

Oral History Center
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

John Sandbrook

*John Sandbrook: Oral Histories on the Management of Intercollegiate Athletics
at UC Berkeley: 1960 - 2014*

Interviews conducted by
John Cummins
in 2011

Copyright © 2017 by The Regents of the University of California

Since 1954 the Oral History Center of the Bancroft Library, formerly the Regional Oral History Office, has been interviewing leading participants in or well-placed witnesses to major events in the development of Northern California, the West, and the nation. Oral History is a method of collecting historical information through tape-recorded interviews between a narrator with firsthand knowledge of historically significant events and a well-informed interviewer, with the goal of preserving substantive additions to the historical record. The tape recording is transcribed, lightly edited for continuity and clarity, and reviewed by the interviewee. The corrected manuscript is bound with photographs and illustrative materials and placed in The Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, and in other research collections for scholarly use. Because it is primary material, oral history is not intended to present the final, verified, or complete narrative of events. It is a spoken account, offered by the interviewee in response to questioning, and as such it is reflective, partisan, deeply involved, and irreplaceable.

All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between The Regents of the University of California and John Sandbrook dated October 16, 2016. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley. Excerpts up to 1000 words from this interview may be quoted for publication without seeking permission as long as the use is non-commercial and properly cited.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to The Bancroft Library, Head of Public Services, Mail Code 6000, University of California, Berkeley, 94720-6000, and should follow instructions available online at <http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/ROHO/collections/cite.html>

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

John Sandbrook “John Sandbrook: Oral Histories on the Management of Intercollegiate Athletics at UC Berkeley: 1960 – 2014” conducted by John Cummins in 2011, Oral History Center of the Bancroft Library, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 2017.

Table of Contents—John Sandbrook

Interview 1: May 20, 2011

Audio File 1

Hour 1

1

Adolescent involvement in sports — Los Angeles sports — Studying at the University of California, Los Angeles — Writing for sports section of college paper the *Daily Bruin* — Contact with university athletics programs and their coaches — Growing interest in the history of athletics at UCLA — Co-authoring booklet celebrating John Wooden’s twenty-five years of service to basketball team — Beginning work with UCLA administration in 1973 — Leading negotiations for Rose Bowl television contract — Possibility of Arizona State University and University of Arizona joining Pac-8 conference, making it Pac-10 — Preparing preliminary reports for expansion of Pac-8 — Working to bring attention to athletics after director J.D. Morgan steps down — UCLA’s year of athletic excellence (1975) — UCLA football program leaves Los Angeles Coliseum — Los Angeles Summer Olympics of 1984 — Making residence halls, other facilities available to Olympic Village — Appointment of new athletic director reduces personal involvement in athletics — Ongoing role in Rose Bowl and television negotiations — Retiring from UC executive management system — Serving as interim general manager of LA Coliseum — More on early management of athletics by Associated Students of the University of California — Pacific Coast Conference scandal of 1957 brings athletics under administrative control — Chancellor Raymond Allen’s resignation — Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy and the “Renaissance-man philosophy” — Using sports to gain national prominence — Cultural differences between UCLA and UC Berkeley — Sense that Berkeley has lower admission standards — Overview of problematic admissions cases

Hour 2

17

Question of honoring student athletes who leave university without a diploma — Comparing administrative involvement in athletics admissions at UC Berkeley and UCLA — Greater budgetary issues at UC Berkeley, sense of financial security and lesser faculty resentment at UCLA — Growth in sports staff salaries — Professionalization of college athletics, salary sizes complicate arguments against seeing student athletes as employees — Belief that student athletes should receive more than grant-in-aid

Interview 2: June 26, 2011

Audio File 2

Hour 1

24

More on addition of Arizona State and University of Arizona to Pac-8 conference — Concern with academic quality of Arizona institutions, view of Arizona as a “cowboy state” — “Sub rosa” visit to Tucson and Temple, fact-finding report leads to more public exploration of Pac-8 expansion — 1976 conference discussion between university presidents and chancellors, eventual expansion — UCLA football unable to compete with the University of Southern California — Decision to move football practices to Rose Bowl — Need for an “independent identity” and space separate from USC — Backlash over the move — Specifics of the Rose Bowl stadium contract — Generating money for structural reinforcement of stadium — Growing attendance and ticket sales — Looking back and affirming Rose Bowl as greater alternative to on-campus solution — Uses and conceptual origins of the auxiliary enterprise — Argument that auxiliary enterprises deserve subsidies — Question of academics-athletics relationship “will continue to be debated unless and until there is a definitive court ruling that ends up classifying students as employees” — More on idea of excluding athletes without degrees from university hall of fame — Contradiction in asking student athletes to complete degrees and opening practice doors to NFL recruiters — Belief that reform will be mandated, if at all, at the national, not university level

Hour 2

39

Envisioning athletics as an integrated academic major: “I think the analogue for me would be equivalent to the ROTC” — Potential for abuse, faculty politics, and budgetary problems make major infeasible — Issue of joint appointments — Inability of past commissions to enact successful reform — Imagining recommendations to future administrators, prioritize academics — Idea of replacing Pac-12 with a University of California Conference

[End of Interview]

Interview 1: May 20, 2011

Audio File 1

01-00:00:00

Cummins: Okay, this is May 20, 2011. This is the first interview with John Sandbrook at UCLA. John, as I said, it would be good if you start at the beginning and talk about the role that athletics played for you growing up, and then your role at UCLA, and then go from there, focusing more specifically on athletics.

01-00:00:30

Sandbrook: I'm currently sixty-two years old, having been born in 1949. I grew up in Long Beach, California, attended a Catholic elementary school. I became somewhat tall for my age at a very young age, and therefore automatically became the center on the elementary school basketball team. But even prior to that, the Los Angeles Dodgers moved from Brooklyn to Los Angeles in 1958, just as I became—at the age where I could understand the game of baseball, beginning to play Little League and whatever. So sports, by virtue of my young affinity for the Los Angeles Dodgers, particularly their success in their early years here, had a big impact on me. The Lakers moved to Los Angeles in 1960, when I was eleven years old. The Rams were already playing in Los Angeles. And then, as I said, I was also somewhat of a semi-capable basketball player for being twelve/thirteen years old. I attended a Catholic seminary in my mid-teenage years, so I was not in an active sports program in high school, but I continued my interest in athletics as a fan, both at the professional and beginning at a collegiate level. Anyone growing up in Los Angeles in the mid-sixties generally would have been a USC football fan and a UCLA basketball fan, and I fit that mold. I was extremely—very much a Trojan fan for football, as well as the fact that UCLA began its extraordinary basketball run when I was fifteen years old.

I decided no longer to study for the Catholic priesthood, and ended up coming to UCLA in 1967. Very fortunate for me that the basketball dynasty, for which UCLA is well known, was beginning its heyday at that time, having already won three championships. I arrived at UCLA not knowing a single individual, but within a year or so I began to be a writer on the *Daily Bruin* campus newspaper, for intramural sports, and would attend all the UCLA basketball games and some of the UCLA football games. As my life developed, particularly through the *Daily Bruin*, I was privileged to become acquainted with most of the leadership of the UCLA athletic programs, including Coach [John] Wooden. I did serve as sports editor of the *Daily Bruin* one year, '70-'71, which I believe was championship number six or seven, and had the extraordinary honor, as someone who was twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two years old to actually go to five straight Final Fours, and it was a remarkable experience.

In addition to that, I had always been fascinated with some of the non, outside-the-court, off-the-field aspects of intercollegiate athletics as a

business. I began to study, very diligently, the history of college athletics at UCLA, going back to the very early years when the Intercollegiate Athletic Program at UCLA, as it was at UC Berkeley, was part of the Associated Students organization as a student activity. That coincided with the fact that one of my closest friends and college roommate became student body president in the Associated Students organization, and therefore I learned a great deal about the history of the Associated Students at UCLA, the role the athletic program played in the history of ASUCLA here on the campus of UCLA, before the changeover in 1960 when the athletic program had become a university department instead of an ASUCLA student activity.

In 1972-'73, when I was still a student in my last year of undergraduate studies, I also coauthored a special booklet that we put together celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of John Wooden's appointment as head basketball coach. That was in the middle of what was called the Walton Gang era of the UCLA basketball dynasty, and the very famous eighty-eight-game winning streak. All of that happened in that time period, so it was an extraordinary, heady ride to be part of all of that extraordinary enthusiasm and unquestionably excellence in terms of the performance of the UCLA basketball team. The football team was good, very good, but not good enough to beat USC on a consistent basis in football, and that caused, in contrast to the tremendous exuberance in the basketball season, it would also result in some very disappointing times and occasionally heart-breaking times with respect to the USC/UCLA football game and times in the Rose Bowl. And of course on top of all that there was my continued affinity for the Los Angeles Dodgers and even the Los Angeles Rams. It was pretty much of a great time in my life.

In 1973 I began to work in the UCLA administration and quickly became associated with the then-chancellor Charles Young. As early as 1975, when I was twenty-six years old, Chancellor Young asked me to assist him when he had been asked by his fellow presidents and chancellors in the then-Pac-8 Conference, to lead the negotiations in conjunction with the Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association for the television contract for the Rose Bowl Game on New Year's Day in Pasadena. So I found myself, at the age of twenty-six, sitting in negotiation rooms with the presidents of CBS, the president of NBC, and the very famous Roone Arledge, the late Roone Arledge, head of ABC Sports.

A year later, Chancellor Young was asked again by his fellow presidents and chancellors to lead the negotiations for the possible expansion of the Pac-8 Conference by the invitation of—by the possible addition of University of Arizona in Tucson, Arizona State University in Tempe, to form a Pac-10. I actually, at age twenty-six/age twenty-seven, was sent to Tucson and Tempe on a secret, confidential mission to acquire a lot of information about those two institutions, and came back and wrote a thirty-page report for the presidents and chancellors of the Pac-8. That led to a series of actions over the

ensuing six months, so that in December of 1976, largely based upon the work that I had initiated, Arizona and Arizona State joined the Pac-8 Conference and that became the Pac-10.

01-00:08:54

Cummins: The year again was—

01-00:08:56

Sandbrook: Seventy-six.

01-00:08:58

Cummins: Seventy-six.

01-00:08:59

Sandbrook: Their addition became effective July 1 of '78.

At that time the UCLA athletic director, the well known J.D. Morgan, became seriously ill and he stepped down from his position as the athletic director that year, in late '79, as athletic director. Because of my role as Chancellor Young's assistant, I became part of a small group of people in the administration that tried to bring a lot of attention and focus to the athletic department. So I became very deeply involved in many aspects. We were approached, UCLA was approached, in late 1979 by a promoter in Japan to possibly take the UCLA football team and basketball team to Tokyo, in separate trips, in late 1980 to play athletic contests. I ended up negotiating those contracts and then coordinating the trips in 1980. We were in an interim athletic director appointment at that time—

01-00:10:20

Cummins: Who was the interim athletic director?

01-00:10:21

Sandbrook: Robert A. Fisher, the late Robert A. Fischer, who had been Mr. Morgan's number-two man. Mr. Fischer was not of the same level of leadership skills as Mr. Morgan was, so there was a lot of support that was needed out of the chancellor's office to help. Of course some of that was resisted by people feeling that there was too much intrusion by the non-jocks out of the administration, but by and large, I think everyone acknowledged that it was successful.

I should regress a little bit about UCLA football. There was the one glorious year of 1975. I mentioned earlier about my involvement in the Rose Bowl television contract negotiations. [In]1975, that March of course was the extraordinarily happy conclusion to John Wooden's coaching career at UCLA, in which his Bruins team won the NCAA Championship in San Diego, in March of '75, and that became his last game, walking off the court with a total of ten championships on national television, causing Curt Gowdy to cry on national TV. Three months later—I mentioned the Rose Bowl television contract negotiations. And then in the fall of 1975, for the first time in a

decade, UCLA was fortunate enough to be the then-Pac-8 Conference champions and played number-one ranked, undefeated Ohio State in the Rose Bowl Game and reversed a half-time deficit to a wonderful twenty-three to ten victory. So it was an extraordinary, exuberant year from March of 1975 through January 1 of 1976. Unfortunately, UCLA football returned to its previous stance with USC and then lost four consecutive years thereafter to USC in football. But good things were going to happen in the 1980s.

In 1980 there was growing dissatisfaction about the fact that UCLA continued to use the Los Angeles Coliseum as its home football field. The Coliseum in Los Angeles is located on state property called Exposition Park, located about three miles from downtown Los Angeles. It is immediately adjacent to the USC campus, and it had also been the home stadium for USC since its opening in 1923. While it had been also the home stadium for UCLA since 1929, the stature of the USC football program, the geographical adjacency to the USC campus, and the competitive performance of UCLA football not being at the same level of SC football, combined to lead to a great deal of dissatisfaction within many in UCLA, and there was actually a large cry about leaving the Coliseum and considering other opportunities.

At the same time, the Coliseum had lost its professional tenant, the Los Angeles Rams, who had relocated to Anaheim, and the coliseum was in search of a replacement NFL pro team and they began to have discussions with the Oakland Raiders franchise of the NFL. That—whereas the Rams had been a part of the Coliseum since 1946 and had respected the role of USC and UCLA football so that there was a three-party use of the stadium, the premise of the Raiders moving to Los Angeles was that the Raiders would be the primary tenant, and USC and UCLA would be secondary, and in UCLA's case probably even a tertiary tenant. That led to some very difficult times in our discussions with the leadership of the Coliseum, Exposition Park, and the City of Los Angeles about our continued tenancy of the Coliseum. In the summer of 1982 I was at a meeting of the Coliseum Commission with then-Chancellor Young and the meeting went very badly, and I was instructed by Chancellor Young to immediately initiate the set of actions necessary that would lead to using the Rose Bowl Stadium in Pasadena as the home field for UCLA football rather than the Coliseum, which we managed to do on seven-weeks' notice.

All of this overlapped at the same time, that going back to 1979, UCLA was part of an effort throughout the city of Los Angeles and the general Los Angeles region for the 1984 Summer Olympic Games in Los Angeles, and because of my role in the chancellor's office I was on point with the LA Olympic Organizing Committee and negotiating with that organization for the use of the residence halls at UCLA for a portion of the Olympic Village and the use of Pauley Pavilion for sports competitions, particularly artistic gymnastics, and also the construction of new facilities such as the John Wooden Recreation Center and the Los Angeles Tennis Stadium, which we

built at UCLA also in the early eighties. So it was an extraordinarily active year/period of time. I think it is safe to say that the period of my life from 1975 to 1985, culminating in the '84 Summer Olympics, was an extraordinary ride that is hard to imagine, that a young person who was then twenty-six years old would have been given the privilege and enjoyed the trust and confidence to be involved in so many things. I was very blessed to be given that opportunity. Hopefully friends and others will evaluate my contributions over the years as being positive, but it was an extraordinary time.

Obviously all at the same time my affinity for the Dodgers in Los Angeles continued. I became a season-ticket holder at the Los Angeles Dodgers in 1975, and here we are in 2011 and this is my thirty-seventh year of having two seats under the press box at Dodger Stadium, for which I go to about twenty of the eighty games a year and sell off the other tickets to friends of mine. And of course the Dodgers, being one of the more storied franchises of all of Major League Baseball, growing up with Sandy Koufax and Don Drysdale and Maury Wills, as I did, again, as a young teenager. And then the eighties when everything else was going on in my life, Fernandomania, with Fernando Valenzuela and the Dodgers' World Series Championship of 1981, then the historic 1988 World Championship—there were some heady times. Very difficult times now for the Dodgers, and disappointing in many ways, but such is life.

In 1983 Chancellor Young appointed a new athletic director by the name of Peter Dalis who was very close to me personally. In fact, Peter was the individual who had recruited me back in my sophomore year in 1968 to write for the *Daily Bruin* on intramural sports that got me started. But I stayed in the chancellor's office. Peter was the athletic director. My direct involvement in a lot of things in the athletic program dissipated after that because the strength of leadership that then existed didn't require my active involvement to the same degree as it had been in the previous five- to ten-year period. Obviously, I've continued my general association and enjoy the opportunity to go on numerous trips with the football team particularly, so I think if I added them all up I have probably visited thirty or so college football stadiums across the country with UCLA, including every stadium in the Pac-10. But my day-to-day involvement was significantly reduced.

But at the same time I continued my involvement with the negotiation of the Rose Bowl Game TV contract throughout the 1980s, and then in 1988 we moved the contract for the Rose Bowl Game from NBC to ABC, and at that time I negotiated that deal over a three-day period with a young vice president at ABC Sports by the name of Robert Iger, I-G-E-R [spells]. He and I have been good friends since, as he's now become the CEO of the Walt Disney Company. The small world that it is, I have been asked since the mid-eighties to help the Motion Picture Academy located in Beverly Hills, to negotiate the long-standing TV contract that they have with ABC/Disney for the US and

international rights for the Academy Awards. And lo and behold, who sits across the table from me but one Robert Iger.

Most recently, after I had retired in January of 2010 from my thirty-seven-year career in the University of California executive management system, I had retired and then two months ago I was asked to serve as the interim general manager of the Los Angeles Coliseum because of the sudden resignation of the previous general manager. So as I sit here today, on May 20, I am in the middle of a short-term interim appointment to address the management issues at the Los Angeles Coliseum. And again, the small world that it is, ironically, as I reminded everyone, I was the one who placed the phone call to initiate the process of moving UCLA out of the Coliseum twenty-nine years ago. I think that's enough of my biography.

01-00:22:17

Cummins: Great.

01-00:22:18

Sandbrook: A very boring biography. [laughing]

01-00:22:20

Cummins: No, I wouldn't say that that is boring at all. So let's go back now and just unpack some of this a little bit. So talk about what you learned as a student about the ASUC role in the management of athletics. You said you studied that in depth, so talk a little bit about that.

01-00:22:44

Sandbrook: Well, what I learned, and I learned it primarily from going through a lot of historical documents and minutes of meetings, et cetera, is that when UCLA first started—and of course UCLA is thirty years younger than UC Berkeley—that the Board of Regents of the university felt that the university's mission should not involve extracurricular activities or commercial enterprises. And as a result, the Board of Regents did not want to involve themselves in developing bookstores or supervising student activity programs. Student housing would be provided locally by fraternities or sororities or private ap[artments]—

01-00:23:34

Cummins: Roughly what period are we talking about?

01-00:23:35

Sandbrook: In the 1920s-1930s.

01-00:23:37

Cummins: Twenties—okay.

01-00:23:39

Sandbrook: Therefore, the establishment of an athletic program, a football team/basketball team, was not viewed by the Board of Regents as something that was part of the core mission of the university. But given the enthusiasm of even a young

budding university community as UCLA wanting those programs, the Associated Students organization at UCLA, as was the case at Berkeley, took on the responsibility of running those programs. And so for twenty-five years, the late twenties to the fifties, the Associated Students program organization had responsibility for the Intercollegiate Athletic Program, the campus bookstores, the campus cafeterias, et cetera. And, in fact, it was the profits from the football games that subsidized the operating losses of the campus bookstore that was run by ASUCLA. The coaches and personnel that were hired for the football program were employees of the Associated Students. The student body president signed the paychecks for the head football coach and the head basketball coach, including Coach Wooden. They might be given appointments in the Department of Physical Education, as a university faculty member in what was then an academic program in physical education, but the base appointment was in the Associated Students. There was no direct oversight therefore, from the Office of the Chancellor or the university administrative hierarchy of the UCLA athletic program, because ASUCLA was not strictly considered a university unit.

Beginning in 1957-1958, there were a series of allegations that four members of what was then called the Athletic Association of Western Universities, AAWU [means Pacific Coast Conference], that at the time also included institutions like Idaho and Montana, that four institutions, UC Berkeley, USC, UCLA, the University of Washington, had engaged [in] or at least tolerated an environment in which some of the student athletes were being paid “under the table” with additional subsidies beyond that allowed by their grant-in-aid program as permitted by the then quite young NCAA. That led to a series of penalties against those four institutions, and there was a great deal of unhappiness among the alumni of UCLA over how that was being handled. And conversely, there was a great deal of embarrassment on the part of the Board of Regents that this was happening. And yet the then-chancellor, Chancellor Raymond Allen was in the awkward position of basically being blamed for something over which he had no authority or even actual responsibility, because the athletic program was part of the Associated Students organization which had its own executive director.

Two things occurred out of that—or three things actually occurred. One is the amount of alumni dissatisfaction with Chancellor Allen grew to the point that he ended up submitting his resignation as chancellor in early 1959. The alumni felt that he should have taken unilateral action to withdraw from the AAWU, which had been assessing the sanctions against UCLA as well as UC Berkeley and USC and the University of Washington. But the Board of Regents also decided that UCLA should not withdraw from the AAWU, and instead the Board of Regents decided to take control of the intercollegiate athletic program and required that as of July 1, 1960, at the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses, the intercollegiate athletic programs would become university departments defined to be an auxiliary enterprise in the same way a

residence hall—the then very young residence halls departments were a university enterprise.

01-00:28:55

Cummins: Let me just interrupt just quickly on Raymond Allen and whether you found anything to indicate that he was not chosen as president, that [Clark] Kerr was chosen as a result of some of this.

01-00:29:10

Sandbrook: Well, the UCLA history book, called *UCLA on the Move [During Fifty Golden Years 1919-1969]*, that was written in 1969, I think states that Allen had come here, had been appointed chancellor in 1952 at the same time that Clark Kerr had been appointed chancellor at Berkeley, and the major reorganization, executive reorganization of the structural hierarchy that the Board of Regents had implemented that year, to have the president of the system and then chancellors, as opposed to provosts on the campuses. The historical accounts that I have read have indicated that Allen had an expectation that his prominence would make him the primary candidate to succeed Robert Gordon Sproul in 1958. There was, as I mentioned, this difficult situation in terms of his erosion of support on the campus, because of his inability/unwillingness to remove UCLA from the AAWU at the time.

01-00:30:30

Cummins: Well, talk also, just a little bit about the Pacific Coast Conference, because the—

01-00:30:34

Sandbrook: Okay, well—excuse me, let me retract—it was not the AAWU, it was the PCC.

01-00:30:38

Cummins: Right, it was the Pacific Coast [Conference], yes, right.

01-00:30:40

Sandbrook: I stand corrected in that regard. The AAWU came into existence as a result, which I won't refer to.

01-00:30:45

Cummins: Later, that's right, that's right.

01-00:30:46

Sandbrook: I stand corrected in that regard. Allen, I am told—I never met the man—also at a personal level was not a very energetic or strong-willed individual, so he was viewed, apparently, as somewhat of a less-than-aggressive leader. And then, as you mentioned, Robert Gordon Sproul stepped down as president of the system and the Board of Regents suggested Clark Kerr to be the next president rather than Raymond Allen. And now, of course there had been issues on the Berkeley campus as well, but apparently because there was not the same issue in Berkeley vis-à-vis the rivalry with Stanford that there was in Los Angeles with the rivalry with USC, there seemed to be much more of a

heightened tension about the athletics “scandal” than had been the case with Berkeley. So Kerr, it would appear, was not tainted in the same degree that Allen was, among the alumni base, as far as I can tell.

01-00:31:58

Cummins:

Well yeah, it’s interesting too because one of the things that Kerr did as a result of the scandals in the Pacific Coast Conference was to issue a public letter of censure against Pappy Waldorf, and that created a lot of controversy, negative feedback vis-à-vis Kerr. But it just—

01-00:32:27

Sandbrook:

I had not—that’s a historical fact I was unaware of. But in any event, and I think the combination also of his personal disappointment that he had not been named president of the University of California System to succeed Sproul, combined with the erosion of alumni support, et cetera, led to a personal decision on Allen’s part to step down effective July 1 of 1959. Now, concurrently with that UCLA did withdraw from the PCC, the Pacific Coast Conference, as did several other of the institutions including USC and UC Berkeley. And from that, the organization known as the AAWU, correcting my earlier misstatement, was then established as a five-institution conference of the four California institutions: USC, UCLA, UC Berkeley, Stanford, plus the University of Washington.

01-00:33:34

Cummins:

Well, now they couldn’t get Stanford in initially. I don’t know if you’re aware of that.

01-00:33:38

Sandbrook:

No, I was unaware of that.

01-00:33:40

Cummins:

Stanford, when these accusations surfaced—Allen, and this in the book, *Roses from the Ashes: [Breakup and Rebirth in Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletics]*, by [Glenn] Seaborg and Ray Colvig, which you would very much enjoy. But Allen, apparently made some statements to the effect that while they were targeted, UCLA was targeted, USC was targeted, Stanford and other institutions were doing this as well; they just covered it up. So the president at Stanford at that time was [J.E. Wallace] Sterling, and he became quite upset at Allen for making these statements about Stanford. So when they created the new organization, following the Pacific Coast Conference, Sterling basically said that he would not join. He would not have Stanford be a part of anything that UCLA was a part of.

So Kerr would have been president by that time, has a meeting, eventually, with the president of Stanford, a secret meeting in a hotel over in the city. In order to get Stanford into this, which was Kerr’s major objective, he said, “I will take the vote that Berkeley and UCLA have, if you come in, and I will be the only one voting. That’s the way we’ll resolve this.” So Stanford agreed to

come in as a result, and then two years later they got over it all and Berkeley and UCLA each had a vote in the conference.

01-00:35:28

Sandbrook:

That's very interesting. I didn't know that. Because you talk about the issues of centralization and decentralization in the UC System, and when does the system office take action. [laughter] That's actually quite an interesting anecdote that—I wonder if even Chuck [Young] is aware of that.

But in any event, going back to the AAWU, then Washington State joined in—no, I can't remember. I think then Oregon and Oregon State joined, and then Washington State joined, so that led to the Pac-8 by 1965/1966, if I recall correctly. The exact chronology and sequencing of the transformation of the AAWU to the PAC-8 I actually would have to go back to the history books to refresh myself.

01-00:36:24

Cummins:

Now, one other quick question, in terms of your own research on this, the ASUC, as you indicate, is running Intercollegiate Athletics. What happened—you gave a specific date. You said that lasted for about twenty-five or thirty years, but preceding that was it strictly an extracurricular activity? Who was managing it?

01-00:36:50

Sandbrook:

Well, prior to—UCLA was at the Vermont Avenue campus from 1919 to 1929, and admittedly, the first four years that they were at the Vermont Avenue campus it was still basically the teacher's college. UCLA did have basketball teams in the mid-1920s. In fact, one of UCLA's more famous alumni, Ralph [J.] Bunche—there's a historical photograph of him being a varsity basketball player, to the extent that that was a significant program. But it was almost what you and I would consider a club sports program, I think, in today's world.

01-00:37:33

Cummins:

Yes right, right. Okay.

01-00:37:36

Sandbrook:

But the first UCLA football season, if I recall, was in 1929 when we moved to the Westwood campus. The Bruins were skunked 76-0 by USC in the Coliseum I think that first year, and that was actually a hiatus, where UCLA declined to play USC for several years because of the imbalance. But ASUC had the responsibility for the athletic program, clearly, from 1929 on. And then in the early thirties Mr. [William C.] Bill Ackerman was named executive director of ASUC. He was also the tennis coach. Eighteen years later he was the coach of the first UCLA team to win an NCAA team championship in tennis in 1950. He continued as the ASUCLA executive director until his retirement in 1967.

But at some point in the 1940s, I think '46-'47, in his administration of ASUCLA, he hired an athletic director—maybe that had occurred earlier, I don't know. So there was, in effect, an athletic department within the ASUC, and the gentleman who was the long-time athletic director was an individual by the name of Wilbur Johns. Mr. Johns is most known for the fact that he recruited and hired Red Sanders from Vanderbilt University to be the UCLA football coach, and he recruited and hired John Wooden from Indiana State to be the UCLA basketball coach, both of those appointments being in the late 1940s. So Mr. Johns was the athletic director all throughout the 1950s, including during the so-called scandal years, reporting to Mr. Ackerman. In fact, Mr. Johns stayed on as the athletic director for about three years after the move to a university department, when he stepped down in 1963 and was succeeded by the gentleman that I mentioned earlier, J.D. Morgan.

01-00:40:02

Cummins:

Now, can you say anything about how athletics was viewed strategically by the administration, either while the ASUC had it or after they had it? This impression, it was talked about at Berkeley, that UCLA was very strategic in terms of its managing of intercollegiate athletics. They viewed intercollegiate athletics as a central part of their—maybe not a central part but an important part of their effort to really attain prominence, increase their visibility nationally, et cetera. Was that—do you pick that up?

01-00:40:54

Sandbrook:

I think that that wasn't so much a strategic decision as much as that was the personal perspective of the new chancellor Franklin [D.] Murphy in 1960 and the gentleman who became his assistant, and later chancellor, Charles Young—that they were both, what I would call, athletic enthusiasts. And they—Franklin is often regarded as the Leonardo da Vinci of this campus and felt that you need to be good at everything. That feeling extended to the library, it extended to the performing arts, it extended to the student experience, it extended to the research mission, the instructional mission, and it also extended towards the role of intercollegiate athletics in terms of fomenting affection for the university on a continuing basis for alumni. I think, of course I think many institutions have that same bent.

The UCLA situation was a little bit more limited because there was not an on-campus football stadium, but it's significant that in the first four years of the Murphy administration, as chancellor, there was, in fact, a proposal to build an on-campus football stadium at UCLA that was denied by the Board of Regents largely because of opposition from the local residential community. But that I think was the drive of the three individuals—Murphy, Young, and as I mentioned earlier, Morgan, who had become the athletic director beginning in 1963.

Those of course were go-go years. You had—the state as a whole was in a tremendous expansion period under Governor [Edmund G.] Brown [Sr.], the

real Governor Brown, with respect to the aqueduct system, the development of the freeway system, the extraordinary population migration into California, the continuing growth of the aerospace industry in Southern California. Silicon Valley didn't really explode until much later into the eighties. It was a go-go year. You had the tremendous baby boomer generation beginning to go to college in the sixties. You had the tremendous growth of facilities funded by the state in the late fifties and early sixties to accommodate that growth, the growth of UCLA's professional schools. So I think quite honestly, while athletics, because of the role that sports plays in American society would have its distinct place in the daily newspaper as a separate section, I think the importance factor for athletics was no higher than in many other areas, it's just you didn't read about it in the local newspapers on a daily basis with the other areas as you did with the sports programs. And of course, as I mentioned earlier, the extraordinary accomplishments of the UCLA basketball team even brought that more to the forefront.

But I don't believe that there was a strategic priority. I think it was just one component of the overall "Renaissance-man philosophy" that Franklin Murphy embodied, of being good at everything. It's very much like the, in the corporate world, when Jack Welch was head of General Electric as CEO, it was widely understood that the operating philosophy of Mr. Welch, as CEO of General Electric, was General Electric would only stay in businesses in which it would be ranked number one or number two in their business segment, and if they couldn't find a way to be ranked number one or number two in that segment he would divest the business. Murphy, and later Chuck Young, who stayed on as chancellor for twenty-nine years whereas Franklin had stayed on as chancellor for only eight, he embodied the same philosophy.

And then on a personal-basis level, the privilege that I had of becoming connected to Chuck Young in about his sixth or seventh year as chancellor and continuing for a long period thereafter—

01-00:45:54

Cummins:

To the present day. [laughing]

01-00:45:57

Sandbrook:

Yeah, I kind of caught the same fever and that was part of me as well.

I think the situation actually is a little different at USC. I think the reason for that is also the adjacency of the football stadium to their campus. Here, when UCLA played at the Coliseum it was fourteen miles away and kind of viewed as the USC stadium, where at the Rose Bowl, which is a twenty-eight-mile drive—it's a somewhat unique situation. Only the University of Miami has a similar situation, where they play a long distance from their campus in Coral Gables. They play at Sun Life Stadium north of Miami. So there's not a daily reminder, by the football stadium, of the prominence of the role of the intercollegiate athletic program.

01-00:46:52

Cummins:

It's interesting, because in the interview I did with Chuck he made a point about the level of involvement of donors vis-à-vis UCLA versus Berkeley, and he said actually that at Berkeley things like athletics—everything becomes a big deal, whereas down here it doesn't because UCLA is this very large metropolitan area, and it's advantageous because you can do things at UCLA as a result of that that don't create such a stir as they do at Berkeley.

01-00:47:37

Sandbrook:

Well, I think that there are probably several factors that account for that. Obviously the town-and-gown relationship with the City of Berkeley, both the city government as well as the residential community in the hills, and the compactness of that residential community, puts a greater strain on that, number one. Number two, I think that the fact that until the current decade, the fact that Berkeley did not enjoy the competitive success, particularly against UCLA in many sports, put a little bit of hurt feeling, I think, in Berkeley. So there was a little bit more of [a] we've-got-to-do-better element.

I think there's also an interesting issue at Berkeley that you would know much better than I, but I've always been told, by you, by many, many others, that there's one great mantra at Berkeley, and that is whenever the national academic rankings come out, you have to be not less than Harvard, and that the world would fall apart if UC Berkeley was all of a sudden viewed as less than Yale, or heaven forbid, less than Stanford. Here, I think UCLA has become accustomed to the fact that we're never going to be Harvard, that we're never going to be even Berkeley academically—or at least in my lifetime anyway. I shouldn't say never. And that we are comfortable with the equivalent judgments with an institution like Cornell, or an institution like Columbia would probably be realistically our thing. So I think psychologically as a campus we're able to adjust a little bit better. I think the fact that we've enjoyed success, maybe in a little way we take it for granted.

There is a famous story that I've had repeated to me numerous times. Back in 1997 the university was conducting concurrent searches for new chancellors at Berkeley and at UCLA, as you know, when Chang-Lin [Tien] stepped down the same year Chuck stepped down. There's a very famous anecdote that I've had repeated to me, in which Bob Berdahl and Al Carnesale, who eventually were the appointees of the two chancellors, compared notes about their search committee interview, and that Berdahl was asked several questions during *his* interview about what would he do for resurrecting or growing the intercollegiate athletic program at UC Berkeley, whereas Al Carnesale said the subject never came up in his search interview.

01-00:50:45

Cummins:

Pete Dalis certainly talked about that, and Chuck.

01-00:50:47

Sandbrook:

Did he?

01-00:50:49

Cummins: Yeah, Pete exactly, that anecdote.

01-00:50:51

Sandbrook: Now obviously I've never seen—there's never any documentation of that. Carnesale obviously is the source of that, compared—with his own conversation with Berdahl. But that has resonated with some of us for a long time, right?

There's also an issue—and I'm sure you've heard it in many ways over the years—a feeling at UCLA that Berkeley sometimes cuts the corners more often than not with respect to its admissions standards for some of the programs.

01-00:51:24

Cummins: Interesting, interesting.

01-00:51:26

Sandbrook: This goes back to the late 1960s/early seventies, particularly in the basketball program, when I think that there were some raw feelings at UC Berkeley when John Wooden had gained even more prominence than Pete Newell.

01-00:51:42

Cummins: Yes, yes, I've heard that.

01-00:51:42

Sandbrook: And I remember particularly a starting center on the UC Berkeley men's basketball team by the name of Robert Presley, and there were a lot of questions that were posed quietly about the admissions standards.

01-00:51:59

Cummins: Well, there was also the Isaac Curtis controversy too, which led to—

01-00:52:03

Sandbrook: Yeah. UCLA had its own set of issues in football, and then later in the late eighties I remember vividly how upset Chuck Young was with Mike Heyman—in fact, I was present when he, in effect, challenged Mike before the start of a Council of Chancellors meeting about the admission to UC Berkeley of Russell White, who was a high school football star from here in the San Fernando Valley. And in fact the headline in the *Los Angeles Times* was, as I recall—and I don't know the exact, verbatim headline—but it went something like this, "Russell White, Denied Admission at USC is Admitted at UC Berkeley." All right? A headline that you never thought you would ever see in your lifetime, suggesting that USC's admissions standards were now higher than UC Berkeley's.

01-00:53:01

Cummins: Yes, yes. Interesting. Dave Maggard, whom I've interviewed also as part of this project, talks about that and getting a call from Mike, probably {because

of this?} or he's all in shock, and Mike saying, "What the hell are you doing? Are you sure you want this?" And yet, Russell White did very well.

01-00:53:19

Sandbrook:

But that's the \$64,000 question, about when do you take—you take a gamble on giving a kid an opportunity—UCLA has its own dirty laundry. There's the famous case of Billy Don Jackson, who was later, because of a criminal charge and conviction that he went through of manslaughter, the judge declared the man to be a functional illiterate—and yet he played football for UCLA in the early 1980s. So there was—how can I put it—dirty laundry on Chuck's side as well as on Berkeley's side.

But there was a strong feeling—in fact, I remember vividly, in 1993, that UCLA played UC Berkeley at the Rose Bowl as the first game of the season, and Berkeley won the game. The next day Terry—

01-00:54:15

Cummins:

And that would have been—Snyder was not the coach then? Maybe he was.

01-00:54:22

Sandbrook:

Ninety-three—yeah, maybe in his last year. But Terry Donahue called Chuck Young up at home and asked if he could come over and talk. Donahue had been the head coach at UCLA for eighteen years by that time, had a very successful time in the 1980s. He basically told Chuck that he really didn't think he could continue to be the UCLA football coach if he was going to have to endure the competitive disadvantage, given the admission standards at UCLA versus what was his understanding was being allowed at UC Berkeley with respect to the football program.

01-00:55:01

Cummins:

Interesting.

01-00:55:05

Sandbrook:

Now, as it turned out, Terry sold himself a bit short. That year UCLA had a wonderful season, was the Pac-10 champion and went to the Rose Bowl Game and was upset by Wisconsin. But that issue has continued. Even DeSean Jackson, a recent player in the last seven years at UC Berkeley.

01-00:55:28

Cummins:

Now in the pros.

01-00:55:30

Sandbrook:

He went to Long Beach Poly[technic] High School. It was well known he wanted to come to UCLA, and a UCLA special action faculty committee did not approve admission for him. He was admitted to UC Berkeley, had a stellar career at UC Berkeley, and has done quite well with the Philadelphia Eagles. That's often even pointed to that things have changed even, or I mean—that that dynamic has continued even in the current decade.

01-00:56:01

Cummins: Yes, exactly.

01-00:56:03

Sandbrook: Now, there's always two sides to every story, and as you point out sometimes there's a little bit more willingness to proverbially take a flyer on a potential kid to give the individual, be it a woman or a male athlete, an opportunity to excel. Sometimes you go down in flames. As I said, the Billy Don Jackson incident at UCLA was clearly one of a black mark for UCLA. It's an interesting thing.

I was reminded about Jason Kidd at UC Berkeley, and I think this goes back to the whole question of the student part of the old student/athletic label. I made the observation to our faculty athletic representative one time that I think it wouldn't be a bad idea if the conference took a policy that no individual could be inducted into the institution—any member institution's athletic hall of fame—unless that person had completed his or her degree. Jason Kidd was, I think, admitted into the UC Berkeley Athletic Hall of Fame. He stayed two years at UC Berkeley. And of course the infamous instance at UCLA, going back now seventy years, Jackie Robinson, one of the most famous athletes in American sports history and American societal history, is well regarded as being a UCLA athlete. He stayed here three semesters, all right? He transferred in as a sophomore after his first year at Pasadena City College, competed in his sophomore year for both semesters, and he competed in the fall semester of his junior year and did not complete the spring semester of his junior year and went into the US Army. And yet Jackie Robinson will always be associated with UCLA. Fifty years from now there will still be association with Jackie Robinson and UCLA. But he—his enrollment here was three years. Now, on the other hand you have accomplished athletes like Arthur Ashe [and] Kareem Abdul-Jabbar who completed their degree, but you have a Jimmy Connors, the tennis player, who spent one year here. You have John McEnroe or Tiger Woods at Stanford who stayed one or two years, so it cuts both ways.

And let me just add one other thing about the admissions and we can then go on to another topic. I remember vividly, back in 1973, there was a recruitment of a very, very highly accomplished basketball player from a high school in Portland by the name of Richard Washington, with less-than-stellar grades.

01-00:59:21

Cummins: Admission here?

01-00:59:22

Sandbrook: Admission to UCLA. The faculty admissions committee, special admissions committee, denied J.D. Morgan's request to have the young man admitted. The director of admissions did not overrule. The assistant vice chancellor, to whom the director of admissions reported, also did not overrule the faculty admissions committee. J.D. took the matter directly to the then-vice

chancellor that oversaw admissions, and that vice chancellor overruled the decisions and the young man was admitted. Two years later, as a sophomore, that same young man hit the winning shot in the semifinal game that allowed John Wooden to retire with his tenth NCAA team championship. I've often wrestled with the question—if the decision had not been overturned about the admission of that young man and there had been no tenth NCAA team championship for UCLA, would UCLA have been better off? Would the young man have been better off? As it turns out, the young man stayed one more year in the first post-John Wooden year and then turned pro early. I'm not sure if he ever came back and completed his degree. I often struggle with that question.

You often hear stories of very successful athletes who come back to the university twenty years later. Two years ago Troy Aikman—an extraordinary quarterback in the pros, this extraordinary quarterback for UCLA, he returned to UCLA to get his degree in sociology. He's in the NFL Pro Football Hall of Fame, nationally known broadcaster, very successful businessman, and yet it was important for him in his mid-forties to come back to UCLA, complete his degree, and have his name called at the departmental graduation ceremony along with four hundred other students who were twenty years his junior. Troy Polamalu just last Friday went through the Department of History graduation ceremony at USC, ten/twelve/fifteen years after his exit from USC, and in the NFL he's been the defensive player of the year several times. Those are great stories, but sometimes you have the other stories—the Billy Don Jacksons and you wonder about a Richard Washington. It's a conundrum.

01-01:02:20

Cummins: It is, and we'll talk some more, I think, about that issue.

01-01:02:23

Sandbrook: Can I take a break?

01-01:02:27

Cummins: Oh absolutely, sure. I'll just turn this off.

01-01:02:27

Sandbrook: And then I've got about twenty minutes left.

01-01:02:30

Cummins: Yes, exactly. Okay. [brief interruption in recording] Okay, we're continuing with the interview, same date, with John Sandbrook.

Can you talk a little bit about—it has been there in this conversation, but the difference in culture between Berkeley and UCLA vis-à-vis athletics, any thoughts you have about that. Because the faculty, from time to time, seem more involved perhaps than—at least my perception is their involvement here at UCLA. I don't know. I know that UCLA has an Academic Senate Committee that reviews the athletics budget, for example. We did not have that at Berkeley.

- 01-01:03:30
Sandbrook: I think that's a cursory review. I don't think that has any substantive role.
- 01-01:03:36
Cummins: All right.
- 01-01:03:35
Sandbrook: It may make the Academic Senate feel better, but there's no substantive review process. I think that to a certain extent the fact that the athletic department has not had to rely upon what I will call chancellor's discretionary funds here has provided a buffer against any real faculty unsettled feelings here. Of course in the last three years at Berkeley that has been a real issue, and I think the difficulties that Berkeley has with revenue generation, given the facility of the stadium until the planned renovation, and for many years the condition of the old Harmon Gym, created a much greater financial challenge for the Berkeley administration in how it funded the program and met the expectations of alumni in terms of the number of sports programs to be fielded and things. The fact that we've enjoyed success here and that has in turn led to a greater sense of financial security—I think even if there is some discomfort about the fact, among some faculty, about athletics being an unnecessary evil, as long as it wasn't—
- 01-01:05:06
Cummins: Eating into—
- 01-01:05:08
Sandbrook: —it wasn't arguably taking resources that could be used for other purposes away, I think made that—allowed the faculty enthusiasts of athletics to be the more prominent voice of the faculty. There are other institutions in this country where the athletic program is so successful, the athletic program is able to redirect revenue towards the academic enterprise. There have been several reports about that.
- 01-01:05:40
Cummins: Sure, sure. USC, right.
- 01-01:05:41
Sandbrook: Well, no—not USC.
- 01-01:05:42
Cummins: Well, at least that's what I've heard.
- 01-01:05:44
Sandbrook: No, no. USC is in *tremendous* financial challenges. There's no redirection of revenue.
- 01-01:05:54
Cummins: I heard they were providing about \$4 million a year back to the academic program.

01-01:05:59
Sandbrook: If that happens at all, first of all, no one knows their budgets, because they're not required to—

01-01:06:04
Cummins: Yes, they don't reveal them, right.

01-01:06:06
Sandbrook: But particularly with the growth in tuition and Title IX responsibilities for gender equity teams and the amount of debt they've taken on for the construction of the Galen Center, and then they've had decreased attendance in football. It may have been the case that they had some very strong years when they were selling out the Coliseum, and that was in the mid-part of the last decade, but that's not the case anymore. Ohio State does, Penn State does, Notre Dame.

01-01:06:40
Cummins: Notre Dame.

01-01:06:41
Sandbrook: But there you have these very—

01-01:06:43
Cummins: Miami appare[ntly]—or Florida.

01-01:06:46
Sandbrook: Florida, not Miami, where you have very large, loyal football ticket subscription. That's the big difference. Wisconsin probably as well.

01-01:06:59
Cummins: Talk a little bit more about that, the financial side. Because you mention, obviously, the Olympics here, UCLA's participation with the Olympic committee, the success of the program. Just talk about why UCLA has been able to succeed without the chancellor using discretionary money, as the chancellors have had to do [at Cal].

01-01:07:32
Sandbrook: Well, I think that going back to Murphy and then Young, they agreed to put student registration fee money into the athletic program from the very start of the—

01-01:07:43
Cummins: Right. We did too.

01-01:07:43
Sandbrook: —1962-'63. But I think it was always understood that the definition, that the regents' definition when they created the university departments in 1960, that the department was supposed to be self-supporting was, I think, more faithfully adhered to here. I think that—and in fact for many, many years there was not a large fundraising effort out of the athletic department, between television revenue and ticket revenue and the share, the modest, at the time,

share of post-season revenue from the Rose Bowl Game or—the athletic department never made a call upon the revenue from the sale of logo material. That was always retained by the Associated Students.

01-01:08:39

Cummins: Is that right?

01-01:08:42

Sandbrook: At Michigan that's part of the athletic department's operating budget. So I think, knock on wood, for whatever reason, there was always the ability here, for UCLA, to basically be—to meet the standard of self-supporting performance financially. Berkeley obviously made different choices. Whether or not that's because [of] the competitive pressures to field the number of programs that vis-à-vis Stanford, its local rival, or even its rivals here in Los Angeles with SC and UCLA, and the fact that the limitations of the two major facilities that we talked about earlier prevented the type of ticket revenue, and the lack of competitive success meant that you weren't going to be on television as much, it kind of fed on itself in a way. And so clearly, over the years, the administration at Berkeley has made its decisions about putting additional resources into the department.

01-01:09:55

Cummins: Well, if you go back to '91 and what was it called, the blue-ribbon committee that you probably are aware of.

01-01:10:01

Sandbrook: Yes, the Smelser Committee?

01-01:10:03

Cummins: The Smelser Committee.

01-01:10:04

Sandbrook: Yeah, oh yeah.

01-01:10:05

Cummins: He talks—and I was on that committee—about the ambivalence at Berkeley, which gets to the cultural question. In other words, that committee recommended a broad-based, highly competitive program mirroring the excellence of the academic program, also said it wouldn't be out of the ordinary to put a million a year of discretionary money into athletics for five or six year to help them build their own fundraising capabilities, build an endowment. They thought an endowment of \$35 million, in those days, would be sufficient, which obviously was not the case. [laughing] But interestingly, Tien was chancellor then and he doesn't respond in writing to the committee. He has a lunch with Neil Smelser and that was the extent of it.

Immediately after that report comes out is when Bruce Snyder decides to leave, and there's a very interesting story about Wally Hass, the icon of our donor community, calling Budd Cheit and saying that he understood that

Bruce was going to leave or was considering it. He understood also that salary was the issue, and Arizona State was going to double what we were paying. And he said to Budd, “Would you call the chancellor and ask him what his views are on this? Because if salary is the issue I would be happy to handle this. We can take care of that.” And so Cheit calls Tien, and Tien says to Budd, “Thank you. Please thank Wally very much, but I can’t have a coach that is making more than the highest-paid faculty member at Berkeley.”

So there’s all this ambiguity. It’s not specified. There is no plan that is put together as a result. There is no formal adoption of that mission statement that was in this blue-ribbon committee, although you would think there would be. So we’ve gone for—almost really up to the present—without having a very firm plan for how we’re going to address athletics. The preference is to keep it ambiguous and keep it murky. That does not seem to be the case down here.

01-01:12:53

Sandbrook:

I think it’s understood that there’s a legacy here that any chancellor who was here, regardless of whatever heightened or lesser personal enthusiasm they have for athletics, they understand that it’s their responsibility to live up to. Gene Block is not a big athletic fan, all right?

01-01:13:16

Cummins:

Was Carnesale?

01-01:13:17

Sandbrook:

He became one. He became one. He became *infected* with it! Now, you also have to remember that UCLA has had only three chancellors since 1968, whereas Berkeley has had—what, seven? Six or seven. So Robert Birgeneau, clearly today, has a much greater personal enthusiasm for athletics than his two immediate predecessors did. Maybe his three or four immediate predecessors—Bowker, Heyman, Tien, and Berdahl I don’t think would anywhere be at Bob Birgeneau’s level in terms of personal enthusiasm for athletics.

01-01:14:02

Cummins:

Well, at least Tien was visibly enthusiastic, but financially was not so.
[laughing]

01-01:14:06

Sandbrook:

Yeah, he enjoyed the experience, I think, but my impression always that Tien was conflicted with what I will call the Duderstadt disease, in that while he was in the seat, and on Saturdays, he enjoyed the experience, but it troubled him the other five or six days of the week and he wished he really didn’t have to have responsibility for it. I admired Chang-Lin, but I always thought that he might be a little conflicted. I remember vividly being at the Pac-10 presidents and chancellors meeting in ’93, when Tien called out, in front of the other chancellors, the president of Arizona State, over the hiring of Bruce Snyder.

01-01:14:53

Cummins: No kidding!

01-01:14:54

Sandbrook: Yes.

01-01:14:54

Cummins: Well, talk a little bit about that. This is brand new.

01-01:14:56

Sandbrook: It wasn't much—he basically felt that the conference should adopt some internal rules regarding recruitment of—or in Chang-Lin's terms, stealing of another member institution's coaches. Okay? Now, the problem is it's a free market system. Salaries being—Chuck Young had the same attitude. Pete Dalis, as athletic director, was always paid no more than an assistant vice chancellor, believe it or not. And now today his successor is paid three times that much eight years later. Chuck had the same rule, that an athletic department employee, be it a coach or an athletic director, should not be paid more than a faculty member. Now, the difference is, particularly with a medical school faculty, with the compensation plans for your surgeons or some of your other major faculty, you could have faculty who would draw down \$2 million a year. But the highest-paid coach when Chuck was chancellor was probably not more than \$300,000-\$400,000 a year.

But the times have changed. You have football coaches now, including at USC, drawing \$3 [million]-\$4 million a year, and the institutional leadership and community can wrestle with that idea. But again, that's the ostrich with the head in the sand, where they enjoy the success but can they really live with it? I'm sure Gordon Gee is having trouble with himself, with Jim Tressel's situation right now. Again, that's part of the inconsistencies that you live with in the world. It's not—and I think quite honestly here, because we're going to have to—I'm going to have to wrap up—is that I think this issue's going to get worse than better with the new television contract in the Pac-12 that has brought in a tremendous amount of money. But now you're going to have a very significant increased demand on the scheduling of the contests on multiple days of the week.

01-01:17:08

Cummins: Yes, travel.

01-01:17:10

Sandbrook: With multiple travel. I made the observation to the faculty athletic representative here, Don [Donald G.] Morrison, that I think this will accelerate the day when either the state or the federal Department of Labor will come down and rule that student athletes are now employees as opposed to students. I think that I have significantly questioned the wisdom and the smarts of the current group of presidents and chancellors, and I only know two of them—at Berkeley and Los Angeles—as to their, the fact that—I'm not sure they get it, that they understand that they're—when hiring a promoter-type conference

commissioner and saying, "Go out and raise more money." I know that the faculty athletic representatives have gone on record as expressing concerns here. I'm afraid that the money is going to rule the day, and I think maybe the next generation of institutional leadership will suffer the consequences, but I fear that there will be some repercussions that will come. I know that there was even a report yesterday that various conference commissioners are now saying it's time to look at putting more money into the pockets of the players beyond the grant-in-aid formula, et cetera, and how do they reconcile paying a football coach \$4 million a year and still keeping the football players on the grant-in-aid basis? I think that you also have in the White House, currently, a president who seems to be very interested in a lot of these subjects.

01-01:19:03

Cummins:

In athletics.

01-01:19:04

Sandbrook:

If he's reelected in 2012 it would not shock me if in his second administration some of these issues come up, even at the most prominent level nationally, but that remains to be seen.

01-01:19:19

Cummins:

Okay, John. I know you have to go. Thanks, and we'll continue this hopefully when you come up to the Bay Area next.

Interview 2: June 26, 2011

Audio File 2

02-00:00:00

Cummins: Okay, this is June 26, 2011. This is the second interview with John Sandbrook. And John, we were just talking about the paper that you did in 1976, dealing with what became the addition of Arizona State and the University of Arizona to the Pac-8, at that time. I had said that I had picked up some concerns, somewhere, about Jack Raleigh, who was a senior administrator on the academic side, a professor in the English Department who had raised issues about, or was concerned about, the academic quality of these two institutions. And so I thought since you had commented on this I just wanted to get any recollections you had about it again, go into a little bit more depth.

02-00:01:07

Sandbrook: There clearly were concerns that at the end of the process came out of John Hokeness at Washington and Dick [Richard W.] Lyman at Stanford, but I don't recall any concerns having been expressed by Al Bowker. Bob Kerley, who was the vice chancellor for business affairs at UC Berkeley was one of about six Pac-8 people who went down to Arizona on a fact-finding trip officially, in June of '76, and I can't recall who was the Berkeley representative when we had a presidents and chancellors meeting at SFO in September of '76. I suspect it was Bowker, but I can't—because I seem to recall that the only non-president that was there was Lyman.

But in any event, the purpose of the document that I had prepared in April of '76, after my *sub rosa* visit to Tucson and then Tempe, was—I think it was, I don't know, a twenty-/thirty-page document that tried to put out some facts about Arizona and Arizona State. And of course we have to remember this was 1976, when fax transmission was still eight minutes a page, so there was no Internet. There was a lot of misconceptions and, I think, prejudices about Arizona and Arizona State that existed around the more well-established members of the Pac-8, in particularly viewing Arizona still as a cowboy state. And so my *sub rosa* visit in March of '76 was followed by my, what I could consider more than anything else a statistical compilation of information, and that was then distributed to the presidents and chancellors by Chuck Young. And then after that, in May of '76, the decision was made, if I recall correctly, that the presidents and chancellors took a vote to officially explore the possibility of expansion in a public way. That then led to a delegation of Pac-8 officials, of which Bob Kerley was a member, that went down there and spent a couple of days visiting facilities in Arizona.

We came back, the athletic directors then started meeting, or a subset, to talk about scheduling issues, and that went on for the better part of the summer. That then led to a September meeting in 1976 of the presidents and chancellors. Lyman did not attend and Bob [Robert M.] Rosenzweig was there

for—he was vice president for university relations. [loud truck sounds on the street below] Out of that conversation came a general concurrence, in September, to still proceed. There were a couple of issues that were conditions that the Pac-8 mandated that Arizona and Arizona State had to accept as a sine-qua-non element of coming into the Pac-8.

All of that process then led up to the memorable meeting in San Francisco at the St. Francis [Hotel] at the December conference meeting, in which it was assumed there would be a vote to invite Arizona and Arizona State, and at the time the bylaws of the conference required that vote to be unanimous. I may be repeating from the first interview, but if not then I'll take it from the start. That discussion was in closed session with only the presidents and chancellors—the eight of them—and Wiles Hallock, the then-executive director of the conference. Chuck Young was in there for UCLA. Outside—I waited outside, because they were there for the conference meetings, [with] our then-athletic director J.D. Morgan and our then-faculty rep Doug Hobbs.

That conference discussion of the presidents and chancellors was going on for an extraordinarily long time and then there was a break. Chuck grabbed J.D., Doug, and me and we went into an empty room. Chuck indicated that both John Hogness from the University of Washington and Dick Lyman from Stanford began to state that they were not going to vote in favor of the invitation because of their concern that the two institutions did not measure up to what they considered to be the academic reputation of the then existing Pac-8 members, and particularly Arizona State, which had the reputation, in their eyes, of an equivalent of a Cal State campus. That precipitated a fury of very unhappy debate, in which Jack Hubbard, from USC, who had been pushing for an expansion all along for monetary reasons, felt betrayed and felt that neither the University of Washington nor Stanford had, at the September meeting, expressed any concerns, so for them to do so now was disingenuous.

As Chuck related it—and I can remember this exchange of comments as clearly today, even though it was thirty-five years ago, as if it happened yesterday—he said that Jack Hubbard said that if Washington and Stanford did not honor what they had agreed to do in September, that instead of inviting Arizona and Arizona State to join the Pac-8 that Jack Hubbard would be going outside to inform the assembled media that USC was immediately withdrawing from the Pac-8. And J. D. Morgan—when Chuck looked at J.D. and says, “What do *we* do?” And I'll never forget this—J.D. said, “We go right with them.” But what had transpired while Chuck was having this conversation with us is that Dick Lyman called Bob Rosenzweig on a payphone and said, “Did you agree in September, and forget to tell me, that you had basically blessed the idea of conference expansion?” Lyman received Rosenzweig's answer and came back into the room and basically caved. And all's well that ends well, and about forty-five minutes later they came out and there was a unanimous vote to invite Arizona and Arizona State, effective July 1 of 1978, so with a nineteen-month lead time.

As I think I recounted last time, the impetus for the whole issue of expansion was a two-edged sword, and it depended upon which chair you were sitting in. Jack Hubbard at USC felt very strongly that he was tired of bringing home small paychecks, his share of the gate revenue from conference games at Washington State, Oregon, and Oregon State. When those schools would play USC at the Coliseum, their share of the gate would be quite substantial, and he felt that that was an imbalance, that it was not in the best long-term interests.

When he had had the occasion, in late 1975, to have visited with then-president of the University of Arizona John Schaeffer, Schaeffer was a very aggressive young president and he believed that it was time for Arizona, as an institution, to step up to what he would consider the big leagues and academically apply for AAU membership. He felt that being in the Western Athletic Conference would be a hindrance to his ability to move that campaign along, and being in a conference where Stanford, Berkeley, UCLA, USC, and Washington and Oregon were already in the AAU would be much more advantageous.

So Schaeffer's impetus was institutional reputation nationally within the AAU; Hubbard's was financial. But the two—politics makes strange bedfellows, and that's what led to the whole impetus. Hubbard never paid attention to the issue of the academic reputation of Arizona State. I think if you, knowing Cactus Jack as I did, his attitude would be what's the difference between Arizona State and Washington State and Oregon State?

02-00:12:01

Cummins:

Good question.

02-00:12:06

Sandbrook:

So I think that more or less that's the synopsis of the 1976 conference expansion issue. And as I said, my report was more a statistical compilation of information, because in those days pre-Internet, pre-everything practically—some people still had mimeograph machines, that it was—my purpose was to provide accurate information, which I did.

I should say that thirteen/fourteen months ago, when the news started coming out about the possibility of the Pac-10 conference expanding, I compiled all this information in a binder and sent it to the now-Pac-10 commissioner Larry Scott, so he could learn from the history. But it was also very clear to me that his marching orders from the Pac-10 presidents and chancellors, to consider the possibility of expansion by six schools in Texas and Oklahoma, that it didn't sound like there was much of a concern about academic reputation. That that was much more the Jack Hubbard factor, which was money, and not so much gate revenue but in this case television. But as we all know, that didn't happen, and we've ended up with Colorado and Utah. Colorado is an AAU member; Utah is not, and we will see whether or not in the coming years

Utah's membership in the Pac-12 is followed by an effort on that institution's part to try to join. So we'll see.

02-00:14:05

Cummins:

Okay. Now, in that first interview you also talked about the negotiating with the Rose Bowl for the use of the Rose Bowl for UCLA and also the negotiator between the UCLA campus and the Olympics Committee. Can you talk in a little bit more detail about what that involved? What were the details of the negotiations and how it either benefited or didn't benefit UCLA in the process?

02-00:14:40

Sandbrook:

Okay, on the UCLA Rose Bowl—that would mean about moving the home field, not the TV contract for the Rose Bowl?

02-00:14:48

Cummins:

Yes, talk about both, yes.

02-00:14:52

Sandbrook:

Well, the UCLA move to the Rose Bowl, it was a mixture of factors.

02-00:14:59

Cummins:

And you talk about that, about the—

02-00:15:00

Sandbrook:

Yeah, there was a long string of losses to USC in football, from 1967 to 1979. That thirteen-year-period UCLA's record against USC was 2-10-1. So there was a lot of raw feeling about the inability to compete with USC. And the fact that the Coliseum, being adjacent to the USC campus in Los Angeles, was viewed as a USC football stadium even though it's managed by this joint powers authority, the Coliseum Commission, UCLA people would find themselves parking on the USC campus. So there was a tremendous amount of dissatisfaction within the fan group/alumni group/supporters of UCLA football wanting to move. In 1980, particularly after the step-down and a year later the unfortunate premature death of J.D. Morgan, there was also a feeling that the athletic program at UCLA was at a crossroads in terms of leadership, et cetera. And so from that vacuum came a lot of people out of the woodwork on the alumni side trying to exercise their influence. So the bottom line was that there was a desire to try to move the UCLA football program's home field to the Rose Bowl.

Now, at the time the Rose Bowl was used basically one day a year for the Rose Bowl Game and nothing else. It's a facility owned by the City of Pasadena. But it's obviously—from the UCLA campus it's twenty-eight miles compared to fourteen miles for the Coliseum. It's not in the city of Los Angeles. And you also had the extremely popular mayor, Tom Bradley, Afro-American UCLA alumnus, who was very insistent that UCLA's football program should stay in the city of Los Angeles. And so there was actually some unhappiness on the part of certain alumni that Chancellor Young was

not being aggressive enough about moving the football program to the Rose Bowl.

There was the additional complication that in 1979 the Los Angeles Rams, which had shared the Coliseum with USC and UCLA since 1946, had decided to relocate to Anaheim. There was a desperation on the part of the governing board of the Coliseum to find a replacement NFL team, and then they were trying to recruit Al Davis and the Oakland Raiders with a lot of promises.

02-00:18:19

Cummins:

You do talk about that. That's in the first interview, and this difficult meeting.

02-00:18:23

Sandbrook:

Okay. Right. And so all of that culminated in 1982, when after the commission had won its anti-trust lawsuit against the NFL that cleared the way for the commission to formally invite the Raiders to play in Los Angeles. Chuck Young and I went to the July meeting of the commission and he asked to be heard, to express his concerns that neither USC's nor UCLA's interests were being properly recognized in the deal between the commission and the Raiders—and as I said, not even given the courtesy of being able to speak. He reacted—and effectively sent me outside to make a phone call to start the process of moving us to the Rose Bowl eight weeks/nine weeks later for our first home football game.

It was a very difficult time. We went through the process of getting approval by the Board of Regents.

02-00:19:42

Cummins:

The mayor tried to stop this too, didn't he?

02-00:19:44

Sandbrook:

Yes, he was also the leading—he was leading George Deukmejian in the polls by twelve percentage points for governor that year, and he tried to stop it and threatened that if it went through he would take punitive action, assuming he became governor. But everybody stood their ground and the move did happen. As it turned out, it was the start of a magical run, in that three out of the next four years UCLA won the conference championship and played in the annual Rose Bowl Game and was victorious. So of the five UCLA Rose Bowl victories in its history, three of those came in that period of the first four years after we moved. Everyone felt that the independent identity—that the Rose Bowl would be a UCLA stadium and not shared with USC—was a very important thing.

Also, there's a little nuance about—the Rose Bowl had bench seating, and the Coliseum had individual folding chairs that had been put in in the 1970s for the Rams. As a result of the architectural configuration of the Coliseum and the greater width required for individual folding chairs, even though the Coliseum has a seating capacity in excess of 90,000, only 28,000 of those

seats were between the goal lines on both sides of the field combined. In other words, 62,000 of the seats in the Coliseum were outside of the yardage, whereas at the Rose Bowl, because of the bench seating, the number of seats between the goal lines was actually in excess of 40,000, and that allowed more people to be seated between the goal lines and the appearance that they would have better seating. Now once they were there, the creature comfort aspect of the bench seating left something to be desired, but that was a material factor as well.

02-00:22:18

Cummins: So talk about the details of the contract. What do you look for when you're dealing with a complex like that?

02-00:22:31

Sandbrook: It's a pretty straightforward set of checklist items. Obviously the rent, which is usually a percentage of gross—I think now the standard formula is 8 percent of gross admission revenue.

02-00:22:47

Cummins: Does that include everything, concessions and everything?

02-00:22:48

Sandbrook: No, no.

02-00:22:48

Cummins: Just tickets.

02-00:22:48

Sandbrook: Gross ticket sales. And then you obviously discuss what the share of the concession revenue would be. Do you sell beer? Do you not sell beer? What's the situation with parking? When we went there in 1982 parking was free. There was no charge for parking. The Coliseum in Exposition Park would charge for parking. If you parked on the USC campus there was a charge for parking. You also—obviously there are considerations about press box/hospitality areas/locker room considerations, et cetera.

What was also occurring at the same time was that there was an effort by the City of Pasadena to begin to put a lot of money into the Rose Bowl, and by the Tournament of Roses, because of what Chuck Young and I had been doing on the other front, of the TV contract for the Rose Bowl Game on January 1 with NBC. The amount of money that was actually coming out of the Rose Bowl Game was much larger than before. So for example, one of the reasons I had opposed going to the Rose Bowl in 1980 was, for example, the entire southern section of the Rose Bowl, there was not structural reinforcement for those seats in the event of an earthquake. The Tournament of Roses and the Pac-10 had agreed to do a \$5 per ticket surcharge beginning in 1980, over three years, which would generate \$1.5 million to basically allow all of the southern seats to have structural reinforcement. That was done by 1982. I *knew* that, so when the issues began to hit with the Raider move to the Coliseum, I had told Chuck

now is the time to go to the Rose Bowl, because there was going to be money starting to be put into that facility, whereas what was going to be done at the Coliseum—hypothetically, and as it turned out it never got done—was significant improvements intended to satisfy the demands of Al Davis, the owner of the Raiders. So later on the City of Pasadena began charging for parking, okay? But I think by and large, even though it is twenty-eight miles from the UCLA campus, the feeling that that is UCLA Stadium is identified as in the fall as where UCLA plays, has been a very significant positive. This coming year is going to be the thirtieth year that UCLA has played there.

The other factor is that when USC, UCLA, and the Rams shared the Coliseum, by November 1, the field was pretty much dirt in the middle of the football field. It was really chewed up. And with only one recurring tenant at the Rose Bowl, the quality of the field surface would be much better, and that, I think, has proven to be true. Now, they would do an occasional rock concert; U-2 did its big show in the Rose Bowl in October of last year. But it's much easier to manage around those one-off events rather than having the constant deterioration of the grass surface by multiple games, sometimes two a weekend.

02-00:26:45

Cummins:

So financially were you better off overall when you went to [the Rose Bowl]?

02-00:26:47

Sandbrook:

Yes, I think actually in the last year at the Coliseum we were paying 10 percent of gross. They had offered to make it 8 percent in order—as a sweetener to keep us at the Coliseum. So when we had discussions with the City of Pasadena we said, “Look, we can't pay you 10 percent and defend this when the Coliseum is saying 8 percent {rev?}.” And so they had to match it, and they gave us a most-favored-nation clause. So financially—clearly, attendance shot up, the enthusiasm of having your own stadium, the success of the team with that magical four-year run. I had gone back through the media guides, and I think in the twenty-five years prior to—from 1957 to 1981—and those are the years since Red Sanders died to the last year at the Coliseum, UCLA had only four games in that entire twenty-five year span with an announced attendance of more than 50,000 at the Coliseum, and I separated out the USC game. We quickly began averaging 55,000-60,000 at the Rose Bowl. So yes, attendance was up; season ticket sales went up. There probably was some diminution in student attendance because of the longer bus ride, but not in the early years when we were in the great run. You also had the ability to attract a greater number of people from the neighborhoods. School districts found it easier for them to go there.

02-00:28:42

Cummins:

To get there, yeah.

02-00:28:45

Sandbrook:

So I don't think there's any question that that's turned out to be a very wise move. I do recall one day—Chuck was someplace in that two week period when Tom Bradley was launching the campaign to thwart this—Chuck I think may have been at a regents meeting or whatever, and I was talking to him on the phone and he said to me, “Well, maybe this isn't such a good idea after all.” And I remember doing something I very rarely did. I barked at him and I said, “You stop that! We are *going*. I want you to say to me, ‘We are going to the Rose Bowl.’ Trust me, this the right thing to do.” And knock on wood, it turned out that way and my prediction proved true.

02-00:29:37

Cummins:

Now, how important do you think it is then, if you look at the Berkeley situation with the \$500 million that's being spent on these two big projects, the stadium and the high performance center, having it on campus versus—how, in your experience, in terms of the school spirit at UCLA and all the arguments that are laid out for doing it, what's your sense of it?

02-00:30:04

Sandbrook:

Well, I'm not going to talk too much about Berkeley, but I will talk about the UCLA perspective, because there was obviously a presentation and a proposal went to the Board of Regents in 1965 to build an on-campus football stadium and for a variety of reasons the regents turned it down. I know some of my athletic department friends would disagree with me, but I think one of the smartest things that ever happened was not building that on-campus football stadium. I think it would have had a very damaging effect on the footprint of available space in the middle of the campus for recreation. It would have only seated 45,000 to 50,000 people. That would have been with bench seating. And there's a tremendous amount of wear and tear that goes on on a campus when you have a football stadium. At Berkeley—okay, it's in the hillside on the edge of the campus. At UCLA it would have been in the middle of the academic portion of the campus, but all the parking would have been all over the place. And I just think that the UCLA campus is better off by that. The tailgating at the golf course around the Rose Bowl I think is even superior to what would have been able to have [been] accomplished there. I think the ability of the UCLA campus to have a full range of other programs on a Saturday when the UCLA football team is playing there—there's no problem of patients getting to the UCLA hospital or visitors, people using the libraries. I think it would have had a—damaging may be a little bit too much of a negative word, but a constraining impact. And I do believe, also, then you didn't have the capital issues.

02-00:32:29

Cummins:

Of course.

02-00:32:29

Sandbrook:

Investment and infrastructure renewal—so I personally believe that UCLA is better off by not having an on-campus football stadium, because we had, I

think, a very attractive alternative in the Rose Bowl. Now, if there was no football stadium on the Berkeley campus, and the alternative was playing in the Oakland-Alameda County Coliseum, I would respond differently, because I don't think the environment around the Oakland-Alameda County Coliseum, be it from tailgating or just the general neighborhood or whatever, lends itself to a super-positive environment. But I think the availability of the Rose Bowl, in my view, was and remains such an attractive alternative, that's why the current UCLA leadership signed a thirty-year lease extension. And I think that makes all the sense in the world.

02-00:33:46

Cummins: Yes, exactly.

02-00:33:46

Sandbrook: Now, I don't buy this business that a football stadium on campus helps you bring in money. UCLA's fundraising hasn't been hampered by the absence of an on-campus football stadium. You could even make the point of UC San Diego doesn't even *have* a football team, and UC San Diego's stature as a) an institution, and b) as a fundraising machine certainly is based upon all of the right issues.

02-00:34:25

Cummins: Yes, definitely. Now, one other thing you talked about when you did the study of the history of UCLA Athletics and the regents then taking it over in 1960—

02-00:34:40

Sandbrook: Sixty.

02-00:34:42

Cummins: —as an auxiliary enterprise. Now, you're probably aware that the term auxiliary—I'm sure with your friendship with Steve Juarez, et cetera, as he's been involved in this issue. [laughing]

02-00:34:55

Sandbrook: And I saw the *Daily Cal* article in which Patrick Lynch clearly was becoming impatient about all of this.

02-00:35:03

Cummins: Yes, yes, exactly. I meant Patrick; I meant Patrick not Steve. So I'm curious about how—what that meant, the auxiliary term at that point in time. You do talk about it. These were essentially non-academic operations that generated revenue of some kind, housing, that kind of thing, and athletics was put in there. Now, the reference to auxiliary, at least for the Berkeley campus, is those portions of the intercollegiate program that actually generate revenue, football and basketball, and everything else is basically *not* an auxiliary. I don't know quite how they handle the accounting on that. So I'm just curious about your views and the changes—

02-00:36:07

Sandbrook:

Well, I think first of all you have to understand the context, the organizational context at the time. The first UCLA residence hall had opened in 1959, about the same time, I believe, the first residence halls open on the Berkeley campus. So the concept of separate businesses was a relatively new concept at the time. You also have to remember that officially there were no student services in the University of California, because the organizational category of student services didn't come into play until two years later when the regents officially adopted, or began, the assessment of the registration fee, that didn't come into play until 1962, to fund the student health services, et cetera. So at the time there wasn't anything else to say.

The athletic departments were part of the AS programs at Berkeley and Los Angeles. The coaches had joint appointments in the Department of Physical Education and arguably were providing academic credit, all right? The idea that Pappy Waldorf was responsible for academic credit for thousands of UC Berkeley students, or Red Sanders in the UCLA case, because of an activity course that they were operating and getting one or two semester units in the fifties, I think still is laughable, but it existed at the time.

So first of all, the concept of *student services* didn't exist, all right? The concept of subsidizing the athletic department with student fees didn't exist. It was coming out of a period with when it—being in the Associated Students, football was subsidizing the deficits in the bookstore, okay? So auxiliary enterprise—the term or the organizational category of it—I thought was a matter of convenience at the time, because it *was* viewed as a revenue-generating enterprise in the same way of a housing or a parking. Now, two years later, when the university registration fee policy was adopted by the board to provide a revenue stream to fund “student services,” defined as placement services, counseling services, student health services—and in UCLA's case recreation services, et cetera—at UCLA there was a \$300,000 use of registration fees to go into the athletic department, under the premise that it would be used to provide the funding for the so-called non-revenue-generating sports—the swimming, the tennis, the track and field or whatever, and that those were activity programs as much as a lacrosse club team was. But that—no one changed the categorization in the accounting hierarchy and it stayed as an auxiliary enterprise.

So I've often been scratching my head about this issue about the definition, and I take it at Berkeley, at some point, it must have moved from auxiliary enterprise to student service because somebody felt that because it was receiving registration fee money it should be characterized as a student service, not as an auxiliary enterprise. There was never any prohibition about an auxiliary enterprise getting subsidy. Child care is subsidized—or it was for many years; I don't know if it still is. But it was considered an auxiliary enterprise.

02-00:40:26

Cummins:

Yes, yes, right. Exactly. In the couple of reports—the *Cheit Report*, in particular, which was in 2000, they talk about the fact that before Men’s [Athletics] and Women’s [Athletics] and Rec Sports was merged—and that would have been ’92, Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics was not an auxiliary. Rec Sports was not an auxiliary.

02-00:40:56

Sandbrook:

Correct.

02-00:40:57

Cummins:

So when they merge into one department, the entire department then is lumped as an auxiliary.

02-00:41:05

Sandbrook:

And that was the case at UCLA.

02-00:41:06

Cummins:

Okay, all right.

02-00:41:07

Sandbrook:

The original department of Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics, that was established in 1974 under the vice chancellor of student affairs, would have been characterized as a student service, just like the recreation department was.

02-00:41:19

Cummins:

Exactly. And so from a budget/financial point of view, according to the *Cheit Report*—and I think that’s right—once you’ve lumped them together and then you do full costing, in other words you’re charging Intercollegiate Athletics like other auxiliary enterprises a percentage for administering these operations, that that was doubly unfair. I think that’s a good argument.

02-00:41:46

Sandbrook:

Well, I think that the argument would be that the women’s sports, as well as the non-revenue-generating men’s sports, if there had been no football or men’s basketball program available to help operate them—but let’s say just like at UC San Diego, if they wanted to establish twenty varsity sports or whatever, they would have been more properly characterized as a student service, no different than a club sport in the Rec Sports Department. So I think one could make the argument, even though a lot of faculty would dismiss it as gobbledygook, that the auxiliary enterprise was still deserving of a subsidy, in the same way child care was for a while. And obviously in today’s world, with tight budgets and picking priorities, people look for conspiracy theories as to how categorizations could be used as loopholes to justify diversion of money or the hiding of money, and I think I agree with those who think this is all a lot of baloney. But nonetheless, I understand that people sometimes see a bogeyman around every street corner.

02-00:43:22

Cummins:

Exactly, okay. So let's talk a little bit about the link or the connection between academics and athletics. You've thought about this for a long time, I'm sure. You could categorize intercollegiate athletics' link to universities and colleges as a historical accident. It's not done this way in any other country pretty much. You also talk about, in the first interview, about—that's just the way life is. You say that a couple of times—you've got to accept these—*inconsistencies* is the word you use, which is interesting.

Mike Heyman, in a tape that I got from Murray Sperber—you know who Murray Sperber is—he's now a visiting professor at Cal. In that interview, which was in 1988, right after Heyman's famous speech at the Dallas NCAA Convention, Sperber interviews him in preparation for one of his books, *College Sports, Inc. [The Athletic Department vs. the University]* And so Mike says basically, "Maybe we should just undertake this as a task. This is just something that we {do?}." Talk about that. How do you view the whole picture of the connection?

02-00:44:56

Sandbrook:

Well—and I guess it kind of goes with the current debate about amateurism and should student athletes get paid.

02-00:45:03

Cummins:

Yes, of course.

02-00:45:06

Sandbrook:

There's a legal aspect. At what point do they become employees as opposed to students, et cetera, et cetera.

02-00:45:10

Cummins:

Of course, of course.

02-00:45:17

Sandbrook:

You know, the original idea that a lot of Olympic athletes would go to the Harvards, the Columbias, the Oxfords, the Cambridges—clearly that's where a lot of things started a hundred and fifty years ago, a hundred and twenty years ago. But the business enterprise, College Sports, Inc., as you put it, clearly has overtaken it. The idea that several head coaches throughout the country, in football or basketball, are earning \$3[million], \$4 [million] or \$5 million a year, because "that's what the market is because of the NFL." In the Southeastern Conference you have the athletic programs actually administered by separate non-profit corporations, for which the corporation of the university has an agreement to lease its name. Those I think will always be troubling.

02-00:46:33

Cummins:

That kind of arrangement?

02-00:46:32

Sandbrook:

Yeah. I think because it basically begs the question of what's the real priority here? It's the set of questions that the folks in Columbus, at Ohio State, are trying to wrestle with right now. Now, you have—you always will have trouble—as when a Bear Bryant is the most well-known individual of a university, not because Bear Bryant was bad, but where's the university president? Where is your best faculty member?, et cetera. Those things become quite troubling—the idea that your coaches are teachers who have physical education appointments, et cetera—those days are long gone.

I do believe that this issue will continue to be debated unless and until there is a definitive court ruling that ends up classifying the students as employees. It's similar, to me, as the issue in the medical schools of internships. Are they—for those universities across the country that have medical schools, they count, in the student head count, interns and residents, even though they're getting paid, they're working long hours, but they're viewed as still being part of the academic program. They've already earned their MD degree but they're counted as students. So when UCLA is counted as having thirty-eight thousand students, there's fifteen hundred or two thousand interns and residents added. I always thought that was screwy. And there have been some court cases now that those people really have to be considered more employees. It would not shock me if in the next ten to fifteen years we end up with a court case that talks about the student athletes, in certain sports, all right—

02-00:48:42

Cummins:

Yeah, not all sports.

02-00:48:44

Sandbrook:

—ending up being employees. Now—obviously, the poster child for all of this is football and men's basketball. You can make the argument that men's baseball at the collegiate level is even a worse abuser from the standpoint of time away from classes, et cetera, because what used to be a spring sport is now a nine-month sport. Golf the same way, tennis the same way. So these sports have taken on a semi-professional quality.

It still troubles me, and I said this earlier, where an athletic hall of fame at a university, be it UCLA, Stanford, or Berkeley, is very quick to admit into its athletic hall of fame young men and women who have gone there for one or two years. Tiger Woods went to Stanford for two years; Jimmy Connors went to UCLA for one year; Jason Kidd went to Berkeley for two years, right? In fact, about eight/nine years ago I raised the question whether or not the Pac-8 or Pac-10 Conference should adopt a policy that says no institution's hall of fame shall admit someone who hasn't earned his or her degree, and I was told that was a non-starter; that was left up to individual discretion. I feel still to be kind of the stick in the mud about that. I think institutions should be careful about tooting their horn about the accomplishments of someone who hasn't received the degree. So again, I'm a stick in the mud.

I get bothered about the idea now that college football players, after the fall season and once they've used up their eligibility, those that feel that they are skillful enough to have some potential for possibility of being picked in the NFL Draft, basically withdraw from school and just start working out for agents. That bothers me. That's not what we're supposed to be doing, and therefore should we just spin this off as a separate corporation, be open enough to talk about these kids as employees and go from there?

Now clearly, there is a subset of the faculty of our campuses that feel very enthusiastic about football and basketball and the other sports and view it in the wholesome way, about well-rounded life experience. And God knows that there are happily and proudly dozens, if not hundreds, of examples of young men and women who have gone on to marvelous accomplishments in the business world and professional practices, be it in medicine or law or engineering, that have been varsity athletes, no more so than if they had been playing in the orchestra. But I think when you—admittedly, if a young student who is a very accomplished violinist but wants to earn the history degree and still plays with the university symphony as a violinist and then gets contacted and says, “You know, you might be good enough to join the Cincinnati Symphony.” And that kid then takes off two quarters to go back to Cincinnati and try to practice and try out—you never hear about that. Is there anything wrong with that? Well, at the end of the day there's nothing wrong with it, in the sense that it's an individual choice by the kid. Unlike, however, what we have now at the institutions with the football, where the football coaches arrange for the NFL teams and scouts to go see all the kids play. That bothers me, okay? You can't tell a kid that he can't do something, but when you're basically facilitating a way for the kid to drop out of school, that does not sit well with me.

Now, the train has left the station. You have idiot university presidents, and I call him an idiot, like Gordon Gee, who's stupid enough to say he hopes his football coach doesn't fire him.

02-00:54:20

Cummins: Exactly, incredible.

02-00:54:25

Sandbrook: It's hard to imagine, short of the president of the United States doing what Teddy Roosevelt did in 1906, and call university leadership to the White House and says you've got to clean up college football. Until you have a president of the United States who basically says this is a scandalous mark on American culture and basically lays down the law in the bully pulpit, I don't see—or there's a court ruling—I don't see this changing. So the misgivings that I have about a certain part of that will always last.

02-00:55:10

Cummins: Just as an aside on the Teddy Roosevelt thing—I find this interesting. When he calls that meeting, Yale sends Walter Camp, the father of [American

football]—does *he* have an opinion? [laughing] And so what you see, often, and certainly this isn't new what I'm saying, but I don't know how many people really appreciate it. When you get into these controversies, say that Berkeley just went through—and this isn't the first time, and committees are set up, et cetera, you tend to put on those committees the people that favor intercollegiate athletics. And so that's also been a pattern that goes all the way through. When the ACE [American Council on Education] did their big reform effort—this was around 1940 or so—the person that they chose to head this up was John Hannah, who wanted to make Michigan State a big-name institution and this is how he was going to do it. So you get this pattern there as well too—anyway, just an aside.

02-00:56:18

Sandbrook:

Well, in going back to the comments I was making earlier that John Schaeffer felt that it would be to his advantage to be part of the Pac-8—

02-00:56:25

Cummins:

Yes, exactly. Exactly, yes.

02-00:56:27

Sandbrook:

—to get into the AAU. There clearly is name recognition that comes with this, with these programs. You don't read about UC San Diego on page one of the sports section and you don't hear UC San Diego talked about on talk radio from the standpoint of its football team.

02-00:56:50

Cummins:

No, true, but do they need it?

02-00:56:52

Sandbrook:

Yeah, you look at what UC San Diego has accomplished since 1965 and it's a remarkable [feat]. Maybe in a way it's just there were certain legacies of American culture prior to World War II—

02-00:57:15

Cummins:

[checking recorder] It's incredible. Keep talking. I'm just checking this.

02-00:57:18

Sandbrook:

—that are very different in the post-World War II era. The formation of your football teams at Berkeley and Los Angeles are an example of that. Now, you've got—Davis is now trying to play major league football. You had Santa Barbara, of all institutions, in the fifties and sixties playing major league football but then they dropped it for monetary reasons. I think that had to do more with the realities of how large the population base was in the Santa Barbara area to come out and watch the team and produce revenue. Irvine doesn't have a football team, but it would certainly have the population base to support it, presumably. But I've often felt the University of California, one of the many great things about the University of California—and that list is a very long list—but one of the great things is that the University of California

System has proven that you can become some of America's best universities without a football team. [laughing]

02-00:58:35

Cummins:

Yes, it's very interesting. Exactly. So let me run an idea by you. But what I'm going to do is I'm going to change the memory card in here, because I don't want this to run out. It says we have—we have—I don't trust this. I'm going to change it. So I'm going to stop this and then we'll start up again. [brief interruption in recording] Okay, this is June 26, 2011. This is a continuation of the second interview with John Sandbrook on intercollegiate athletics, and I just changed the memory card.

So I wanted to put an idea out for you to see what you think of it. You talked about admitting students with special talent, a music student/art, et cetera. We admit student athletes for special talent, in so many words. The problem, the difference is that there is no academic discipline related to athletics. There used to be a physical education kind of component, but that's non-existent now. And what occurred to me was could you create a department, an undergraduate and graduate major, that encompassed the health and wellbeing of the entire campus community and would focus on physiology, anatomy, maybe have some courses on health care, kinesiology, anatomy—

02-01:00:28

Sandbrook:

Nutrition science.

02-01:00:30

Cummins:

Nutrition sciences—and you incorporated those within the overall mission of the university, so that this is the kind of community that we want, you tie in the School of Public Health—you've got a medical center at UCLA. And this would be a component where we're building a healthy campus here, and there would be studies done by these various disciplines that could offer courses in this major that would look at the continuum of sports. So it would be students in rec sports all the way through club sports, intercollegiate athletes. People would be studying them, they would be research subjects, they would learn as a result of the process, et cetera. What do you think of that idea?

02-01:01:22

Sandbrook:

Well, I don't think it can be a stand-alone unit. What comes to my mind—

02-01:01:27

Cummins:

A major kind of—

02-01:01:29

Sandbrook:

What comes to my mind is the ROTC units on the campus. Those are considered academic departments, and you do graduate with a degree in military science. But the number of courses that you take in military science is a fraction compared to the larger set of courses you'll take throughout the campus. So I think yeah, I think you could do that. Now obviously, the potential for abuse is there. But I think, for example, it would be healthy for a

lot of the young men and women participating in intercollegiate athletics to take even an undergraduate lower-division course on the business of sports.

02-01:02:24

Cummins: Yes, of course, of course. Absolutely.

02-01:02:28

Sandbrook: And dealing with agents, right? I was just this morning having breakfast at the Bel-Air Country Club and I was talking to the long-time pro there who was the former UCLA coach. I was talking about what he could tell me about this nineteen-year-old young man, who in the last four weeks has become quite a phenomenon—

02-01:02:51

Cummins: I'll say, Cantlay, yeah.

02-01:02:52

Sandbrook: —on the PGA—Patrick [Cantlay]. And the kid has been saying the right things, that he's not going to turn pro; he wants to get his college degree. He's only a freshman. But Eddie [Merrins] was back at Congressional [Country Club] for the US Open and he said that several of Phil Mickelson's management team asked Eddie to introduce them to the young man. So the piranhas were already out for a nineteen-year-old freshman at UCLA, about whether or not he should turn pro. And even if he's got, as apparently this young man has, a very thoughtful father or mother to help guide the process—they may even be a little bit in over their heads.

So yeah, I think a lot could be said to that. There is, unfortunately, the prejudices that exist in the faculty senates across the country, partially fueled by the headline-driven, ad-hoc “scandals,” and Ohio State clearly is now, eight months ago the Auburn and the Cam Newton issue are—unfortunately just continue to add fuel to that. But yeah, I think that there would be some potential. But I think the analogue for me would be equivalent to the ROTC.

02-01:04:27

Cummins: Now, one thing you could do, if you think about this, is you could then have athletics or recreation, or whatever you want to call it, report on the academic side, which would also change people's concepts about this. Because one of the things I've found—I think I've mentioned this to you—is how people who care about these issues operate on stereotypes. They have a lot of passion about them but they really don't have a real understanding of what's going on almost at any level. And I wonder what that would be like, if you move this over to the academic side.

02-01:05:08

Sandbrook: Well, given the most recent episode on the Berkeley campus, that just about the nomenclature used and the organizational classification of the athletic department as an auxiliary enterprise vis-à-vis student services, I think you would probably run into the buzz saw of that segment of the faculty who does

not want any money going to those type of participatory sports when there are budgetary challenges, be it in history or law or optometry, or whatever. So I think in an ideal world what you're suggesting makes a lot of sense. But I think the concern I would have in the practical world is given the concern that people have about if you've only got so much money what are the priorities, would money going to this type of athletic-oriented academic program be more important than an expansion of the Mideast Studies Program? And that's the issue.

02-01:06:33

Cummins: Of course, of course. Yes. But at least you would have faculty fighting faculty over these issues. [laughing]

02-01:06:41

Sandbrook: Well, the question would be—would the faculty in this academic unit be tenured faculty—

02-01:06:45

Cummins: Oh yes.

02-01:06:48

Sandbrook: —with doctoral programs in their CV? I'm not sure where you would get the pool of people who'd want to give—obviously there could be a split appointment. You have history in this department plus history or whatever, but I think it's like the whole argument about you didn't have free-standing ethnic studies departments because the concern was that the fact—you wanted a broader pool of faculty, and they needed to be so enmeshed in the departments. Now, that clearly has changed.

02-01:07:27

Cummins: Right. Well, if you had—we have faculty on the campus that are currently studying concussions, which is a very prominent issue right now. We have others that are studying knee injuries and things, and you would have a ton of people who are doing this.

02-01:07:44

Sandbrook: Oh yeah, and probably—any significant medical school would have a significant program in orthopedic surgery, right?

02-01:07:50

Cummins: Exactly, exactly.

02-01:07:52

Sandbrook: Certain schools will have nutrition science or—as you put it, physiology. So yeah—I think what you're saying makes—

02-01:08:03

Cummins: You can envision it.

02-01:08:06

Sandbrook: Yeah.

02-01:08:06

Cummins: Yeah, you could envision it. Because what I'm looking for here, in terms of doing all this work, is what you could do to change something, to change the dynamic from the kind of repetition, year after year after year of these kinds of events that occurred at Berkeley. I told Brian Barsky, the professor that has been leading the charge, that basically he's an actor in a play, and this play has been acting itself out for a hundred and fifty years. [laughing] There isn't anything terribly new about it. And that was news to him. He admitted—seriously, he said, "I'm totally naïve. I don't know anything about athletics. I have never even been on a[n] Academic Senate committee." It's a very interesting—the politics of what they did, the seven faculty members that signed this resolution, fit into that framework—the naïve faculty. And they're back there in the late 1800s at Yale saying wait a second.

02-01:09:18

Sandbrook: It's no different than, going back to what I said to you earlier about the 1976 Pac-8 to Pac-10 extension. And there you had the president of Stanford, with little information but just reacting on prejudices, that Arizona is still a cowboy state.

02-01:09:37

Cummins: That's right. That same—exactly.

02-01:09:40

Sandbrook: So that happens at all levels, unfortunately.

02-01:09:44

Cummins: Yes, it does, it does. Okay. So I wanted to at least get that on here. Now, you had started to talk about the connection between the donor community and athletics, and we've referenced this indirectly, for example, with UC San Diego not having this and doing exceptionally well. So what's your take on that? And anything that you might want to say on a comparative basis vis-à-vis UCLA and Berkeley. We talked a little bit about this in the first interview too, but what's your take on that?

02-01:10:22

Sandbrook: Well, there clearly are going to be examples of people who give money only for intercollegiate athletics. But I think by and large the sources of major money understand that if they're giving to a university they're going to give to it for the right reasons. Now, there are multiple donors at UCLA who have given significant amounts of money for either capital projects or endowed scholarships at the UCLA athletic department who have also given millions of dollars to the business school, the medical school, the engineering school, or the arts and sciences program. Casey Wasserman has pledged \$20 million for the redo of Pauley Pavilion. His foundation is also building a brand-new research building for ophthalmology. He has given millions of dollars for

scholarships, undergraduate scholarships in letters and science. So generally, in most cases, athletics becomes part of the overall pie. It's not a driver. Richard Ziman, who ironically is a USC graduate, got involved in the athletic program at UCLA only after he had been recruited to be the major benefactor to the tune of \$8 million at the business school and set up the Ziman Center for Real Estate. Then he got involved in athletics. He saw that, wanted to go to the basketball games and enjoyed that experience. So generally, there's a complementary relationship. Will there be situations that it's really athletically driven? Yeah. At USC the Galen family gave \$35 million to help build the basketball arena, right? But it's—

02-01:12:39

Cummins: It's an interesting point. It's just part of the picture, in other words. You said it's not a *driver*.

02-01:12:48

Sandbrook: No, no. For certain people could it be? Yes. There are certain institutions—Auburn University is often a poster child where that seems to be the case. I don't think, at least in California, that's the case—even at USC. It becomes part of the icing on the cake to help cement relationships. Now, sometimes it is difficult to get the athletic department to fully cooperate, of giving up some premium tickets for the hundred-million-dollar donor in letters & science or medicine, and that's where you need to have a lot of balance coming out of the chancellor or president's office about making those type of adjustments and *telling* people what to do. A lot of times the athletic director understands and he works closely with the medical school dean or the provost of the college or whatever, but sometimes that doesn't always happen as smoothly as one would like, and a president's office or chancellor's office has to step in and play Solomon.

But I think the real ch[allenge]—for example, at UCLA, the individual who is the director of development in the athletic department is split-funded with the overall campus development office, so that person reports to two masters: the director of athletics and the director of development for the campus as a whole. The same thing is true at UCLA in the athletic tutoring.

02-01:14:32

Cummins: So it's a joint appointment?

02-01:14:35

Sandbrook: The athletic tutoring staff at UCLA is part of the staff of the College of [Letters and Science] counseling. Now, on a full-time basis they may be down in the athletic department building, but they are part of the overall staff of the head of academic counseling in the College of Letters and Science.

02-01:14:58

Cummins: Which is where it should be.

- 02-01:15:02
Sandbrook: Yeah, now twenty years ago that probably wasn't the case.
- 02-01:15:08
Cummins: And what about the medical program, sports medicine? Where is the reporting line there? Is it to somebody in the medical school? Or is it—because at Cal it's at the Tang Center. It's basically—the head team physician is an employee of the Tang Center.
- 02-01:15:27
Sandbrook: Of the student health service?
- 02-01:15:30
Cummins: Of the student health service.
- 02-01:15:30
Sandbrook: Yeah, well see—that's because you don't have a medical school.
- 02-01:15:34
Cummins: Yeah, I know, so that's why I wondered what is the connection and how does it work? Because I think there's a—some ADs—I don't think this happens very often, but some ADs would like that head team physician to report to them, which I think would create a conflict of interest.
- 02-01:15:48
Sandbrook: Right, you have the conflict of interest. No, it's basically a joint appointment. The chair of the Department of Orthopedic Surgery was for many years the head team physician. There's a Sports Medicine Program inside the School of Medicine. But the athletic department *could* jettison all of that if they wanted to contract with Saint John's [Health] Center in Santa Monica, that would be their prerogative. I think the chancellor would probably slap the athletic director around. But there is no medical school at UC Davis. There is no medical school at—well, at UC Berkeley, as you know.
- 02-01:16:43
Cummins: Yes, absolutely.
- 02-01:16:44
Sandbrook: So it's possible to do that. The Cal State campuses—
- 02-01:16:47
Cummins: Don't have a [medical school].
- 02-01:16:48
Sandbrook: Don't have a medical school. In your case, what you're saying at Berkeley is your student health staff includes somebody who gets appointed team physician.
- 02-01:16:59
Cummins: Yes, and there's others that have—I think it's actually a small number. It's something like 1.6 FTE at Cal for dealing with Intercollegiate Athletics, and

then they rely on a lot of volunteer docs to help. But Cindy Chang—I don't know if you ever met her. She was the head team physician from '94 to 2008. She did her residency at UCLA in sports medicine and also at Ohio State—got her MD from Ohio State. One of the interesting points she makes is that until 1991 there was never an American [Medical] Society [for] Sports Medicine.

02-01:17:51

Sandbrook: Right.

02-01:17:51

Cummins: That's when that came in. So the big focus was always on orthopedics and not the broader picture, and there was a real shift then that occurred there. So anyway—

02-01:18:04

Sandbrook: I think, going back to my comment about could the athletic director just say I'm going to contract with Saint John's—I think before the athletic director could do that you would have issues from the insurance and risk management side, because if the university is going to be responsible through general coverage for insurance issues, then who's providing the medical care presumably would need to be "certified" by the university in some way. Just like, for example, if the athletic director said they wanted to use a private law firm to draw up its coaches' contracts and those contracts would be binding upon the Regents of the University, then obviously there's going to have to be some other approval process to oversee that.

02-01:19:05

Cummins: Yes, exactly. Okay. I think we've covered all the points that I had. Did you want to make any other—anything we might have missed, anything you want to say about this general issue?

02-01:19:21

Sandbrook: No, no. There clearly is, whether or not you want to use the word *inconsistency* or *hypocrisy*, there's a lot of that characteristic that I think applies to Intercollegiate Athletics. I think that there is a lot of benign neglect about it at the university executive level that—

02-01:19:47

Cummins: Well, let's talk a little bit about that, because Chuck—I think I told you this—but Chuck said in his interview, in so many words, that he served on the Knight Commission from the beginning, is still on the Knight Commission, and said at a recent meeting that he could see very little difference that they actually made over all those years. That's a very interesting statement. Would you agree with that?

02-01:20:18

Sandbrook: The Knight Commission itself is not taken seriously. Have there been improvements in academic aspects of the administration of intercollegiate athletics? I would think the answer is yes to that.

02-01:20:33

Cummins: The APR? [Academic Progress Rate]

02-01:20:33

Sandbrook: Yeah, right. I think the idea that the last two presidents of the NCAA were university presidents is better than an athletic administrator being president of the NCAA.

02-01:20:55

Cummins: Although some of the research would certainly show, and this is what athletic directors believe, I think—a number of them and Murray Sperber, for example, and a lot of the people that do research in this area do—once the presidents and chancellors took over the NCAA, in the mid-nineties, things have gotten worse. They haven't gotten better, in terms of—the big money, et cetera.

02-01:21:23

Sandbrook: Well, I think—

02-01:21:24

Cummins: And that they're the last people that can lead reform, because they're too conflicted. That's the other side of this.

02-01:21:29

Sandbrook: Yeah, I think that there's Jim Duderstadt as the classic example of somebody in conflict. There you have him leading the University of Michigan, and all of its aggressiveness in intercollegiate athletics. And a few years after he steps down from the presidency he writes a book that basically bares his soul about his own conflicts about it, et cetera, et cetera. Sometimes it's very difficult for an individual, particularly if they come in not with a lot of prior understanding or experience about the enterprise, and then—how important is it to deal with? A lot of people just use the metric—is the financial statement in the black or in the red? as their metric. If it's in the black, why do I need to really worry about it? Well, Gordon Gee had a lot of financial statements in the black, but right now he's having to worry about it.

02-01:22:37

Cummins: Exactly, exactly right.

02-01:22:42

Sandbrook: I think a lot of that depends upon the individual attitude of the presidents and chancellors. In the case of Gene Block, the current UCLA chancellor, I think he's probably pretty clueless about this stuff.

02-01:23:02

Cummins: But would you, for example—

02-01:23:03

Sandbrook: What, in the case of Berkeley?

02-01:23:05

Cummins: Yeah.

02-01:23:06

Sandbrook: I think Bob Birgeneau was probably much more engaged than Al Bowker would have been forty years ago.

02-01:23:14

Cummins: Yes. I would say he's engaged—but I don't know how knowledgeable he is. In other words, he's engaged; Tien was engaged—but nobody was engaged like Chuck Young was engaged, right?

02-01:23:30

Sandbrook: { In his last year. }

02-01:23:31

Cummins: And so for Chuck to make a statement like I said, that's a pretty amazing statement. So it's—I think you can say on the one hand that things have remained—that this play metaphor that I used I think is true. You can see this playing out, all the major themes, all the major controversies, concerns, et cetera. What has changed the most is this ballooning empire of intercollegiate athletics and the fact that nobody thinks they can really get this thing under control or they wouldn't know what to do.

02-01:24:13

Sandbrook: Well see, to me, I think it's a little bit like, to put it in the context of foreign affairs, if you have let's say—to me the Knight Foundation is no different than the Brookings Institution. The Brookings Institution would have a lot of bright minds and they could write a very analytical, thoughtful document that provides the pathway towards how to solve the Israeli-Palestinian issue. But politics being what it is, both domestically and foreign-wise, it's never going to change. And so to me, Chuck is probably like somebody at the Brookings Institution who has written on Palestinian-Israeli affairs for twenty years and would say nothing has really changed.

02-01:25:11

Cummins: Yeah, I think that's right. I think that's right. Anyway, it's very interesting.

02-01:25:20

Sandbrook: Yeah, but—the problem is that a lot of times things like this are not easy to gauge progress. Yeah, I'm not so sure I would—I thought the expectations that he and others had of what the Knight Foundation might accomplish were overstated and exaggerated from the get-go and not realistic. They don't really get any credence from the sports press or anybody else.

02-01:25:59

Cummins: Well, none of these organizations do. So if you look at the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, COIA, the other efforts—if you look at these reform efforts—and that's part of the history here—none of them have made much of a [difference].

02-01:26:14

Sandbrook:

Well, unless and until something is directly related or co-related with the ability to perform on the field, be it the “death penalty” in terms of an infraction or the suspension of a team—like for example the famous incident at Ohio State or at Auburn last year. Should Cam Newton [have] been allowed to play in the BCS game, or the five Ohio State players? Until you take something like that and dramatically say we’re taking these away—no, I don’t think people are going to pay attention to it. And that—

02-01:26:52

Cummins:

So what would you advise then, the chancellor/president who’s coming in, about intercollegiate athletics?

02-01:26:58

Sandbrook:

At what campus?

02-01:26:59

Cummins:

Any one.

02-01:27:01

Sandbrook:

Well, I think it depends a lot on the campus.

02-01:27:01

Cummins:

Well, maybe—for example, here’s what—I’m going to be meeting with John Wilton, who’s the new vice chancellor in about a week. And so I’ve been keeping a list of things—I haven’t shown him this or anything, so just to you—and part of the list is: here are the things you need to know about intercollegiate athletics nationally, the history, et cetera, and what’s going on; here are the things you need to know about Berkeley specifically. So one of those items is that this Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics—and that grew out of the Senate resolution and this donor/faculty committee [Chancellor’s Advisory Council on Intercollegiate Athletics Financial Sustainability] both issued reports. They both say that the chancellor and the appropriate vice chancellor and the AD should lead an effort to reform, to get costs under control.

My advice to them would be don’t do that. You’re wasting your time. This is way bigger than anything that you can do coming from Berkeley, and you’ve got many more other important things to worry about than intercollegiate athletics. So what you want to do is you want to run a clean program, you want to do the best you can to keep the costs under control. When you vote, when you have to take a position, an NCAA or a Pac-10 position, always vote on the side that is going to benefit the academics of the student athlete and not the other way around, in terms of number of games played and all of this kind of thing. Would you do that? Would you make a similar kind of recommendation down here or at Berkeley or whatever?

02-01:28:52

Sandbrook:

I think what I—I may be Pollyanna here, but what I would do is to say that there should be, on the campus and maybe throughout the UC System, a very clear set of policy statements about intercollegiate athletics. For example, that if you're going to work for the University of California in any coaching position, you would know in advance that at no time would your total compensation exceed—

02-01:29:31

Cummins:

Some number.

02-01:29:32

Sandbrook:

Well, a multiple of the highest-paid faculty member in the UC System. And I would use the *system*. I wouldn't say Berkeley versus {unclear}, because medical school faculties come into play. Whether or not that factor, that multiple, should be 1.0, 1.2, or whatever; that there would be no incentive payments in employment contracts for coaches if you get into a bowl game or not, all right? There is no incentive system for that. Stupid issues like car allowances should be consistent. And I think the strength of us as a system, the power of ten—

02-01:30:15

Cummins:

Of doing that, yes.

02-01:30:16

Sandbrook:

I just think everybody would benefit. Now, some schools don't have to worry about football—San Diego, Irvine, San Francisco, Santa Cruz, so maybe they don't care. But I just think it would be useful, even for the big two that—

02-01:30:33

Cummins:

And what chance do you think that would have, of—

02-01:30:37

Sandbrook:

If you had a—well, let me put it this way. If Chuck Young had become president of the University of California System or somebody—I could see him making that an agenda item. I've always been worried, if not disappointed, that there is no understanding or appreciation within our governing system, at the Board of Regents, about intercollegiate athletics.

02-01:31:09

Cummins:

Absolutely. Yeah, almost by design, right?

02-01:31:12

Sandbrook:

Yeah, since 1959 or '58, when they said you're going to become an auxiliary enterprise. And that wasn't so much the board, that was obviously [Clark] Kerr. But I think that—that has always troubled me. Now, God forbid, you went through this, I went through this from afar—you don't want a Dick Blum as a regent involved in messing around. So the separation of the Board of Regents from the athletic programs is nice to have when you have a bully member of the board such as Dick Blum, okay?

I just kind of—again, I’m too much of a Pollyanna I guess, but I would like for us to take on things as a system. I remember during the Kerr era there was this fantasy about whether or not, by the turn of the century there would no longer be a Pac-8, but that there would be a University of California Conference, right? And now that you see Davis with a 28,000 seat stadium trying to play football, whatever. And UCLA and UC Berkeley schedules the UC Irvines, the UC Riversides, the UC Santa Barbaras now, in men’s basketball, there’s a part of me that wishes that were to be the case. Would you still—Berkeley would still play Stanford in football in the big game; we would play USC. But aspiring to play for the BCS Championship? Who cares! So there’s a part of me that almost wishes that if you got a University of California president, I would even go so far that maybe part of the shake-up of public recognition of the UC System and appreciation for it might be aided if you had a new university president who basically came in and said he wanted UC Berkeley and UCLA to pull out of the Pac-12 and we’ll play among ourselves.

02-01:33:53

Cummins: Interesting. And what the financial implications of that would be.

02-01:34:00

Sandbrook: Well, you wouldn’t be paying—let’s put it this way. You probably would end up with a different head football coach at Berkeley, but again, I’m saying what’s the downside of that?

02-01:34:09

Cummins: Yeah, of course.

02-01:34:13

Sandbrook: I don’t see—when [Tom] Holmoe was the football coach he made a nice scarecrow to throw things at, but did that really affect the stature of the Berkeley campus?

02-01:34:29

Cummins: Not at all, absolutely.

02-01:34:32

Sandbrook: Now, what *did* affect the stature of the Berkeley campus—when your basketball coach back in the nineties got into hot water for not running a clean program.

02-01:34:40

Cummins: You bet, you bet. And when one of our faculty members was altering grades of—yeah. Okay. This is very helpful, John.

02-01:34:52

Sandbrook: All right. Well, good luck. We’ll see you at dinner.

02-01:34:55

Cummins: Thank you. Thank you very much.

02-01:34:57

Sandbrook: Hopefully everything can be transcribed completely.

02-01:35:00

Cummins: Absolutely. I think we got it. So I'm just going to turn this off.

[End of Interview]