



University of the Pacific
Scholarly Commons

Emeriti Society Oral History Collection

University Archives

1995

Atchley, Bill Oral History Interview

Don Walker

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/esohc>

Recommended Citation

Walker, Don, "Atchley, Bill Oral History Interview" (1995). *Emeriti Society Oral History Collection*. 16.
<https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/esohc/16>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Emeriti Society Oral History Collection by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

FACULTY EMERITI INTERVIEWS
UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC ARCHIVES



Atchley, Bill (1987-1995)
University President

June 21, 1995
Stockton, California

By Donald B. Walker, Ph.D.
University of the Pacific, Stockton

Subjects: Balancing the budget, financial difficulties, problems at physical plant, outsourcing food service, employee benefits restructuring, increasing endowments, alumni interests, faculty salary, and Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation.

[Interview Session, June 21, 1995]
[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

Atchley Farewell Interview (06-21-95)

WALKER: This is Don Walker, University Archives. This is June twenty-first and I'm talking to President Bill L. Atchley in his office at about 9:10, 9:15 in the morning. I think we'll start with this question: President Atchley, how did you perceive the condition of the University when you first came here?

ATCHLEY: Well, naturally, the perception of any university when you first go on campus is a little different because you're looking at it at a visual point of view, you know, you vision-- you see a beautiful campus and the atmosphere in which, is setting in, and so you see it from that point of view, but naturally, if you had an internal vision, that you've done some studies before you actually arrived and I had not really heard as much about the University of the Pacific in-- where I was in the east and so on-- but I did know the engineering program for instance because my background is engineering and Bob Heyborne, who was the dean of engineering at that time here, and since I was the dean of engineering at West Virginia one time, we became acquainted and through that acquaintance, I knew UOP and had a sense of-- but I was-- But as I looked into it in a little more detail, I found it to be a unique opportunity, a unique campus. First of all, in its variety of programs for such a small campus. There are very few campuses that are of this size that have as many professional programs and in the arts and science, in those programs, so closely related, and that's a very big plus, even though sometimes people do not realize that. It's a big plus because usually, they have the humanities and the arts, the dramas and some of those, to have an opportunity to associate closely, which this campus gives you that opportunity, to those in the professional schools of engineering and business, and some of those things and vice versa. Those two things bring more than a richness to the-- to an education for a young person. So I think that was one thing that struck me as important, and also struck me that the relationship that I kept hearing about with the faculty and the students, and so on. I first, as you might remember, or you may have remembered, when I-- when my first vision, and the vision I have and still have for this campus, would be an uncommon educational experience, and I could see that is something you can develop around a good education for young people.

That may-- there could be an-- and maybe was a more unique in maybe other places in throughout the country. Now, naturally you-- I would have never told and about the budget situation. It's one of those thing that sometimes you don't delve into as much, you assume that the budget, if there would be any difficulties in the budget, you would assume that those would be made apparent to you, but in this case, they were not made apparent to me, and my first year and first encounter, I quickly found out that the financial situation wasn't too good. We had a deficit my first year just in the flow of cash-- just for that year, and I immediately attempted to do something about that, and we did, for the first year. But as I looked into it in more depth, I found that we had a cash flow problem of approximately-- now this happened in the first year to two years naturally-- that there was a deficit in the negative flow of cash, which made us about six-- almost million dollars out of balance of the budget, plus the thirteen million unsecured debt-- and that doesn't mean that most universities have a debt, that's from building and so on. But most of those debts are at least being paid off by bond or something that is a cash flow; housing, like student housing fees and so on. However, it is sort of unusual, at least in my thinking, to have an

unsecured debt of that amount out there that must come from other sources. That bothered me.

So one of the first things I felt was important, was to see if all the activity that we were doing, that were cost centers and so on, were we really running as efficient as we should be running a university in every area? And in my speech I gave, I think it was the inauguration speech or one of the speeches, I indicated that I was going to look at every operation within the University to see if it was being run efficient, to see if we could actually get some better cash flow, better accountability.

I-- and so I started that, and naturally, one of the first things I ran into as I looked into the cost factors, was essentially the physical plant situation. And things started coming to life there, that, and naturally I'm skipping through some little things that went about to lead up to that, but I found that we had a-- some things going out the back door, or leakage, I guess is the better term for that, but more like a drain than a leakage. And without giving out too much, why, I felt that was very important to look into. And a few things happened along the way that make me think more so and led us to finding that the kind of management in my mind was not the proper kind of management because we were doing things-- the philosophy of that area at that time was to-- that they would maintain the campus and the things inside, but anything different, other than that, that had to be built or so, would go outside on bid. But as you look internal into their personnel, you'd found they had people who could make fine cabinets and who had great, great amount to potential and great, great skill and I couldn't understand why we would continue to go out when we could do some things in the house, and so we started looking at that.

At the same time, we ran across a scam, so to speak, of the way that some things were happening, and from that, there were indictments and so on, and even charges, so we found that there was quite a bit of leakage out of there. There was illegal things happening and probably as much as we could go back in the records, and the records didn't go back any great degree, but as far as we could go back in the records, there was a large amount of dollars, at that time, and if the records go back much farther-- and there was that kind of a pattern, an estimate, to me, would be a high in the million dollars.

WALKER: Is that kind of problem confined mostly to physical plant or was--

ATCHLEY: Well, it was-- to large degree, to that large degree at that time, though I did find a few other areas that I felt, but now probably as much of leakage directly, but indirectly, it wasn't being managed properly, so as a few things leaking out that shouldn't have been. Some of the philosophies in which they had causage which were established, for instance, one policy it was established by administration, previous administration--and I'm not criticizing that or whatever, it was different times, different places. It's not one that I think is one that's gonna protect you from these things happening, but as I understood one of the policies, because they said the salaries were low in the physical plant and other things, that people could-- who worked for us, could actually check out or buy(?) of University equipment to do their own private little enterprises out there. Naturally that-- that kind of approach cleans things to go and maybe not come back and too easy to drive out without anybody checking certain things, and so there were some of those things that were happening then.

So we stepped in and corrected those and that's how we came about to bring in a service master and outside management group. Really for the primary purpose of getting us on track and management, though we didn't do that just off the top of our head. We felt that they needed to have some bid, they needed to look at it fist, so Marriott who has that kind of business-- service

master, and one of those, they would come in and for no dollars, make an evaluation. All of them came back with an evaluation of saying that we were top-heavy in management and we weren't running very efficient, but naturally, some of that you might say is salesman too, but-- but we did look at that. We said, "Okay, give us a bid. How can we better do this and in what way?" So they did bid, and then we sent a couple people out to check their firm out, service master, where they had some business elsewhere, and without those people even knowing that we were there, for instance, another university, and we could check the cleanliness of the building and whatever else was going on. We found it to be very positive, so that is how we came about to have a service master.

We-- by doing that, and by what happened since then, we have had nothing but improvement. We probably saved over six hundred thousand dollars easily just by doing some conserving and cutting back because we were in some financial difficulty, we had to cut back to be efficient and make different job assignments, and so on. And Mr. Joe Karem(?) came on as a service master, but then later in that period of time, he then switched over to be our own permanent employee, because we thought we needed to bring a person on that worked for the university as much as for service master for a longer term, and recently we just terminated the service master since we had everything pretty well in place and we run it ourselves, and by doing that, we'll probably save another three hundred thousand or so since we got a ?our own business?. So that's one thing that we did, and I think the results of that you can see, the morale was so low when all these things were happening, and I've sent Mr. Dochterman over here, when I dismissed the director over there and he jumped in immediately and did-- we did some things that brought the morale back up.

So the morale today is pretty high, even though we have a union there. We haven't had a difficulty with that, we treat them fine, they have not caused us too much difficulty. Actually, I think this one time when a few things were happening, they were gonna picket but, and they did in front of my house briefly, but that was interesting because after it happened about when it all settled down, and I got the letter and the person that headed their union, not our-- but the head of the union itself, and then he came in here and sat in the chair you're sitting in and indicated to me that he wanted to come and thank me personally. He was-- I was one of the very few people at this University or anywhere that did have the association with, that really lived up to their word of what they were going to do. With all those cases, some fringe benefits or something which can turn quickly. So that was-- that relationship has been strong, had been good and I think you look at the campus today, and you see a beautiful campus-- it's improved, and the document-- or the tape that I gave you there, over those years that you have, you'll see that all those thing have taken place and it brings it up to date.

And naturally, we were interested in the food business because most universities and most people who deal with universities from the outside, inside or whatever had made list-- these lists consist of variants in which they-- in their mind, that the university should carry on itself in areas where it should be done from outside sources-- such as security, well, you know, that's one-- some people do it from the outside, other people do it inside, they recommended you're better off doing it inside, and I agree with that. Food service is something they recommended that maybe we should do outside. Even though, at that time, we did our own food services here on campus. But I was interested that, I wasn't interested doing this away with their food service for that reason.

Again, we had solved it(?) that time was in the food business, Marriott and ARA. Those were all in the business of food service. They came in and just reviewed, you know, the service

we had. They came in and just reviewed, you know, the service we had and to see if I wanted to put a bid. So after they reviewed it, I said, "Okay, I had our own food service," which we had, and we were running this food service, I said, "now draw up plans," cause our own food service was probably ?generating? which they said was two hundred thousand dollars, however, they were not paying for any overhead or any electricity or any of those things, so it was us false dollars in a way, but you had to put it back in the operation, so what I did, I said, "Okay, I'm gonna-- I want the-- our own food service to draw stringent guidelines as is they were doing their own, I mean very stringent guidelines, which a bid could be made on, what they had to do and what they had, and so on." So those were drawn up by our own people and I made a chart for that, and then we gave it to those three outfits, I said, "Okay, give us a bid of what you can do meeting these stringent guidelines," and they were stringent guidelines. And when I had that, then I went to look across the bottom of all this. After we did that, we found out that one of them was out of proportion beyond-- but after I subtracted out this amount that our food service-- even without paying the rent because all the bids, they paid their own rent, they paid some other things, the utilities or whatever the case is, different things anyhow. And so when I took the bottom line it came across, I went and subtracted this, I think it was one hundred thousand or two hundred or whatever our food service was generating and I'd subtract that to the bottom line. When I did all that, then I looked at what we had left, because naturally, that's what you're going to value at your problem and then naturally, I pick quality and ARA was the one that showed us that we buy whenever we got to the final stages, we ought to be able to generate at least five hundred thousand more profit-- plus something off the catering service that helped us. So I felt that was an important move in that direction.

Now the money at that time was designated-- this is-- now you gotta remember this is-- we were saving things, but we were trying to get ourselves out of debt, but also I didn't realize how deep we were in totally, then we were still in that process. But I made a statement that those dollars-- four or five hundred thousand dollars, at least three hundred thousand dollars of that went to the library, some went back to the laboratory and the education laboratory. So I did want to put it back to those areas, and we did the first year when we were in operation. I already hit the greater crisis, and now we really gotta get in here and balance this budget out so we naturally get to plea our bid and headed toward that.

I think that's where it got very well, by doing that, we were able to, as all the contracts, not just ARA, all of them had in it, that they would put a loan-- a loan amount in there and that was a paper loan because if they got the contract and this didn't matter if it was Marriott or ARA, or the rest, they have them in there, that they would save five hundred thousand dollars would be put aside to remodel the food service areas in anyway we wanted. Now that was a loan to us and we didn't-- as long as-- every year that they were in service with us, that loan would say be forgiven by a hundred thousand dollars. So that's at the end of a five-year period, or some period where you had to renegotiate the contract. That loan would be totally paid off. If there would be something in between, that they decided to get out for some reason, then we wouldn't have any more interest, if we decided to get out and break the contract, then all we'd have to pay would be the unpaid loan or something like that. So those are the kind of details that were in it, that you always have to put in something along those lines, so we ended up naturally, there was a lot of-- as you can imagine and realize, there was a lot of people who had the-- thought that all the food service we had here was great, and I'm not criticizing that and-- you know, everything else, but when I looked at the students-- student-- you know, review and such, way before we even started the other one, their number one drag was food service, kinda interesting-- and so that didn't really

matter, they do that everywhere, but I had to look at what I thought would be the best way to approach it, and so by that savings, we were able to do some other things. That moved us to look into all the other areas at the same time. But those were the major ones looked at and when you said whether there was any leakage-- there was a little leakage in the food business that-- in that you might expect that somewhat, when we run our own because-- and some of it went down to the-- and there's nothing wrong with this, to the food kitchen and so on where you serve, you know, the people homeless-- that's good. But it should have been-- I don't think it was credited to the University doing it, maybe credited to someone individual do it. All I said the University should have been credited. It needed that kind of image in the public, so-- But other than that, that didn't have anything to do with too much-- that's just a side comment that's there-- But at the end, it turned out that, to me, it's been a--it's been a plus, it's been able to save us money. It's been to help us balance the budget, it's continued to improve. We think that-- or I think when we get things back to a point where the budget is-- has more revenue coming in, you know, they might be able to use that dollar more that they did to support the library(?), but we went on, naturally, to balance the budget. I also had to look internally to what we were doing internally. And I don't know if you want to get into that right now-- if you wanted to ask another question--

WALKER: Well, you've been talking about ways in which you improved the University's financial situation--

ATCHLEY: Yeah, we-- we went on to look at other things, naturally, and one of the things we had to look at-- which is never a situation that you like, but you had to try to balance the budget, you have to look at a lot of things. Faculty salaries and some of those, naturally, were low, but you can't-- you can't so anything at a university, or anywhere else, the things you'd like to do, like salaries and other things, until you have a stabilized budget and in the basement(?) you have to be stabilized, so I still felt we needed to do that and work on some things. I looked into the health benefits which has always been a big thing anywhere, and I found out for years, I mean if you go back fifteen to twenty years or more, and I don't know if it goes that far, but as far as I can see back, at that time, the health benefits, the end that the employee paid was about thirteen dollars and fifty cents, which is pretty reasonable, way back fifteen years ago, can you imagine what it's congruent(?) at that point? the amount? But when it grew, it didn't grow from proportionate to each one, you know, the individual paying and the University, it grew on the University's side. So the University had to put a large amount and said for everybody(?) that may be putting in four hundred thousand dollars where the other one stayed at, you know, thirteen point five a month. So I felt there ought to be some way to raise that amount that the individual paid to some reasonable amount. I didn't want to make it real large because I didn't think anybody could absorb it. I mean absorb it without someone being hurt a little bit, so I tried to keep from that from happening. So we raised it, the first year to-- I had a plan to raise it to twenty-five dollars, which wasn't a tremendous amount. At the same time, I tried to find some other ways, even though there was criticism and that always is the case when you're doing something.

I did hold about four of five different meetings over here in the theater to talk about another way would be out fringe benefit, because of our retirement program and some of those-- we were putting in-- we were matching dollars and dollars to the individual and we required-- which is still good-- but we required all our people to put in, I think five percent, I think that's the amount, mandatory into, you know, out of your paycheck, into a retirement. And we-- so we

thought about that and thought about how much we matched it with, you know, we matched it up to a certain amount of dollars. And in the first blush pad(?), we reduced that over a certain period of time. We could balance the budget, you know, stabilize it, and then restore it. There was some concern about that as we met over here and naturally, there's always a big battle, but I-- someone brought up a good point. They said, "If you raise the health thing, you do this cutting back on matching dollars, and so on. In the end some of the lower-paid workers for sure are gonna be taking home less pay," and I said, "Well, I understand that," so I went back to the drawing board after discussing that. I sat there one weekend and tried to figure out how can I get around and not hurt at least the people on the lower end to any degree and try not to hurt any of the people-- my idea was to try to get everybody's paycheck to be no less than what they were taking home today, or that day anyway. So I took a twenty thousand dollar person and said, "Okay, I'd maybe"-- I doubt if any of our people are much lower than twenty thousand, I assumed that, anyhow, ___?___ So I said, "Okay, if I'm gonna raise that a certain amount of dollars, thirteen five, then I will not require this person to put in, you know, the five percent. They can put in whatever they want. And naturally, that means if they wanted a choice of not doing that, if they needed more money, you know, cash flow, they can do that. At the same time, I could use(?) the amount the University was matching dollars to that now in a way, that's a negative thing because they're not getting the same fringe benefits that they normally would get.

But when I developed all that, I did come out with a formula that allowed for-- just one year to reduce the fringe benefits that the University put in which naturally saved that much that the University put in, raise the medic(?) report that the employee put in which actually saved that much that the University was gonna put in. And taking those two savings made the take home pay for that twenty-thousand-dollar person to be at least not negative. There's either more or at least the same. Now they made the choice on their own to say I wanna put in five percent or twenty percent into savings, they can do that, but that was their own prerogative. The people on the other upper-level could do that anyhow, or they could invest in wherever they wanted.

Now they may have lost what we were doing on the other side, but they were not-- you know, they weren't losing their jobs, and what was I was trying to do was to keep them from losing their jobs too, because I, if I slide back a moment in here, we also introduced the early retirement program, we didn't put in a program together like that and there were forty-two people as I remember, took that, maybe, I think, fourteen or fifteen of those were faculty and the rest of them were staff and so I went that direction. They were happy, they got a good retirement program and it helped our budget situation because we had now ___?___. We then-- and I promised them, when I go back to those fringe benefits and cutting those back, I did promise each one that I would restore those by one year or some year or one year after that, I'm not sure about that. I think it was one year, but I said I would restore those, and try to go beyond if possible. Well fortunately, by things we did and then by also paralleling all the things we were doing, cutting back paralleling with some new ways to go out and to track four hundred new students into the University. When we paralleled that, we were successful there, so by additional dollars and what I had cut back, I found that these additional dollars allowed me to restore the fringe benefits here much earlier, six months earlier, and then I started matching from dollar one instead of after the first twenty thousand, which is what we originally had to do, I reckon(?). So that essentially gives you a certain percent much higher 'cause we're gonna start matching at your first dollar instead of twenty thousand dollars down, naturally that's some percent of dollars you got in your savings from the University, so we restored back a little bit more than what we had really, I think, taken away. At the same time, when I looked at the enrollment back to that part, which is

the other resource part of the University. It was-- it didn't-- it was very obvious if someone ever looked at it over the last five, or maybe ten years, if you plotted it, you saw the enrollment dropping off, gradually, at the same time, if you plotted the overhead where the number of people and the number of dollars spent, it was slightly going up or staying the same. So at a point in time, at least when I was there, it only crossed that line, so you know when the resources dropped below the expenses, you're headed for bankruptcy.

And I thought we had, you know, we had to reduce that, we had to reduce the overhead which I was doing on this one side, at the same time, if I could increase the revenue, the two would start coming up. So I hope because I stop the negative cash flow out the back door on one side, and got better efficiency on a couple of other things, that over the years would start to benefit and at the same time, if I can get the enrollments up, that would benefit, so, fortunately, we put in some kind of programs, we put in a regent's scholarship, we put in the middle-income loans, and we put in some of those and we were able, through the efforts of a lot of people, to get the enrollments up to the four hundred we wanted--

WALKER: I've been surprised to hear students tell me that they can go to UOP more cheaply than they can go to a state university--

ATCHLEY: That's true, that's true. And you'll find that we-- the other thing we had to do, even though this university is the oldest university in west of the Mississippi River, I get in trouble with that a little bit because my own home state, Missouri, is older so they're west of the Mississippi so closer, clearly they'll just do west of them-- they are-- we're the oldest. However, when you look at the amount of endowment we have, it's very, very low and the amount of, you know, alumni including-- in the bringing together of alumni, it wasn't unified. And if you look at the structure that they had to do those things, they were very slim. So I felt it was very important to bring together a-- an alumni structure, got to start develop the alumni to get back to their institution and organize better, and become more of a cohesive group. But on the other side, I had to put together a development because I felt it was important to get out endowment up. So when we put that organization together, then the first thing I said, "Let's go for a seventy million drive, and that we call fulfilling the promise." And I think the record shows today, we started maybe, very, very low, say eleven million dollars, may have been plus or minus, I don't know, eleven million dollars where today we're above sixty, and I can honestly say, there are two that I already have out here that haven't come in yet, but we worked on it, and they've been promised to me. Both of these would raise it beyond the hundred million dollar when they-- when they do become-- probably more than that, but at least that amount. And I can't really say-- well, not those(?), I haven't voiced them. But I have been working on them. They have promised me and I-- and they'll happen I think. So, those will be very important dollars, the seventy million dollars even more important now, the additional will be very important in the future.

So I think when we looked at all that and we balanced the budget about three years ago now, I think in '92, '93, somewhere there, I'm not sure when it was, we did balance the budget and then we did one other thing which was very unique, which was really a thing that had us all working together to do, but I thought it was a chance to refinance, and we had a chance to get some SEGO(?) bonds, now SEGO(?) bonds are ___?___ bonds which are very low and usually those come about primarily because a group, in our case, a group in a small independent college, which we were the largest, came together. Their assets were such that collectively they could float them on out there at a very low interest rate to the government, so that's what we did and we

got-- we got enough by lowering the interest rate, the amount of debt we had to pay off was unsecured and so on, just paying out payments by lowering the interest rate, we were able to save a million dollars just on the interest a year, not just one year, but every year, so naturally, I'd said we'll take that million dollars which doesn't come up any money(?) and put it toward-- to retire that debt, the twelve million, thirteen million dollar debt.

And at the same time, we had about three-point-two million of this that we could put back into campus things which you see around the campus, streets, and things we've done, and that's what they had to be used for, and so I proudly say today, the University is in such a way, in such a position, financially it's balanced, it's in-- the enrollments have been stabilized above-- the quality of students, which a lot of people thought we wouldn't be able to do that, has increased tremendously, probably over the last four years or so since we established those. The SAT averages have probably gone up sixteen to twenty points, and the GPA's have booted from, I don't know these numbers exactly, but they've gone up maybe .4-.5 points-- to 3.6 probably-- that's pretty good and so the quality of students we're getting in this year as I leave this year, which is the ending of my year, which is really the-- what's coming in is what we've done now, it looks like it's even gonna be above that, the enrollment is probably gonna be the largest it's been, maybe the last two or three years. So the plus side on that is-- meaning then that, when we put in the regents scholars, the regents scholars were developed in such a way to put in that-- the amount of dollars that you give to that individual, say maybe half the amount of your tuition, or whatever, but the remaining part must come from other sources. So you can see University dollars, by giving the regents scholars, we attract good students, so you put in so many dollars, but the remaining dollars must come from other sources, which means you increase your budget from those sources, if you get it all from internal dollars, then you don't-- you don't increase, you can get out a UOP loan and a, or not a loan, but a UOP scholarship and a regent's scholarship and all those, naturally, you're using your own dollars to buy a student __?__, so what we did, that was a very successful program. One that I really liked too is the first one, the first two in the country. We found, as you remember, that the state institutions were essentially laying off people two hundred faculty here and everything, no raises and so on. I might say proudly that we have given a raise every year in this campus except one, and we gave two in one year, so we've given a raise every year and we didn't have to go out and just lay off people like they did in other places. And then we found that when, I read that they were telling young people in San Diego State-- lot of these different state schools, that it would take five to six years to finish, then I-- this is when I put out the idea of a four-year guarantee program, 'cause we knew if a young person came here and stayed with their advisors and did the things-- and didn't flunk, you know, they can get out in four years. So we took advantage of that which would be salesmanship bargaining in college, but it worked out very well, it was unique. People around the country, you know, could do it, but they copied.

The other thing we did which I thought was sorta unique and I really felt strongly about was the middle-income loans, I felt the middle-income people were being left out. When you found that people in this category would try to go to Washington for pell grants and those kinds of grants, they couldn't get them, their income's too much. Then they tried to go the other way there, they had too much, they couldn't get the Cal Grants and some of these, so they found themselves out here in the middle of this place, but still not having enough money to send one or two-- maybe two to a school like this. So we put it then, what I call the middle-income loan. I went out and got Mr. Powell and some of those to give us some money to put in as middle-income loans. The middle-income loan was unique in a sense that you required not to have, not

to be able to get this money, you know, in these areas, you had to have a certain grade point and some of those things, to be able to get to be attractive, but it said you got a certain amount of loan at a very low interest, but the uniqueness of it comes, I felt for some time that people come into this University and they get their loans or whatever they can get, then they go out, get them a job off campus to try to pay their tuition and things to get along, and so try to work their way through school, and there's nothing wrong with that, I did that myself so I noted them. However, I said, "Well why don't I put a loan fund in that is middle-income loan and good students, they can come in and they can work off their loan too, but they do it academically", so I said, "if a person makes, after their four years, they get a loan say five thousand for four years, so that would be twenty thousand dollars, let's say, if they had a loan that if their grade point was, I can't remember what we said, 3.5 let's say, they end up with a 3.5 over a four year period, they 25% or some percent of their loan would be reduced. If they were above that, it would be more, and I think if they had a 3.8, 3.9, I don't remember exactly what that number is, then it should be a hundred percent reduced, so it was kinda unique in a sense that a person that wanted to dedicate themselves to work, or academics, the benefit of that could be working their loan off as well as the person working outside. I mean both are important, but that was one way they could do it, and so it worked out very, very well.

And so those plus the bishop(?) scholars which were brought on Kurt Rendon(?) and some of those suggested, here we are, a Methodist University, why don't we go out and hit-- we're the only Methodist thing in the state or in Hawaii and Nevada and northern areas. So why don't we attract and say go to the schools-- churches and say if you'd -- we'll give three thousand dollars or some stipend to a Methodist oriented good student that you select, as you select them, and if they meet our standards and everything, you could pay the additional for the congregation(?), so we started that and that worked out very well and we're getting a really good student.

So overall, we've done some things to attract students we bring the(?) resources, we've been able to go out, with a lot of work from everyone, not just Bill Atchley, we've been able to go out and get, you know, the funding in for our endowments and increased. We've been able to close some things inside and be more efficient, so today I-- as I use my old Missouri term my father told me, "Never get in a job where you have to back up to the window and get your paycheck." So I always try to remember and I don't feel that we have to do that.

WALKER: Well, let me ask you, are there any challenges that you hadn't faced that you don't feel you really accomplished?

ATCHLEY: Well yeah, there were challenges, there's one challenge, for instance, I definitely wanted to get the faculty salaries up to an adequate level, when I say faculty, I talk about all salaries, but the faculty some levels of the faculty that I felt that, you know, there are areas where you needed to, especially at the full professoring. And I'm not one that just gives it across the board, so I went back to look because I felt, and I still feel, that, and I've done this with my colleagues at other universities when you're at a teaching university, if a professor is teaching and doing scholarly work and I mean scholarly activity, that's another thing we started the teacher scholar content(?). The scholarly work in which they do should go toward their activity of becoming a better teacher. That should always be done by a teacher at school. So you should be doing that. You should be doing a certain amount of value(?). To me, that makes up what a teacher should do. Now I think in the average across the country, there would be twelve credit hours per semester would be a full load plus do your(?) scholarship for your class, plus your

advisor. Well, I found, to my dismay a little bit that the work load here was five courses per year, which meant there were twenty hours instead of twenty-four hours, you know, per year which I though was lower, so and then the other thing I found that-- which kinda dismayed me a little bit was the sabbatical leaves. They have been-- most places I've been, on your sixth year after the end of seven years you be going to sabbatical leave, if it was approved. Here, you could go every four years or you know, on the fifth year. So I thought that was kinda funny so I wanted to know why that took place. I went back into the, as much as I could, the by-laws and the history and I found sometime back there that the salaries going from six courses to five courses, they used to be at six, they went to five per year based on four credit hours per quarter, was in lieu of salaries and the sabbatical reduction was in lieu of salaries. It kinda stuck in my mind if the reduced-- the reduction of the workloads were in lieu of salaries, that when you tried to increase the salaries back-- shouldn't you try to bring up the work load too? You know, at least double(?)-- and so my-- and I think you'll find they'll argue with me on this, that the reasonable amount, you know, most places don't have twelve credits, that's not true, if you're doing research, then you-- then you get some time for that to equivalency of a course or two--- whatever, actually that all has to be worked in. But in general, that's true, so I felt, and still feel there is a plan, I put a plan together which I never ever initiated, but I'll pass onto the-- my successor, whether they use it, that's their call. A plan that I put together that I think could work to bring faculty salaries up and be efficient and do the ones that are good teachers. I'll just quickly give you a demonstration of that which you may want or may not want, but you take a-- you take today, you-- if a person in engineering, for instance, and I'll use that discipline, retired and I had to go out and replace that person teach four to five courses, and I may end up paying fifty thousand dollars plus fringe benefits to get them in, and I say, "Okay, that's what I had to pay." Then I got to thinking, well, as a dean, deans should know there's three or four or five people over there in his college that should take an extra class, since they're good teachers. So if ___?___ sabbatical it would be up and hence(?) up in that area to teaching. If I gave each one of those, say four of then another course to teach in place of bringing this person on for fifty thousand for twenty thousand, if I gave each one of them a five thousand dollar increase in their salary to teach that course for twenty thousand or twenty-five at the most-- I could teach-- I could do that-- I wouldn't have to replace this person. I'd have twenty-five thousand dollars still to go into more faculty salaries or other things for savings. That time, I would have a person teaching twelve credit hours which is still the load of 4-6 courses per year(?) plus I'd increase their load and I wouldn't increase the burden on the back of a student by increasing tuition for dollars.

To me it's simple, but you don't, if a person doesn't want to do that, or if a dean doesn't think Bill Atchley is a teacher-- is a good teacher, for some reason. and I need to improve myself, then he doesn't give me that offer or that opportunity until I improve myself. And our Bill Atchley says, "I don't want to do that" then that's okay, you stay down here at a different salary and they'll teach less load, and the ones that are good, the ones that want to can move up to the higher salary. But always give the person the opportunity to improve themselves, you know. Whatever in order to move up into the-- have the opportunity to become a better teacher, but you give them an incentive to do that.

And then there's the other ones that just, they don't want to do that, they're happy at what they're doing, that's fine too-- they should have that opportunity. That is a simple solution to a complex problem. But a lot of people always think that complex problems have to have complex solutions, and I think sometimes when we do that, we overlook the simplicity of it. I always parallel-- maybe it's my engineering-- I parallel that to an automobile. If you took out one spark

plug the whole thing go to heck-- wouldn't run-- and that's complex 'cause you can't get more complex you get into a motor engine-- start to look at that(?) and it's a simple solution, if I just put one spark plug in. I mean so everything, but I've seen people and I mean I could(?) go through the complete looking for some kind of minor thing which-- or looking for a major thing in an automobile or electric circuit, I couldn't figure out why these things wouldn't work and they end up a little wire being disconnected, very simple, but it's a simple solution to a complex problem, now it may take some thought process to get to that, you know, but-- so I think that's important to realize that we did that but, yeah, I didn't bring the faculty salaries up at least the productive ones up and I think that I feel badly about, but I think it's because we didn't do some of these other things because we ran into difficulties in what people want to call ?governance?, faculty governance(?) and as you know, that was a big issue.

WALKER: I suspect it will be again.

ATCHLEY: Yeah, and I don't have any problem with-- I don't have any problem with the input from the faculty for that kind of shared input. My problem comes that somebody has to make a decision. If you're gonna have shared decision making, then I think you should lay your tenure on the line with me so we both have to share the whatever comes out of the bad mistake we make or whatever. And another is that what person wants to do. So if you and I were to make a decision and I said, "Okay, we'll make this," and the Board gets it and all of a sudden it's a wrong and they're come back and crash you and you got a tenure and I don't, my is gonna be out there, but you can say, "Well, I got-- sorry, see you later, I got a tenure, you know." So, not that I'm posing, I'm just saying realistically somebody had to be accountable for those and if you're gonna be accountable, it's your neck. I think you wanna be sure neither one of you are responsible for your neck out there not somebody up. And so that became a start of a problem, and loss became a problem. I think loss was a self-made problem on a lot of people, but I think by us going through, and I was in favor, going through the really fine tooth comb and evaluating ourselves and looking at ourselves, the negative and the positive, I think was healthy for us inside. I think WASC is interpreted and a matter of fact, the second person that came in on the second visit of the WASC team told me that, that we-- it was unfair. That president's candidates come in, my successor came in for an interview. They couldn't believe that we'd even do that because we were in much better shape than they were where they were coming from. So, you know, sometimes you get caught in those things. Sometimes people use that and I-- it maybe, maybe it's not a reasonable suggestion, but it has been presented on two or three different areas, and so on, that the faculty had the opportunity to, that when it came about one of the WASC people made the wrong statement, whether they intended to or not, by saying, "Well, you gotta be more forceful, you gotta get more involved in on that." So they took that as having to do some things other than what I think was intended, yeah, I think they gotta be more involved input, more involved in getting things done ?together collectively?, and that's really the kind or unity we need. Not should you always agree because you won't, you shouldn't, in a healthy situation talks about all sides, but I think that they used that in the wrong way, they used it to-- to I think it was a threat to the faculty, to the Board. Everybody said, "Oh, we aren't not gonna be accredited," some people went out told us to, we had to fight that all the time-- that was-- but when we came in the end we're better off-- today we're fully accredited, very peaceful, very few campuses-- very few campuses have all the professional schools totally accredited like we do, and it always seems strange to me that when the agencies and they're under criticisms in there that are being(?) looked

at, you know, the overall agencies such as WASC and such. How can you-- every one of the professional schools had been evaluated by a team of their own peers that are pretty tough 'cause I've served on them, and they got a hundred percent accreditation, and then WASC comes in, puts a shadow over us because really WASC does is COP or the ___?___. because they don't do the-- they don't get accredited by an outside firm, district on the other hand are professionals, I don't like that, but it's one of these that, I think, that shouldn't have happened like it did. If you go back into the-- since we're doing this, if you go back into the Ross studies(?) or reviews, the two before this last one, you'll see some patterns in there where they criticize certain things much worse than they did with us, but nobody did anything about it.

WALKER: Right.

ATCHLEY: And so all of a sudden, we did it, and I thought that's why it was unfair. We took ourselves, hung ourselves out clean and said, "Let's clean ourselves out and do something right, and then they took it to-- a very righteous way of doing it, and then hit you on the head with it, which I don't think is the right thing to do, and I told them that too. So I think that was wrong, but anyhow, that's sort of in a nutshell were some of the things. The thing that never gets mentioned sometimes is that the importance of a wife and a spouse in a presidential, they play an important part-- role and they pay a price, and they get nothing for it really. My wife has been a great teammate of mine, and I admit that we wouldn't-- I wouldn't be at my successes if she hadn't been there. She's good at doing things, but they can't do anything outside things maybe they want to do because they gotta be there to do some things and some of the wining, dining, some of the fundraising goes a long way...(at this point President Atchley's next appointment was announced and we ended the interview by mutual agreement)