

10-27-2006

Earle Traynham

Earle Traynham
University of North Florida

James B. Crooks
University of North Florida

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/unf_oral

 Part of the [Oral History Commons](#)

Suggested Citation

Traynham, Earle and Crooks, James B., "Earle Traynham" (2006). *Creating a University: UNF Oral History Project*. 7.
http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/unf_oral/7

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the UNF History at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Creating a University: UNF Oral History Project by an authorized administrator of UNF Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Digital Projects](#).

© 10-27-2006 All Rights Reserved

Interviewee: Earle Traynham

Interviewer: James Crooks

Date: 10/27/06

C: Today is October 27, 2006. It is UNF Oral History Interview Program, Jim Crooks speaking, interviewing Dr. Earle Traynham. Earle, a little background, tell us where you grew up, where you got your education and [so forth].

T: Okay, well I grew up in Greenville, South Carolina, and spent my entire life in the same house that I came home from the hospital to. Then I attended, after graduating from high school, Clemson University for two years, at which time I decided to major in business administration. Clemson didn't have a business program at that time; all they had was industrial management. I transferred to the University of South Carolina and completed my undergraduate studies there, and entered the MBA program, the Master of Business Administration program. So, I graduated in 1966, and went into the MBA program in 1967.

[I] finished in June of 1967 and had actually applied—of course, that was at the height of Vietnam—for Naval OCS [Officer Candidates School] and Air Force, I think it's called, OTS [Officer Training School]. I had not heard back from either one. I was offered an opportunity to teach in something called the College of General Studies, which is like a two-year school within a school there at South Carolina. So, I accepted that. In the fall of that year, I was notified by the Air Force that I had been accepted, but I said, "I'm in the middle of teaching. Can we delay this some?" They said, no. So, I passed on that opportunity and continued to teach. Later, I believe that same year, I think it was 1968, they actually had the lottery on the draft. I was very fortunate [that] I came up with a very high number. But I still had no real thought that I would teach for a career. This was just something to do. So, I started my second year teaching, though, and thought, well, as long I'm here, I might just go back to graduate school until I decide what I want to do. So, I re-enrolled in the doctoral program, again at the University of South Carolina, initially in business administration. I started that in January of 1969. Not too much later, I switched to economics, because it seemed like that was where my interest was. So, I continued on, and the more I taught, the more I actually liked it. I did that full-time, going to school part-time, until 1971. Then I quit to finish up my course work and [my] dissertation. So, I finished my Ph.D. in 1973 from South Carolina.

I interviewed at several places, but I had become friends with Steve Shapiro in the graduate program. We went to graduate school together. He had come down here the year prior. He encouraged me to come down and interview, which I did. They offered me a job. Joe Perry offered me a job as assistant professor and advisor. It was a twelve-month appointment, as I'm sure you recall, in the advising system back then. I took the job, and I have to say, it was so different from any school I had ever been at that the attraction of coming to a new school and building the school really wasn't one of my motivations. I've heard a lot of charter faculty members say, this is an exciting opportunity to come here and be a part of building a new school. I really came because they offered me a job, and I thought it would be interesting. I really did not think I would stay.

I thought I'd be here for a year or two. In fact, I had never even been to the state of Florida, until I came here to interview. I had sort of a negative impression about the entire state, not knowing anything about it. So, I came here, and was very pleasantly surprised. Jacksonville didn't fit my preconceived notions of what it was going to be like. I felt very comfortable here. I liked it better than I thought. [I] still thought I would probably go back maybe to the Carolinas. I was from South Carolina, my wife was from North Carolina and both of us thought we would end up back there. But anyway, I ended up, obviously, staying here a very long time.

Through the years, I did the advising for the first three years, then when I was promoted to associate professor, I stopped being an academic advisor. I was a little uncomfortable, to be honest with you, being an academic advisor. Not that I didn't enjoy the interaction of the students, but at that time, there were very few economics majors. And I just felt like... It wasn't a fair assignment. I had other colleagues, who were either management advisors or marketing advisors, and they would have eighty-five advisees or something. I had twelve. I just felt uncomfortable getting the same course releases that they got for a job that was not quite as much. While I enjoyed it – and I wasn't interested in advising non-economic majors – so I just felt like I'd be more comfortable feeling like I'm earning my income by being a full time faculty member. So that's really why I stopped back in 1976.

C: Let me stop you here and ask you about that advising system. How did you feel about it in terms of the way it worked compared to what it changed to later on?

T: I actually liked the advising system that we had then. Almost all of us were new, young Ph.D.s, and, at the time, I thought it was good for the students. It put them in touch with advisors who were probably very well qualified in terms of the discipline [and who] were young enough that they related well to students easily. So, I thought it was good. Over time, I realized that there was a growing expense to this type of system. So, over time I felt like it needed to change. Advising was something that had become very expensive when one gets to be an associate or full professor. I think my attitude toward it changed over time. At the time, I was young; everybody was young. It seemed like a good idea, but, to me, it became more of a luxury, an expensive system.

C: The University couldn't afford luxuries.

T: That's right. And times were good for this university, again. Increasingly. From my perspective as an assistant professor, the university seemed to be well-funded in those Earley years. I guess there was acceptance that there are certain start up costs and classes are going to be small. Advising loads are going to be smaller than they might otherwise be. And so, it was, in a way, a very idealistic place to be. And that was all very nice. But, over time, of course, as you said, universities can't very well afford some of these luxuries. They can't afford small classes. They can't afford advisors who are being paid what some of our full professors came to be paid. I do think it needed to change.

- C: What was your impression of students initially compared to students you had in South Carolina?
- T: Wow. What a change! First off, they only came to school at night. They were all my age or older. Most of them brought considerable business experience with them and a degree of seriousness that I wasn't accustomed to from South Carolina. Most students at South Carolina were traditional age, very focused on extracurricular activities, whether that was football or fraternities or sororities or their social life or whatever. School was something that you did preferably in the morning to get it out of the way. Here it was totally different. Daytime was quiet. The school was quiet. Students came to the school at night, and they came typically from full-time jobs, with families. They were very focused on finishing their studies. So, on the whole, I was very impressed by them and thought that the classroom experience here was a richer experience for everybody, not just the students, but the faculty members. I can remember being challenged over comments that I would make by students, who were, in some cases, vice presidents of large companies here in town. And I was teaching maybe a graduate course or something. And as often as not, found out they were correct and I was incorrect. It was a learning experience for me as well.
- C: Were they prepared?
- T: Some were and some weren't. I'm not going to say they were all really good students, but they were focused on their classes and, as a rule, pretty well-prepared, I thought.
- C: Fast-forward to the present. How do students compare now, other than the age factor, with students then?
- T: Well, I think, of course, as the university has evolved, we have two different student bodies here. We still have an evening student body not unlike the one we had then, particularly at the graduate level. They bring a lot of years of experience with them. They are very focused on getting that degree. I don't necessarily like it if someone has to miss a class or something like that. So, that part of it has pretty much stayed the same. But, there is this whole daytime student body here that is much more traditional. I think, they're not as serious or as focused on their studies as any of us would like. I don't know that they're any worse than the students were at a place like South Carolina during the day. We probably have been somewhat spoiled by these nighttime, more serious, older, more mature students. And then we'd see the younger ones and think the students are not as good as they used to be, but they're probably like they always used to be, at that age.
- C: What was your initial impression of your colleagues, the faculty?
- T: I liked them all. We've been, I think, fortunate. I've always considered it lucky, looking back on it. I didn't necessarily consider it lucky then, because you take things for granted. Looking back on it, I considered it very lucky to have come to UNF at a time when I did, because there were so many people starting out. So many people who were young, assistant professors. We all got to know each

other—and not just in the department or even in the College—but at that time, as you know, you felt like you knew everybody on the faculty. Since we were all young and all starting out, trying to establish our careers and so forth, we had things in common. On a personal level, I really liked most of my colleagues. We socialized together, because none of us knew anybody in Jacksonville. We were all new to the town. So, since we were all new, it was easy to make friends with each other and so we socialized with each other.

C: Professionally, did you think your colleagues were on a par with your colleagues at South Carolina?

T: Some were, and some weren't. We had very, very good people here that not only was I friends with but did research with. I did a lot with Ken Jennings and Jay Smith, two of the most profuctive people we have ever had in the college in terms of research and grant acquisition. I would say that those two people would be on a par with anybody I knew anywhere. Jay's actually retired. He went on to be a dean and then an endowed professor at another university. Ken, I'm sure, could have gone to a number of places but actually liked it here and wanted to stay here. So those two people were, I think, were on a par with other people. There were others, maybe not quite like them, but others who were very productive in the research output and very good in the classroom. In general, I would say that the faculty here have tended to be very devoted to their classrooms. They've always done a good job in the classroom. Some have been more productive in research than others.

C: In the beginning, was there much emphasis in the College of the Business on research?

T: No, there wasn't. I can remember having conversations with the founding dean, Jim Parrish, and he said, "Well, we say we want to be a different kind of place, and we want to emphasize teaching, and be a premiere teaching institution. But," he said, "I've always found that it's necessary to do research. My advice to people is to do some. How much is going to be necessary here? I don't know, but I always advise people to do some." And even the dean at South Carolina gave me advice: "No matter what people say about being a teaching institution, do some research. In essence, they will reward people who are mobile, who can get jobs somewhere else. And if you don't publish, you're not going to be worth anything to them or to anyone else." So, in my case, I've tried to follow that advice. I'd say it served me well. Other people really did focus just on teaching and did not do research. I think they had more frustrations because, as you know, as the university evolved, it has put increasing emphasis on research output.

C: And there's also the fact that people say that research influences and improves teaching in many cases.

T: And I think that's true in almost all cases. If you're not actively engaged in some kind of scholarship pursuit – and it's hard to demonstrate that you are if you're not publishing – if you're not involved actively in scholarship, you ten to get stale

even as a teacher. So, to me, they are very complementary. One nice thing, even though we have increased our emphasis dramatically over the last thirty years, but gradually and continuously over the last thirty years, on scholarship, it has been almost always with a view toward how does it complement what goes on in the classroom. In [the College of] Business, for example, we have very few faculty members who are engaged in pure theoretical research. It's almost always applied, which comes right back to the classroom, I think, to make you a better teacher.

C: Any stand-out moments as a teacher in the classroom or with students that you can remember? Were there particular satisfactions from teaching? You say you enjoy teaching.

T: Yeah, I do enjoy teaching. You always get a sense of satisfaction when a student either changes their major to your field, or decides to go on to a doctoral program because they indicate that you had some influence on them, or indeed, even if they get out and go into business, and after several years, they say they remembered your class, and they found that what you taught them in class was beneficial to them. So, I've had two or three students over the years that have given me that kind of feedback. Then I've had students that I just particularly liked. I remember Jim Rice who was a vice president of CSX. He was one that I had in a graduate class that I really enjoyed. He was one, in particular, who used to challenge me occasionally on my assertions about regulated industries being non-innovative or whatever. He gave me the railroad perspective on regulated industry. We actually maintained a relationship after he graduated.

C: Did you have any transfer students from Florida or Florida State?

T: Yes. I mean, I can't tell you names and so forth, but that was another thing that, over the years, it was always nice to see a student who had transferred from Florida or Florida State to come to UNF and then tell you how much more they were getting out of their classes here than they did there, because of either the small class size or the fact that the faculty members actually were willing to spend time outside of class. That was always, in a way, surprising feedback, because, again, I came to this school with a bias that big schools had to be better, small schools and old schools had to be better than new schools, and to have students come back and tell me, wow, I'm learning so much more in my classes here than I did at Florida or Florida State, or Georgia, or some other larger, older institution. Again, I was slow to process all of this. You know what? At the undergraduate level... I came to believe that at the undergraduate level we really do a better job than many of these schools. Probably even than in South Carolina, although it wasn't as obvious as it was for Florida or Florida State, because the students were coming back. It made me, over the years, change my thinking about what makes for a quality undergraduate educational environment. It's not bigness, and it's not oldness, and it's not good football teams. It's interaction between the faculty and the students, making eye-contact with them and so forth. All these are things, at least up to now, that UNF has

done a pretty good job of hanging on to in creating that kind of environment. Over the years, [I've] become a much bigger advocate for UNF and schools like this, particularly at the undergraduate level.

C: The reason for that question is, all the way along, we're trying to assess how good are we? Because this bias built in on many people's part, the "Oh, we're great" or whatever. What's the evidence? Stories like that, which you're not unique in, tell us that students are giving us the kind of feedback that you've described. You were also involved in the community. You were at JCCI at one stage. What prompted you to do that, because not a lot of faculty got involved in the community?

T: No, you remember, there was a guy here named George de Tarnowski. George was in political science, at the time. I'm pretty sure it was his invitation to get involved with the predecessor organization to JCCI. I'm trying to remember now what it was. It was in the DuPont Building over on Riverside [Avenue]. So I did. You know, I just enjoyed meeting people in the community, and I got involved a little bit with that. Of course, once the JCCI was created, I joined that and participated in a number of study committees. I've just always had an interest in meeting people in the community, meeting people downtown, so to speak, and learning more about the community. Again, that to me was one of those things that I considered myself just fortunate that it happened, that it evolved, that I had an opportunity to chair a study committee one time. That was a nice experience. Then the University offered me the opportunity to be their representative in Leadership Jacksonville Earley on. That was a nice experience because I got to meet, again, a lot of people, a cross section of the community. I can't tell you why I did those things, except that I just enjoyed meeting people off-campus.

C: You're fairly unique, I would guess, among the faculty in this regard? Would you say that half your college faculty were involved in the community? Or a quarter?

T: Probably closer to a quarter. A lot of people were very content to have most of their life here, and maybe other organizations, whether it's Boy Scouts, Church, Little League, and so forth. I just enjoyed interacting with different people in the community. I chose that route, and had some opportunities that were great.

C: As a faculty member, you were obviously involved in the Faculty Association committees and such. Any memories stand out there with involvement, whether its in terms of creating the constitution of the Faculty Association, of Tom Mongar largely, or were there other committees, Strategic Planning or any of those, that stand out in your memory?

T: No. Again, for a number of years, I was on the Faculty Affairs Committee, during that period. Then, I served on the Promotion and Tenure Committee once, Earley on, at the university level. But, in the Earley 1980s, I got involved in academic administration, and my focus turned more toward the College and the community and little less toward the Faculty Association. So, a lot of my Faculty Association involvement was up through the mid-[19]80s or so and not much beyond that. Maybe a little bit beyond that. After that it was much more heavily

focused inside the College and in the community. I don't have any stand-out thoughts about the Faculty Association. It's always been an interesting governance structure to me. At times, I've appreciated it more than others, I suppose.

C: Let's shift to the administration. What happened in the Earley 1980s?

T: Yeah, actually, I had an interest in getting involved in academic administration from about 1980 on. In fact, even at one time, I was in a department where the department chairman, Joe Perry, who was about eight years older than I was. So, I was pretty sure Joe was not going to go anywhere for a long time. It turned out, of course, to be correct. He stayed here until he retired. I actually started looking at other schools, with the possibility of maybe being a department chairman somewhere, and interviewed. I was offered and accepted a job at Western Carolina University as department chair. I forget the year. It was 1981 or something like that. [I] was on a house-hunting trip up there. [I] had already turned in my letter of resignation here. Jim Parrish was still the dean. I got up there to learn that the dean had accepted a job somewhere in Michigan and was leaving, and the person that he selected as the interim dean, while he was a nice person, wouldn't provide the kind of leadership I thought I wanted to work for. So, I called Jim Parrish Sunday morning from Waynesville, North Carolina, to ask him if I could tear up my letter of resignation and come back or not leave. He said, yes, of course.

That whole episode really made me uneasy, just because it was the first time I had ever done anything like that. Once you resign, it's almost like having a terminal disease. You and your colleagues start building these separation areas to prepare for the separation and it's an emotional thing, I guess. That process had already begun. I had sensed it. I thought that tearing up a letter may not take away those barriers that had begun to build. I didn't know how people would accept that. But, again, I was very fortunate. It turned out fine.

Within about a year and a half or so, Jim Parrish offered me the job as assistant dean and director of graduate studies to replace Dick Kipp, who was retiring. It gave me an opportunity to get involved in academic administration, to stay here, and all of my personal relationships with my colleagues seemed to be fine. So all of that worked out well. I enjoyed that. It was really very challenging for the first several years, because Dick Kipp, who had so many wonderful qualities, had made an enormous number of admission decisions which were exceptions to our admissions policy. I think his view was... I used to kid him about this... if you can't be a Wharton, which is where he got his degree, then you shouldn't be so selective, and you should allow people to come in and prove their ability to survive. While that's a good philosophy and everything, it doesn't sit well with your accrediting associations who say that you should have a certain type of admission standards. Jim Parrish, by the way, knew this was the case. We were coming up for re-accreditation in about four years, and it really took me two years to get our admissions back to within the guidelines of our accrediting

association. That was a good experience for me. Plus, I was back advising at that time. The director of graduate studies was also the advisor, and about 400 and some odd MBA students. My Earleier concerns about advising only twelve economics majors went away. I had so many advisees, I didn't know what to do. Fortunately, most of the graduate students didn't require much face time in advising. Still, it was a big load to do all their admissions and all their advising and all their transcript evaluations. They put in place processes that would allow us to actually monitor the admissions.

C: You mentioned accreditation, and coming up for re-accreditation. Explain to me the importance of accreditation for a College of Business. Does this mean a minimal standard of performance, or is it a sign of excellence? What does accreditation mean?

T: For a school like UNF, to be accredited by, at that time what was called the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, AACSB – they kept the letters but changed the name – was a mark of quality. They would say that they enforced certain minimum standards. They hoped that the schools would exceed those standards, but every good business school in the country is AACSB accredited. Frank McLaughlin used to say accreditation doesn't mean you're excellent, but if you have a list of all the business schools in the country, and you separated them into two lists, those that are accredited by the AACSB, and those that are not, you'd rather be on the list of those that are. By and large, that includes every good school in the country. There may be some that are mediocre, but all the good ones are there. There's not a single good one on the non-accredited list. For a school like UNF that is new, has no image... As you know, we didn't have an image in the city of Jacksonville. We were confused with the community college, it was then Florida Junior College, or with the University of Florida, being a branch or something. [We] didn't have an image in our own town. No one outside of Jacksonville even knew we existed. For us, it was extremely important to get that accreditation, or that seal of approval. Of course, once you get it, the worst thing is to lose it. It's maybe worse than never having it. So, we've always put a lot of emphasis on meeting and indeed exceeding the requirements of the AACSB. Jim Parrish, that was really one of the reasons he was hired. He had led two different schools through their initial accreditation prior to coming here. In fact, he got us accredited in about the shortest time possible. We had to graduate at least one entering class, which for us meant since we opened in 1972 – even though we had a few people graduating in 1973, the class didn't graduate until 1974 – I think maybe you had to graduate two classes. We got accredited in 1976, which was the shortest period of time possible under AACSB rules. We got our undergraduate accreditation. Back then you could do an undergraduate. We got graduate in 1978. So, we were coming up for reaccreditation in 1987, and Parrish knew that a lot of work needed to be done with the graduate program in order to get it back into shape.

C: How long did you stay in as associate dean?

T: Ten years, from 1983 to 1993. It started out, he actually hired Franklin McLaughlin and myself as assistant deans. Frank did a lot of the academic stuff and focused primarily in the undergraduate program. I did the graduate. We were both assistant deans. He even said to us when we were hired, “You each should have the title of associate dean, but, for whatever reason, when I hired Dick Kipp and made him assistant dean, and I don’t want, in any way, for him to be insulted by me hiring the two of you, neither...” – he didn’t say this – “neither of whom is as qualified as Dick Kipp, by giving you the title of associate when he was only assistant.” He says, “Let’s leave it alone for awhile, then we’ll get it changed.” Well, that was fine with us. In Frank’s case, he may have known better. But I didn’t know any better. Assistant dean sounded fine to me. I never thought about the distinction. Anyway, in a few years, it was changed to associate dean, but the duty stayed the same. I stayed in my job for ten years. He left, of course, retired. After Frank was interim for one year, we hired Ed Moses. Ed made a change with Joe Perry, his department chair, in 1987, and asked me if I would serve as department chair. So I did that also for six years.

C: In addition to [being associate dean]?

T: Yeah. It was a small department at that time. He just asked me if I would do it. It was acceptable to the department. I served as department chair, although I was housed in the dean’s office. I did that for six years as well from 1987 to 1993. And, of course, I became the interim dean of the college and stopped being department chair.

C: Where did Ed Johnson fit in this?

T: Ed Moses was the dean from 1985 to 1989. Then we hired Ed Johnson. He was the dean from 1989 to 1993. He resigned. Then I was appointed interim dean by Adam Herbert. We searched for the job, and I became dean in 1994.

C: And you retired from that when?

T: In 2003.

C: You basically did it for ten years.

T: That’s right. I was dean for ten years. When I became dean, I am kind of a goal-oriented person, and there were specific goals that I had. We had two things in particular facing us at the time. One was a new building, which we had begun the process – hadn’t broken ground or anything – but begun the process. Frank was very much involved in that. He led a committee that helped provide information and design information to the architects. But we had said from the very beginning in building this building that we wanted to raise private money to equip it to make it a state-of-the-art facility. And we knew the state wouldn’t provide that kind of money. So, that was one goal, to get this building built and get it furnished and equipped like we wanted to. Ed Johnson had already mentioned the goal of two and a half million dollars. It wasn’t really based on sitting down and making a list of what we needed and adding up the prices. And he never really shared with me where he got that goal. It was just there, floating

around. Since I wasn't responsible for raising any of the money at the time as associate dean, it was fine. But that was one, to raise money for the building. The second was... This was 1993, and we had our reaccreditation effort coming up in 1997. All the standards had changed. The processes had changed since the last time we went through it in 1987. So, there was concern about whether we would meet the new standards and so forth. Those were the two primary things. I really thought I would take the job and try to get through those things and then would stop and go back into a regular faculty position. I had really grown tired of being associate dean and Frank and I had had conversations for about two years about going back to a full-time faculty position, because we had just done this. I really believe someone shouldn't be associate dean for ten years, because it's kind of hard to keep your batteries charged for that long in a staff position. I was ready, probably from about 1991 or so on, or maybe 1990, to go back to a regular faculty position. I thought I would be dean for maybe five years to get us through accreditation and the building.

We did launch, what I'll call now, a small capital campaign for the building. Again, I've been very lucky in my career. I was fortunate to have Elizabeth Head as my development officer. She is just excellent and knows this community very well. She and I worked very well together. She's the kind of person that can be very assertive and tell you exactly what she thinks. That worked well for me to have somebody telling me, you need to do this, and you need to do that. You need to spend more time on this. We worked well together. Neither of us had ever been involved in a major fund-raising campaign. Indeed, if you remember, the University had never been involved in a major fund-raising campaign. We looked for help in other offices. We were just told, you know, there's not resources here to help you.

C: Julia Taylor was just beginning at the university level then, I guess.

T: Yes, she was.

C: She had done fund-raising in the college before Elizabeth.

T: That's right. She was Ed Moses's development officer. She did that for four years. When Ed Johnson was hired, Julia Taylor went over to Institutional Advancement, and Elizabeth Head was hired.

C: Had either of the Eds done much fund-raising?

T: Yes. They both had really laid the groundwork, which was critical. Ed Moses started the Business Affiliates Program, which was the first organized attempt to try to get the business community involved in a financial way supporting our college. He started with probably fifteen companies that gave about \$500 a year to be business affiliates. He began to expand that. I don't know what the number was up to, no more than 25 or so businesses by the time he left four years later.

Ed Johnson came. He had a very strong background in fund-raising. While Ed got a couple of larger gifts, primarily what he was able to do was to expand the number of business affiliates from twenty-five to about 100 by the

time he left. That was critical in two respects. One, all of these donations... And by the way, some firms gave more than \$500. They'd give \$1,000, and some like CSX and, at that time, Barnett Bank, were giving as much as \$2,000. This was bringing in about \$100,000 a year to the College, of discretionary money. Having been in administration, you know that discretionary money is hard to come by and very valuable. The College actually had sort of a war chest built up of, I can't remember exactly, but I'm going to say about \$250,000 in a [UNF] Foundation account. Had we not had these 100 business affiliates and the \$250,000, we never could have been successful in this fund-raising campaign for the building, because it turns out that every major gift we got was from a firm that had already been a business affiliate. You know, it's very difficult to walk in to someone you've never met and to ask them for 100,000 dollars or 500 or 300,000. So, by having them as business affiliates, they had already begun to invest in the College financially as well as emotionally. Professionally, they had begun to see this symbiotic relationship, because we used to tell them we're either teaching your current employees, many of them come back to school at night, or we're teaching your future employees. So, it's in your interest for us to do a good job and to be well-equipped. They had been hearing this for several years, so that really was critical for us.

I went over and asked for assistance with either hiring or consulting to help us with this fund raising campaign, or to even put out brochures and things like that, and was told, you know, we don't really have any resources for that. Elizabeth and I... You asked about moments you can remember. I can still remember sitting in my office with Elizabeth Head, and we said, "You know, if we hire this consultant..." And consultants we found out were just really expensive. We got this brochure which was going to be just a very slick copy and expensive brochure. We were looking at spending about \$200,000. We looked at each other and said, "Well, you know if we spend this \$200,000 and we don't raise this money, you know, we'd be fired, and we should. On the other hand, if we don't spend this money and we don't raise this money, we're going to get fired, and we should. Let's at least go down swinging." We really took some risks. We almost depleted the College's discretionary money to raise money for that capital campaign.

C: How much did the capital campaign raise?

T: In the end, it raised about \$3,000,000. It was successful in a number of ways, because, not only did we hit our goal, which is always important to hit your goal...

C: This was Ed's goal?

T: Yeah, this was Ed's goal, and later people said, how did you arrive at the two and a half million? I said it was established before me. I remember sitting down...

C: You remember sitting down.

T: Yeah, I remember sitting down with our plans now from the architect and putting price tags on spaces in the building. Of course, we were accustomed to asking people for \$500 or \$1,000. The thought of asking somebody for six figures made

everybody really nervous and made your stomach just get into a knot. I priced out what I thought I might could raise for various spaces in the building, like classrooms or offices or lobbies or auditoriums or whatever. [I] added it all up, and it added up to about 1.8 million dollars. I thought, "This won't work, because if I sell every space I've got here, I'm not going to hit my goal. I had to go back and raise prices and was really uneasy about that, because I thought nobody was going to give us that kind of money. It all worked out, again. The business community was extremely helpful. We had a chair of the campaign, Bobby Paul. He was very helpful to us in terms of talking to other people.

C: What was your reaction to the first client who gave you close to what you asked for? This wasn't Luther Coggin, I don't assume.

T: No, no it wasn't. I've told people before that being in administration, the highs are higher, and the lows are lower, than being a faculty member. It's one of the most exciting days of my life when, I think, Barnett Bank and First Union gifts came through at the same time. They were both six-figure gifts. I just was so excited, because I thought these people believed in us. They're willing to do this, and it sends a signal to other people. If they believe in us, then maybe you should, too. It took a long time for the first gifts to start coming in, but once they did, they came in at a good clip, the Stein family gave us the largest single gift.

C: Which Stein family?

T: The Martin Stein family. We named that auditorium the Martin Stein Auditorium. That was the largest single gift, I think, at 350,000 dollars. The gifts came in and exceeded our goal. Not only that, by the time we actually added up all the equipment and furniture that we needed, it all added up to about \$1.6 million, or maybe \$1.7 million. We were able to cover all of our administrative expenses that we had incurred; restore the College's discretionary fund, which was important, in other words to charge those expenses to the campaign, and we were also able to set aside, I think, about \$900,000, which became critical to us in hiring our tech support people that we needed.

The University at that time didn't provide any tech support to any college, and we had made the decision to go with Dell Computers and, at the time, the university said, if you do, you're on your own, because we only support IBMs. Dells, we thought, were better and much less expensive, at the time, than IBMs, so we made that decision. That meant we had to hire our own tech support person, because, here, for the first time, we went from an environment where we maybe had fifteen computers in a building to where we had maybe 200 computers in the building. So, we knew that we had to have tech support. So we hired our own tech support out of that extra \$900,000. Of course, that person began to build a staff. Fortunately, the University then started to hire tech support people for all the colleges and they took over that person's salary and we only had to pay eight people who were working for him. Then ultimately, I took, I think, \$600,000 and put it into a tech endowment, which is still spinning off money to help support technology in the building.

C: Did either Adam Herbert or Pierre Allaire help with the fund-raising at all, or was it all basically you and Elizabeth and Bobby Paul?

T: No, Adam helped. In fact, Adam went on the first call with me to Bobby Paul. As chairman, we felt we should call on him first for a gift, and he and I rehearsed what we were going to say. Julia and Elizabeth worked with us. “Adam, you focus on this, and Earle, you focus on that.” That’s probably the closest to being physically sick that I ever got. We were asking him for a large gift, and he and his wife, Pam, ultimately did make a very nice gift to us. I think Adam also was almost physically sick. He would probably deny that. He was nervous, and I was nervous. We got in there, and we did it, and it went fine. Bobby did not say yes right then, but later he and Pam did talk about it and did make a very nice gift.

C: It was personal and not corporate.

T: In that case, their’s was personal. That’s correct. Adam was absolutely essential with the Stein family, because he had already had a good relationship with Joanie Stein. I don’t think that would have happened without Adam. On selected people, Adam was very helpful. Adam’s presence in the community was an indirect help that you almost can’t measure, because, at that time, he was president of the Chamber [of Commerce] in that period. So people had already begun to change their whole attitude toward the University and all parts of the University. So, whether he went with me on a call, it would be unfair to say that his presence wasn’t always there. There were people who I’m sure that said yes to me because of the relationship they had with Adam.

C: What I find so remarkable is all these people, like Bobby Paul and others, had allegiances to other institutions, yet they were willing to support UNF and the College of Business.

T: We found a number of people like that. Another one is Leighton Smith, who was a retired broker with Solomon Brothers and retired to Ponte Vedra. John Rood, who is now Ambassador Rood, came on the advisory council that the College had when I was dean. Part of his role on the advisory council was to look around and see people that he thought might enjoy getting involved with the College. One of his partners – he used to form partnerships to build apartment buildings – led him to Leighton Smith, who invested with him. So, he arranged a luncheon for me to meet Leighton. Elizabeth and I had Leighton out to lunch, and this is when we were in Building 10. The new building was under construction. She and I are still very nervous about asking people for money, more than \$1,000. We had decided in our own minds that we were going to have this lunch with Leighton, talk to him about this business school and our hopes and dreams, and then follow up with another meeting where we would ask him for money. So, that made it nice. We weren’t tense. We had lunch in my office. We finished, and we were thinking, okay, this meeting is over. We don’t have to get tense until the next one. Leighton said, “Well, okay, that’s all fine. How much money do you want?” Well, we stumbled, we fumbled, because we really hadn’t agreed on an amount. I said, well, \$50,000. He said, well, give me a day. I think I can do

better than that. Sure enough, a day later, he called me back and said he and his wife would like to give us \$100,000. We laughed about that; he forced money on us. You know, there's another fellow, just took an interest in this school, and liked what we were doing, liked what he saw. His allegiance is that he attended Harvard. I'm sure he had things up there named for him. He and his wife later gave us a million dollars, which was matched with \$750,000, to create a student-managed investment fund, endowed professorship in investments, and a million dollars worth of scholarships. These kind of people just always amazed me. They have allegiances to other places. They just liked this place.

C: Dusty Rhodes tells the same story about Dottie Dorian and people like that who helped the baseball team. We should shift focus to international education, because I've been very curious about that. Betty Flinchum talked about how she began in the College of Education. How did it begin with the College of Business?

T: Well, I had a little bit of interest in international business when I became dean. At the time we had already started to talk about international business major, and a little bit of work had been done on it but not very much.

C: Had any students gone abroad at this point?

T: No. No students had gone abroad, and the only faculty that had gone abroad had done so on their own. We had a few faculty members who, by birth, were international – Reza Vaghefi, Josh Samli, Adele El Ansari – that was probably about it. They would occasionally travel, but we had no international business program, so to speak, and no real emphasis on it. I had little bit of interest in it, but it's not my academic training. But it seemed to me that the world of business was changing, becoming more international, and business schools need to think about moving in that direction. When I became dean in 1994, at that time to get a new undergraduate program degree was a very tedious process, because of the Board of Regents. We had to get planning authorization. We had two people who were interested in doing that. One was Reza Vaghefi and the other was Jeff Steagal. I selected Jeff Steagal to work on that department, which he did and really did a good job. He got it through the planning authorization process, and got it approved by the Board of Regents. That all happened by 1996 or so. 1995, maybe. So we started an international business undergraduate program. Jeff was selected as director of the program, and has done an excellent job.

I've been lucky in my career. It's one thing to have ideas about something, but you really have to have people to put them to work, and Jeff Steagal was one of those people. I asked him not long after becoming dean and selecting him as director, how many schools in the country have undergraduate degrees in business? He came back and told me at the time there were about seventy-five schools in the US and Canada. I said, we should really be able to be a top-ten program, it's conceivable to be a top-ten program if we wanted to in a pool that only includes seventy-five schools. Whereas we could never be listed as a top-ten business school with no doctoral programs, and management faculty

and marketing faculty and finance faculty in these major schools are bigger than our entire faculty. So, this seemed to me to be a niche that we might could really develop and get some mileage out of it. I asked him to put together a white paper for me on what it would take for us to be considered good in international business. He did and came back and it had a budget. At the time, of course, it was way out of sight for us, but I said, “Look, let’s commit ourselves to this and let’s bite off as much as we can bite off today. I’ll commit to you, I’ll raise the money, and we’ll bite off more tomorrow. If you’ll have some faith in me, let’s get started.” So we did. I’d have to say that I think I had good success in raising money, but the thing that I’m proudest of in my tenure as dean is how we transformed that college with respect to international business. Because we started, as I say, with just a few people who were international really by birth. We made a commitment Earley on at Jeff’s urging that every faculty member we hired should have either a major or minor area in international within their discipline. So, if we were looking at somebody in marketing, they had to have international marketing as one of their areas. If we made an exception, we’d have to understand why. The whole time I was dean, I think we made maybe one exception. We hired a person in tax in Accounting. We needed someone who knew the U.S. tax codes. Everybody else that we hired, the whole ten years I was dean, had a major or minor area in international business within their discipline.

Over time, you really make a lot of difference in terms of how many people we engaged in research internationally. We went from three. I remember once when Anne Hopkins was president, she asked at a reception to recognize people who were involved in international work in their discipline. I think we had something like, out of a faculty at that time of about sixty people, we had about thirty-two, thirty-three people in that list, which was more than half of our college engaged in international research. It made a huge difference over there. The number of countries represented on our faculty, the number of people that are traveling internationally, that are doing joint research internationally. To me, it’s amazing.

C: Is it global, or are there particular areas?

T: Well, we started out opportunistic. Betty Flinchum was another one that, the minute I became dean, Betty was almost in my face saying, “You know, you really need to do something about this college. It’s not international.” She was pushing me. The first thing I did, by the way, was offer any faculty member – we had, I think, at that time two agreements with schools in France to send us students. They both were in Paris, and they both had been negotiated by Betty. Ed Johnson had been involved in that, and Betty had taken him and they had signed these agreements for students who were in these programs to come to our school and come into the MBA program or whatever. So, I did know these people. I offered for any of our faculty members that wanted to go to Paris for spring break, no responsibility, we pay your way. If you take your spouse, you

have to pay your spouse's way. We arranged for faculty at these two schools to host them. So that... All it cost the College was air fare. Room and board were covered by the host family. It was really relatively cheap, and I held my breath that forty people wouldn't take me up on the offer. We couldn't afford that. But we had, I think, five people that went. They got a little excited about going. Some of them had not been abroad. Betty wanted me to go, and I said, I can't do that. I have to send faculty first. I can't be the first one to go abroad.

The next year, Betty did get me to go to Paris. I met with the people at the schools there. We went down to Aix-en-Provence and met a new school there. They had a graduate program there in business and economics. That led to the exchange agreement with the University of Provence. Initially, we were very opportunistic with Betty pushing me all the time to do things. We found ourselves within about three years with maybe five agreements in France, and one outside of France. Then Jeff and I sat down and said, you know, we need to be more strategic about this. Where are our students likely to go when they graduate, or interact with in a business relationship? We knew that Latin America had to figure very large for any school in Florida and then Asia, particularly China, has to be a big part of the future. We started out now seeking relationships with schools in Latin America, and wanted a relationship with a school in China as well. Now, I'd say it's fairly global. We're not everywhere, but we do have over twenty exchange agreements with business schools in China, New Zealand, still in France, but also Germany, Poland, the Czech Republic, in Spain, and then a number in Latin America, Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, and Brazil.

T: Lou Woods did something down in Belize, did he not? Or was that just on his own?

C: Yeah, on his own, really. Lou, and Joe Perry, and other faculty members that would work with me from time to time got some grant opportunities to go down and do some work in Belize. They went back and forth to Belize a lot. In fact, Betty and I talked about whether or not we should be involved in Belize. She didn't push it, but she said, "Here's an opportunity for your college." Truthfully, Belize is a very poor, developing country, and even though that's a great program for the College of Education, I didn't see that as a good market for us. We didn't pursue that, so we've never gone. We have never gone into Belize as a school.

C: Have you ever seen these partnerships in terms of developing economic systems? Obviously, France and the European Union are mature systems.

T: Our goal wasn't so much to try to develop countries as has really happened with the College of Education program. Our goal has been to try to establish relationships that would provide opportunities for our students to go to study, and learn about different cultures, where they may doing business, either directly, themselves, working for a company in those environments, or managing employees or business relationships with companies. We've been more interested in markets that are growing very rapidly, in Argentina, Brazil, China,

- Chile, and so forth. These are all places where we tell our students, whether you major in international business, it doesn't matter; you're going to work in international business. You're going to either do business with clients or customers, employees are going to come from there, so you need to understand those cultures. Our model has been a little different than theirs. We're not looking for underdeveloped countries that we can assist in that regard.
- C: What's been the impact upon the students. The feedback you've gotten in this regard.
- T: Yeah, I think it made it a much more exciting undergraduate program. Our students, a large number of them now go abroad as part of their undergraduate educational experience. In addition to these twenty or so exchange agreements that we have where we exchange faculty and students, by the way, we run roughly eight to ten or eleven short-term study abroad courses every year. It has introduced a very exciting element into our undergraduate curriculum.
- C: And they've responded in kind.
- T: Oh boy, the students have really responded well. We started with the very first one. Jeff Steagal took a group of students Paris. Paris is nice. It's attractive, but it's really not, from a business standpoint, the greatest place to go. That was a good one to get it started with, but since then, we've run trips to Hong Kong, to Shanghai, to Beijing, to Australia, to Rotterdam [Netherlands]. We still take students to the south of France, to the Czech Republic and Poland, to Hungary, to England, and target specific businesses or industries. We have so many of them now, that we actually give them each a discipline focus. This group going to London is going to look at all finance and accounting. This group going to Rotterdam is looking at their ports. We have a group going next year to Marseilles [France] and Istanbul to look at their ports.
- C: In effect, a person who majors in international business is doing a double major, the international plus the finance or marketing.
- T: They don't have to. They can just major in international business, but a large percentage of them do a double major, because we tell them, "Your employer still wants you to know a lot about some area." So, most of them double major in either marketing, finance, or logistics.
- C: Has international business become the largest major in the College?
- T: No, it's not the largest. The largest is still management. I think that's true. Since I left the dean's office I don't pay as much attention to the numbers. It's become a large major. We thought it would grow slowly, but it's, I would guess, around 250 majors. It's a large major. Management probably still is 400 or so.
- C: Have there been other major substantial changes in the College of Business curriculum over the thirty years? Insurance and real estate didn't work out.
- T: Right. We dropped insurance and real estate because, even though Jacksonville is a big insurance and real estate market, the industry told us over and over they weren't interested in people that had their undergraduate degrees in those fields; they'll teach them insurance and real estate. We finally listened to them and got

out of those fields. The curriculum hasn't changed dramatically, but I would say there's been a huge difference between the curriculum now and when we started. There's no dramatic point in time where we made this change. It's just been an evolutionary thing. The biggest difference has been in every major, and in every course, it's much more international in focus today. That's a function of changing the course structures, but, as much as anything, changing the faculty. We can only teach what we know. As long as we didn't have people with that kind of focus, we couldn't teach it. Now, in every course, virtually, there's a heavy dose of international materials, just because the faculty's become more international. That's the biggest difference. We've always had a pretty heavy emphasis on writing. We have a lot of papers. We don't give too many objective tests, at least solely objective tests, in our classes. That's always been the case. Hopefully, it will continue. But, as we get larger, it becomes more difficult. But, again, I think it's been more a matter of gradual change than dramatic change.

C: Are there gradual changes besides the international? I'm thinking, technology of course, has played a major role in terms of access to Internet and so forth.

T: I guess that would be the other major change. Our students are very proficient in technology. Once we got into this building, we had so much technology in the building, I actually worried that we were going to buy all this technology and the faculty aren't going to use it. But, in fact, the students drove that process because, if a faculty member was sitting up there with... Every classroom was equipped with an overhead projection unit that was hooked to a computer, at that time a VCR, now a DVD player, and it's a mounted camera unit that you can bring in to watch the Journal, lay it down, project it on the ceiling. Students tended to give faculty members who didn't use the technology that was sitting in front of them very low teaching evaluations. So, the faculty member quickly learned how to use this stuff, because the students knew how to use it. The other thing, of course, it gave our students opportunities to polish their presentation skills. We asked them to make presentations in class. They all use PowerPoint slides. That's become more sophisticated every year, with the students and with the faculty members.

C: In terms of content, I know back in the 1970s, Paul Samuelson sort of reigned supreme in many respects in terms of textbooks. Laffler came in and Friedman became more and more important. So the economics, I would guess, has been taught somewhat differently thirty years later. Would that be a fair statement?

T: A little bit. I mean, as you say, Samuelson really was the dominant force in the Early 1970s. Since that time, people who would be classified as rational expectationists have grown in stature. Now, there's a much greater awareness of dynamics. People do adapt to situations. They adapt their behavior, so that this notion of rational expectations influences policy decisions. So, we now try to incorporate that into teaching economics.

C: Something like Milton Friedman's theory has been taken over by the Federal Reserve, in some regards, in terms of... We used to think in terms of shaping

the economy by deficit spending; now it's more by interest rates. That kind of shift has been a mega-transition.

T: It has. Although, again, the world as seen by Paul Samuelson really emphasized government spending or taxes, a fiscal policy. With Friedman, it was more a monetary policy, but beyond that, monetarists shouldn't be too actively engaged in tinkering with the money supplies. They ought to put it on an automatic pilot and let it grow, because the markets adapt. Even that's changed. The new monetarists and the new Keynesians to represent the Samuelson group, are much closer together in that both believe that there's a role for an active monetary policy to try to influence interest rates, to try to interfere with markets a little bit. Both groups see that as a rule. Both groups see a role for fiscal policy. They disagree on the amount of emphasis.

C: Have similar changes taken place in management and marketing and finance over the years?

T: I think the biggest change in finance has been one, the degree of sophistication, the quantitative techniques that are used to analyze it. To me the biggest change has been just a total integration of services and products offered by all the financial institutions. For years and years and years, to go back to the faculty that came here, we had Barnett Bank was the big bank, and then you had all these University Atlantic Bank, and Flagship Bank, and all these little banks. All of them could only do commercial banking in the state of Florida. Then, you had a credit union that could only do certain things, like make car loans.

C: Savings and loans.

T: Yeah, savings and loans. You had insurance companies that could only sell insurance, and you had Sears that could only sell appliances. And brokerage firms that could only help you buy and sell stocks. Now, everybody does everything. Merrill Lynch will offer you a checking account. Sears, at one time, played around in the insurance and finance industry, offering new checking accounts and credit cards.

C: This affects the curriculum, doesn't it?

T: Oh, sure. How you're teaching what's going on. It's a major change. And the banking industry's completely changed. No bank that was here when we came here still exists.

C: Except over in Riverside.

T: Maybe so. I actually think the First Guarantee Bank might still be, but that's about the only surviving bank. Of course, even Barnett is gone. Interstate banking, in fact, international banking, and all the lines of distinction between who gets offered what service, whether it's an insurance company or stock brokerage firm or a bank? They're all doing the same things. So that's become a much more complex field.

C: The Internet has added a whole other level of complexity.

T: You can move money around with the flick of a button.

C: Let me shift focus to your perceptions of the University over time. You

mentioned Earleier, the two Eds each served about four years. Were there particular reasons why they moved on?

T: Candidly, Ed Moses got frustrated with the vice president at the time, for Academic Affairs.

C: That would have been Bardo?

T: That would have been John Bardo. If Ed were sitting here, he'd agree with me. He's a very impatient person.

C: Moses?

T: Ed Moses. Then Adam Herbert was hired, and I believe joined the university in January. I may be wrong on the time of that, but I think he came about that time. Ed Moses met with him, told him of his frustrations. The rumor is... The feedback I received, let's put it that way, is that Adam Herbert said, "Give me some time. I know there are some problems. I just got here. Give me some time to work things out." About mid-February, Ed Moses resigned. That tells you how impatient he was. He [Ed Moses] gave him about two or three weeks. That's a pretty significant change for a new president to even contemplate. Later that spring, he did make a change. And Bardo, I think, resigned.

C: Ken Martin came in.

T: Yes. In fact, Adam was willing to move on this, but Ed didn't give him the time. So, we started a search. In fact, it was interesting, Ed Moses later had a change of heart when he saw what happened, and Bardo had resigned, and he actually applied for the job. It came down to Ed Johnson and Ed Moses were the two finalists. Adam Herbert selected Ed Johnson. I think there was a message there to Ed Moses: "I asked you to give me some time, and you didn't. Don't come asking me for a second chance." But anyway, he hired Ed Johnson. Ed came with really good credentials and background and had been dean...

C: Colorado, right?

T: Yes, he came here directly from Colorado. Prior to that, Texas Christian University. And prior to that, Rochester Institute of Technology. He had a number of years of experience, so we were excited to get him. He came and, I don't know, we talked about keeping your batteries charged. I think Ed had been dean for about seventeen years when he came here. He was excited when he came. He may have been a little frustrated in his ability to start to raise major gifts. He was used to that at Colorado, and TCU [Texas Christian University] both. He told me, I always moved in with somebody that I knew that could help me make things happen, some person in the community who had already identified these schools as their major philanthropic focus. He said, "I haven't been able to find that person in Jacksonville." So, he might have been a little frustrated with that. I really don't know if he had other frustrations within the University. But after four years, he decided he really didn't want to do it anymore. So, he resigned. He and Adam obviously got along well because Adam later asked him to be VP for University Advancement. I can't end this conversation, by the way, without saying how fortunate I've been to meet Luther

Coggin. I want to make sure I get that in.

C: Tell me how that came about.

T: Well, Leighton Smith had already been a donor to our building. At this time, we were still focused on the building. Leighton lived about three doors down from Luther and Blanche Coggin. So we asked him if he would help us arrange a dinner that would include Adam Herbert and Elizabeth and Bob Head, Ann and myself, and Leighton and Joey Smith, and Luther and Blanche. So, he did help us set that up, Leighton did. So, we went to the River Club, and I'm thinking only about the building, you know, about raising money for the building, and thinking can we maybe ask him to give us \$100,000 or so. All Adam wants to talk about is his Pathways scholarship program and how wonderful it is, because if you give to that, the state will match it. At that time, the state would not match any of our gifts for the building. I've got Leighton sitting beside me poking me, saying, "Was my gift to you matched, and if not, why not?" So, I think, God, this is not going at all how I wanted it to go. After dinner, about two weeks, Elizabeth and I set up a meeting appointment to go see Luther. We're going to the door, and I said, "Now, you watch. No matter what we say, first words out of his mouth are going to be, 'tell me about this program where I get my money matched.'" Because people with money love the idea of leveraging their money. So, sure enough, we get in there and we start telling him about the building and what our needs are, and he said, "So, tell me about this program where I can get my money matched." I said, "Well, there are two types of gifts you can give. One is scholarships. They'll match that fifty percent within a range. But, you know, you could also give to establish a professorship and they will match that. Those go into endowments. Then there's the building. Obviously, we want a first-class building so we can do a good job for our students, and scholarships help us attract good students. But if we don't have good faculty and good facilities, it doesn't matter how many students we get. So, really we need all three, and right now we're trying to build this building." He said, "Well why don't you give me a proposal that addresses all three." So, we went away and came back with a proposal to establish a professorship, a Coggin professorship, \$100,000 in scholarship money, and \$50,000 – we did scale that back – for the building for classrooms. He went home, talked to Blanche, and called us and said he'd do them all. So, that was my introduction to him. We asked him and received \$350,000. Steve Paulson is the first Coggin professor and has been ever since that gift. We have a Coggin scholarship and we have a classroom. So, then, after two or three years, I went back to him and talked about... we got into the capital campaign. That gift took about two and half years to come to fruition. It created a really nice friendship that continues to this day. I mean, he and I still get together every few months and have lunch. They're wonderful people. We're really proud to have his name on the building, regardless of money impact.

C: Is he a self-made man?

- T: Absolutely.
- C: Did he go to college?
- T: He did attend college. I don't know that he graduated. I don't think he did. He went to Peabody College, I think, up in Nashville.
- C: For education?
- T: In education. I think he went there, and he may have gone to another school, but I don't think he ever finished college. He got involved in the car business. His father was in the car business in Birmingham, where he grew up. So, he got involved in the car business very early on and got married early on. I think maybe he got married at nineteen and was completely independent at nineteen, selling cars, and then got his first dealership in West Florida. He got an opportunity to open a dealership, which he did at the age of about twenty-four or twenty-five. Then, again, at a very early age, was offered the GMC Pontiac dealership in Jacksonville in the area that became Regency Square. That was in 1967. That was before any of that area was developed. Of course, then the rest is history. He developed seventeen dealerships before he sold it all. He is an absolutely self-made man.
- C: He was older, wasn't he? In his seventies?
- T: Yeah, he is in his seventies. I don't know, seventy-five, seventy-six. I don't know exactly. To me, that was really... You know, you think about things you always cherish. The opportunity to get to know people like that was the best part of being dean.
- C: The donors, by and large, were not patronizing in their relationship with you?
- T: I don't know what you mean by patronizing?
- C: Well, some people are philanthropic for relatively selfish reasons. It builds ego, builds reputation. To have a business college named after you obviously is a monument to the future. Some people might approach that as a "look what I've done" kind of thing. Other people do it out of generosity of heart.
- T: Well, you know, it would be impossible for me to separate this out and to say how much of this falls into one category or the other. I'm sure he takes great pride. I'm sure he feels good about our college because he wouldn't want his name associated with it if he didn't. I think he takes great pride in having his name associated with our college. But, every time he's ever had an opportunity to say it in front of other people, he has thanked me, personally, and this college for giving him and his wife the opportunity to get involved with the University of North Florida and with our college. He is an extremely gracious man. He thanks us for the opportunity to give us financial help.
- C: That's an indication.
- T: So, I think he takes great pride in what he sees happening, and the impact that UNF in general is having on this community. He likes the idea of being associated with that.
- C: Some people express that in a patronizing way.
- T: That was not his driving goal. When I started talking to him about a gift that

would name the College, he said, I don't understand what that means. So, I've tried to educate him on what this means, but I don't think that was the driving motivation. He had earned a lot of money and thought, "What can I do that's good, that will have a positive impact on this community." He could not have been better to us in terms of giving us the money without a lot of strings. He asked me, "If you got this money, how would you use it? What would you do with it?" In fact, I presented him with a proposal, and he said, that sounds good to me. It wasn't like, no, I want it here, I want it there. By the way, along the way there were people that tried to intervene, to steer that money in one direction or another. He always came back to me and said after the conversations were over, he'd come back to me one-on-one and say, is that what you want? Is that what you think is best for the College?

C: You obviously built a relationship with him.

T: I did. I really did. To me, it was extremely rewarding to have that opportunity.

C: In your capital campaign, was it easy to work with the central administration? Has it always been a sense which I've heard, that university advancement didn't want the colleges to take their potential donors away from them.

T: Yeah, well, you know, anytime you get more than one person raising money, there's bound to be tension, how you carve things up and prospects and so forth. From my perspective, it always worked pretty well. There were times when we would identify a prospect and somebody else would say, "I think I have a better shot at them." I'd say, Pierre [Allaire], when he came on board, implemented a process that allowed him ultimately to make those decisions about who gets this person? It was fair. It was basically either you're working them and moving them along, or let's get somebody else a shot. By and large, I'd say it worked out, from my perspective, to be very fair.

C: Let me shift to some sort of institutional questions. You've worked with to some degree, all the presidents, Carpenter, McCray, Herbert, Hopkins, and the interims. Who stands out to you?

T: Well, Tom Carpenter. Everything has to be put in the context of where I was sitting and looking at these people. But Tom Carpenter, to me, was always the perfect image of a president. He looked like a president; he acted presidential. I think he did a wonderful job at the time this university hired him of building this university. To me, I look at him and I see a man who is a builder. That's really what he wanted to do. It seemed to fit his skills, and met our need.

Curt McCray helped expand the image of the University downtown. We have to give him credit for that. I thought he was a little bit more ruthless than I would be comfortable with all the time. But, I didn't have to work with him or report to him directly.

Then, Adam Herbert, I think, just did a fantastic job in building a relationship with the community and strengthening that relationship. Everything has a cost. And Adam spent more time in the community, and somehow people here would be critical of him, but from my perspective, in the business school, I

knew that was something we needed. I always thought he did an excellent job of expanding the image of this university and making people in the community start to view UNF as their university, whether they went here or not. He stressed the importance of UNF in this community. He did a great job of all that.

By the way, E.K. Fretwell, I think, was nice, and was an excellent interim. He kept things on an even keel; didn't mess anything up. His role was not so much to move us forward as much as keep things in place. I think he was very, very good.

Ann Hopkins, I think, was very nice. Her health problem... I think she never really fully recovered, energy-wise. So, I think she had a difficult time, and probably, to her credit, realized this is not working very well for me, and ended it before the University suffered much. I felt bad for her for her health problems.

Then John Delaney was just delightful and a surprise. I thought a lot of him as mayor. I thought he was the best mayor since I've lived in Jacksonville. But I didn't know he would be a good president, just because I thought he might fall prey to that tendency of, "Oh, I can run an academic institution out of the back of my pocket. It's no problem." In fact, he really focused on what he does best, his relationship with Tallahassee, and with the community and raising money, and relying on the provost to run the academic part.

C: Now that he has the right provost.

T: I think now he has the right in Mark [Workman]. I think the world of Mark. They're a good team. They complement each other very well.

C: Looking at the academic vice presidents, Lassiter, Minahan, Merwin, Bardo, Martin, Kline; do any of those stand out to you?

T: Well, again, Roy Lassiter, to me, is one of those people, like Jim Parrish, that, the longer they're gone, the better they look. I don't mean that to say they didn't look good when they were here, but by comparison with everyone who came afterwards. Roy Lassiter, again, did a wonderful job building this university, building the curriculum, helping to hire the faculty. I always admired the fact about him, and I had several occasions where this would be the case, when he told you something, you could count on it. He was a man of his word. He had tremendous integrity. He would tell you... He was very candid, very straightforward. I always admired that about him.

Minahan, I think, you could not always count on him to do what he said. Bardo was the same way. Merwin, I got along very well with Bill Merwin, and thought that he probably did a very good job. I think he had a difficult job serving with Curt McCray. A lot of challenges there, probably many, many more than I knew about. There were a few I knew about. I think he had a difficult time and was ready to leave when he left. So, part of that was the whole dynamic between him and Curt McCray.

As I said, John Bardo was somebody that I don't think always you could count on what he said.

Alan Ling, I thought very highly of Alan. He was another one that I think

was very bright. You could pretty much count on what he said. He made me nervous, because he was in the process of developing a model for funding of the different colleges that would have penalized the College of Business, at least initially. It was a very objectively arrived-at model. I didn't agree, necessarily, with some of the parameters in there. He wanted us to average about fifty-three students per class. I thought that would make it impossible for us to do the kind of job we want to do if we have to meet those kinds of targets. But I at least admired his approach. He was an analytical person, and I admired his approach. It was a tragedy the way that he died.

After Alan, I think David Kline was an excellent provost for me to work with, because David was a person of integrity. He was concerned about quality. But he wasn't concerned about meddling too much and how a dean did things. He didn't decentralize the budget process maybe as much as I would have liked in a dean. But then, no vice president has in the history of the university. They talk about it but never do it. But, he left me alone to try to raise the money, to try to build the international business program. He never said, "No, I want you to do this or I don't want you to do that or somebody doesn't like the way you're doing something, so stop." He basically said, "As long as you meet your targets and meet your budget, I'll give you latitude to do what you want." For me, that was great, because it gave me a lot of latitude on how I wanted to do things in the College, and to make changes that I thought we needed to make, or move in the direction I thought we needed to move. I really enjoyed working with David. He gave all deans a lot of freedom, not just me.

C: Ken Martin comes in there too.

T: Yeah, Ken Martin. Ken Martin came and went. I think Ken suffered from the same problem of bad chemistry with the president. He seemed to struggle. I was assistant dean at the time and had not a lot of interaction with Ken, to be honest with you. I guess it was Ed Johnson that had some frustrations with him. I didn't interact too much with Ken. But I think the chemistry between him and Adam wasn't all that great. He certainly didn't last long.

C: The chemistry between him and Charles Winton wasn't all that great.

T: That's true, too. That's true. All those things maybe undid him. I think he found the job difficult.

C: Looking at the University as a whole, what are the most significant things that you've seen happen here, two or three, over the last thirty years? Are there any things that stand out?

T: Of course, getting the lower division is to me the most significant. Because of that one thing, it began the process of turning us into a normal-looking university, with a daytime life and residential students. All these things to me turned us into a university that looks and feels like a university. I liked that. I never was crazy for a strictly commuter environment in so many different ways. You might invite a speaker on the campus and, unless they came during the time when your class is meeting, no students would come see him. They're only out here for class. So,

anyway, getting lower division, to me, was the most significant thing that's happened.

Beyond that, I think it's been, rather than a single event, just an evolutionary process of watching this community become aware of the University, and then grow in their appreciation of the University.

The other thing is, I think we've been fortunate to be in a state that's growing, and a community that's growing, but not as fast as South Florida, so I have no illusions that we would have handled rapid growth any better than UCF or USF. But we've been blessed that we didn't have to face that challenge. We had a faculty that has always wanted to put an emphasis on quality and a higher administration that is eager to embrace that or found it convenient to go along with it. So, that made this into a very nice school. The faculty want to grow, but we don't want to grow at the expense of quality. The administration needs to grow because we're in an FTE-driven budget, but the opportunity to grow has probably exceeded our need to grow, so we can still be a little selective in our students. So, again, to me, it's not a single event beyond the lower division issue as much as it is how we've evolved into what I think is a nice school.

C: Coming to that point, in your experience both as dean and as faculty, generally looking at other universities like ours, not like Florida or Georgia, but regional universities, how do you compare us, how do you evaluate us in that context, whether it's the whole university or the College of Business? How do we stack up?

T: It's hard to do, as you know, because you have your own biases, and you have great insight into your own school.

C: Well, you've talked to other business deans over the years. You've talked to other economists over the years.

T: Yeah. And students. I think in my own mind, we stack up very well at the undergraduate level against any of the major state institutions in the Southeast. And, in particular, I can give you examples at Florida of why we stack up very well. Their mission, and it's written down, is graduate education, not undergraduate education. So, in order to focus on their mission, something like sixty to seventy percent of their undergraduate courses are taught via T.V. I've actually been there, and I've watched a television presentation and so forth. The faculty that are teaching on T.V. are, I'm sure, very good, but there are very few students in the class. Even during the live presentation, the one period during the day at 8 o'clock in the morning that has a live person, has very few students. Because, the dean will tell you, well, they know that they get this in their dorm room, so why come to class? So, it required a tremendous amount of self-discipline to go to their program. In fact, we went to their video library, and the librarian there told me, "Yes. What most students do is they come in and check them out two weeks at a time, because if they know they have a test, they'll stay up and look at all the videos one night, and come in and take the test." To me, that's not exactly consistent with quality undergraduate educational experience.

So, I feel that we would stack up very well undergraduate-wise against that kind of program. FSU does some of that, but not as much. Georgia does some of that, but not as much. But, most of these business schools, anyway, have shifted their mission to much heavier emphasis on graduate education. To do that, I know what they're doing. They're either teaching very large sections of 500 to 1,000, or they've gone to video or some kind of combination of the two. They've eliminated a lot of the paper-writing assignments, and those kinds of things that take time, because of the emphasis on research. So, in my mind, I think we stack up very well against those kinds of programs. At the graduate level, they probably still run a better graduate program than we do. Or at least, even at the MBA level, they are at least as good in the classroom as we are, maybe better. I don't know. Where they excel over us is in placement. CIEarley, many, many more national firms and international firms go to Gainesville to interview students than come to Jacksonville. So, as long as they place their students better than we do, they're going to have a better reputation, no matter what goes on in the classroom. So, I think they're still doing a better job at the MBA level, all things considered, including placement. Our market's different; most of our students get their MBA and stay here in town so we don't have to put as much emphasis on placement. We're not going to crack through that until we do develop a high profile placement operation.

- C: Are there any mistakes we've made over the years? Any decisions that have gone the wrong way? Any opportunities missed that you've felt over the years, with regard to the University?
- T: Probably. I can't remember anything that jumps out. I know there have been times when I disagreed with what people have done, or how they've done it..
- C: Sure.
- T: In higher administration, aside from that stadium over there that doesn't seem to serve any purpose, I don't see any obvious errors that we've made.
- C: There are errors of commission as well as errors of omission and opportunities missed.
- T: There's nothing that really jumps out at me.
- C: One of the images or stereotypes of your College from the outside has been that it is a white male bastion, somewhat autocratic. How do you respond to that?
- T: Well, I think that I'm aware of that image of the white male bastion. We've even had some problems with charges of racism when I first became dean. That erupted over some racist humor that was left on a copy machine, which by the way, back then, we used these autotrons to plug into the copy machines. It was never clear whose racist humor it was, but since it was in a copy machine in our building, it was assumed it had to be one of our faculty members. So, that led to a lot of accusations. It was a tense moment for me I guess as dean, but it died down. Partly, our faculty had been predominantly white male because of market reasons, not because of intent. It's been very difficult to hire... and initially it was African Americans that was the focus. It's been very difficult for us to hire African

Americans simply because there were so few in top programs in business schools. The market was very small, and supply and demand works the way it works. These people command very high salaries. You wouldn't get enough money on the line to hire somebody in that market. So, we had very few. We had very little representation. We have had a few and do have a few African Americans on the faculty. But, quite honestly, I would say from the time that I became dean, we really tried to shift.

And let's talk about women. There have been relatively few women in doctoral programs in business as well. Over the past fifteen years, we've done a much better job of identifying and hiring well-qualified women on our faculty, partly because there are more of them who have entered graduate schools, and provided more opportunities, and we've taken advantage of all that. I think that anybody who looks at our hires over the last fifteen years would probably find, I guess, at least fifty percent of them would be women. We have many more women now in our faculty, some of whom have left, by the way, for better opportunities, so we don't have as many at the full professor level, but we have a good many at the assistant and associate levels. But that takes time, as you know, to get them to that stage. We have a number that undoubtedly will get there because they're really, really good.

We really changed our emphasis once I became dean to defining diversity as being not just a black-white issue, or a male-female issue, but rather a cultural diversity issue. We had a strong interest in building a faculty that exposes our students to all kinds of different cultures, whether it happens to be African American or a better gender balance, but also people from different countries. I couldn't list off the top of my head, but we have faculty from India, from China, from Taiwan, from Egypt, from Sweden, from England. We just have a large number of faculty from all over the world, and much more diverse than we have ever had. In addition, we probably bring in six or eight, sometimes as many as ten visiting faculty members from outside the U.S. to lecture our students. So, our focus has been on diversity in a larger sense than just a black-white issue. We still struggle with that. We still try to identify African American males and females, but there just aren't many.

C: All the colleges struggle with that. The other part was that there was a sense that the college was run top-down.

T: I think I probably can confess guilt to that in my time as dean, maybe because I had been here a long time and felt like I knew all these people and what they thought. But, I probably was not as good at being inclusive or trying to build things from the bottom up during my tenure as dean as other people would have been. I guess a difference in style.

C: So, you may have been better than some of your predecessors in that regard.

T: Well, better or worse. I'm guiltier of being top-down. I think Ed Moses came in with a very definite set of ideas about what the College should be and how it should be focused. I think he would have been viewed as a top-down kind of

person. Ed Johnson did a little blend of that, I think. He talked to people more, tried to get ideas more. I came in, and I really thought the College needed to change. I had been most impressed with Ed Moses and his emphasis on improving research. The standards that he tried to put in place, many of which continued through Ed Johnson, and I simply continued them. I didn't change them, I just continued a lot of the processes and the standards. But I also felt like we needed to change and move much more in the direction of international business. I ran into a lot of resistance from a number of faculty members who said, "I'm not an internationalist, so this is going to leave me out in the cold, and I don't like it." I basically said, "Well, I'm sorry. This is the direction we're moving in."

C: Some faculty don't like change any more than anybody else does.

T: Exactly. A lot of faculty. A lot of people don't like change and faculty are no different. So, there was a lot of resistance to the change. Even I know when Jeff Steagal said we should be hiring people with fields in international business. Of all the chairs, not a single one supported him. Everyone of them said no. It was going to restrict our pool, and we won't get as many well-qualified people. I had to say, "Well, we're going to do it for two years. If after two years you're right and he's wrong, we'll stop. But we're going to do it for two years. And he's going to be on every search committee. He's going to interview every candidate that comes on this campus. If he doesn't say they're good, then we'll have trouble hiring them." But what we found after two years, is that every one of them said, "You know, I think it's actually enhancing our pool." People are finding out that there are opportunities there. So, it worked out okay. Had I not been somewhat top-down, heavy-handed, I don't think the change would have happened.

C: There's a fine balance between top-down and bottom.

T: Other people more skillful than I in interpersonal relations could have pulled that off, but I didn't. So I didn't.

C: The committee advising this interview program had one question they want to ask everybody. The question is, who are the two or three most colorful characters you've known at UNF?

T: Well, Ken Jennings.

C: He's been mentioned by others.

T: CIEarley.

C: Describe Ken for me. I didn't know him as well as you folks did.

T: Ken was an amazing person, because he had this terrific sense of humor. He was a good judge of character, a good observer of people and human nature. He loved to write, and he loved to read. Here was a guy who read about five newspapers every day and would clip articles out of them and keep them in a file. He had this enormous filing system. But he was fun to be around, and he was productive. He was good in the classroom. Students loved him. He loved to say things almost for shock value sometimes. Students eat that up. So he was extremely effective in the classroom with students. Although was not the kind of

person to go around and say I love students, he did. He loved helping other people achieve things maybe beyond what they thought they could achieve. He had the best record of publishing with students, or getting students published on their own without him of anybody in our College, and certainly one of the best in the University. He had over thirty articles published with students, and probably another dozen that he had helped students with that he didn't even have his name on in refereed journals. And almost always with undergraduate students. So he was fun, and I had the good fortune of working with Ken and Jay Smith on grants. So, we ended up traveling a lot together and spending a lot of time together. You really get to know people well and I always thought that was neat.

Jay Smith is another colorful character. I can still remember Jay when Curt McCray was here. We were coming back from lunch one day from the cafeteria, and Curt McCray stopped. He was walking toward us. He stopped to pick up some trash on the ground, which was his habit. He walked up to us and said, "Oh, good day, gentlemen." Jay said, "Well, there's the captain again polishing the brass while the whole ship is sinking." I thought, wow, I don't think I would have said that to the president. But anyway, Jay just had a way with words and was not afraid to speak his mind. So, I really enjoyed him.

Cherrill Heaton, to me, is a really colorful character. Cherrill had one of the best senses of humor and wits. He actually made Faculty Association meetings fun to go to sometimes because he would write these things and ask these questions.

T: Are there individuals who stand out as being most important in making the University get to where we are today?

C: Well, I've already mentioned each of the presidents, I think, and in particular Carpenter and Adam Herbert were, I thought, particularly good fits for this university at the stage that they came along. John [Delaney] may well turn out to be – it's too Early to say – in that same category. I would put those two in that kind of category. Roy Lassiter was an outstanding fit for what this university needed at the time. Jim Parrish, outstanding fit for what we needed at the time. Frank McLaughlin had a tremendous impact in terms of hiring young faculty members and bringing in an outstanding faculty in his department. Frank was just an outstanding department chair. I always thought he did a good job.

C: Even though you didn't work directly for him?

T: No, he wasn't my department chairman. He hired some outstanding people. He enjoyed putting that curriculum together and hiring those faculty members. He was good at it. He's got great people skills, I think. Dick Kipp, another person who had tremendous impact on the university, but particularly our college.

C: What was his impact? Because he's overshadowed a bit by Jim Parrish

T: Well, you know, he was a really humble person. He didn't mind playing a behind-the-scenes role. Dick ran the graduate program for all those years and worked very hard at it. He also was department chair in the Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate. So he hired initial faculty in that area and did a very good job. And

then, of course, the impact he had on our college, we had no idea. We had some idea that he was going to leave the College some money, but we had no idea what kind of money we were talking about. He had already given the University a couple hundred thousand dollars before he passed away. Once he passed away, we realized that, with the state match, it was around four and a half million dollars.

C: What was that used for?

T: It's all been used to create professors. Every bit of it.

C: Endowed?

T: Endowed professorships. This was all set up. That part of it was set up, and I knew that. I knew that there might be another few hundred thousand dollars that would create another two or maybe three professorships. But I had no idea. So, we used it for professorships, and in fact, it created the opportunity for more professorships than we had deserving faculty. We have used a big piece of it for what we call Kipp fellowships. It enabled us to be the first college at the university, and maybe still the only college. And from 1995 or so on, every faculty member we hired we gave them two summers guaranteed full-time research. Initially, it was eighteen percent and then it jumped to twenty-five percent. That helped us a great deal in finding very good faculty. All of that is funded out of Kipp money to this day. So, we used a lot of it for Kipp fellowships for new hires. And then we have four or five Kipp professors in the college.

C: That takes care of my questions. Is there anything that you came to this session that you wanted to share particularly about your experiences at UNF?

T: Well, it's been a great experience for me. It's been my good fortune because I had no intent to stay here. I didn't particularly like the school or the type of school it was. It changed, and I changed. It's worked out to be a wonderful life for me.

C: You've been a good fit for each other. Thank you.