsessed with bricks-and-mortar projects. They retain “signature” architects as campus planners and commission them to make architectural statements on the campus. Unfortunately, this leads to disaster in many cases, since prominent architects frequently have little understanding of the culture of a campus or the facility needs of academic programs. Many ambitious projects come in at costs far higher than original estimates or result in buildings that are dysfunctional for their original intent. Furthermore, since the lifetime costs to operate buildings is generally several times their original construction cost, far too many signature architectural projects become white elephants, placing a heavy burden on academic budgets, while meeting the original objectives in only a marginal fashion.

Although I had long had a strong personal interest in architecture (not only taking Vincent Scully’s famous course on modern architecture at Yale, but actually working for an architect-engineering firm in the 1960s), I stayed far away from any direct involvement in architectural issues as president. Instead, I relied heavily on the chief financial officer and his experienced staff in our plant extension department, who worked closely with the provost, deans, and faculty in academic units to develop realistic program statements and then utilized competitive bidding processes and strong project management to make certain that capital projects moved ahead smoothly, remained within cost estimates, and met program objectives. As the CEO of an organization spending hundreds of millions of dollars per year on capital facilities, I was not about

The key to rebuilding the campus: Farris Womack, VP-CFO, who put together the financial plan, and Paul Spradlin, head of Plant Extension, who managed the vast complexity of the many projects.
to inject amateur architectural interests or whims into major expenditures addressing critical needs of the campus.

Rebuilding the Campuses

During the decade from 1986 to 1996, the University launched and completed over $2 billion of major construction and renovation projects that provided essentially every activity of the University on its multiple campuses with a physical environment of unprecedented quality.

Yet, in the mid-1980s, this challenge seemed almost hopeless. Although the UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint, with new campuses and relatively strong political support, did manage to receive significant state support for capital facilities during the 1970s and 1980s, badly needed capital projects on the Ann Arbor campus remained logjammed, with little public or private support in sight. The Central Campus of the University was in particularly serious condition.

In part this was due to two earlier University decisions. In the 1960s the University challenged the state’s authority to dictate certain aspects of capital facilities projects, thereby losing the opportunity for state capital outlay during the 1960s and early 1970s, a time when other state universities were expanding rapidly. This freeze on state-funded construction of academic facilities at UM-AA continued throughout the 1970s and early 1980s because of the University’s decision to push the construction of the Replacement Hospital Project, a new adult hospital to replace the aging “Old Main” University Hospital, as its highest priority for state funding. Because of the massive size of this project, then the largest in the history of the state of Michigan at over $300 million, other capital needs were put on the back burner throughout the 1970s and early 1980s. Indeed, the size of state funding required for the Replacement Hospital Project took a significant bite out of the capital outlay dollars available for all of higher education in Michigan during the 1970s.

This posed a particular challenge to the Ann Arbor campus. Not only was UM-AA the largest university campus in the nation, with almost 26 million square feet of space, but many of its buildings were fifty to seventy years old. Heating systems were antiquated, windows drafty, and teaching and laboratory facilities were outdated. The severe budget problems of the 1980s had resulted in an accumulation of deferred maintenance, which also took a serious toll on the University’s infrastructure. Growth and advances in pedagogy, research, technology, and the public service mission had left the University woefully in need of state-of-the-art facilities to meet the needs of its students, faculty, and staff.

Although there were several state-funded projects in the early 1980s, such as Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Building, the Chemical Sciences Laboratory, and a science facility at UM-Flint, this modest state commitment paled in comparison with the needs of the academic programs of the University. Many of the most distinguished academic programs of the University were housed in ancient buildings, in bad need of repair, and totally inadequate for modern teaching and research. As the University approached the 1990s, the situation looked bleak indeed for any relief of its capital needs.

Yet, in the late 1980s, several factors converged simultaneously to provide the University with a remarkable window of opportunity for rebuilding its campuses. First, falling interest rates, coupled with the University’s high credit rating, made it quite inexpensive to borrow money. Second, because of a weak economy, there were few competing construction projects underway in the private sector, and hence construction bids tended to come in quite low. Third, the University’s success in auxiliary activities, including clinical revenue and continuing education fees, generated substantial revenue. And, fourth, the University was able to convince Governor John Engler to launch a major state capital facilities program, with the understanding that the University would match the state contribution through the use of its own internal funds.

But there was one final ingredient. We managed to convince the Regents that the University should debt-finance critically needed academic facilities using student fees. While this was a common practice in private universities, Michigan had generally used student fees to finance only non-instructional facilities such as the Crisler Center and recreational sports gyms, depending on state funding for academic facilities. To
make this step more politically palatable in the face of concerns about rapidly rising tuition, the administration developed a plan of “shared sacrifice” in which faculty and staff salaries were held level during the first year of the new fee. (This latter step earned harsh criticism from some faculty members, even though the lapse in salary increases was only temporary and more than made up through strong salary programs in later years.)

The Central Campus

Most encouraging of all was the great progress in addressing the critical needs of the Central Campus. The Undergraduate Library, appropriately referred to as the “UGLI” was surrounded by an attractive shell, totally renovated, and dedicated as the Shapiro Library. The Physics Department benefited from a major new research laboratory. A major building was constructed between Angell and Haven Halls to serve the humanities faculty. Total building renovations were accomplished for East and West Engineering, (renamed East Hall and West Hall), C. C. Little, and Angell Hall. Furthermore, $80 million of funding was obtained for the last renovations, the LS&A Building, Frieze, Mason, and Haven Halls. And a marvelous new building was built for the School of Social Work. There was also a substantial effort to improve the landscaping and appearance of the campus, including a complete renovation of the Ingalls Mall and the Diag, the East University mall, the rest of the Central Campus, and the “North Woods” landscaping plan for the North Campus. At the same time, a number of safety concerns were addressed with increased lighting, new plantings, gardens, and courtyards designed to augment the new construction.

The Medical Campus

The Medical Center led the way with a series of new teaching, research, and clinical facilities that augmented the new Adult General Hospital. A new Child and Maternal Health Care Hospital replaced Mott and Women’s Hospitals. A high-rise Cancer and Geriatrics Center was constructed. A trio of sophisticated research laboratories, Medical Science Research Buildings I, II, and III came on line to keep the Medical School at the forefront of biomedical research, while also housing the Howard Hughes Medical Research Institute. As the Medical Center growth began to strain against the limits of its downtown Ann Arbor site, the University Hospitals acquired a large site northeast of Ann Arbor and began to develop its East Medical Campus to respond to the need for additional primary care facilities. It also developed new primary care facilities throughout southeastern Michigan, including a major concentration in the Briarwood area in south Ann Arbor.

The South Campus

There was also extensive construction activity on the South Campus of the University, including the renovation or construction of most athletic facilities. Michigan Stadium was renovated, and a natural grass field was installed. In the process, the stadium floor was lowered so that an additional 3,000 seats could be added, thereby increasing the capacity of the stadium to 106,000. Other new or substantially renovated facilities included Canham Natatorium, Schembechler Hall, Keen Arena, Weidenbach Hall, Yost Arena, the Michigan Golf Course, the varsity track, and the new Michigan Tennis Complex. New facilities were provided to support business operations, including the Wolverine Tower and the Campus Safety Office.

Extensive renovations were made to Michigan Stadium, including elegant entrance plazas and a surrounding wall of brick and iron work under the leadership of Athletic Directors Jack Weidenbach and Joe Roberson.

The North Campus

The last remaining facilities needed to complete the North Campus were finished, including the FXB Building for aerospace engineering, the Lurie Engineering Center, and the Media Union, a remarkable digital library and multimedia center. Further, the eminent American architect and University alumnus, Charles Moore, was commissioned to design a striking carillon, the Lurie Bell Tower, which soon became the symbol for the North Campus.

In 1994, the University conducted a blind
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competition involving several of the nation’s leading planning firms to develop a new landscaping plan for the North Campus. A jury panel consisting of Michigan’s North Campus deans selected a very novel design submitted by the firm of Johnson, Johnson, and Roy. Their Northwoods plan created an exciting new character to the North Campus, based on two circular areas surrounded by plantings, fountains, streams, and community areas. Throughout 1995 and 1996 the first steps were taken to execute this plan, concurrently with the completion of the Media Union, the Lurie Tower, and the Lurie Engineering Center. Yet, in 1997, with the arrival of a new president, all such actions were once again brought to a halt and remain suspended to this day.

Unfortunately both the North Woods master plan and further construction on the North Campus was stagnant until the mid-2000s when the Walgreen Center for Performing Arts was built.

UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint

The University’s regional campuses in Dearborn and Flint were certainly not left out of this renewal process. Indeed, both campuses experienced even more of an investment in facilities, on a per student basis, than the Ann Arbor campus. UM-Dearborn benefited from new classroom and laboratory facilities, while UM-Flint brought on line a new science laboratory, library, and administrative center. Further, UM-Flint was given the AutoWorld site, along with funds for site preparation, by the Mott foundation, as the first stage of a major expansion of the campus.

Concluding Remarks

While the rebuilding and/or major renovation of most of the University’s campuses during the decade was an extraordinary accomplishment, of comparable long-term importance was the massive effort to eliminate the deferred maintenance backlog that had arisen during the 1970s and 1980s. Furthermore major efforts were made to provide ongoing support for facilities maintenance so that such backlogs would not arise again in the future.

By 1996, essentially all of our projects to rebuild the University of Michigan were either completed, underway, or funded. Over the next two years several dozen of these facilities projects would be completed and dedicated. During spring of 1996 the University had managed to obtain a commitment to provide an additional $137 million of state appropriation, including $79 million for the Ann Arbor campus. This amount was sufficient to complete the renovation of the Central Campus, including the last key LS&A facilities: the LS&A Building, Haven Hall, Mason Hall, Frieze Hall, West Hall, and the Perry Building. Since this required a 20% University match, the University had developed a funding plan that would use University funds to renovate Hill Auditorium and the Rackham Building as the University’s contribution (in fact, $20 million was set aside for the Hill project). Since Farris
Groundbreaking duties: Years of working on a highway construction crew trained Jim for this Presidential role.
Womack and I had realized that construction costs were likely to increase rapidly with a prosperous economy, we arranged to have these projects fast-tracked with the intent to have them completed by late 1998.

The funding was in place, the plans had been completed, and the University was ready to proceed through the state capital construction process. Unfortunately, these important projects came to a halt in 1997 with the arrival of a new University president, Lee Bollinger. At that time a decision was made to hire a new campus master planning architect, Venturi, Scott, Brown, led by noted architect Robert Venturi (who Bollinger had worked with on projects at Dartmouth). All such projects were put on hold for several years to allow the development of a new master plan. Although Bollinger eventually moved ahead with the Venturi-designed Life Sciences Institute (ironically a repeat of an earlier Venturi design of a larger biomedical sciences laboratory at Yale), there was little effort to resume the projects to renovate important Central Campus academic buildings. During this delay, the original construction estimates of $80 million later soared to over $300 million because of the delay. The master plan for completing the North Campus met a similar fate. Although the University benefited greatly from the successful effort to rebuild the various campuses of the University, it was frustrating to see the effort halted when it was so close to completion.
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Chapter 14

The End Game

One of the greatest challenges to the contemporary university presidency is knowing when and how to step aside. Note here the two questions: when and how. For in many ways, knowing "when to hold and when to fold" is far more straightforward a decision than figuring out how to do it. The challenge is to dismount a bucking bronco without getting trampled in the process. And this was a concern as we prepared to enter our tenth year as members of the central administration.

Sooner or later, several facts of life begin to dawn on most university presidents. They become increasingly aware of just how much of their time is spent doing things they do not really like to do, such as stroking potential donors for gifts, lobbying politicians, pampering governing board members, and flying the flag at numerous events—football games, building dedications, political rallies—that eventually become rather boring. This is particularly true for those who come from academic ranks, since these are just the kind of activities that most faculty members avoid like the plague. Presidents also begin to notice how much of their time is spent with people that most faculty members would choose to avoid, including politicians, reporters, and bureaucrats of various persuasions. Finally, they realize how much of their role has become that of a lobbyist, a huckster, or, worse, a sayer of things they know to be exaggerations, intentionally confusing, or even (for some) mildly false. These are all warning signs that a university president is outgrowing the job—or at least growing weary of its trials and tribulations.

Of course, one approach is to simply accept a job elsewhere and leave. Some presidents move like gypsies from one university to another, typically staying five years or so at each before moving on to the next. Sometimes, their progression is upward, through institutions of higher and higher distinction. But just as frequently, the transition is sideways or even downward, leading one to suspect, in many cases, that the president has left just before the fall of the ax. Other presidents move into retirement, although this is becoming more of a rarity as presidents end their service at ever-younger ages. Some—although few and far between—return to active faculty roles, although very rarely in the institution they have led.

In private universities, presidents usually are allowed to step down with honor, grace, and dignity and return to the faculty or retire completely from academic life. In sharp contrast, many public university presidents these days end their tenure by stepping on a political land mine. Sometimes, they run afoul of their governing board or faculty discontent or even the intrusion of a powerful political figure, such as a governor determined to control the state’s public universities. Occasionally there is a triggering event, such as a financial crisis or an athletic scandal. But more frequently, it is the continued wear and tear of university leadership that eventually leads to a personal decision that enough is enough, that the further sacrifice of health and good humor is simply not worth it. Whatever the reason, many presidents who have served their institutions well, with deep commitment, loyalty, and considerable accomplishment, all too frequently leave bitter and disappointed. One of the greatest fears of many presidents, particularly those leading public universities, is that they will not be able to control the endgame of their presidency and will be savaged by hostile political forces and perhaps even severed from the very institution on whose behalf they have worked so hard and sacrificed so much.

There were many factors that eventually persuaded both Anne and me that it was time to step aside as president. Since I had served both as acting president
during Harold Shapiro’s sabbatical and then as provost and “president-in-waiting” for roughly two years prior to being inaugurated as president in 1988, I was approaching the 10-year point in my leadership of the university. I was already second in seniority among Big Ten presidents (serving as chairman of the Big Ten Conference) and sixth in longevity among the 60 AAU presidents. Hence, as Anne and I approached a new academic year in 1995, it was natural to take stock of how far the university had come and what the road ahead looked like. And, of course, the accumulation of scars from battles fought and doubts from efforts failed continued to accumulate.

The Two-Minute Warning

Looking back, we would identify three quite separate phases in my presidency. The early phase involved setting the themes of challenge, opportunity, responsibility, and excitement and developing a vision for the future of the university. During this phase, much of our time was spent meeting with various constituencies both on and off campus, listening to their aspirations and concerns, challenging and encouraging them, harvesting their ideas and wisdom, and attempting to build a sense of excitement and optimism about the future of the university. This period marks the establishment of some of my administration’s most important strategic directions for the university: for example, the Michigan Mandate, financial restructuring, the Campaign for Michigan, the Undergraduate Initiative Fund, NSFnet and the Internet, and numerous international activities. This bottom-up visioning process was assisted by numerous small groups of faculty and staff, some formal, some ad hoc.

The second phase of leadership, while not so public, was equally substantive, since it involved developing and executing an action plan to move toward the vision. Key were a series of strategic initiatives designed to position the university for the leadership role. These ranged from the appointment of key leaders at the level of executive officers, deans, and directors, to setting new standards for academic and administrative quality, to rebuilding our campuses, to a bold financial restructuring of Michigan as the nation’s first privately supported public university. Largely as a result of these efforts, the university grew rapidly in strength, quality, and diversity during the early 1990s. One by one, each of the goals we had set was achieved.

During this decade-long effort, begun with Harold Shapiro during my provost years, the university made remarkable progress. Due to the extraordinary talents, commitment, and depth of the leadership team (not to mention a great deal of luck), we had been able to accomplish essentially everything we had originally set out as goals. The institution had been restructured financially and was now as strong as any university in the nation. The Campaign for Michigan, with over a year yet to go, had surpassed its original goal of $1 billion. The endowment had passed $2 billion, almost 10 times the amount we began with. Minority enrollments and faculty representation had doubled as a result of the Michigan Mandate. Michigan had surpassed MIT and Stanford University in research volume, to become the nation’s leading research university. The massive $2 billion effort to rebuild the university’s campuses was approaching completion, with over a dozen new building dedications already scheduled in the year ahead. Not only was our senior leadership team—executive officers, deans, and administrative directors—highly regarded as one of the strongest in the nation, but talent ran deep throughout the university administration and staff. Furthermore, most of our enemies in state and federal government had either been vanquished or had long since moved on, leaving us with relatively strong support among various external constituencies—including, for a change, even the state’s media.

By the mid-1990s, our administration began to shift the university into a third phase, shifting from a positioning effort to a transformation agenda. I had become convinced that we were entering an era of great challenge and opportunity for higher education, characterized by a rapid and profound transformation into a global knowledge society. I realized that the task of transforming the university to better serve society and to move toward a new vision for the century ahead would be challenging. Perhaps the greatest challenge of all would be the university’s very success. It would be difficult to convince those who had worked so hard to build a leading public university of the twentieth
One by one, all of the items on the “To Do” charts were being crossed off.

...
groups during the spring of 1995:

I believe the UM is as strong as it has ever been right now, . . . better, stronger, more exciting. That is due to the efforts of an enormous number of people, obviously. I inherited the fruits of the financial wisdom of Harold Shapiro, the diplomatic-political skills of Robben Fleming, and an enormous number of talented faculty and executive officers who brought us to this point. Yet while Michigan is very strong right now, it is also a time when institutions of higher education are being asked to change very dramatically to serve a changing world, just as other social institutions are. And leading an institution during a time of change, during a time of transformation, puts an additional stress on the entire system.

I had become increasingly convinced that the university needed to undergo a further series of profound transformations and that this period would require sustained leadership for many years. Both Anne and I were increasingly concerned about whether we would be able to sustain the energy and drive necessary to lead Michigan through such an extended period.

Another related consideration was the very nature of the activities I saw as necessary for the university in the years ahead. In part because our progress had been so rapid, I began to look farther ahead—five years, a decade, even a generation or more into the future. I became more interested in blockbuster goals than in the incremental and opportunistic approach of our earlier efforts. I sought larger agendas than those that could be addressed by Michigan alone, agendas that would require new coalitions at the national and even international level.

Although I had a personal vision for the future of the University of Michigan, I also realized that there were many questions involving the evolution of higher education that remained unanswered. As a scientist, I preferred to look at the decade ahead as a time of experimentation, in which leading universities, such as Michigan, had both an unusual opportunity and a responsibility to explore new paradigms of the university. Looking through my notes from that period, it is clear today that my sense of the challenges and opportunities facing higher education in general and the University of Michigan in particular were moving ever farther beyond the perceptions of my colleagues.

Although I had a very strong interest in leading progressive efforts, I began to question whether I could do so in my role as president. The ongoing roles of the presidency must continue—as chief executive officer for the institution; its lead promoter and fund-raiser; the shepherd tending its many flocks; and defender of its values, missions, and quality. I became increasingly concerned about whether I could build sufficient regental understanding and support for this bolder agenda, particularly when the board was becoming increasingly divided. Although many faculty and staff in the university were excited and energized by the boldness of the transformation agenda, many others were threatened. Hence, awareness began to build that my next stage of leadership for higher education might best be accomplished from elsewhere, far from the politics of the presidency and the glare of the media. It was becoming increasingly clear that as I challenged the university to change in more profound ways to serve a changing world, I would gradually exhaust my political capital.
Ironically, Anne and I were forced to think a bit more seriously about our future when two regents of the University of California flew out to visit us over a Memorial Day weekend to discuss the possibility of the UC system presidency. This was probably the only leadership position in the nation more complex than Michigan, with nine major campuses and three national laboratories. This, combined with our earlier experiences in California, compelled us to at least consider the possibility of the UC presidency. The University of California had looked earlier to Michigan for its leadership, tapping UM provost Roger Heyns for chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley, in the 1960s and approached Robben Fleming about the UC presidency in the 1970s.

But for us, there were serious drawbacks to the UC presidency, not the least of which was the intent of the UC Regents to pass a motion to ban the use of affirmative action in admissions (a decision later reinforced by California’s Proposition 209). Such a policy would have placed me in almost immediate conflict with both the UC governing board and the state of California, in view of my successful efforts through the Michigan Mandate to build diversity at Michigan. But more significantly, Anne and I also realized that we had invested far too much in serving the University of Michigan to simply walk away.

Yet perhaps it was in this effort to take stock of what we had accomplished and what remained that we began to think more seriously about just how much longer we could serve. Early in the fall of 1995, as Anne and I walked through the campus and saw all the new buildings and landscaping and went to events to meet the new faculty, we had an increasing sense that our job might be complete. After all, we were entering our eighth year in the presidency, a term comparable in length to the terms of our predecessors and longer than average for public university presidents.

Fate Strikes Again

As fate would have it, another factor became the straw that broke the camel’s back, pushing us to a decision to step down after 8 years at the helm: this was the deteriorating support provided by the university’s board of Regents. As a result of the 1994 elections, the board of Regents had become badly fragmented—in political beliefs (it was composed of four conservative Republicans and four labor-left Democrats), in generation (four young Regents resisted the leadership of more senior members of the board), and in relations with the university (four Regents who were Ann Arbor residents were regularly lobbied by students, faculty, and staff on various agendas). But more seriously, the long-standing senior leadership of the board, its chair and vice-chair, were defeated in the 1994 elections. The four-to-four political division of the newly elected board made it difficult for members to agree on new leadership. Several regents soon reached the conclusion that the board would remain dysfunctional until a new political majority could be reestablished. One regent even stressed to me that my role must become that of protecting the university from its governing board during this stalemate. As a sign of the difficulties to come, the board finally assigned its most senior member, ironically the most disruptive maverick (in whom they had little confidence), with the task of being the primary interface with the president and administration—a decision perhaps meant to send a signal of the eroding support by some members of the new board.

As a result, the executive officer team was forced to deal with a governing board without any internal structure whatsoever—no chair or even party caucus leadership. Although I, as president, had constitutional authority to preside over the meetings of the board, I did so without a vote. Hence, with a four-to-four political split, it became increasingly time-consuming to obtain the additional vote to achieve a majority on matters of importance, such as setting tuition or approving property acquisitions, and to avoid getting a majority vote on issues that could harm the university, such as the rejection of the Michigan Mandate diversity agenda or our student disciplinary policy. The political divisions on the board, its inability to agree on many issues, and its instability made the executive officers increasingly tentative, always concerned that the regents might fail to support them or even attack them publicly on one agenda or another.

A badly divided governing board can take a considerable toll on the executive officers, the university, and the president. Roughly one-third of my time was
spent dealing one-on-one with various regents because of their inability to trust one another. Regent intrusion into such areas as finance, personnel, state politics, and athletics was particularly excessive, placing added pressure on the executive officers responsible for these areas.

It soon became apparent that the changing character of the board not only had put our strategy at risk but was also increasingly threatening the University. The Executive Officer team eventually concluded that we had no choice but to narrow our agenda, stressing only those efforts we believed could be completed over the next year or two and lashing down the wheel to prepare for the stormy seas ahead. Since it was also becoming increasingly clear that my own tenure might be shortened considerably by an intrusive governing board, we began to lock in place a series of key actions—for example, developing the responsibility center management structure and endowment investment strategy and protecting university financial reserves—and moved even more aggressively to decentralize authority to the unit level. Needless to say, developing and executing this doomsday strategy was depressing at times, particularly in view of the extraordinary progress that the university had made over the past decade. But in the end, we became convinced that our responsibility to the institution and to those it would serve in the future demanded such downside strategies.

This was the atmosphere surrounding the University administration as I approached my last year in the Michigan presidency. It was the calm before the storm, characterized by both a sense of satisfaction about remarkable accomplishments of the past decade and a growing dread of the damage that, despite the best efforts of several regents to heal divisions among their colleagues, an increasingly divided governing board was capable of inflicting on the institution as some members pursued their political and personal whims.

Finally, following a particularly difficult week in early fall, when several of the regents undercut my efforts to recruit a new provost, I realized that the oscillations of the board were becoming increasingly unstable and dysfunctional. Hence, I concluded that the best way to stabilize the board, regain control of the agenda, and refocus the university on academic issues once again was to use the visibility of my resignation and a year as lame duck to regain command. This was not an easy decision (at least as far as timing was concerned), but sometimes the general has to fall on his sword to save his army.

My decision was announced simultaneously to the Regents, the university community, and the world (via the Internet). By carefully designing both the tone of the announcement and its broad release, I tried to take the high ground and set the right context for the decision as the key paragraph in my letter to the board indicates.

After considerable thought, Anne and I have decided that the university, the board, and the two of us would be best served if I was to retire from the presidency at the end of the current academic year (June 30, 1996). This would provide the Regents with both the opportunity and the time to conduct a search for a new president. It would also allow me to keep the university on course, hold together a stable leadership team, and prepare for a graceful transition back to the faculty. We ask only for the respect, honor, and dignity that our efforts and accomplishments merit through service both as president and as dedicated members of the university for the past 27 years.

Anne and I were deluged by hundreds of letters of support and thanks, which were reassuring. Fortunately, the Regents’ new role in searching for and selecting a successor soon smoothed the controversies on the board, while most people close to us understood and accepted our decision as yet another of our efforts to serve the University. After the flurry of dinners and receptions hosted by various groups to honor and thank us for our efforts on behalf of the University, it was only appropriate that we return the favor. We hosted events designed to thank the staff that had worked so hard to support us: the President’s Office team, the staff supporting the President’s House and Inglis House, and the staff from the Plant Department that kept these historical facilities running.

Taking Stock

In 1996, Anne and I handed off a university that not only benefited from the highest academic program rankings in its history but had become regarded nationwide as a leader and an innovator. Michigan led
Presidential farewells from alumni, executive officers, deans, faculty, staff, students, and the President's Office team.
the nation in the magnitude of its research activities. It had the most successful medical center in the nation. It had achieved national leadership in information technology, playing a key role in building the Internet. It had become the strongest public university in the nation in a financial sense, as evidenced by the fact that Wall Street gave it its highest credit rating, AAa, in 1996 (along with the University of Texas, the only two public universities in the nation to receive this rating). A CBS News segment on the University of Michigan in 1995 observed, “While America has a number of world-class universities, Michigan truly stands in a class by itself.”

More specifically, by the time I stepped down, Michigan’s endowment had surpassed $2.5 billion, an increase of almost tenfold. The Campaign for Michigan was nearing completion, raising over $1.4 billion, 40 percent beyond its original goal. The university’s portfolio of resources was far more balanced, with tuition revenue increasing to over $500 million per year, and private support (gifts received plus endowment payout) had passed $260 million per year, clearly on track to surpass my administration’s goal of exceeding state support by the end of the decade.

The campus environment for teaching and research had been improved significantly. All of the university’s campuses—UM Ann Arbor, UM Dearborn, and UM Flint—were essentially rebuilt, with over $2 billion of new construction and renovation, all paid for with little debt left for our successor. The campuses had also been re-landscaped, and new master plans had been not only adopted but achieved. As the quality of the campus was improved, a new sense of pride appeared within the campus communities (particularly among the students), resulting in a dramatic decrease in littering and other activities that defaced the environment.

There was also a significant change in the quality and style of university events and facilities. Both the President’s House and Inglis House had been completely renovated. There was a new level of quality achieved in university advancement events. The university had also begun to reconnect itself with its remarkable past, developing a new sense of understanding and appreciation for its history and traditions and restoring historically important facilities, such as the Detroit Observatory.

The student body was characterized by a new spirit of leadership and cooperation. Such programs as Leadership 2017 attracted a new generation of leaders,
and fraternities and sororities accepted a new sense of responsibility for their activities. Although initially difficult to implement, the student code and campus police had become valuable contributions to the quality of campus life. This was augmented by a major effort to improve campus safety, including the improvement of lighting, transportation, and security.

Michigan athletics had evolved far beyond its football-dominated history, to achieve leadership across a broad range of men’s and women’s sports. Furthermore, Michigan became the first major university in America to achieve full gender equity in varsity opportunities. The Michigan Mandate and Michigan Agenda for Women had a dramatic impact on the campus, doubling the number of underrepresented minorities among Michigan’s students, faculty, staff, and leadership; breaking through the glass ceiling to appoint women to senior leadership positions; and creating a new appreciation for the importance of a diverse campus community.

The external relations of the university were back on track. There were strong teams in place in Lansing, Washington, development, and alumni relations. The university also benefited from what was regarded as one of the strongest leadership teams in the nation at the level of executive officers, deans, and senior administrative staff—although, unfortunately, many of these were to leave early in the tenure of the next president.

Not to say that there were no remaining problems. The Regents still suffered from a political selection process that posed a gauntlet to many qualified candidates. The state’s sunshine laws had become increasingly intrusive and were clearly hampering the operations of the university. A scandal was uncovered in the men’s basketball program that would plague future presidents. Prospects for the restoration of adequate state support continued to look dim.

Yet in assessing the decade of leadership from 1986 to 1996, it is clear that the university made remarkable progress. It approached the twenty-first century better, stronger, more diverse, and more exciting than ever, clearly positioned as one of the leading universities in the world. During this decade, the University of Michigan completed the ascension in academic quality launched years earlier by Harold Shapiro. Its quality and impact across all academic disciplines and professional programs ranked it among the most distinguished public and private universities in the world.

As the strategic focus of my administration shifted from building a great twentieth-century university to transforming Michigan into a twenty-first-century institution, a series of key initiatives were launched that were intended as seeds for a university of the
future. Certainly, highly visible efforts, such as the Michigan Mandate and financial restructuring, were components of this effort. However, beyond these were numerous exciting initiatives led by many of our most distinguished faculty members and designed to explore new paradigms for higher education.

Fortunately, in 1996, as we approached the end of our years in the presidency, the state of Michigan and America were entering what would become the most prosperous time for higher education in many years. State support was relatively generous, and a booming equity market (the “dot-com” boom) stimulated strong private giving and endowment growth. The university coffers were filled. A strong leadership team of executive officers, deans, and administrative staff were in place, and numerous important initiatives were running in high gear. Hence, when I stepped down from the presidency, the future of the university seemed secure—at least for the moment.

The Lame-Duck Year

During our last, lame-duck year in the presidency, the pace of activity certainly did not slow down. The transformation effort moved ahead, as did other major efforts, such as various academic initiatives, the fundraising campaign, the major capital facilities projects, and the effort to strengthen support of the university from both state and federal government. The effort to appoint a new provost was put on hold, to preserve the prerogative of the next president. Fortunately, we were able to entice one of our senior deans, Bernie Machen, dean of dentistry, to serve in the interim role. Bernie was highly respected by the deans and executive officers, and although my successor, Lee Bollinger, would look elsewhere for his provost, Bernie went on to highly successful presidencies at the University of Utah and then the University of Florida.

As I mentioned earlier, unlike Harold Shapiro, I found that my power, responsibility, and accountability continued undiminished, with major decisions put on my desk up to my final day as president in the summer of 1996. Since people realized that Anne and I fully intended to remain at the university as active members of the faculty and community, they trusted us to do what was best for the institution up until the very end of our tenure.

Anne turned much of her personal attention to providing encouragement and support to the deans and executive officers during the transition. Since most organizations, whether in government, commerce, or higher education, tend to experience a significant turnover in executive leadership whenever the new CEO arrives, we attempted to provide both reassurance and some protection for our team (although the local newspaper once again pounced on these efforts in an effort to stir up controversy).

We arranged to move our activities, including Anne’s growing activities in University history, into one of the last major building projects of my administration, the Media Union. However since it would not be finished until later in the fall, I took up temporary quarters in a small office in the North Campus Commons, a dining and meeting facility. In a sense, I was moving back to the same part of the Michigan campus where I had begun my academic career 30 years earlier, although my new career would be quite different.

It is appropriate to stress once again that one of the most important objectives for a university president is to make certain that you pass along your institution to your successor in better shape than you received it. Anne and I had committed ourselves to achieving this objective during our tenure in the presidency and achieved this goal, thanks to the talent and efforts of the hundreds of members of our administrative team and the thousands of students, faculty, and staff. Hence, we hoped that we would be welcomed back to the University family as I rejoined the faculty and Anne would continue her service to the University.
Perhaps symbolic of this return, on the last night of the Duderstadt presidency, I snapped a blurred photograph of the moon rising over our new place at Michigan, the Media Union (that eight years later would acquire a new name: the James and Anne Duderstadt Center, or more simply, “the Dude”!).
Our decision to remain at the University of Michigan following the presidency was rather unusual. Most university presidential searches today end up selecting candidates from outside. While these individuals bring new ideas and experience, they usually do not have the emotional attachment that comes from years of service on the faculty or within the campus community. Hence, when they step down from their presidency, they usually do not remain as part of the university community but rather move on to another institution or retire from higher education entirely.

Anne and I were somewhat unusual in higher education, since we had spent our careers at the same institution that I would lead in the presidency. We had many opportunities to go elsewhere. Yet we turned away these approaches by saying, each time, that our job was not yet complete at Michigan. Our commitment to finish what we had started was firm. We did give some thought to life after the presidency, as all presidents should—particularly in a public university with a political governing board.

In the negotiation associated with my decision to continue for several more years of service following my first five years as president, I followed a pattern set by Harold Shapiro and negotiated a path to return to my role as an active professor, but reporting to the provost rather than to a particular academic unit. To indicate the university-wide character of the appointment, the regents approved the title “university professor of science and engineering,” noting it was comparable to an endowed chair. This was intended to be similar to the titles University Professor at the University of California or Institute Professor at MIT, indicating that I would have an appointment in all of the University’s schools and colleges and report directly to the provost. In this way, I could both teach and conduct research in any academic unit of the University and yet also avoid the complexities of reporting to deans that I had hired.

Both Anne and I were provided with a small suite of offices in one of the last buildings constructed on the university’s North Campus during my presidency, the Media Union. I was able to marshal sufficient funds for a small staff and several student assistants for a research project aimed at exploring over-the-horizon topics involving the impact of technology on society, while Anne moved over her work on several University history projects. Since the core of these funds was intended to last only five years, ending in 2001, I selected the name “Millennium Project”, which actually would continue to survive for the next 20 years.

There were other interesting aspects of my transition back to the faculty. It was decided to set my post-presidency salary initially at the average of the top three faculty salaries in the College of Engineering and then increase it each year at the University-wide average. Although it is customary in higher education to provide a faculty member serving in a senior leadership role such as dean, executive officer, or president with a year-long sabbatical leave when they step down, I felt it was more important to begin my new teaching and research duties immediately. In almost 50 years of service, I have never taken a sabbatical leave from my academic duties at the University. Although these cannot accumulate, these forgone leaves have, in reality, provided the University with roughly six years of my service on a voluntary basis, and, of course, considerably more volunteer service on the part of Anne.

A Professional Chairman

The first jarring transition after stepping down from a senior leadership post is the loss of the strong support
staff so necessary for the hectic life of a university president. In the transition back to the faculty, it soon becomes apparent that execution becomes more important than delegation. One must learn once again how to make travel arrangements, maintain a filing system, use the copy machine, and make the coffee.

Calendar management also becomes a new challenge. Although has-been presidents are expected to be ghosts on their campuses, the former leaders of such a prominent university as Michigan still retain some visibility and credibility on the national stage. The invitations to speak or participate in various activities are quite numerous. The challenge, of course, is to prioritize these opportunities into a coherent pattern. Otherwise, one soon finds the calendar filled with too many such commitments, leaving little time for other activities, including the normal faculty pursuits of teaching and research. In my own case, this overload of opportunities was compounded by my continued involvement with numerous state and national agencies, including the National Science Board, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, and the National Academies. Beyond this, I faced the very pragmatic challenge of seeking longer-term funding for my own research interests, since grantsmanship is a requirement for any productive faculty role in science and engineering.

It soon became apparent that beyond acquiring the usual speaking and writing roles characterizing the afterlife of a university president, I had become, in effect, a “professional chairman,” because of the numerous requests to chair various committees and task forces. Apparently my colleagues thought that my experience chairing a politically elected board of regents for many years had prepared me for almost any chair assignment. The assignments ranged from chairing a wide range of National Academy groups on such topics as national science policy, information technology, and science education to advisory committees for federal agencies on such topics as nuclear energy research and space exploration. Michigan’s governor asked me to launch a new Internet-based university, the Michigan Virtual Automotive College—later renamed the Michigan Virtual University—so I was once again a university president, if only in a virtual sense.

Many of my speaking engagements were at the invitation of my colleagues who were still sitting in the saddle as active presidents. I referred to my role in such engagements as that of a “professional two-by-four,” recalling the old Missouri adage that, sometimes, to get a mule to move, one has to first whack it over the head with a two-by-four to get its attention. I would be invited to a campus to meet with trustees, the faculty, or even governors and legislators, to help them read the writing on the wall about the future of higher education and to raise such issues as tuition, tenure, and college sports, which were dangerous territory for a sitting president.

Fortunately, as I became more adept at calendar management, I was soon able to define my own priorities and began to resume my pre-presidency activities as an author, although this time on subjects of current interest,
such as the future of the university, public higher education, and intercollegiate athletics, rather than, as in my past efforts, on such archaic subjects as nuclear engineering and mathematical physics. I launched a series of projects under the umbrella of my research center, the Millennium Project, including exploring the impact of rapidly evolving digital technologies on learning, the development of strategies for assisting states in evolving into knowledge economies, and the future of engineering education.

Since I had considerable freedom in my teaching activities, I arranged with the deans to develop and teach an array of new courses scattered across the university, depending on my interests of the moment. These ranged from new undergraduate courses in engineering to capstone courses developed for last-term seniors in our liberal arts college to graduate-level courses on information technology, nuclear technology, science policy, and higher education. I was asked to build a new program in science, technology, and public policy within our Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy; to lead a university-wide effort to build a major institute in energy research; and help the university develop a strategy for information technology.

**Pushed Into Exile:**
*The King Is Dead; Long Live the King!*

During our years of university leadership, we had strived to treat our predecessors with great respect and concern. Although Harold and Vivian Shapiro had left for Princeton, we made every effort to acknowledge...
and honor their extraordinary impact on the University. In keeping with long-standing University custom, we arranged to have a major building named in their honor. We gave them a choice, and they thought it most appropriate to rename the Undergraduate Library as the Harold and Vivian Shapiro Library, in part because of its central role on the campus and its proximity to the location of the original Department of Economics where Harold had served. Anne helped to arrange a dedication event, inviting their families and friends back to campus.

Of course Anne and I had worked closely with Bob and Sally Fleming throughout our years at Michigan and particularly during the transition period preceding my presidency and had established a strong friendship. Anne was also a friend of Alene Smith. Hence it was important to make certain that Bob and Sally Fleming and Alene and Allen Smith—and later Harlan and Anne Hatcher, when they returned to campus—were invited to and welcomed at university activities including both formal events such as commencement and convocations as well as informal events we would host for the executive officers and deans (e.g., events to launch the fall term or celebrate holidays).

We also continued an important tradition launched by the Shapiro’s by inviting former presidents and spouses to join us in the President’s Box at Michigan Stadium, in a sense redefining and naming it as the Presidents’ Box for all university presidents. In fact, as the Flemings became older and moved into assisted living, Anne and I would take Bob and Sally both to the tailgate events and then to the Presidents’ Box, bringing them back home after the game. While it was clear that the Flemings enjoyed this immensely, it was also clear that members of the University community enjoyed seeing them regularly at these events, reinforcing an important link with Michigan’s history. Although Harlan and Anne Hatcher were less active in these events, we did arrange for Harlan to be present at the basketball game when the great Michigan star, Cassie Russell, had his jersey number retired, since Harlan had been president during his Michigan team’s great records.

It was therefore a surprise when we encountered quite different treatment after returning to our earlier roles in the University community. Actually, we should have recognized that the efforts we had made to involve our predecessors was unusual, at least in public universities, since those of my colleagues who had attempted to remain active on campus following their years of service as president frequently found themselves persona non grata to their successors. All too frequently they were viewed as a threat to the new regime (more frequently in myth than reality), and if not successfully pushed off the campus or into retirement, then at least buried and paved over as far as visibility and engagement is concerned.

I remember well the “good news–bad news” advice given me by a colleague who had also returned to the faculty after long service as the leader of his campus. First the bad news: He warned that life would be difficult under my first successor, since in public
universities, there is usually a tendency for new presidents to obliterate any evidence of the existence of their predecessors—“The king is dead, long live the king!” A retiring president will frequently be ignored—if not buried and paved over. He noted that loyal staff would be replaced and that programs would be dismantled as the new leader tried to establish his or her own agenda and steer the university in a different direction.

However, my colleague also had some good news. He suggested that my first successor would not last very long, since, like an ocean liner, a university is very hard to turn about, and efforts to attempt this usually end in failure. Second, he believed that life could be quite enjoyable under the subsequent successors, who no longer would have any need to discount the accomplishments of earlier predecessors and hence felt comfortable welcoming them back once again as valued members of the university community. Unfortunately, we were to find that neither of our successors felt very comfortable in continuing the relationships we had established with our predecessors, a message that quickly found its way through the University administration leading to even more isolation on the part of their staff.

For example, during the four year tenure of my first successor, Lee Bollinger, I can recall only one face-to-face discussion, ironically when running into him on the jogging track in the weeks after he had announced his decision to go to Columbia. He was curious how I had put up with the politics of the Michigan presidency over my eight years since he had only lasted four! Actually, if he would have invited me for a chat from time to time, I might have been helpful. Ironically, I had been the one to elevate him from a faculty position to become dean of our law school.

It was particularly irritating that as each of the many buildings planned, funded, and constructed during our years came on line, the role that Anne and I played in both their planning and funding was not only totally ignored, but we were usually not even invited to the formal dedication ceremonies. For example, we read in the University publications about the Cancer Center dedication, so we decided to drop by for the occasion, only to be asked why we had not attended the luncheon preceding the event (which we didn’t even know about, much less having been invited to). Similarly the dedication of the new School of Social Work, funded through a complex process we had developed both with a donor and state government, we again happened to notice in the newspaper but attended without invitation.

Fortunately, we were able to plan the dedication of one of the most important facilities of our era, the Media Union, during our last month in the presidency, inviting the governor to make remarks. (This was fortunate for another reason, since in 2004 the University Regents decided to honor our service in a long-standing tradition for past university presidents by naming it the James and Anne Duderstadt Center.)

Perhaps the most remarkable omission was the new regime’s failure to invite or honor us during the major celebration of the completion of the Campaign for Michigan, the largest fund-raising effort in the history of public higher education that my administration had launched and succeeded in raising over $1.4 billion. Anne and I sat quietly in the rear of the audience to celebrate the success of the campaign watching President Bollinger and his administration take full credit for this effort, even though they came on board after it was essentially completed. It is worth noting here that had he continued the effort for three more years, the momentum of the Campaign would have taken it well above $2 billion, making it the most successful in history at the turn of the century. However, for whatever reason, he decided to dismantle the fund-raising effort during his brief tenure at Michigan, although he certainly did not throttle back his enthusiasm for expensive new facilities such as Life Sciences Institute and Palmer Commons, which had to be funded from University Hospital reserves.

As one by one, many of my colleagues completed successful presidencies and attempted to return to their faculties, most have had similar experiences. I have always marveled at the ability of United States presidents, albeit from vastly different eras and political perspectives, to unite in a “Presidents’ Club” to serve the needs of the nation. For whatever reason, many university presidents have been unable to elevate the interests of their institution to similar priorities over their personal agendas by building strong bonds with their predecessors.
Unfortunately this same tradition of showing the door or burying former academic leaders also arises at the level of deans and department chairs. This custom is terribly damaging to higher education, since we try to select the very best of our faculty to serve in these critical positions. We ask them to sacrifice years of their academic life and other priorities to serve their schools and colleges, and then ask them to step aside after a decade or so without any assistance in helping them to transition back into meaningful faculty roles. Hence as they approach the last years of their tenure as leaders, they are faced with the decision of leaving the university, an institution that they have sacrificed greatly to serve, if they are unable to find another position further up the food chain (unlikely in most cases). This is yet another example of “the king is dead; long live the king” syndrome of higher education.

Among the other disappointments was the tragic loss of the process we had made through the Michigan Mandate in boosting Michigan to a national leader in the diversity of its students, faculty, staff, and leadership and the remarkable achievements of this diverse institution. Unfortunately, in an effort to best position the University for the court cases it would face challenging affirmative action (which, ironically, had never been high on our agenda to build a diverse campus), the Bollinger team moved rapidly to shut down all of the activities that had been so successful in the Michigan Mandate. As a consequence, minority participation began almost immediately to drop rapidly in student enrollments, faculty hiring, and leadership roles. The decline became even more precipitous following the 2003 Supreme Court case and the arrival of Mary Sue Coleman as president, and today has dropped back below the appalling levels of the 1960s. It has been frustrating indeed to see the complete reversal in what was regarded by most as one of the most important University achievements during the 1990s.

A second major disappointment concerned Michigan Athletics, under the new University leadership put in place athletic directors from the business world who saw their major objective as transforming the Michigan Wolverines into a highly commercial venture that would lead the nation in revenues (although not necessary winning records...) Michigan Stadium, Crisler Arena, and Yost Arena were renovated to include premium seating (i.e., sky boxes), and ticket prices both raised dramatically and augmented by seat license fees to make Michigan athletics the mostly costly in the national to both patrons and students. Working closely with the Big Ten Commissioner, Jim Delaney, the Big Ten was restructured (rather destroyed) by adding Nebraska, Maryland, and Rutgers to expand the audience for the Big Ten Television Network.
What has been the result of this major shift toward rampant commercialism over the past 15 years? Michigan Athletics has been largely ripped apart from both the University and the Ann Arbor community, since few faculty members, students, or townspeople can afford the commercial pricing imposed on these activities. The “wow” factor introduced at the events themselves has acquired the carnival character of professional sports, perhaps not surprising since this is what Michigan football, basketball, and hockey have become (at least for all but the student-athletes). And the performance of Michigan’s teams has dropped to an all time low, e.g., with Michigan football’s record against Ohio State now stands at 2-11, while its recent performances against Michigan State are 1-5. Not exactly what one would regard as “the leaders and best”...and certainly not in the tradition of Michigan athletics.

There was one final disappointment characterizing our return to the Michigan faculty family: the number of our university friends that had drifted away during our 15 years in academic administration. Fortunately we managed to maintain some very close family friends during our leadership years, including some of those from our earliest days at Michigan (including even friends from the Northwood housing days). And Anne’s efforts to sustain the Faculty Women’s Club in the years following our presidency certainly maintained many friends in this organization.

Years later I would suggest that an astronomical analog to the fate of many has-been university presidents would be the Oort Cloud, that region a light-year from the sun, so far away that it was difficult to discern, but for where it is thought that comets may originate. Here former university presidents are all too frequently exiled, doomed to contemplate issues out of sight, out of mind—although they are occasionally able to launch provocative comets back toward the sun to perturb the higher education solar system.

The Millennium Project

The Millennium Project at the University of Michigan is a research center engaged in both the study and creation of the future through over-the-horizon technologies. Located in the Media Union (aka Duderstadt Center), the Millennium Project provided a platform for exploring the impact of advanced technology on social institutions. It also gave both Anne and me an opportunity to explore how this technology could be used to capture and articulate the character and history of the University of Michigan in novel new ways.

In some ways, the Millennium Project was designed as the analog to a corporate R&D laboratory, an incubation center, where new paradigms could be developed and tested. Rather than being simply a “think-tank”, where ideas are generated and studied, the Millennium Project was a “do-tank”, where ideas led to the actual creation of working models or prototypes to explore possible futures. Like the famous Lockheed Skunkworks, every so often the hanger doors of the Millennium Project would open, and something really new and interesting would be wheeled out and
flown away.

Although the Millennium Project was launched in 1996 as a platform for our further academic activities, with the University providing seed funding for an initial five-year period (to the year 2001, the Third Millennium), the project rapidly evolved to encompass an unusually broad range of scientific, technological, education, and policy issues, supported by both government agencies and foundations.

The Millennium Project has been heavily involved in activities exploring the impact of disruptive technologies such as info-nano-bio technology that evolve exponentially (e.g., Moore’s Law). Working through the National Academies, I led a major effort (the IT Forum) to assess the impact of information and communications technologies on knowledge-intensive organizations such as research universities, corporate R&D laboratories, and national laboratories. Many of these activities continued through the National Science Foundation and other federal agencies with Dan Atkin’s appointment as first director of NSF’s new cyberinfrastructure division and my role as chair of the NSF Cyberinfrastructure Advisory Committee.

We have also been very actively involved in studies concerning the future of higher education in general and the research university in particular. These have been coordinated with national efforts (National Academies, ACE, AAU, NASULGC, AGB, Educause), international groups (the Glion Colloquium, OECD), and regional efforts (e.g., Michigan, Ohio, North Carolina, Texas, California, Missouri). Of particular note here were my roles as a member of both the Secretary of Education’s Commission on the Future of Higher Education (the Spellings Commission), the Association of Governing Boards’ Task Force on the State of the University Presidency, and the National Academies study on the future of the American research university.

Because of my experience with both the National Science Board and the National Academies, I remained heavily involved in national science and technology.
policy. In particular, I chaired a major blue ribbon study by the National Academy of Engineering concerning the federal investment necessary to sustain the nation’s technological leadership (a precursor to the “Gathering Storm” report and the American COMPETES Act); the National Academy’s Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy; and serving on the guidance committees for studies of interdisciplinary research and major scientific facilities.

I was given the assignment of building the new Science, Technology, and Public Policy (STPP) program, centered in the Ford School involving students and faculty from across the University. The Rackham Executive Board approved the offering of our new STPP graduate certificate program, based on a five-course sequence developed. We received a $610,000 grant from the Dow Foundation to support a STPP postdoctoral program for five years, which added to our capacity to expand both instructional and research activities (including both the introduction of an undergraduate course and Washington-based internships).

After serving two years as chair of both a committee exploring major energy research activities as well as the executive committee of the Michigan Memorial Phoenix Project, I merged these committees into a university-wide Michigan Energy Research Council. The first task of this new body has been to develop a plan for creating the Michigan Energy Institute as an umbrella organization to coordinate and promote the University’s energy research activities (already conducted at a level of $35 million per year). Working closely with Vice President Steve Forrest, a multiple-year plan was developed for building upon the renovated Phoenix Memorial Laboratory, while a combination of state, federal, and private support to position the University as a leader in multidisciplinary research in energy sciences, applications, and policy, with particular emphasis on transportation applications.

Our regional economic development studies aimed at developing strategies for building the workforce and knowledge infrastructure necessary to compete in a global, knowledge-driven society and culminating in The Michigan Roadmap, has triggered a great deal of interest not only within Michigan but in other states and nations. A broader activity involving the multiple-state Great Lakes region is moving ahead, working in my role as a non-resident Senior Scholar with the Brookings Institution.

Of final note was a low key effort we called “The DaVinci Project”. The University’s North Campus contains a formidable concentration of academic programs characterized by the common intellectual activities of creativity, invention, and innovation (e.g., art, architecture, music, engineering, information technology, and design), along with unique commons facilities such as the Media Union, the Chrysler Center, and the Pierpont Commons. The presence of the Walgreen Center for Performing Arts significantly enhanced the character of this academic constellation, once referred to by the North Campus deans as the Renaissance Campus. With the growing priority of the nation given to innovation as the key competency required for economic prosperity and national security in a “flat world”, it seemed natural to undertake
a major effort to better integrate and support joint efforts among these academic units. The Millennium Project continued to support multidisciplinary student innovation projects with this philosophy.

Largely stimulated by Anne’s strong interest in the history of the University of Michigan, the Millennium Project launched a number of activities designed both to better document and elevate the awareness of the important role that the University has played throughout its history. Early efforts involved authoring pictorial histories of both the College of Engineering to celebrate its 150th anniversary, a massive photographic history of the University, several books on important University facilities such as the President’s House, the Inglis Highlands estate, and the University campuses through the seasons. Early biographic work included a history of the University’s strategic planning activities during our years in the presidency, as well as an early draft of the current volume containing our memoirs.

But beyond that, Anne led the effort to utilize rapidly evolving digital technology to describe the history and character of the University. This included interactive websites, 3-D simulations of the University campus during various periods of its history, and various video and photographic media distributed in digital formats. In addition Anne designed and led students in developing a website (actually, a “web portal) concerning the history of the University, which is continuously evolving (http://milproj.dc.umich.edu). More detail on these projects can be found in Chapter 17.

The Media Union (aka the Duderstadt Center)

“Open to all those who dare to invent the future…
For students, faculty, staff, and even our far-flung community of alumni, the Media Union offers a radically new environment for learning, teaching, and performing.

Both a physical commons for the North Campus and a virtual commons for the entire campus—open twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week—the Media Union will initially house:

An on-line library of the future
A laboratory for virtual reality
Interactive multi-media classrooms

High-tech theater and performance spaces
Cutting-edge design and innovation studios
But the most important part of this project is its unpredictability. Creative people will continually reshape its mission and determine its impact.”
(1996 Dedication Brochure for the Media Union)

The opening of the Media Union in 1996 was a significant and tangible commitment by the University of Michigan, in partnership with the State of Michigan, to provide all members of the University community access to some of the most sophisticated and transformational tools of the emerging digital revolution. Conceived as a model for the Library of the Future—or perhaps even the University of the Future—the North Campus deans viewed the Media Union project as an effort to create a physical environment to meet the rapidly changing character of teaching and research for many years to come, in a sense of “…designing a building full of unknowns.”

The University retained the architectural firm descended from the famous architect, Albert Kahn, who had designed much of the University campus in the early 20th century, as well as many of the leading buildings in Detroit. The design team of deans, faculty, and staff responsible for the program of the new facility envisioned it as more akin to the MIT Media Lab for students and faculty of the North Campus academic programs. It was designed as a high-tech collection of studios, laboratories, workshops, performance venues and gathering and study space for students. Its original program statement in 1993 portrayed it as an Internet portal to the world (since the Internet was still rather new at that time). Although it was designed to provide space for the library collections of the College of Engineering and Schools of Art and Architecture, its function as a “traditional” book-based library was never a major part of the vision. Instead it was a place intended for collaboration and innovation in teaching and learning, a place where students, faculty, and staff could access a technology-rich environment, a place open to all “who dared to invent the future”.

More specifically, the resulting 250,000 square foot facility, looking like a modern version of the Temple of Karnak, contained over 500 advanced computer workstations for student use. It had thousands of
network jacks and wireless hubs for students to connect their laptops to work throughout the building or in its surrounding plazas and gardens during the summer. The facility contained a 500,000 volume library for art, architecture, science, and engineering, but perhaps more significantly, it was the site of several of our major digital library projects (including the JSTOR project, the first of the national digital libraries). There was a sophisticated teleconferencing facility, design studios, visualization laboratories, and a major virtual reality complex. Since art, architecture, music, and theater students worked side-by-side with engineering students, the Media Union contained sophisticated recording studios and electronic music studios. It also had a state-of-the-art sound stage for digitizing performances, as well as numerous galleries for displaying the results of student creative efforts. To serve the unique needs of students and faculty in these areas, the Media Union was designed to open 24 hours a day, seven days a week, so that students have round-the-clock access to its facilities.

Over the past two decades since it opened, this facility “full of unknowns” has become the home for a large and evolving collection of new information and communications technologies far beyond the resources that any one school or college could acquire and maintain. The Media Union’s collection of digital assets and resources requires constant renewal with the latest versions of software and hardware, and an expert team of professionals who enable U-M users to get up-to-speed and use them productively for innovative research and teaching. Rationalizing significant investments in cutting-edge resources by enabling free access to a shared, expertly-supported collection of assets has enabled a widespread culture of innovation in digital technologies at the U-M. Students and faculty are free both to envision and to lead, hands-on, change in disciplines being transformed by the digital revolution – from engineering, the design arts and medicine, to economics and government.

The Media Union rapidly became one of the most active learning spaces in the University, providing thousands of students with 7x24 hour access to rich resources including libraries, advanced technology, workshops, performance venues, and high quality study and community gathering spaces. The center has evolved into an innovative center for discovery, learning, invention, innovation, demonstration, and deployment utilizing state-of-the-art technologies and facilities and assisted by expert staff. In a sense, it serves as a new form of public good, an innovation commons, where students and faculty would come to work together with expert staff mentors to develop the skills and tacit learning acquired through studios, workshops, performance venues, and advanced facilities such as simulation and immersive environments. It encourages experimentation, tinkering, invention, and even play as critical elements of innovation and creative design.

It also invites and enables the creation of highly interdisciplinary teams of students and faculty from various academic and professional disciplines, providing a Greek agora, where people could exchange knowledge and create new ideas working with experienced staff.

In 2004, in keeping with a long-standing tradition of naming an appropriate building after each former president, the Media Union was renamed the James and Anne Duderstadt Center, or more commonly known to students simply as “the Dude”. Perhaps one student best captured the role of the center when asked to explain its purpose as: “The Dude is the place you go to make your dreams come true!”

Activities on the Family Front

There were also major changes on the family front. In fact, the Duderstadt family doubled in size over the five years following our presidency. When last they were mentioned, our daughters Susan and Kathy had been married to John Iskander and Nathan Schwadron, respectively, and the four had been rapidly accumulating advanced degrees.

Susan and John were both board-certified pediatricians with not only M.D.s but also M.P.H degrees. They met doing their pediatric residencies in Children’s Memorial Hospital in Chicago and then moved to work in Neil Shulman’s rural clinic (portrayed in the movie Doc Hollywood) near Albany, Georgia. After several years they moved to Columbia, South Carolina where John worked in public health, and Susan had her first child, Eleanor. They then moved to Atlanta where John worked in infectious diseases in the U.S. Public
Dedication of the James and Anne Duderstadt Center
Health Service at the Center for Disease Control while Susan consulting with CDC in bioterrorism, while having her second child, Jonas.

Kathy and Nathan both received their Ph.D.s at Michigan in atmospheric science and space science, respectively, while Kathy had her first child, Marina. Nathan’s work took them to San Antonio where he worked at the Southwest Research Institute on the IBEX satellite project, while Kathy had her second child, Jane.

Their careers next took them to the Boston area (Natick) where Nathan taught at Boston University while Kathy taught physics at Newton High School. The family finally moved once more to Durham, NH where both accepted faculty research positions at the University of New Hampshire.

The activities of our grandkids can best be told through the following images.
Marina
Eleanor
Jonas
Jane
The Duderstadt Grandkids
The Duderstadt Grandkids
The Duderstadts and the “Machine”
Chapter 16

Life after Leadership

So, what have the past two decades been like after two decades in various university leadership activities? Fortunately we can confirm that there can indeed be an active life after returning to the faculty and campus communities. To be sure, there are particular challenges when one decides to return to university life at the same campus one has led, not the least of an expectation that one will remain largely unseen and unheard—or in our case, we suppose invisible guardian angels would be a more appropriate analogy.

Actually, it is possible to have considerable impact built on the experience and external visibility gained while serving and leading a university of Michigan’s prominence. It is even possible to have greater influence and impact after serving, at least beyond the campus, since as a faculty member or member of the University family, one not only has more time to think, but perhaps more significantly, fewer constraints on one’s activities. Put another way, leaving leadership roles, behind, one regains those valuable prerogatives such as academic freedom, freedom to think, and the opportunity to act and serve in new ways.

Different Eras, Different Roles, and Careers

Perhaps the best way to consider this is to recognize that while Anne and I have been part of the same institution for almost 50 years, in reality each of us have changed not just activities but entire careers every five years or so.

In summarizing this for myself, I would identify these transitions as shown below:

1960-65: Undergraduate education (training and practice as an engineer)
1965-70: Building research career (training and work in theoretical physics)
1971-75: Junior faculty: Teaching, PhDs, (teacher, scholar, grantsmanship)
1976-80: Senior faculty: (Textbook writer, faculty politician, computer geek)
1981-85: Dean of Engineering: (engineering administrator, fund-raiser)
1986-90: Provost, Acting President, President (university leadership)
1991-95: President, National Science Board (administration, higher ed policy, science policy)
1995-00: “Professional Chairman” (federal and global science and technology policy)
2001-05: National Academies, Federal and International agencies (science and technology leadership)
2006-10: State, National, Global Activities (science, technology, higher ed leadership)
2011-15: More State, National, Global Activities (policy, writing, moving and shaking…)

Anne has also experienced similar transitions, which I will list here, but wait until the next chapter to describe in more detail how these have evolved.

1960-65: Undergraduate education (marketing and management)
1964-70: Building a family…and moving to Michigan
1971-75: Building campus communities (e.g., Faculty Women’s Club)
1976-80: Returning to campus for a liberal education
1981-85: Deanette and partner in leading the College of Engineering
1986-90: Provostess, First Lady, and partner in leading the University of Michigan
1991-95: First Lady, fund raiser, organizer, facilities
1995-00: Launch of major history project to build a digital model of UM campus
2001-05: Research and author of books on UM history and character
2006-10: Development of methods for collecting, curating, and distributing digital resources on UM history
2011-15: Advocating the importance of UM history, particularly “Beyond the Bicentennial”

It seems best to separate these experiences into two chapters, first describing how I reinvented my activities (and myself) over the past two decades, and then turning to Anne’s considerable efforts to capture, articulate, and preserve the University of Michigan’s remarkable history.

Finishing Up Loose Ends

At the time of my return to the faculty after serving for 15 years as dean, provost, and president, I was still engaged in many ongoing activities:

National Science Board: Although my term as chair of the NSB was about to end, I continued to direct a major study by the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable on the future of the research university.

The Michigan Virtual University: We already had launched an effort to build one of the nation’s first online learning institutions, the Michigan Virtual Automobile College, authorized by the State Legislature. For a brief period following my service as UM’s president, I would serve (in a volunteer service) as the president of its successor, the Michigan Virtual University.

Corporate Directorships: I continued to serve on the board of directors of two major corporations, CMS Energy and Unisys, as well as a fellow of a consulting company, Diamond Cluster.

There was also a continuation of various other ongoing volunteer activities:

The National Center for Postsecondary Education at Stanford University
The IT Advisory Committee for Yale University
Director of the Oberlin-Kalamazoo-UM Project
The National Partnership for Advanced Computational Infrastructure
The Development of a Technology Strategy for the Ontario Province
Strategic Roles for the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, CA

And, of course, I continued to be involved in numerous higher education activities both at Michigan and at other universities across the country such as the litigation concerning Michigan’s affirmative action programs, numerous honorary degree and commencement addresses, and various requests to assist other universities in strategic planning.

I was also able to resume my writing activities, publishing several books on some of the more controversial issues facing university presidents, including the future of the university, financing public higher education, university and leadership, college sports, the globalization of higher education, disruptive technologies for universities, and the role of higher education in economic development. A list of such publications along with weblinks are provided in an appendix to this book.

Some of these topics were too hot to handle while president (particularly college sports), even if I had the time. Fortunately, however, has-been presidents can begin to talk and write about what they really think. Of course these sensitive issues will still irritate powerful people who can always find ways to get even. But as a faculty member, one regains the protection of tenure.

National and Global Affairs

Perhaps because of the experience of chairing a publicly elected university governing board, a presidentially appointed National Science Board, and numerous other boards in higher education, government, and corporations, I continued to get tapped to lead various volunteer efforts. Several of the activities are described below along with several tables and illustrations.
As an elected member of the National Academy of Engineering, I continue to play many roles both in the Academy governance as well in many of its studies. The most important of these concerned the future of engineering research in the United States (which led to the concept of translational research organizations now implemented with the “innovation hubs” of the Department of Energy and Department of Commerce) and a more fundamental study of the changing nature of engineering education, research, and practice.

National Research Council

Governing Board

Division of Policy and Global Affairs (chair)

The National Research Council is the principal operating agency of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering (NAE), and the Institute of Medicine (IOM) providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. Its mission is to improve government decision making and public policy, increase public understanding, and promote the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge in matters involving science, engineering, technology, and health. Each year, more than 6,000 NAS, NAE, and IOM members and other volunteer experts serve on hundreds of study committees or oversee roundtables, workshops, cooperative research programs, or fellowship programs.

After serving in numerous roles as a member or chair of various National Academy studies, I was asked to chair the largest section of the National Research Council, the Division of Policy and Global Affairs, with an unusually broad mission of helping to improve public policy, understanding, and education in matters of science, technology, and health with regard to national strategies and resources, global affairs, workforce and the economy. The division is particularly charged to identify and build synergy among the disciplines and issue areas, and to promote interaction among science, engineering, medicine and public policy. The division includes a range of standing committees and boards concerned with the vitality of the research enterprise in the US and abroad. In that connection, the units of the division focus particularly on the interaction of key institutions central to science and technology policy, on the standing of US research around the world and cooperation with Science & Engineering bodies in other countries, on the mission and organization of federal research activities, and on the sources of future manpower and funding for research. The division consists of 17 standing committees and boards, with oversight by the Policy and Global Affairs Committee, which manages a diverse portfolio of activities. PGA produces technical and policy reports, convene workshops and conferences, collects and analyzes data, and manages fellowship competitions. It also represents the United States in international scientific organizations, assists researchers subjected to human rights violations, manages international exchanges and collaborative research grants, conducts bilateral dialogues on sensitive topics, and helps to build the capacity of partner academies in developing countries.

National Academies Committee on Science, Technology, and Public Policy

Federal Science and Technology Budget Analysis
Postdoctoral Education
Scientific Research in the States
Postdoctoral Appointments

The Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (COSEPUP) is a joint unit of the National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. Most of its members are current or former members of the Executive Councils of the three institutions. COSEPUP mainly conducts studies on cross-cutting issues in science and technology policy. It was chartered by the National Academies to address the concerns and requests of the President’s Science Advisor, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Chair of the National Science Board, and heads of other federal research and development departments and agencies, and the Chairs of key
science and technology-related committees of the Congress. It also monitors key developments in U.S. science and technology policy for the Academies’ leadership. COSEPUP studies are usually conducted by special interdisciplinary panels comprising the nation’s best scientific and engineering expertise. While many studies are sponsored by government agencies, COSEPUP procedures safeguard its studies from the influence of sponsors or other outside groups.

National Academies
   Studies on Information Technology
   Scholarship in the Digital Age
   Information Technology and the Future of the Research University
   The IT Council

The National Science Foundation
   Education and Human Resources
   Advisory Committee on Cyberinfrastructure (chair)
   Strategic Planning

The Education and Human Resources Committee is one of the standing bodies of the National Science Board. After chairing this body during the 1980s, I was asked to once again become a member in recent years. The Advisory Committee for Cyberinfrastructure (ACCI) provides perspective and advice to the National Science Foundation on the Agency’s plans and programmatic strategies to develop and support a state-of-the-art cyberinfrastructure that enables significant advances in all fields of science and engineering. As the former chair of the National Science Board, I am also routinely invited to participate in strategic planning sessions for the National Science Foundation.

Department of Energy
   Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee (chair)
   Secretary of Energy’s Commission on Research Futures
   Facility for Rare Isotope Beams Advisory Committee (Michigan State University)
   Consortium for Advanced Simulation of Light Water Reactors (board of directors)
   The Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee

was established in 1998 (with me as its first chair) to provide independent advice to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) on complex science and technical issues that arise in the planning, managing, and implementation of DOE’s nuclear energy program. NERAC assists DOE by reviewing the research and development (R&D) activities of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology (NE) and providing advice and recommendations on long range plans, priorities, and strategies to effectively address the scientific and engineering aspects of these efforts. In addition, the committee provides advice on national policy and scientific aspects on nuclear energy research issues as requested by the Secretary of Energy.

More recently, I have served on the Board of Directors of CASL, the Consortium for Advanced Simulation of Light Water Reactors, the first (and largest) of the DOE Energy Innovation Hubs recommended by our studies for the Brookings Institution.

The Glion Colloquium (co-director)

The Glion Colloquium has established itself as an influential resource in addressing both the challenges and responsibilities of the world’s research universities. Every two years, the Glion Colloquium provides a “Davos-like” forum in Switzerland for research university leaders to join with leaders from business and government to consider together the role that the world’s leading universities should play in addressing the great challenges and opportunities of our times and to explore together how universities, in partnership with governments, industry, and society, can contribute both to solutions of global challenges and especially as partners and leaders in change. These activities, consisting of papers prepared by participants prior to three days of intense discussions in Glion-above-Montreux, Switzerland, are captured in subsequent books given wide circulation throughout the world.

Over the past 14 years, over 200 leaders of higher education, business, and government agencies have participated in the Glion activities to consider issues such as the challenges of the new millennium, the governance of universities, the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of teaching and research, the
The evolution of activities from science to education to policy can be seen in the changing nature of the books published.
globalization of higher education, the relationship between universities and industry, the role of university research in driving innovation and ways to address the challenges of global sustainability. The publications resulting from the Glion activities are now regarded as an important resource for better aligning higher education with the needs of a rapidly changing world.

The Salzburg Seminar (session leader)

Salzburg Global Seminar is a nonprofit organization that holds seminars on topics as diverse as healthcare, education, economics, geopolitics and philanthropy. Its objective is to “challenge present and future leaders to solve issues of global concern” through seminars held at the Schloss Leopoldskron in Salzburg, Austria and in other locations throughout the world. The mission of the Salzburg Global Seminar is to challenge present and future leaders to solve issues of global concern. The Salzburg Global Seminar convenes imaginative thinkers from different cultures and institutions, organizes problem-focused initiatives, supports leadership development, and engages opinion-makers through active communication networks, all in partnership with leading institutions from around the world and across different sectors of society.

Other Major Studies

The Future of Higher Education in America (Department of Education)

This major study, sometimes referred to as the Spellings Commission after Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings, was launched to address the themes of access, affordability, and accountability in American higher education. The Commission issued a series of sweeping recommendations to better align higher education with the needs of the nation, including 1) reaffirming America’s commitment to provide all students with the opportunity to pursue postsecondary education; 2) restructuring student financial aid programs to focus upon the needs of lower income and minority students; 3) demanding transparency, accountability, and commitment to public purpose in the operation of our universities; 4) adopting a culture of continuous innovation and quality improvement in higher education; 5) greatly increasing investment in key strategic areas such as science, engineering, medicine, and other knowledge-intensive professions essential to global competitiveness; and 6) ensuring that all citizens have access to high quality educational, learning, and training opportunities throughout their lives through a national strategy to provide lifelong learning opportunities at the postsecondary level.

The Future of the American Research University (National Academies)

Widely considered the best in the world, our nation’s research universities today confront significant challenges and opportunities, including financial pressures, advances in technology, developments in teaching and learning, a changing demographic landscape, and increased international competition. In response to a request from Congress to examine these issues, the National Research Council empanelled a committee to undertake a study of the challenges and opportunities our nation’s research universities face and the ways our nation can ensure that they continue to play a critical role in meeting national goals, particularly for prosperity and security.

The study committee provided recommendations that Congress, the federal government, state governments, research universities, and others can take to strengthen and focus the work of our nation’s research universities, allowing them to continue to produce the knowledge, ideas, and talent the United States needs to be a global leader in the 21st century. It highlighted the need for strengthening and expanding the partnership among universities, government, business, and philanthropy that has been central to American prosperity and security. The study also examined trends in university finance, prospects for improving university operations, opportunities for deploying technology, and ways to reduce the regulatory burden on higher education institutions. It also explored ways to improve pathways to graduate education, take advantage of opportunities to increase student diversity, and realign doctoral education for the careers new doctorates will follow.
The Glion Colloquium, Glion-above-Montreaux, Switzerland - Touring the Hadron Collider near Geneva
Max Reinhardt 1873-1943

The Salzburg Seminar for Higher Education
The role of the committee chair...including getting advice.
DOE E. O. Lawrence Award
Chair, National Science Board
NSPE Engineer of the Year

National Medal of Technology
NAE Arthur Beuchle Award
Yale George H.W. Bush Award

National Academy Election
McGill Honorary Degree
U Vienna Dies Academicus

Dartmouth Honorary Degree
Arizona State Honorary Degree
Diversity Keynote Berlin
Since the presidency, Jim has taken on an unusually broad range of leadership roles in science, technology, and education at the national and global level, managed from the Millennium Project in the Duderstadt Center (aka Media Union), and occasionally assisted by visitors such as our grandchildren (and their pet velociraptor...)}
Brookings Institution, Non-resident Senior Scholar

For the past several years I have served as a nonresident Senior Scholar for the Brookings Institution as part of their Metropolitan Studies program to assess issues of regional economic development. In particular, I chaired a major study of the impact of energy policy on the Great Lakes region, the most energy-intensive region of the United States. This influenced the Energy Innovation Hub program of the Department of Energy. More recently I chaired a major study of the education needs of the region, including K-12, higher education, and lifelong learning to develop a “Master Plan” for education in the Midwest.

Some Other Assignments

- Advisory Council, National Center for Atmospheric Research
- Keck Futures Initiative Review (National Academies)
- Board of Directors, CASL Energy Innovation Hub, (Department of Energy)
- Intelligence Science Board (Director of National Intelligence)
- The State of the Academic Presidency (Association of Governing Boards)
- National Science Policy Commission (American Academy of Arts and Sciences)
- Educate to Innovate Study, National Academy of Engineering
- Roundtable on Global Sustainability, National Science Foundation
- Presidential Search Committee, National Academy of Engineering
- Assessment of Triana Satellite, NASA
- International Activities
  - Dies Academicus, University of Vienna
  - European University Association, Spain
  - Glion Colloquium, Switzerland
  - Universitas 21, Nagoya, Japan
  - Diversity Conference, Berlin, Germany

As an example of activities, we have included a brief appendix to this chapter a list of major activities over the past two decades.

Appendix to Chapter 20

Post-Presidency Activities

1996-1997

- Sunflower Report
- Michigan Strategy
- Rebuilding the University
- Launch of Media Union
- Michigan Virtual Auto College
- CMS, Unisys

1997-1998

- State Technology Strategy
- Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy
- Chair, NRC Federal Science and Technology Study
- GUITR-NSB Stresses on the Academy
- Stanford National Consortium on Postsecondary Ed
- Glion Colloquium
- University for 21st Century
- Cyber Camp
- President Michigan Virtual Auto College
- National Academy of Engineering Executive Council
- CMS, Unisys

1998-1999

- Chair DOE Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee
- Chair, Scholarship in the Digital Age
- Chair, Future of Science and Engineering Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy
- Director, UM Oberlin Kalamazoo project
- Yale Advisory Council on IT
- Stanford National Consortium on Postsecondary Ed
- Glion Colloquium
- National Partnership in Science Computing
- Chair, DOE Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee
- Ontario Master Plan
- UM Admission Litigation
- CMS, Unisys

1999-2000

- Chair, IT and the Future of the University
Chair, NRC Federal Science and Technology Study  
Chair, DOE Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee  
Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy  
NAE Executive Committee  
Stanford National Consortium on Postsecondary Ed  
Advisor, Naval Postgraduate School  
UM Admission Litigation  
CMS, Unisys, Diamond Cluster  

2000-2001  
Chair, DOE Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee  
Chair, IT and the Future of the University  
Chair, NRC Federal Science and Technology Study  
Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy  
Stanford National Consortium on Postsecondary Ed  
Advisory Board, National Center Atmospheric Res  
CMS, Unisys  

2001-2002  
Chair, DOE Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee  
Chair, IT and the Future of the University  
Chair, NRC Federal Science and Technology Study  
Chair, COSEPUP Scientific Research in the States  
Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy  
Advisory Board, National Center Atmospheric Res  
NSF, Advisory Committee on Education  
CMS, Unisys  

2002-2003  
Chair, DOE Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee  
Chair, IT and the Future of the University  
Chair, NRC Federal Science and Technology Study  
Chair, COSEPUP Scientific Research in the States  
Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy  
Advisory Board, National Center Atmos Research  
NSF, Advisory Committee on Education  
CMS, Unisys, Diamond Cluster  
NSF Grant: $110,000 for Nuclear Fission minor  

2003-2004  
Chair, NRC IT Forum  
Chair, NRC Federal Science and Technology Study  
Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy  
DOE Secretary Committee on Research  
Chair, NAE Study of Engineering Research  
Advisory Board, National Center Atmospheric Res  
UM Chair, STPP Committee  
UM Chair, Hydrogen Initiatives Commission  
UM Co-Chair, World University Workshop  
CMS, Unisys, Diamond Cluster  
Atlantic Philanthropies Grant ($890,000 to UM)  

2004-2005  
Chair, NRC IT Forum  
Chair, COSEPUP FS&T  
Chair, NAE Engineering Research  
Co-Chair V Glion Conference  
Chair, UM Science, Tech, and Pub Policy Committee  
Chair, Hydrogen Initiatives Team  
Chair, UM Phoenix Project Executive Committee  
Chair, NRC Workshop on OMB Performance Metrics  
Chair, WASC Accreditation Team  
Member, Kansas City Project Team  
Member, Great Lakes Brookings Project  
Unisys, Diamond Cluster  

2005-2006  
Chair, NRC IT Forum  
Chair, COSEPUP FS&T  
Chair, NAE Engineering Research  
Chair, Cyberinfrastructure Advisory Committee, NSF  
Chair, Presidential Search Committee, NAE  
Member, Spellings Commission, D Ed  
Member, AGB Task Force on University Presidency  
Member, UC Task Force on Compensation, Accountability, and Transparencies  
Chair, STPP Program  
Chair, Michigan Energy Research Council  
Member, Tulane University Post-Katrina Planning  
Member, KC Project Team  
Member, Great Lakes Brookings Study  
Member, AAAS Executive Council  
Funding, Atlantic Philanthropies, IT Leadership ($890,000)  
Funding NSF, 21st Century Engineering ($250,000)
Funding, STPP Postdoc, Dow Foundation ($610,000)
Funding, MilProj, GKCCF ($42,500)
Unisys, Diamond Cluster

2006-2007

Member, Intelligence Science Board
Chair, NAE Engineering Research Study
Chair, Cyberinfrastructure Advisory Committee, NSF
Chair, Presidential Search Committee, NAE
Member, Spellings Commission, D Ed
Member, AGB Task Force on University Presidency
Co-Chair, Glish Colloquium
Chair, NRC Review Committee for Keck Futures Program
Chair, STPP Program
Co-Chair, VI Glish Colloquium
Chair, Michigan Energy Research Council
Member, Advisory Committee, New Economy Initiative for Michigan
Member, Detroit Renaissance Team
Member, Executive Council, AAAS
Unisys
Funding NSF, 21st Century Engineering ($250,000)
Funding, STPP Postdoc, Dow Foundation ($610,000)

2007-2008

Member, Intelligence Science Board
Chair, NAE Engineering Research Study
Chair, Cyberinfrastructure Advisory Committee, NSF
Chair, NRC Review Committee for Keck Futures Program
Chair, Brookings Next Energy Project
Member, Spellings Commission, D Ed
Member, Evolution of the Research University Project, NRC
Member, Red Team to Assess 20 year Strategy for Nuclear Energy Research
Member, UC Regents Task Force on Accountability and Transparency
Member, Chicago Council study of Regional Economic Development
Member, AGB, Miller Center, Public Purpose
Member, Advisory Board, UM National Depression Center

2008-2009

Member, Intelligence Science Board
Co-Chair, VII Glish Colloquium
Chair, Brookings Next Energy Project
Co-Chair, NSF Roundtable of Global Sustainability
Member, Policy and Global Affairs Committee, NRC
Co-Director, STPP Program
Member, Executive Council, AAAS
Member, Chicago Council study of Regional Economic Development
Member, UC Regents Task Force on Accountability and Transparency
Member, NAE Study of Lifelong Engineering Learning
Chair, Study to Assess Economic Progress of Greater Kansas City
Member, UM Bicentennial Planning
UM Faculty History Project
Unisys
Funding, STPP Postdoc, Dow Foundation ($610,000)
Funding, Grant from GKCCF ($72,000)

2009-2010

Member, Intelligence Science Board
Chair, Brookings Next Energy Project
Co-Chair, NSF Roundtable of Global Sustainability
Member, Policy and Global Affairs Committee, NRC
Member, Chicago Council study of Regional Economic Development
Member, Presidential Search Committee for the University of Khalifa
Member, NAE Lifelong Learning Committee
Unisys
Funding, STPP Postdoc, Dow Foundation ($610,000)

2010-2011

Chair, Policy and Global Affairs Division, National Research Council
Member, National Research Council Governing Board
Member, National Academies Study of Research
Universities
Nonresident Senior Scholar, Brookings Institution
Member, President’s Project Advisory Committee,
Member, President’s Project Advisory Committee,
Facility for Research on Ion Beans (FRIB)
Co-Chair, VIII Glion Colloquium
Director, Chicago Council Midwest Master Plan
Member, IT Council
Member, History and Traditions Committee
Co-Director, STPP Program
Member, Executive Council, AAAS
Unisys
Funding, STPP Postdoc, Dow Foundation ($610,000)
Funding, NSF, Glion VIII Colloquium ($99,000)

2011-2012
Chair, Policy and Global Affairs Division, National Research Council
Member, National Research Council Governing Board
Member, National Academies Study of Research Universities
Nonresident Senior Scholar, Brookings Institution
Member, President’s Project Advisory Committee,
Facility for Research on Ion Beans (FRIB)
Member, Board of Directors, DOE CASL
Chair, Festschrift for Dan Atkins
Chair, NSF DLI Conference
Chair, Future of the DC
Member, IT Council
Member, History and Traditions Committee
Co-Director, STPP Program
Unisys
Funding, NSF, Glion VIII Colloquium ($99,000)
Funding, NSF Workshop on DLI ($89,000)

2012-2013
Chair, Policy and Global Affairs Division, National Research Council
Member, National Research Council Governing Board
Member, National Academies Study of Research Universities
Nonresident Senior Scholar, Brookings Institution
Member, President’s Project Advisory Committee,
Facility for Rare Ion Beams, MSU
Member, Board of Directors, DOE CASL
Co-Chair, IX Glion Colloquium
Chair, Festschrift for Dan Atkins
Chair, NSF DLI Conference
Member, Review of UT Fracking Study
Member, NAE, Educate to Innovate Study
Funding, NSF Workshop on DLI ($89,000)

2013-2014
Chair, Policy and Global Affairs Division, National Research Council
Member, National Research Council Governing Board
Member, National Academies Study of Research Universities
Nonresident Senior Scholar, Brookings Institution
Member, President’s Project Advisory Committee,
Facility for Rare Ion Beams, MSU
Chair, Board of Directors, DOE CASL
Co-Chair, X Glion Colloquium
Member, Advisory Committee, National Center for Nuclear Weapons Verification Technology
Member, American Academy of Arts & Sciences Committee on National Science Policy
Member, UM IT Council

Major Policy Studies

National Science Board

1982 University Industry Research NSB
1986 Undergraduate S, M, E Education NSB
1987 NSF in Polar Regions NSB
1988 State of U.S. S&E NSB
1989 Foreign Involvement in US Universities NSB
1989 Loss of Biological Diversity NSB
1992 A Foundation for the 21st Century NSB
1993 Desktop to Teraflop NSB
1994 State of US S&E NSB
1995 K-12 STEM Education
1996 US S&E in Changing World NSB
1998 Graduate Postdoc Education NSB
1998 NSF Strategic Plan
2000 NSF History in Highlights
2006 NSF 2020 Strategic Plan NSB
Other NSF Efforts
- Nuclear Engineering Minor Study
- Strategic Plan Input for NSF
- ACCI Reports

National Science Policy
- 1992 Chair, NSB Study of Future of NSF
- 1998 FS&T Committee
- 1998 GUIRR-NSB Stresses on the Academy
  1999 Draft Proposal NSF NSB
- 2000 FS&T Op Ed
- 2002 Triana NASA Study
- 2001 Chair, COSEPUP Scientific Research in the States
- 2003 Chair, NAE Study of Engineering Research
- 2003 DOE Secretary Committee on Research
- 2006 Chair, NRC Review Committee for Keck Futures Program
- 2009 Member, President’s Project Advisory Committee, FRIB
- 2010 Chair, Policy and Global Affairs Division, National Research Council

National Higher Education Policy

Economic Development
- 1999 Ontario Master Plan
- 2003 Regional Learning Ecologies
- 2004 Member, KC Project Team, Time to Get It Right
- 2004 Member, Great Lakes Brookings Project
- 2005 Chair, Michigan Energy Research Council
- 2005 Gathering Storm
- 2005 Michigan Roadmap
- 2005 Time to Get It Right KC
- 2005 Member, Great Lakes Brookings Study
- 2006 Member, Advisory Committee, New Economy Initiative for Michigan
- 2007 Chair, Brookings Next Energy Project
- 2007 Member, Chicago Council study of Regional Economic Development
- 2007 Chicago Midwest Media Project
- 2007 Michigan Roadmap Redux
- 2008 Chair, Study to Assess Economic Progress of Greater KC
- 2009 Kansas City–time-to-get-it-right-Update
2010 Brookings Hubs of Innovation
2010 Director, Chicago Council HE Master Plan
2011 Midwest Master Plan Launch
2011 Midwest Master Plan Heartland Paper

Information Technology and Cyberinfrastructure

1999 Chair, Scholarship in the Digital Age
2000 Chair, ITFRU
2003 Chair, IT Forum
2003 Preparing for the Revolution
2005 Chair, NSF Cyberinfrastructure Committee
2011 Chair, Festschrift for Dan Atkins
2011 Chair, NSF DLI Conference
2011 Chair, Future of the DC
2012 NSF DLI Workshop Description

Engineering

2003 Chair, NAE Study of Engineering Research
2004 21st Century Engineering
2005 Engineering Research and America Future
2005 PI NSF, Flexner - 21st Century Engineering
2007 5XME Workshop
2007 Engineering Flexner Report
2008 ABET Effort
2008 Member, NAE Study of Lifelong Engineering Learning
2009 Brookings Energy Report
2012 Member, NAE, Educate to Innovate Study

Energy-General

2003 DOE Secretary Committee on Research
2003 DOE-SC SWOT Analysis
2003 DOE_Task_Force
2005 Phoenix Energy Institute
2007 Chair, Brookings Next Energy Project
2009 Brookings Energy Report
2011 Glion VIII Duderstadt Black Swans
2012 Member, Review of UT Fracking Study

Energy-Nuclear

1999 Chair DOE Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Comm
2000 DOE Nuclear Energy Strategy
2001 Nuclear Engineering Minor Proposal
2002 NSF Grant: $110,000 for Nuclear Fission minor
2004 Nuclear Energy France
2004 DOE Study of Research Priorities
2004 Energy France
2009 Member, President’s Project Advisory Committee, Facility for Rare Ion Beams, MSU
2012 Member, Board of Directors, DOE Coalition for Advance Simulation of Light Water Reactors

International Issues

1989 UM International Center
1992 Tree Tops Strategy for State Support
2002 JAPAN Policy Discussions
2002 Nagoya Keynote Lecture
2003 UM Co-Chair, World University Workshop
2005 Canadian Provosts Briefings
2007 Salzburg Seminars
2008 Co-Chair, NSF Roundtable on Global Sustainability

Glion Colloquium Topics

1999 Glion I Challenges Facing HE
2001 Glion II University Governance
2002 Glion III Walls Come Tumbling Down
2003 Glion IV Reinventing the University
2005 Glion V Universities and Business
2007 Glion VI Globalization of HE
2009 Glion VII Universities and Innovation
2012 Glion VIII Global Sustainability
2013 Glion IX Sustainability of Research University Paradigm
We both believe it is very important to always keep in mind the historical context for leadership. Institutions such as the University of Michigan have existed for centuries and will continue to do so, served by generation after generation of leaders. To serve the University, any Michigan president must understand and acknowledge the accomplishments of his or her predecessors and build upon their achievements. Each president must strive to pass along to his or her successor an institution that is better, stronger, and more vital than the one they inherited. Indeed, this strong tradition of improvement from one presidency to the next had long been the guiding spirit of its leaders. Anne symbolized this continuity by displaying photographs of all of the presidents and first families of the University in the central hallway of the President’s House. We also made a concerted effort to keep former presidents and first ladies actively involved in the life of the university.

Yet, also like our predecessors, we had unique objectives that would characterize our period of leadership. While being sensitive to the traditions of the University, we also believed that Michigan would have to change to serve a rapidly changing world. Our role was to prepare the University for this future of change.

Ironically, to launch a change agenda, one must first look to the past, to understand better the unique character, strength, and traditions of the institution.

History and Tradition

Although we viewed ourselves as change agents, preparing the University to face a challenging and quite different future, we also believed it important that this effort build on those traditions, and values from the University’s past. Here, part of the challenge in making this connection between the past, the present, and the future was the degree to which the slash-and-burn activism of the 1960s and 1970s had essentially decoupled the University from its past. In their efforts

The portraits of Michigan’s presidents in the entry hall of the President’s House
to reject “the establishment”, students and many faculty and staff almost took great pride in ignoring the University’s earlier history and traditions.

Anne took a particular interest in the history of the University, reading the biographies and writings of past presidents and University historians and developing a deep appreciation for Michigan’s remarkable history and traditions and its impact on higher education. She sensed the importance of developing a greater awareness of this history among students, faculty, and staff.

Perhaps because of our experience with Yale and Harvard through our daughters, Anne and I took great interest in how these institutions managed to preserve and appreciate their remarkable histories and pass their traditions down through generation after generation of students and faculty. We believed that the University of Michigan had just as distinguished a history as any private university. In fact, Michigan had time and time again provided the model for the evolution of higher education. But this recognition had simply not been woven into the University culture. Hence the challenge was to take a series of steps to better connect the University with its remarkable past.

We were joined in this effort by several distinguished and committed faculty members: Bob Warner, former Dean of Library Science and Director of the National Archives; Nick and Peg Steneck, through their years of effort in both preserving University materials and teaching a course on the history of the University; Fran Blouin, as Director of the Bentley Historical Library; and Carole LaMantia as staff from the President’s Office. The first step suggested by Anne was to create a formal University History and Traditions Committee, appointed by the president and staffed by the Office of the President.

Next I established the position of University Historian, and Bob Warner was appointed by the
Anne led the effort to renovate two historic University facilities: the President’s House and the Inglis House Estate.

Regents as the first holder of this title. In this role, he would also chair the History and Traditions Committee.

Certain early steps had already been taken. For example, even while I was provost, I had established base funding for the Stenecks’ course on the history of the University, since this had always been at some risk due to changing funding whims in LS&A. The Bentley Library was given a more formal role and funded to serve as archive for the University’s historical materials along with the necessary budget, and guidelines were established for historical documentation and preservation.

One of the most important efforts of the History and Traditions Committee was historical preservation. Anne led the effort to restore and preserve the Detroit Observatory, one of the earliest university scientific facilities in America and key to the early evolution of the research university. This particular project illustrated the effort required to preserve such important facilities. Anne led the effort to raise the roughly $2 million necessary to renovate and endow the facility. She enlisted the support and interest of key members of the University administration including the Vice President for Research, Homer Neal.

In turn, Homer appointed one of his most talented staff members, Sandy Whitesell, to direct the project. Her love of historical preservation coupled with her knowledge of working with University staff was idea for this project. Working closely with Sandy, Anne played a major role in the effort to raise the funding and complete the restoration. She and Sandy researched historical photographs in the Bentley Library to display throughout the building. They worked together in the hard task of cleaning the facility to ready it for University groups. On May 21, 1999, after five years of meticulous restoration, the University of Michigan’s Detroit Observatory was rededicated.

Anne became involved in an array of other historical projects. She helped to arrange for a gift of historical materials from the ancestors of one of the early students of the University, and then assisted in the design of a major exhibition gallery for this gift in the new Heutwell Visitor Center. This display featured a re-creation of the first student dorm room.

Sometimes these efforts involved documenting the importance of a particular site or facility on campus and placing an appropriate historical marker, for example, the President’s House or the East University plaza (the eastern boundary of the original campus).

A process was launched to obtain personal oral histories from earlier leaders of the University, including Harlan and Anne Hatcher, Robben and Sally Fleming, Allen and Alene Smith, and Harold and Vivian Shapiro. The University’s 175th anniversary provided a marvelous opportunity to host a symposium involving the living presidents of the University.

Anne was also involved in the effort to create a number of publications on the University’s history. The Stenecks were commissioned to update the popular history of the University by Howard H. Peckham, The
Working closely with Sandy Whitesell, Anne played an important leadership role in raising the funding and priority for renovating the Detroit Observatory.
Making of the University of Michigan. One of Anne's most significant projects was to develop a seasonal photographic essay of the University that would serve for advancing the interests of the University with key donors in the Campaign for Michigan.

After we left the presidency, it was natural that one of the major activities within the Millennium Project has become an effort to document the history of the University of Michigan. The early contributions were a series of books that utilized the powerful technologies of desktop publishing and digital photography both to contribute to major historical milestones such as the 150th anniversary of engineering education at Michigan and the evolution of its campus over the past two centuries.

In addition, we were able to utilize the unique resources of the Duderstadt Center to develop new ways to present this history, including three-dimensional virtual reality simulations of the Michigan campus in various eras, a highly detailed computer model of the historical evolution of the campus (Mort's Map), and an array of web-based databases intended to document the contributions of the University's thousands of faculty members, students, and staff.

A Partner in Exile

Initially Anne faced many challenges similar to those I had experienced in leaving the presidency, since several of the projects where she had been heavily involved were no longer available to her, e.g., guiding the renovation of important historical projects such as the Detroit Observatory, the President's House, and the Inglis Highlands estate. She was also removed as a member in the History and Traditions Committee, an organization she had helped to launch in the 1990s. Unfortunately this committee was later disbanded, just as the University was approaching its Bicentennial Year.

To be sure, Anne remained heavily involved in other important organizations such as the Faculty Women's Club, where she took the lead in developing a modern computer support system for its members. But it was also clear that her strong interests in the history of the University would require a somewhat different approach to compensate for the lack of support.

Both the mission of the Millennium Project and its location in the Duderstadt Center provided a unique access to rapidly emerging digital technologies that were ideal for supporting her projects. Anne recognized that the challenge of capturing the rich history of a complex, consequential, and enduring institution such as the University of Michigan is considerable. To be sure, there are numerous scholarly tomes and popular histories of the institution, its leaders, and its programs. Yet the history of the University required much more. In fact, Michigan's history, those characteristics evolving over time that have determined its distinctiveness and shaped its impact on society, assume the form of a saga requiring many forms of narratives, words, images, music, and even digital simulations!

So where to begin? One of the purposes of the Millennium Project was to explore the use of emerging digital technologies in the development of new approaches to instruction. Anne's first effort was to develop a more interactive way to explore and understand the history of the University's campus. But she first needed to gain a better understanding of the history of the Michigan campus itself. So she turned to Fred Mayer, University Planner, and Paul Spradlin, Director of Plant Extension (new construction), both of whom immediately replied: "You need to look at Mort's Map!"

Mort's Map and Campus History

During the 1960s, Myron Mortensen, the chief draftsman of the Plant Department, had researched the history of every building on the campus and drawn a very detailed map showing the historical evolution of the Ann Arbor campus from its origin to the 1960s. Using "Mort's Map", Anne worked with undergraduate engineering students in the Millennium Project to develop a web version of this map that enables one to use a timeline display and accompanying narrative to describe the evolution of the campus throughout its history. She then linked the digital maps to hundreds of historical photographs from the Bentley Library to illustrate the evolution of the campus. The Mort's Map website can be found at:

http://umhistory.dc.umich.edu/mort/
The Web Portal for Campus History

But Anne was interested in going beyond this. During our years in the presidency there had been a significant effort to develop digital representations of the contemporary campus that could be used in campus planning. In fact, the Plant Extension Department, under the leadership of Paul Spradlin, had assembled a quite sophisticated team (including the use of programmers in Russia) to build these digital representations of the campus. Our goal was to build similar digital models that would describe the historical evolution of the campus, beginning with the earliest campus in 1836. We sought to explore several of these approaches, including a comprehensive 3D digital simulation of the campus and its evolution, virtual reality simulations, digital video and DVD-based materials, and sophisticated database methods for organizing and searching through scholarly materials. Working with Plant Department staff, our students were able to create a 3D virtual reality version of the campus for earlier eras that allowed both navigation as well as the development of videos. The website containing both the digital version of Mort’s Map as well as the 3D simulations can be found at the website:

http://umhistory.dc.umich.edu/

Unfortunately President Bollinger’s appointment of a new VPCFO resulted in a massive turnover in the Plant Department, including many of those involved in the digital campus work, resulting in the termination of this University project and the loss of most of its software. While our work still remains, much of the early work of the Plant Department was purged, a tragic loss for the University.

Anne next turned to a more traditional project to learn how to use the University’s archive of historical photographs to develop books describing the evolution of the College of Engineering, which was preparing to celebrate its 150th of engineering education in 2004. Rather than simply writing the text and selecting the appropriate photographs for an experienced designer, she decided to master the process of digital design by learning to use Adobe’s Creative Suite of applications: InDesign, Photoshop, Illustrator, Acrobat, etc. She then worked closely with the University Printing Service to design and develop her first major book on University history:
A Pictorial History of the College of Engineering

http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003884452

Drawing on the resources of the Bentley Historical Library, University publications such as the Michigan Technic, the Michigan Alumnus, and The University of Michigan: An Encyclopedic Survey, but also on the vast writings, personal papers and photographs of two Engineering Deans, Mortimer Cooley and James Duderstadt, Anne was able to create a pictorial history of the college. Although this photographic essay was focused on the evolution of the campus of the College of Engineering, it also attempts to introduce the people and events that contributed so much to the College’s history. It stitched together images with the words of members of the Michigan family who participated directly in the building of the College. This photographic history not only documented and honored the remarkable achievements of the College of Engineering during its century-and-a-half of leadership in engineering education but has provided a resource to guide those who will determine and benefit from its activities in the future.

Following Anne’s lead, Jim also mastered Adobe’s Creative Suite sufficiently to develop a personal history of his years as Dean of Engineering, a period that covered the move of the College of Engineering from the Central Campus to the North Campus of the University.

On the Move: A Personal History of the University of

http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003884451

More recently, we have extended our skills to Apple’s iBook Author software so that we could transform these books into interactive iBooks that can be downloaded directly from the Millennium Project website:

http://milproj.dc.umich.edu

Anne’s next project involved a massive effort to utilize historical photographs to develop a book describing the history of the entire Michigan campus, including not only its buildings but as well the activities of its students, faculty, and staff. To learn more about how to handle the design and color schemes necessary for such a project, Anne decided to first use technology to create a more modest book of contemporary photographs (mostly taken by Jim) to illustrate the appearance of the campus during the changing seasons. This was similar to a book she had helped design during our presidency that we used as gifts to visitors, but in this case she did the entire project herself: design, photographic layout, digital development (again using InDesign), and finally working with the University Printing Services to produce the final project.

The University of Michigan: A Seasonal Portrait

http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/005121919

Anne also produced several important photographic
To produce a high quality photographic volume concerning the history of the College of Engineering required mastering many skills, including the collection and arrangement of historical photographs through digital scanning and then careful edit using digital tools such as Photoshop. The actual layout of the book required desktop publishing skills (in this case, InDesign, Illustrator, and Acrobat). The next stage involved working closely with the printers. The final stage involved boxing and shipping the final copies to hundreds of readers, including the faculty of the College of Engineering.
The production of the “photographic saga” of the history of the University was considerably more complex, involving thousands of illustrations, extensive historical research, and the use of the full power of the Adobe Creative Suite to design, layout, and produce the final digital files for the printers (in this case, a high-quality commercial printer, University Lithoprinters, Inc.). Since the final digital files were over 60 GB in size, the computing requirements for this project were considerable. From initial concept to final product required roughly three years of continual effort! (Jim provided a small cake to celebrate success!)
books concerning the President’s House and the Inglis Highlands estate of the University, both because of her personal activities with these two historical buildings as well as because of the role that she played in their renovation. These books can be downloaded from the HathiTrust website.

The President’s House of the University of Michigan

http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003494187

The Inglis Highlands Estate of the University of Michigan

http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/011706

Both books have been rewritten and are now available in iBooks format from the Millennium Project Website:

http://milproj.dc.umich.edu

With this experience, Anne turned back to the “Michigan Saga” book. The scale of this history project was immense, not only consisting of over 1,000 high definition photographs, many of which she scanned herself, along with text that generated over 60 GB of data, pushing the limits of the Millennium Project computers. In fact, by the end of the project, Anne was using the most powerful computer in our complex.

She worked closely with one of Ann Arbor’s leading commercial printers, University LithoPrinters, to complete the project, including spending a day and night supervising the final printing runs to make certain that the design format and colors were correct. The entire project took over three years.

A Photographic Saga of the University of Michigan

http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/005399524

Although this project made extensive use of the photographic assets of the Bentley Historical Library, it also involved digitizing materials from many other Michigan publications and resources, including the Michigan Alumnus magazine, the University of Michigan: An Encyclopedic Survey, and student publications including the Michigan Technic and the Michigamensis yearbook. Books and articles written by Michigan faculty, students, and alumni were also of great value. In particular, the letters, diaries, and various papers of faculty and students provided a glimpse of what life was like in the early years of the University.

Of great value in reconstructing the early history and evolution of the Michigan campus was Mort’s Map, a work created by Myron Mortensen, an engineer in the Plant Department until 1954 when he became Chief Draftsman. The map provides the footprint of all
of the buildings that existed on the campus from the 1840s through the 1960s.

This photographic saga provides vivid evidence of the profound impact that the University of Michigan has had on the evolution of higher education in America and hence upon its state, the nation, and the world during the first two centuries of its long and distinguished history.”

This book can also be viewed from the Millennium Project website:

http://umhistory.dc.umich.edu/history/publications/photo_saga/Saga.html

Creating New Digital Historical Resources

With one of the largest and most sophisticated university libraries in the world, the University had long provided leadership in providing new forms of access to its 8 million volume collection. During the 1990s it had led the effort to merge the catalogs of the 11 universities of the CIC (the Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten plus U Chicago). As digital scanning technology became more sophisticated, the University worked with the Mellon Foundation to build the JSTOR archive of journals in economics and American history (whose computers were located in the Media Union).

Faculty members in its College of Engineering and School of Information worked on a major research project for the National Science Foundation to build a digital library for scientific materials.

Anne and I decided to extend our historical projects to demonstrate just how powerful the University’s rapidly expanding digital technology environment could be in gathering and providing access to its activities, both present and past. The combination of the University’s cyberinfrastructure environment, search engines such as Google, and most important of all, the leadership of the University of Michigan Library in digital archiving and distribution, gave Michigan a quite extraordinary opportunity to define the path these knowledge-intensive institutions should take in the digital age. Working closely with both students and staff of the Duderstadt Center, Anne played a leadership role in the development of these important new digital histories of the University.

The UM 1817-2017 Web Portal

The first effort was to design and build a comprehensive web portal to a vast array of historical information about the University of Michigan, including summaries of the histories of its academic programs, visual material concerning its campus and activities, links to hundreds of historical documents,
The UM 1817-2017 Web Portal and databases providing both biographical information and memoirs of its faculty, staff, students, and alumni.


This website provides an array of links to access this rapidly growing collection of materials designed to be easily searchable and readily available in digital form. Included in these resources are:

1) Information about the many thousands of faculty members who have served the university since its earliest years, searchable and available as biographies, memorials, and photographs.

2) Histories of the myriad academic programs of the University—schools and colleges, departments and programs, centers and institutes, with a particular focus on the intellectual life and academic impact of the institution.

3) The evolution of the Ann Arbor campus of the University through the years, with interactive maps and histories of all of the major buildings and facilities of the University.

4) Information on the important role of staff members in the University, both through brief histories and short vignettes illustrating their remarkable talent, dedication, and diversity of roles.

5) Student life through the years through an array of historical documents.

6) Information about all of the Regents and Presidents of the University.

7) Access to an interactive collection of memoirs by contemporary Michigan faculty members concerning the intellectual life of the University.

8) A vast collection of historical photographs and video materials made available in digital format.

In many of these efforts, Anne has been using the powerful resources of the HathiTrust, already the largest digital library in the world. We have persuaded the Regents of the University to release copyright control to provide full-text access to all University publications, books and periodicals, which have relevance to the history of the University. These can be found in a special search collection:

http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/mb?s=listis;c=745985614

The Faculty History Project

The next project was even bolder. Anne led the effort in the development of a database providing information about all of the faculty members who have been associated with the University of Michigan since 1837, organized by their schools and colleges. Working with a very talented undergraduate, Alex Burrell, who quickly became experienced in programming in Drupal, Anne developed a website capable of accessing information on every faculty member who had ever worked at the University, with dates of appointment, fields, memoirs, and photographs, if available. In fact
The Faculty History Project

she personally scanned over 3,000 photographs from the Bentley Library and compiled information on more than 14,000 faculty members.

http://um2017.org/faculty-history/

As she noted in the preambles to the website, one can only understand the intellectual impact of the University of Michigan by understanding who its faculty members were (and are) and what they did (and are doing). To appreciate the intellectual vitality of this institution, it is necessary to trace the lives of its faculty members, their contributions, and their circles of discourse. One needs to capture their stories and link them to the University’s academic programs, its schools and colleges, departments and institutes.

Yet this is a formidable challenge since many of the University’s schools, colleges, and departments have only brief histories on websites or buried away in file drawers. Furthermore those histories that do exist are usually more concerned with buildings or enrollments or who was dean or chair than the intellectual life or achievements and impact of the faculty.”

The broad intellectual span and size of the institution makes it hard to capture its history (or even understand its present nature) through conventional means such as popular histories or occasional papers. Instead it seems more productive to take advantages of the University’s exceptional capacity in digital technology to build online resources that would evolve over time to serve those wishing both to understand and analyze not only the University’s history but even its intellectual structure and impact today.

This Faculty History Website represents an attempt to begin this effort. The goal is eventually to include every faculty member who has been appointed at the University, working with the University’s schools, colleges, and departments to fill in these databases with information such as photos, biographies, memorials, and even video oral histories for more recent faculty members.

The goal of this project is to document, remember, and celebrate those achievements of our faculty that have made Michigan a great university; to use such resources to reaffirm academic achievement and excellence as the cornerstone of the quality, strength, and impact of the university; and to rededicate today’s faculty members and University leaders as faithful stewards for the remarkable legacy left by previous generations of Michigan faculty members, accepting the challenge of adding their own contributions to extend this legacy.

Today the Faculty History Project has over 14,000 entries for the Ann Arbor campus (with ongoing additions and corrections). It has already become an invaluable tool for understanding the role of faculty at the University, and its open access availability leads to its frequent appearance in Google searches for people with Michigan ties.

The Faculty Memoir Project:

A similar database was created to contain the memoirs of senior faculty members concerning the intellectual life and impact of the University.

http://www.lib.umich.edu/faculty-memoir/

The University of Michigan Faculty Memoir Project assembles the memoirs of senior University faculty members concerning both their personal academic work and their reflections concerning the intellectual life of the University more generally. It is intended both to capture the history of the Michigan faculty as well as provide a vivid demonstration of the extraordinary
impact that faculty members have had on the quality, strength, and impact of the University throughout its two centuries of service to the state, the nation, and the world.

This website has been designed to enable senior and emeritus faculty members to contribute reflections on their intellectual experiences through an interactive process that allows them to add and edit their biographies, curricula vitae, photographic or video materials, and memoirs, thereby helping to build a rich and accessible resource describing faculty contributions to the University and broader society.

The Staff Memories and Memoirs Project:

A similar database has been developed to contain both the memoirs and memories of the staff of the University throughout its history.

http://www.lib.umich.edu/staff-memoir/

The University of Michigan Staff Memories and Memoirs Project assembles the memories and stories provided by members of the Michigan staff family over their long careers at the University as well as the Memoirs for earlier staff members as they completed their years of service to Michigan. This project is intended both to capture the history of the University from the perspective of its staff while recording the contributions of earlier staff members, thereby providing a vivid demonstration of the great impact they have had on the institution.

In addition to providing a record of the Memoirs for earlier staff members, the website also enables senior and retired staff members to contribute directly their memories, stores, and reflections concerning the life of the University through an interactive process that allows them to add and edit their contribution.

Over time it is hoped that this website will become a rich and accessible resource describing the degree to which staff members have influenced the growth, evolution, quality, and continuity of the institution.

The Town-Gown Historical Maps Project

Anne has recently launched another project to develop interactive historical maps of the City of Ann Arbor with links to the historical photographs and descriptions of key buildings. The maps begin with the original platting of Ann Arbor in 1824 and then continue through each decade until the early 20th century. By using the power of iOS technologies to develop a “MapApp”, this powerful technology will be capable of extension to the study of other historical maps. Key in her efforts has been the extraordinary collection of the University of Michigan Library’s Map Collection and the programming skills of an extraordinary Michigan undergraduate, Nathan Korth.

http://specular.dmc.dc.umich.edu/map/drag/
The Parable of the Little Red Hen

It seems appropriate to conclude this chapter with a well-known fairy tale, The Little Red Hen (Golden Books, 1940), which actually takes the form of a parable in our efforts to preserve the University of Michigan’s history:

Once upon a time there was a little red hen who lived on a farm. She was friends with a lazy dog, a sleepy cat, and a noisy yellow duck.

One day the little red hen found some seeds on the ground. She had an idea. She would plant the seeds.

The little red hen asked her friends, “Who will help me plant the seeds?”

“Not I” barked the lazy dog. “Not I” purred the sleepy cat. “Not I” quacked the noisy duck.

“Then I will”, said the little red hen. So she planted the seeds all by herself.

When the seeds had grown, the little red hen asked her friends “Who will help me cut the wheat?”

“Not I” barked the lazy dog. “Not I” purred the sleepy

cat. “Not I” quacked the noisy duck.

“Then I will”, said the little red hen. So the little red hen cut the wheat all by herself.

When all the wheat was cut, the little red hen asked her friends who would help her take it to the mill to be ground into flour.

“Not I” barked the lazy dog. “Not I” purred the sleepy cat. “Not I” quacked the noisy duck.

“Then I will”, said the little red hen. So she brought the wheat to the mill all by herself, ground the wheat into flour and carried the heavy sack back to the farm.

Like the Little Red Hen, for several years Anne and I have sought in vain for help in the effort to prepare historical materials for the University’s Bicentennial celebration in 2017. Although the Bentley Library was assigned lead responsibility for such historical projects while I was provost, they continued to decline a major role. Little interest was expressed by the University administration in the information we gathered from the experiences of other institutions (e.g., Yale’s Tercentennial in 2001), since they preferred instead to focus the Bicentennial year on the launch of a major fund-raising campaign. We contacted the deans to explain both the importance of this event and the opportunities it would provide, but once again we found little interest. Anne and I even hosted a major dinner event to solicit the assistance of senior faculty in the Scientific Club and Azazels, with only modest response.

Although we found ourselves reappointed to the History and Traditions Committee, after meeting for several sessions in which the topic of the Bicentennial was raised by its members, the University found that a simple way to keep this topic off of the agenda—and far away from creating any work for the Bentley Library—was simply to stop scheduling meetings of the University’s History and Traditions Committee. Although its website suggests that the Committee still existed, it did not meet for several years. Other faculty groups convened to develop plans for celebrating the history of the University have also found themselves suddenly discontinued, e.g., the planning committee for the 100th anniversary of the graduate school and a special committee convened by the former VP Communications to consider how to use technology in
promoting the history of the university.

Hence we had little recourse but to use our limited resources to launch a series of projects ourselves, such as the Faculty History Project, the Faculty Memoir Project, the UM 1817-2017 Web Portal, and many others, hoping to at least demonstrate what might be done. Perhaps it was inevitable that we would run into the Little Red Hen syndrome as efforts were made by others (Bentley, LS&A, Communications) to take over our projects as they reached maturity and began to be used by many both within the University and beyond the campus. Since none of these organizations had been of help during the development of these efforts, it made little sense (and actually was rather frustrating) to suggest that they be handed off to others. We concluded that it was even more important that we continue to push these projects ahead ourselves, building into them sufficient resilience to continue Beyond the Bicentennial when a new administration might have the foresight and wisdom to understand the importance of such historical efforts for the future of the University.

When the bread was finished, the tired little red hen asked her friends “Who will help me eat the bread?”

“I will” barked the lazy dog. “I will” purred the sleepy cat. “I will” quacked the noisy duck.

“No” said the little red hen. “I will”. And the little red hen and her chicks ate the bread all by themselves.

The moral of this story is that those who show no willingness to contribute to an end product do not deserve to enjoy the end product: “If any man will not work, never let him eat.”
When the University of Michigan celebrates its Bicentennial year in 2017-2018, we will also be celebrating our 50th year at the University—in fact, surpassing the tenure of all other Michigan presidents in our years of service to the University (including even Presidents Angell and Ruthven). Needless to say, as those years have passed by, our respect, loyalty, and commitment to the University have continued to grow. We have long considered Ann Arbor our home and community, the University of Michigan our institution (even if adopted), and the Michigan students, faculty, staff, and alumni our extended family!

In earlier chapters we have looked back over our years at Michigan to draw together many of our memories and stories about serving the University, perhaps in part to justify our unusual commitment of half-a-century of service to this institution not only to others but to ourselves. To be sure, the University of Michigan is one of the great universities of the world—but then so are Yale, Caltech, the University of California, Stanford, and other institutions that were opportunities for our leadership over the years. Hence it seems appropriate to close this personal narrative with a few observations about why we believe Michigan is such an exceptional institution…and why we have committed most of our lives to serving this remarkable institution. To this end, we consider three important points:

i) The importance of tradition to the character, the quality, and the leadership of this university;

ii) Our belief that service to such an institution, particularly in leadership roles, must be regarded as a calling of the highest priority rather than a role meriting fame and fortune, and

iii) A reminder once again of the unique character and value of this university as a pathfinder and trailblazer for all of higher education, a role Michigan has played throughout its history.

Tradition

Great universities are sustained over time by important traditions. What are the most familiar Michigan traditions?

- Not stepping on the “M” on the Diag to avoid flunking your first exam?
- Nor the football team running out under the M-Club banner.
- Nor the Michigan Band playing “Hawaiian War Chant” and “Temptation” at the football games. (You can’t have one without the other…)
- Not even the president “spinning the Cube” to start up the University each morning!

These are certainly well-known, but they are simply amusing anecdotes rather than important traditions sustaining the quality and impact of the University. Instead, let us suggest the following traditions for more careful consideration:

The Catholepistemiad or University of Michigania (a university founded in 1817 by Woodward in the Enlightenment spirit of civil rights, equality, and public purpose)

The flagship of public universities or “mother of state universities” (although, of course, UM was created and financed by the U.S. Congress as a territorial university and hence is as much a national university as a state university).
A commitment to providing “an uncommon education for the common man”, in the words of Angell (although this has become increasingly difficult as public support has declined)
The “broad and liberal spirit” of its students and faculty (as noted by a 19th century article in Harpers Weekly and always to be encouraged)
The university’s control of its own destiny, due to its constitutional autonomy providing political independence as a state university and to an unusually well-balanced portfolio of assets enabling independence from the usual financial constraints of a state university
An institution diverse in character yet unified in values (as reflected more recently in the Michigan Mandate)
A center of critical inquiry and learning (ranked as one of the world’s great research universities)
A tradition of student and faculty activism (which has recently reawakened after a long nap)
A heritage of leadership (most prominent and effective at the grassroots level among our faculty, students, and staff)
The “leaders and best” (in some ways, to be sure, but certainly not merely as “Victors for Michigan”)

While change and transformation are important if the institution is to evolve to serve a changing world, one should always be aware of the important traditions that endure to shape and guide these changes. Those faculty and staff who commit their careers to the University not only learn about these traditions, but also play important roles in sustaining them. Others, such as students, have only a brief moment to sense them and understand their importance. Fortunately, the learning experiences we design for our students are intended not only to introduce them to these traditions, but also provide them with opportunities to adjust them to their own situations.

Of more concern here are those faculty, staff, and leaders who spend only a brief time in our university before moving on to their next assignment, frequently with little opportunity to learn or appreciate the traditions that have made Michigan a great academic institution. It is natural for newcomers to attempt to put their own stamp on the institution, but one should beware of the “if it ain’t broke, break it” approach taken by those with only a very superficial understanding of this institution, its most important missions, and its most enduring traditions.

Fortunately, however, great universities have a self-correcting nature, and challenges and changes of the moment that conflict with the institution’s long-standing traditions are quickly cast aside and sink beneath the waves without a ripple.

Service

Higher education should be viewed as both a “public good” to society as well as an individual benefit to graduates. As such, academic leadership roles have a “calling” character that should be understood and accepted as a public service, much like other public leadership roles. Leading an academic organization should be viewed as both a privilege and a responsibility, not as merely a route to fame and fortune.

Indeed, many in higher education today view the frequent institution hopping and excessive compensation of senior academic and administrative leaders in higher education as one of the unfortunate trends that has seriously undermined our society’s understanding of the contemporary American university and its public good character.

We believe it is particularly important that governing boards view university leaders as public servants rather than corporate executives, both in their unique responsibilities, their accountability, and their compensation. To impose such a corporate culture and values on an academic institution is both disruptive and dangerous to its fundamental purpose and mission.

Institutional Saga

Universities such as Michigan are based on long-standing traditions and continuities evolving over many generations (in some cases, even centuries), with very particular sets of values, traditions, and practices. Burton R. Clark, a noted sociologist and scholar of higher education, introduced the term “institutional saga,” to refer to those long-standing characteristics that determine the distinctiveness of a college or university. These might consist of long-standing practices or
unique roles played by an institution, or even in the images held in the minds (and hearts) of students, faculty, and alumni.

In other books (see Appendix) we have suggested that Michigan’s unique combination of quality, breadth, scale, and spirit has given it a unique capacity for leadership in higher education. Michigan’s vast size and breadth allows it to experiment and innovate on a scale far beyond that tolerated by most institutions, as evidenced by its long history of leadership in higher education. It can easily recover from any failures it encounters on its journeys along high-risk paths. This ability to take risks, to experiment and innovate, to explore various new directions in teaching, research, and service, enables Michigan’s unique role in American higher education. During a time of great change in society, Michigan’s most important institutional saga is that of a *pathfinder and a trailblazer*, building on its tradition of leadership to reinvent the university, again and again, for new times, new needs, and new worlds.

And it is this unique character as a pathfinder and trailblazer that should shape the University’s mission, vision, and goals for the future. Such bold efforts both capture and enliven the institutional saga of the University of Michigan. And these are the traits that must be recognized, honored, and preserved to earn its reputation as a “leader and best”.

**A Privilege and a Calling**

We have regarded it as a great privilege to have served this wonderful university during the past half century. Indeed, we have regarded our various roles—faculty member, community leader, academic leader, historian, and author—as callings of great importance over a lifetime of service. And over these many years, our respect, loyalty, and commitment to the University have continued to grow. While emotions toward an institution always have a symbolic character, we have come to understand our service to the University, its academic community, and the people dependent upon it, as very much driven by our love of Michigan!
Appendix A

Books, Reports, and Websites

Books Relevant to the University of Michigan and Higher Education

Anne and James Duderstadt, *A China Odyssey* (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1994)
http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/011667262

James Duderstadt, *Legacy Documents* (Millennium Project, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1996)
http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003294038

Anne Duderstadt, *The University of Michigan President’s House*, (Millennium Project, University of Michigan) (in iBook format) (2014)
http://milproj.dc.umich.edu
(in text format) (2000)
http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003494187

Anne Duderstadt, *The Inglis Highlands Estate* (Millennium Project, University of Michigan) (in iBook format) (2014)
http://milproj.dc.umich.edu
(in text format) (2000)
http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/011706

Anne and James Duderstadt, *Wings over the Nile* (The University of Michigan Alumni Association, Ann Arbor, 1999)
http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003449641

http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/004120306

James J. Duderstadt, *Intercollegiate Athletics and the American University: A University President’s Perspective* (University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 2000)
http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/004133434

James J. Duderstadt, *Positioning the University of Michigan for the New Millennium: A Case Study in University Transformation* (Millennium Project, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1999)
http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/011706891

http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/004599107

http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/004298726
Anne Duderstadt, *A Seasonal Portrait of the University of Michigan* (Millennium Project, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2005)  
[http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/005121919](http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/005121919)

Anne Duderstadt, *The University of Michigan College of Engineering: A Photographic History Celebrating 150 Years* (Millennium Project, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2003)  
[http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003884452](http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003884452)

[http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003884451](http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003884451)

Anne Duderstadt, *The University of Michigan: A Photographic Saga* (Millennium Project, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2006)  
[http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/005399524](http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/005399524)  
[http://umhistory.dc.umich.edu/history/publications/photo_saga/Saga.html](http://umhistory.dc.umich.edu/history/publications/photo_saga/Saga.html)

James J. Duderstadt, *The View from the Helm Illustrated: Leading the American University during an Era of Change* (Millennium Project, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2010)  
[http://milproj.dc.umich.edu](http://milproj.dc.umich.edu)

[http://milproj.dc.umich.edu](http://milproj.dc.umich.edu)

[http://milproj.dc.umich.edu](http://milproj.dc.umich.edu)

[http://milproj.dc.umich.edu](http://milproj.dc.umich.edu)

[http://milproj.dc.umich.edu](http://milproj.dc.umich.edu)


[http://milproj.dc.umich.edu](http://milproj.dc.umich.edu)

James Duderstadt and Anne Duderstadt, *For the Love of Michigan: A Half-Century of Serving the University of Michigan* (Millennium Project, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2014)  
[http://milproj.dc.umich.edu](http://milproj.dc.umich.edu)
James Duderstadt, *Charting the Course of the University of Michigan’s Activities over the Past 50 Years* (In preparation, 2015)
http://milproj.dc.umich.edu

http://milproj.dc.umich.edu

http://milproj.dc.umich.edu


Web-Based Historical Resources

The Millennium Project
http://milproj.dc.umich.edu

The University of Michigan Campus (and Mort’s Map)
http://umhistory.dc.umich.edu/

The UM 1871-2017 Web Portal on University of Michigan History

The Faculty History Project
http://um2017.org/faculty-history/

The Faculty Memoir Project
http://www.lib.umich.edu/faculty-memoir/

The Staff Memories and Memoirs Project
http://www.lib.umich.edu/staff-memoir/

The Town-Gown Historical Maps Project
http://specular.dmc.dc.umich.edu/map/drag/

The Collection of UM Historical Books by the HathiTrust
http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/mb?a=listis;c=745985614


