

OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY HISTORY PROGRAM

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEW

WITH

*James T. (Jim) McGill, Ph.D.*

Interview conducted March 2, 1999

by

Joan Ash

## SUMMARY

James T. “Jim” McGill served as Vice President of OHSU under President Leonard Laster, during the period 1980-1986. In this interview, McGill discusses the organization and administration of the institution in those early years of university consolidation, touching on issues of funding, planning, and community relations.

A native Oregonian, McGill begins by explaining why he came back to Oregon to join Laster’s leadership team. He talks about the administrative structure in place when he arrived and the role of the Vice President in the day-to-day activities of the University. He shares his impressions of Dr. Laster’s vision for OHSU, which included building a top-notch faculty and expanded research facilities. Senator Mark Hatfield played a large part in advancing Laster’s agenda here in Oregon, and McGill talks about the contributions that Hatfield has made nationwide with regard to biomedical research.

After approximately eighteen months here, McGill moved into an expanded role within the administration, assuming responsibility for most internal activities. He talks about his work on the campus master plan, which laid the foundation for future building on the Marquam Hill Campus. He notes that the current incarnations of the Casey Eye Institute, the BICC, and Doernbecher Memorial Hospital all grew out of that master planning session. He also talks about financial challenges that he faced during his tenure at OHSU, in terms of state and research funding as well as clinical funding.

He candidly reveals that the relationship between himself and Dr. Laster began to fray after a few years, and that he began to look for a position elsewhere. He talks about his moves, first to the University of Missouri and then to Johns Hopkins, and about the different challenges he faced in those institutions. In light of these later experiences, he notes that much of the tension in town-gown relations here at OHSU may stem from the egalitarian culture of the state, in which power and influence remain diffuse throughout the community and the government.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Biographical Information	1
Coming (Back) to Oregon	2
Administrative Structure	3
Role of the Vice President	5
President Laster's Vision	6
Senator Hatfield	7
An Expanded Role	9
Moving On	12
Campus Master Plan	14
Funding Challenges	17
University Hospital	19
Career After OHSU	20
Town-Gown Relations	24
Women at OHSU	25
Index	27

Interview with James T. (Jim) McGill, Ph.D.  
Interviewed by Joan Ash  
March 2, 1999  
Site: Dr. McGill's office, Johns Hopkins University  
Begin Tape 1, Side 1

ASH: It's March 2, 1999, and this is Joan Ash, interviewing Dr. Jim McGill in his office at Johns Hopkins University.

We sort of jumped in here. We were going to start with the beginning of your life, but since we're already in the middle of OHSU, we were talking about the people who had an influence from the outside, the Board of Overseers in particular, and how, when Dr. [Leonard] Laster came, the old board changed to a new board.

McGILL: Yes. Len brought the idea that he needed an advisory group of citizens from around Oregon, that he ultimately called the Board of Overseers, that would dedicate time and be philanthropic. He had assessed that the standing group, the group that he inherited—and I don't recall what it was called—hadn't been formed for those purposes. And so Len did pull together a new group of people. There was some overlap, old to new, as I recall, but it was made clear to the people coming onto this new group that they were expected to help raise funds for the institution and, to the extent they could, contribute themselves.

Len also used that group as an important way of getting his OHSU message out to the business and philanthropic communities of Oregon. It had on it people like Otto Frohnmayer from Medford, the father of Dave Frohnmayer. It had some other people from that southern part of Oregon, as I recall. A woman, whose name I do not recall, from Bend, and, then, many people, business people particularly, from Portland. Betty Gray, Bob Mitchell from U.S. Bank, Don Tisdale, an S&L CEO, are three people who come to mind as having provided particularly strong leadership in their devotion of time to this enterprise.

ASH: Then—we'll get back to this, but let me start at the beginning, because—let's just take a few minutes to describe who you are, where you were born and raised and what led up to your coming to our university.

McGILL: Okay. My mother reminds me that I am a sixth generation Oregonian down her side of the family, my ancestors having traveled on the Oregon Trail from Missouri to Oregon in the 1840s, I think. I was born in Portland during the war, in 1943, but, except for a year or so in Portland—because my father was involved in some of the early war production efforts, shipbuilding—my home was Stayton, a small town about fifteen miles from Salem. I grew up and went to school in Stayton, Oregon, and then to Oregon State for a baccalaureate degree in mathematics and then to Stanford for my Ph.D. in operations

research, finishing that in '69.

ASH: And then what?

McGILL: And then several moves. Immediately post graduate school, three years at a federal contract research center in Washington, D.C., that was engaged primarily in defense work. And then I was invited to go with a man that I worked for in Washington to Illinois as part of the coordinating board staff at the Illinois Board of Higher Education. He put together his finance group, and I was part of that group. I worked there for four years, then went to the University of Illinois at the Medical Center for four years, working for the provost on planning, budget, institutional research, and the like; and then to OHSU in 1980, April as I recall, and was at OHSU until 1986.

ASH: What was it that brought you to OHSU? Was it OHSU at that point...

McGILL: No.

ASH: ...or still UOHSC [University of Oregon Health Sciences Center]?

McGILL: It was still UOHSC, that's right. The name change occurred, as I recall, within two or three years after I arrived. I recall some early discussions with Len Laster regarding a name change and what that name might be; he vetted that issue very, very carefully and came up with OHSU.

My going to OHSU was the result of the typical recruiting processes in academe. Len had advertised for a chief administrative/financial officer. I answered the ad. I had not known Len; of course, I knew a little about the institution, and, after the usual somewhat lengthy process, ended up getting an offer to join Len at OHSU, then UOHSC, and accepted the offer.

ASH: And why, of all the positions in the country you might have accepted with your credentials, did you seek this one?

McGILL: Well, certainly, the fact that it was in Oregon, my home state, was a factor. It also played to the experience that I had gotten in Illinois at the Medical Center of the University of Illinois, and actually before that, when I was with the coordinating board. My particular area of focus was in the health professions, too. So for most of the eight years immediately before going to OHSU, I had been working in the health sciences in administrative and planning roles, and OHSU just appeared to be a good challenge. Len was an engaging person who painted a picture of an opportunity to make some change, to have some impact on an institution, and that was appealing to a relatively young administrator at that stage of his career.

ASH: When you came on, you came on as Vice President for Finance?

McGILL: Vice President for Finance and Administration, I think was the ordering of the words, yes.

ASH: And what were your feelings about coming back to Oregon?

McGILL: Oh, I was excited about it. It was terrific to be back in the state, close to family, able to experience the Oregon coast and mountains, and there was no question, too, that the job itself was challenging, which is what I was looking for. There were a lot of things to be done.

ASH: Now, did you take over for someone who had this job before?

McGILL: Yes. I succeeded Bob Peterson, who had gone to Thomas Jefferson University in Philadelphia, with Bill Bluemle. I don't recall the length of time between Bob's leaving and my arriving, but it was some period, perhaps a year plus. Ron Parelius was the Acting Vice President before my arrival.

ASH: Now, my picture of our becoming a university back in '74 was that the finances were in a bit of a state of disarray. How did things look when you arrived?

McGILL: The administrative systems and processes, to my eye when I came, needed modernizing. There was a lot of perpetuation of doing things the way they had been done for some time, running the gamut from computing to financial systems. The physical plant operation was more modern in terms of its processes than some of the other parts of administration. Personnel was another area that had been captured in terms of the way the processes had been done in the past. And so one of the things that Len wanted, too, was to modernize the administrative systems and processes.

ASH: And what role did the hospital play at that time, and how was it attached finance-wise?

McGILL: When I arrived there was a Vice President for Hospital Affairs, or a title close to that. It was filled by Don Kassebaum. Don reported to the President of the University. The financial operation of the hospital, while indeed part of the university as a whole, was run quite independently from the rest of the university, in part, I would surmise, because Don had, in a sense, grown up professionally and administratively at OHSU, had a strong team of people, including Dave Witter, that had been on the financial side of the hospital for some time. And so, in many ways, the financial operation of the hospital was quite a bit ahead of the rest of the university in terms of good business practices.

ASH: So what was the first thing you did when you came?

McGILL: Oh, golly.

ASH: Do you remember?

McGILL: I don't remember. I'm sure it was a process of getting acquainted, trying to meet and understand the people with whom I would be working most closely, not only those that reported to me, but those people on the senior management team, if you will, with whom I would be working most closely, including the deans, which there were three, as I recall, at the time: Medicine, Nursing, and Dentistry.

ASH: That would have been Lou Terkla and...

McGILL: Ransom Arthur in medicine.

ASH: Ransom Arthur.

McGILL: Right, now deceased.

ASH: And Carol Lindeman.

McGILL: And Carol Lindeman, right.

ASH: And who replaced Ransom Arthur? Was that Bob Stone?

McGILL: John Kendall.

ASH: So Stone was prior to that?

McGILL: Yes. I didn't know Stone. He had left before I came.

ASH: So the leadership team for the University was Dr. Laster, yourself, Kassebaum, and the three deans, basically?

McGILL: Right. Oh, and I'm forgetting the CDRC, Center for...

ASH: Menashe?

McGILL: Yes, Vic Menashe.

ASH: Child Development and Rehabilitation.

McGILL: Thank you. That's it, right.

ASH: So that was the leadership team, then?

McGILL: Am I forgetting anyone? Help me. I think that was it.

ASH: Let's see. My second question was the role of the vice president. Sometimes—having been an associate director myself for many years, I know sometimes it's tough because you have to represent the University to the person above you and you have to represent the person above you to the University.

McGILL: Right.

ASH: Could you explain how you saw your role as vice president?

McGILL: Well, in the initial months, a year or two perhaps, one part of the role of the Vice President was relating to the Chancellor's Office, because at that time, and persisting until, I think, just relatively recently, many of the policies and procedures were driven out of the Chancellor's Office for the System as a whole. Also, a big component of the job at that time was relating to the various staffs in Salem: the staff people with the General Assembly, with the Legislature, and with the Executive Branch. And so my recollection is that I spent a fair amount of time in Salem and in Eugene working with those people whom we relied upon for support from the state and with whom we had to work in terms of managing the various processes of the Oregon State System.

So that was a big piece of the job, more so, perhaps, as I recall, than I thought it would be. The processes then were very bureaucratic in many, many respects, with not a lot of elbowroom to do things differently on any one campus. We had to adhere quite closely to the rules and regulations of the State System.

Joan, in terms of what might have been on my agenda when I first came to OHSU, I really don't have any distinct recollections, other than the fact that, as I've already mentioned, there were things to be done in terms of improving processes and working with colleagues in Salem and Eugene to try to—whether it was justify resources flowing to the institution or loosening up processes where they needed to be loosened—allow us to do what we needed to do. A lot of interaction there. And as I reflect on that, good relationships. I think I had good, effective working relationships with those people. We did get some things accomplished.

Bill Lemman was the closest colleague at the Chancellor's Office, and a man named Bill Barrows, a legislative staffer in Salem, with whom we worked closely in going to the Emergency Board and dealing with appropriations.

ASH: So you were on the road between Portland and Salem quite a bit?

McGILL: A fair amount, yes, right.

ASH: And under what circumstances would you do that versus Dr. Laster doing that?

McGILL: Particularly in the earliest part of my stint at OHSU, UOHSC, I would, of

course, talk with Len and decide whether he was going to do something or I would do it. As we got to know each other's working style and what he wanted to do, then it became a little bit more automatic. But it was working closely with him to decide who would do what.

ASH: Getting back to the name, then, why was the name changed, do you recall?

McGILL: Well, Len Laster would be the best to get the true perspective on that, but I do recall many discussions with Len. One of the characteristics of Len is he would work an issue, work a problem, intensely, which is to say many conversations, typically with many people, before coming to a conclusion as to what he was going to do. I do recall that kind of a process around the name change.

He had done a lot of thinking and consultation, as I recall, before I actually arrived. He wanted *health sciences* in the title, he certainly wanted *university*, and he wanted to make it clear that this was an independent campus, as indeed it was, at that point from the University of Oregon in Eugene.

So there was a lot of toying around, I think, with the various permutations of words before settling on the Oregon Health Sciences University. That seemed to meet most of the criteria that Len had laid out himself in the talking with others. He then pushed it through the Chancellor's Office. And I recall it took legislation. As I recall, too, he used some of his outside advisers, his Board of Overseers, to help promote in the media in Portland and otherwise the name change. So that was a major item of focus, at least for a period of time, until he achieved it.

ASH: How would you describe Len's vision for OHSU at this point?

McGILL: Hoping not to sound pejorative, but I do remember the words spoken on several occasions by Len to the effect—and I guess I am paraphrasing a little—to the effect that while there were many, many good things that had happened at the institution over the years, including educating a very strong cadre of professional health practitioners, particularly populating Oregon, while that indeed is success, he was saying something to the effect that the institution is in the backwater nationally, particularly in terms of attracting federal research funding.

One of his visions, one of his objectives, was to move it from that backwater status with regard to national visibility to an institution that was playing with the rest of the medical schools, or some of the best medical schools, in terms of research. That was—in fact, as I think back on Len's vision for the place, that is paramount in my memory.

And there were some others. Improving some of our business processes, relating more effectively to the local business community and philanthropic community. Some of those indeed were part of the vision, but the overriding one, I think, was to make OHSU higher quality in terms of research and a recognized institution nationally.

ASH: In terms of bringing in funding from private sources, I'll ask him on Friday, but do you recall his relationship with the Vollums?

McGILL: To some extent, yes. He was asked to join the Tektronix board, and, of course, Tektronix was founded by Howard Vollum. I can't speak in a lot of detail to the relationship except to say that he valued highly the relationship with Howard and Jean Vollum. Very highly. He respected Howard Vollum as an individual. In fact, Len was asked to deliver a eulogy at Howard Vollum's funeral, and I think he was quite close to Jean Vollum as well.

As you undoubtedly know, Howard Vollum left as part of his estate—and I think he was philanthropic while he was alive, too—a substantial amount—substantial certainly in terms of gifts that had been made previously to the institution—to the institution; as I recall, and I may be off in this, \$17 or 18 million, a good part of which was used to build the biomedical research institute, again which was part of Len's strategy to have absolutely modern space for biomedical bench research. And that building, called the Vollum Institute, was funded to a large degree by a gift from Mr. Vollum. It may also have had some federal money arranged by Mark Hatfield too, I don't recall for sure.

But I do recall our doing a substantial amount of financial planning for the Vollum Institute, not only in terms of the upfront capital cost to put the building up, but also how we would operate it, financially operate it, once it was up. And we looked at the amount of sponsored research that we could expect to attract to a building of that size, what those direct reimbursed costs would be, what the indirect costs would be, what the plant costs would be, and so on. Len, as part of planning that institution, brought in several nationally recognized medical research people: Lee Hood; Bishop, I think his name was Mike; someone from Texas whose name I don't recall now, and they all helped advise, and we worked out this plan to operate that building, too.

That Institute was a keystone to Len's strategy to attract some additional first-flight research people to the institution. And so the Howard Vollum relationship played out very, very nicely in terms of allowing that to happen.

ASH: Now, as far as the relationships with Hatfield, do you know how that all began and grew?

McGILL: I don't know how it began, but it was clear that Len had developed Mark Hatfield's confidence in Len Laster and in the institution, and Mark Hatfield just could not have been more supportive than he was. And it played out time and time and time again, whether it was the building of the new VA [Veterans Administration] building, of which Len Laster was highly supportive, and which was a matter of some controversy in Portland at the time, as I recall; to providing some money for the BICC, Biomedical Information Communication Center; providing some money, I think, for the Vollum Institute, and on and on and on, for the hospital itself and so on.

So that relationship between Len Laster and Mark Hatfield was very close personally, and Mark Hatfield's role as minority, and I think for two years as majority, leader of the Senate Appropriations Committee, paid in a financial way huge dividends for OHSU, with Mark playing out his dedication and support of OHSU.

By the way, just as an aside, I had some time with Mark Hatfield here at Hopkins about, perhaps, six months ago. Mark and Antoinette were here as part of a dinner, an event, sponsored by a group of people—the Lasker Foundation, as a matter of fact—that are trying to gather broad-based citizen support for the funding of biomedical research. So Mark Hatfield's interest in that area that I recall from fifteen years ago persists today. He believes, and I do too, that such efforts will improve the quality of life, the health quality of people in this country.

Mark has just been superb. As he talked that night here at Hopkins, all of the old fire and zeal that I had heard fifteen years ago at OHSU was still there in there in terms of his fundamental belief in what he has helped accomplish at OHSU, and some other places as well.

ASH: So could I surmise, then, that Dr. Laster's encouraging Mark Hatfield's thinking about biomedical research may have actually had an impact on the whole country?

McGILL: My guess is that that's right, but I don't know for sure where Mark Hatfield really came to his commitment to biomedical research. I would speculate that it was those conversations with Len, but I'm really not sure. Len will have to tell you, or Mark Hatfield.

ASH: I did interview Mark Hatfield, and he related some stories, actually, from his childhood and his war years that expressed his interest in, or, piqued his interest in health sciences research. But then he said that when Dr. Laster became President, he went knocking on Mark Hatfield's door and reminded Mark Hatfield that OHSU was there. So to him it was almost an awakening. He said he had been so busy in Washington that he had felt out of touch with what was going on at OHSU, and Dr. Laster reminded him what was going on.

McGILL: Well, then, your comment is absolutely right, because if Len stirred that interest in Mark Hatfield, what Mark did, not only for OHSU but biomedical research generally in this country, is just phenomenal. And I still am so pleased and, frankly, somewhat incredulous, at the level of support I think generally the population, the citizens in this country have for their faith in research in the medical sciences and its improvement of health. It's still being evidenced, of course, in NIH [National Institutes of Health] with a fifteen percent increase in funding this year. Tremendous support. Of course, at Hopkins, which is a major research engine in the biosciences, the kind of support we get from NIH and the private sector is incredible.

And when you have a man like Mark Hatfield who is still out on the stump, if you will, pushing for this, trying to raise the awareness of people as to the importance of this, it's

incredible. And without the kind of support from people like him and Mary Lasker and the Lasker Foundation and the others like that, well, it's just absolutely invaluable. So, yeah, I guess maybe this may be traceable to those early conversations between Len and Mark.

ASH: At least a part, trying to find the thread, here. It's exciting when you're part of that thread, and you were part of that thread.

McGILL: Right.

ASH: I don't know how much contact you had with Hatfield personally, but you were there behind the scenes. You ran the University, didn't you?

McGILL: Let me relay just one more personal anecdote in terms of Mark Hatfield. I did spend some time with him while I was at the institution, but Len handled that relationship almost entirely himself. But a word about Mark Hatfield. My grandfather, who had a business in Stayton, Oregon, was quite close to Mark Hatfield. He knew Mark when he was at Willamette as Dean of Students, as I recall. My grandfather, who was a Republican, was one of the early contributors to Mark Hatfield when he was beginning to get interested in politics. That didn't translate into my getting really to know Mark Hatfield, except somewhat tangentially after I had come back to Portland at OHSU, but Mark Hatfield and my family go back a ways, and my grandfather always was very proud of his early support of Mark and what Mark had achieved.

ASH: Interesting. Sometimes Oregon seems like such a small place. Everybody knew everybody else, at least at one time.

McGILL: Right.

ASH: So your early days, then, at OHSU you were setting up systems, getting to know people. And then, from what I understand from a couple of other interviews, about a year and a half into it, eighteen months into it, something happened.

McGILL: Right.

ASH: Do you want to tell us about that?

McGILL: One day I was sitting in my office doing routine business, I suppose, while down the hall in Baird Hall in Len's office there was a conversation going on between Len—and I hope I've got this right—and the then-Chancellor of the System, a man named Bud Davis. And I'm trying to recall the relationship, the time relationship, between Roy Lieuallen and Bud Davis. I think it was Bud. Bud and Len were in Len's office talking. Len comes down to my office and says, "Jim, please join us in the conversation." So I went into the President's Office, and Len, in some combination of informing me and asking me, along with Bud, said, "Look, we want to reorganize things a little bit differently in terms of senior administration."

And the particular of that was for Len to ask me—and I really didn't feel I had a whole lot of choice, which was okay—if I would take on a broader role at the institution. Part of it was a title change to—I guess it was to Executive Vice President, I think that was the title change, but with a role across the institution, as I think it was characterized by Len, certainly as I characterized it, as being the “inside” person, allowing Len to devote more of his time outside, if you will; outside including fundraising, working with legislators both in Oregon and working with the political structure in Washington. And so that happened.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1/Begin Side 2]

ASH: Did your title change from vice president or executive vice president to—just for finance to administration also?

McGILL: The title when I came to OHSU was Vice President for Finance and Administration, or, Administration and Finance, whichever way it went, and I guess the change was to Vice President, not Executive Vice President. I think it was just plain Vice President, although I'd have to check my résumé to be sure.

But the import of that was a couple of things. One, I was the only vice president. Then or shortly after, and I don't recall the timing for sure, the title of Vice President for Hospital Affairs was abolished. It wasn't long after that before Don Kassebaum stepped down as Hospital Director and Vice President and then a little later on, after spending a year or so in research, moved on to other things. Oklahoma, as I recall.

I don't recall for sure, but there may have been an acting academic affairs vice president at the time, and I think that may have been set aside, too. So whatever the titles were, and that can be checked in the records of the institution, for me the major shift was a broadening of responsibilities. The deans and the director of CDRC and the hospital were the key educational and clinical leaders of the institution, and, then, I was part of that mix and the President was part of that mix.

I never really worried about reporting responsibilities nor titles, frankly. The question for me is, “What is the job to be done and who are the colleagues one works with to get the job done?” And so I viewed the three deans and the two clinical directors as very close working colleagues. I think formally they continued to report to Len, although I do recall that Len, for some period of time, several months as I recall, toyed around with various ways to show these relationships on a piece of paper, laden with circles and spokes. And I don't recall it all, and, frankly, I could never really get very engaged in that exercise, because, again, it really didn't matter much to me. It was a question of what one does day to day, and, what is one responsible for.

So, as I recall, the deans and the clinical directors continued in a formal sense to report to Len, but I think the difference was that they and I were expected to work very closely together on anything having to do with the operation or the management of the

institution. And coming out of that, I recall those relationships with those people very, very warmly, all of the deans, Ransom Arthur and Carol Lindeman, with whom I maintained relationships in other professional ways over the years, and Lou Terkla. Great people. Vic Menashe. Great people, and I enjoyed working with them immensely.

ASH: They've all said wonderful things about you, and one of the things Carol Lindeman told us was that you used to go over to the School of Nursing to meet with her every other—did you meet weekly or...

McGILL: Whatever.

ASH: Anyway, every other meeting you would go to her. And she just thought this was a symbol that was really important to her.

McGILL: Well, it was important to me, too, and it was symbolic, and I did that with a purpose in mind, in that, again, I saw them as colleagues and equals. I didn't want the relationship to be hierarchical, because, indeed, what did this person who came out of a background of applied mathematics and on-the-job training in terms of the academic health sciences, what did I know about the educational programs of a school of nursing or medicine or about the clinical delivery of health care? So I did see them as colleagues and as equals and our working together as a team.

ASH: Then, as time went on and you were managing the internal operations and Dr. Laster was managing the external operations, how did that go?

McGILL: It worked fine for a while. And I'll be quite candid. I said words something to this effect to Len when he asked me to take on this new role. I don't think it was contemporaneous with the asking, but very shortly thereafter as I was thinking about it and reflecting on it. I said words to the effect that this will work for a while. We will both need to be very focused on communicating with each other, but this kind of reporting relationship, this kind of role, is not a stable one, and won't be able to persist.

And I said that in part because of personalities, Len's personality in particular, and mine and some of the others of the group. And so that was part of what made me think about the instability. Part of it, too, is that you don't, over a long period of time, have the CEO of an institution divorced or two arms' length from some of the key day-to-day operations of an institution. So I knew going into it, or suspected anyway, thought I knew, that it would last for a while, that we would both need to work very assiduously at making it work, and it did work for a while.

But, you know—and it was inevitable—it began to fray—the relationships frayed a little on the edges. And I don't say that pejoratively at all with respect to Len. He did some things and I did some things that in hindsight, probably both of us, if we'd done them a little differently, would have delayed the fraying somewhat. But having said all of that, I think it was a productive four years or so where we had that kind of a working relationship.

ASH: You actually stayed in that role for quite a while. When other people were leaving, you were still there. So how was it that you were able to keep that vision?

McGILL: Let me—in reflecting on this and answering that, let me characterize, from my perspective to be sure, Len Laster a bit on this, because I think that's a factor, and let me give my characterization. Len was driven. He had an unremitting need to be focused on quality. And I really think that was the characteristic of Len that served the institution as well as it did, because I do think it was a better institution for Len having been there, by a marked amount. And it was his unremitting focus on quality. Len simply was constitutionally unable to settle for anything less than first rate, as he judged it.

Stemming from that, in my judgment, were several characteristics in terms of day-to-day operating style. He put an extreme amount of pressure on himself. He worked incredibly long hours. He dealt with a lot of paper; he dealt with a lot of people. I have no idea how many hours a week he worked, but a lot of his time, probably almost all of his waking time, was committed to OHSU. I remember phone calls—and that was fine—phone calls on evenings and weekends, and I knew that on Sunday evenings particularly he was absolutely focused on the institution and the next week, and so on. So he certainly set an example for hard work and focus that he expected other people to emulate. And not everybody is wired quite the same way, and, frankly, that caused some problems. Some people who were willing to settle for less than first rate, for top quality, or who were not quite as focused and hardworking as Len, found Len a difficult person with whom to work. So he set very high standards for himself and other people.

So expectations were high, and people who did not meet his level of expectation found it difficult to work with him. I like to think, and other people have to judge—we are not any of us very good judges, I suppose, of ourselves—that I never had a problem working long hours or hard. That never bothered me. And I like to think that I had a focus on quality too. I think Len recognized that. And, actually, he and I worked very, very closely and quite well most of that four or four and a half years in which I was the only vice president.

ASH: And what was it that made you look to going elsewhere?

McGILL: A couple of things. One I referred to earlier. This relationship was so intense, and, as I say, began to fray a little on the edges, plus the fact that I was beginning to think about professionally advancing, having a broader set of responsibilities. So after I had been at the institution about a half a dozen years, I began to look at a couple of opportunities. One of them was the one that I ended up taking in Missouri, which was the chief financial/business officer for a very large public university system, recruited by Peter Magrath, who had been President of the University of Minnesota. Peter was putting together a new team. And so part of it was professional advancement, a chance to do a set of things broader than just health sciences, and I was ready, after half a dozen years at OHSU, to look to go somewhere else.

I'll tell you that Len didn't know that I was looking. I decided that I would go ahead and take a look at a couple of places kind of quietly, and Len was surprised when I told him that I was leaving. And so we had a discussion about how that would be announced and how it would be dealt with, and so on, and that all, I think, worked fine. When I went to OHSU, as a matter of fact—and I reminded Len when I told him I was leaving—I made a commitment to Len that I would stay at least five years, and I was there six.

ASH: You ended up, then, resigning while Len was still there?

McGILL: Yes. He stayed on perhaps two years. I left in '86. Did he leave in '88 or '89?

ASH: Well, I know Dave Witter was acting president in '88, so just where between '87 and '88 Len left, I'm not sure. But then who replaced you? Was it Dave Witter who replaced you?

McGILL: Let me think a minute. Was it Dave? You know, I really don't recall. I know that Hank Van Hassel, the Dean of Dentistry, Lou Terkla's successor, was pulled into the President's Office, if you will, and I think served in an administrative role for a while. Hank would have to give you the particulars.

ASH: He's retired now.

McGILL: Yes, I saw. A new dean from—I forget where, but a woman.

ASH: A woman with a law degree as well as a dental degree. Very interesting.

McGILL: Yes. Of course, Jim Walker ultimately ended up in that position. I think there were a series of people before Jim.

ASH: Or pieces of people, maybe.

McGILL: Or pieces of people. There was a woman for a while, whom I did not know. She came out of an accounting firm, I think.

ASH: Yes, for a very short time...

McGILL: Oh, I do know her, as a matter of fact.

ASH: ...in '89.

McGILL: Carol Lindeman introduced her to me, and I don't recall her name.

ASH: That didn't last very long.

McGILL: No.

ASH: The buildings on the campus. I should have told you in the beginning that the people we're interviewing—we're trying to focus on certain themes so that when future researchers come along who may want to delve into the changes in curricula within the schools, for example, we'll have that targeted as one of our themes. Becoming a university has been one of our big themes, and that was fascinating to go into with Dr. Bluemle and other people at that time. But I think that the theme of the physical layout of the campus is one that I'll definitely talk to Len about, but you were there then, too.

McGILL: Right. One of the most fun things that I was able to be part of while I was at OHSU was a master plan, a physical master plan for the campus. Len was very involved and very interested in it too, which was terrific, so all of the top administrators were engaged. We hired a Portland firm, Zimmer, Gunsul, Frasca, to help us do master planning for that campus, looking at potential building sites, functionally what kinds of things might go on various building sites. We looked at how people circulate on the campus, how cars were to be handled, and, then, linkages to things like the VA. And given that marvelous site that the institution sits on, overlooking Portland with the ravine in the middle, it presented all kinds of challenges physically and by being bounded in terms of possible acquisition of new land. And essentially the conclusion was that we were not going to be able to purchase much, if any, additional property around the main campus. So there were some very interesting constraints on master planning for the campus.

One of the principles that Len enunciated was that he insisted that any new building that was built would not only serve the immediate purposes to be housed in that building—research or classrooms or whatever—but that that building would also serve some of the broader campus objectives, whether it was connecting other buildings so that people could move from one place to another more easily, or perhaps provide some places for contemplation. Len envisioned some quiet places, perhaps with a bench or some green space, where a faculty member could sit and just think. So that would be another thing, that Len wanted to make this campus a place that was a little more humane and had a human element to it in terms of physically how it presented itself.

So that was one of the major guiding principles that came out of all this, as well as some of the things that master plans usually do in terms of looking at where roads ought to go and so on. And so that plan, at least through the time that I was there, served as a guidepost or a set of guideposts as we thought about new buildings and where they went and how they were to be done.

And as I recall, the first major building done within that plan was the biomedical research institute, and a little later on the planning for the—what is now named, I think, the Casey Eye Institute—ophthalmology offices and outpatient areas. And I guess there were some additions to the hospital that were thought about while I was there, too, under the rubric of this plan.

ASH: I think those were the days when the courtyard was designed too, the cafeteria spilling out into the courtyard.

McGILL: Yes. And we were giving some thought to making the place a bit more felicitous for students as well. While I was there that didn't really play out in terms of new buildings. I think buildings related to students, student recreation facilities and all, came after I left.

ASH: What role did you play in this?

McGILL: Oh, I spent a lot of time working with the consultant and working with the people inside of the university that were engaged in the planning. And these things involved a lot of, basically, brainstorming sessions, and then the consultant would come back and give you two or three options that would reflect some ideas as the way to achieve certain kinds of things. So I was quite closely involved in that effort and, as I say, look back on it as one of the really engaging, fun things that was done. And important things, I think, to some degree, but certainly just a lot of fun. We had a great group of people, both inside and outside, working on this project.

I do recall one of the early ideas in that that has now actually played out was that the end of the ravine, as we called it at that time, where I believe the Doernbecher Hospital has been built, was seen as a major building site, and it was a way, again, to serve a broader objective, and that was to provide a better linkage between the two sides of the campus, the CDRC and the School of Nursing on one side and the rest of the campus on the other side. It was very difficult at that time to traverse those two parts of the campus. So we did see that end of the ravine, whether it was parking or another facility, as some day providing a connector between the two campuses.

And, of course, another connector issue was with the VA, and I believe we contemplated in that master plan some kind of a bridge that ultimately got built. I've never walked that bridge, as a matter of fact.

ASH: The whole thing is pretty exciting, but that bridge has a view that is incredible, as does the Doernbecher now, and the Doernbecher—I hope you have a chance to visit it, because it's absolutely lovely, and—I'm talking too much, here.

McGILL: No, no.

ASH: We interviewed Gary Jones recently. Dick Jones's son is a pediatric oncologist.

McGILL: I don't think I knew him.

ASH: He had been a medical student at our institution, actually while his father was Acting President, but then he went off elsewhere to do all kinds of fellowships, and I think he

was at Vanderbilt, and came back about two years ago to work on campus. And so he is now working over in the new Doernbecher, and he says he thinks it's a national, and maybe an international, model for how a children's hospital should be designed.

McGILL: Oh, terrific. Pete Kohler is a pediatrician, isn't he?

ASH: I didn't interview Pete, but—no, I don't think...

McGILL: The president?

ASH: Uh-huh.

McGILL: He's not?

ASH: I don't think so.

McGILL: Okay. He's an internist, isn't he, come to think of it?

ASH: Yes.

McGILL: I think a new children's hospital was, I'm told, one of his agenda items on his coming.

ASH: Ah. Well, he's there every day now.

Also the Hatfield Building. It's been built between University Hospital and our building, the BICC. It's all filled in now with a building that has Mark O. Hatfield's name on the front, and it's a new emergency department, but also neurosensory clinic, speech, and hearing is there. It's exciting and beautiful. And our building did tie the School of Nursing, the School of Medicine, and the School of Dentistry pretty nicely together, too.

McGILL: I did get a chance to walk through the School of Nursing building. It had been open perhaps a year. Carol Lindeman took me through it with a great deal of absolutely well-placed pride. That's a beautiful building, well designed, well laid out.

ASH: And she was able to get funding to match federal funding for that.

McGILL: Right. Betty Gray, I think, was one of the people who was involved in fund-raising. Betty was an early supporter of nursing. In fact, Betty—if you check the records, I think this is right. Betty gave money to endow a chair in the School of Nursing. I think that was the first endowed chair of nursing in the country. I believe that's what I was told at the time. And Carol Lindeman deserved a lot of credit for that. And so Betty contributed to the building as well, I believe.

ASH: I see. I didn't realize that.

Then, the whole building issue seemed to be a very happy issue for most people to work with.

McGILL: Right.

ASH: And a lot of that was because there was funding foreseen.

McGILL: Right.

ASH: Now, when you first came, how would you judge the amount of funding OHSU had versus when you left?

McGILL: Actually, I don't have any precise financial numbers in mind, so my answer is impressions, and broad rather than specific. From the state of Oregon and tuition, those kinds of typical revenues, OHSU was not as well funded as a lot of medical schools around the country. I think I recall some of those comparative statistics. And I don't know that we made a lot of progress on that front in state appropriations while I was there. Some, I think.

We had some relatively—let me back up. I came in '80. Those were rocky years, by and large, actually, for state appropriations. I had been on board in 1980 two or three months. Len Laster was out of town one weekend. A call came in from the Chancellor's Office—perhaps it was on Friday or Thursday—calling all of the eight presidents together in Eugene for a Sunday meeting. And with Len being gone, I went down in his stead.

ASH: Was this a common thing, Sunday meetings?

McGILL: No. Very unusual.

And we got to the Chancellor's Office, and Roy Lieuallen said that he had been given directives by the Governor that he was to present two or three budget reduction options with the worst a thirty percent reduction in state appropriations for the whole System. And, then, I think there was a twenty percent scenario, there may have been a ten percent, but the worst was thirty percent. And so he was asking each of the presidents at this Sunday afternoon meeting to be back within a short period of time—I don't recall the details, but perhaps a week or two or three—with a scenario saying what would you do if you had to take a thirty percent cut.

So Oregon was heading into what turned out to be a long recessionary period that began in late '79 or '80. And, as I recall, Oregon didn't come out of that recession until after I had left. It was a long, long period of time. The timber industry was badly hit in terms of economics.

As you'll recall, the late seventies, early eighties were the periods of very high

inflation, high interest rates, which just killed the home building industry. And so, as I think now, no, we did not make much progress in terms of increases in state appropriations during the early to middle eighties. We were under tight budgets that whole time.

ASH: Do you remember what the upshot of the weeklong process was?

McGILL: Yeah. It wasn't anything like a thirty percent cut, and the process extended well beyond a week or two, as you would expect. I do recall some tough, tough meetings on the campus, and this was probably—it was in the summer or fall of 1980, where we immediately engaged the deans and the clinical directors in the process. And there were, as I recall, budget hearings around the campus, and various scenarios were built as to reductions here or there and what the implications would be, and all of those were pulled together and presented to the Chancellor and his staff. It was not a pleasant exercise to go through.

As I recall, one of the things that was put on the table, I think by the Chancellor's Office, was the elimination of the whole College of Dentistry. If thirty percent reduction were to occur, tell us what would happen if we were just to abolish the College of Dentistry. There were draconian kinds of measures like that were being suggested. And so I do recall some of the dealings with Lou Terkla at that time, who is one of the all-time great human beings. Lou dealt with all of that in his very calm, rational manner very effectively on the part of the College of Dentistry. But, yeah, it was a tough couple of three months as I recall now.

ASH: I remember—I was around then, too, having to put together some of these proposals, but also I remember we almost declared financial exigency in which faculty would be laid off. I personally had to lay off a number of people in the library. Then there were bumping privileges and people moving around.

McGILL: Yes, that's right. It's coming back. I put that way in the recesses of my mind, I suppose, not wanting to recall it, but that's right. I'd have to check the statistics, of course, but I do think that those tough budget straits lasted several years.

ASH: How nice that they ended. We're all feeling better now about...

McGILL: Right. But financially, the other side, if you set aside state appropriations and look at sponsored research—and I don't recall the figures '80 to '86, the time I was there, but I do recall that in 1980 we were getting a paltry amount of sponsored research from NIH and other such agencies, and I've seen the statistics recently—well over a hundred million dollars a year now. And so I would argue that the investments that were made in that half dozen years I was there—and I'm not taking any credit—in buildings, in part by the Vollums and Mark Hatfield, have paid off. They are paying off.

It's a long lead time from providing space to recruiting faculty to getting the grants and to having all of that fall into place, but it looks to me now that some of the things that Len began in the late seventies, early eighties, indeed are having payoffs for OHSU. And that's a factor, of course. A lot of people, including the people who are there now, the faculty and the

people who recruited the faculty and so on deserve credit, too. But I really do think that the basis was laid during Len's presidency.

And to my way of thinking, that is one of the major legacies of Len Laster—to begin to get people thinking in terms of quality and that they could and should compete nationally, and putting into place some of the core infrastructure, bricks and mortar in particular, that have led to the ability now to do the things that are being done now.

ASH: This is going to click in just a minute, but I should ask you a little more about the hospital. Was that part of your responsibility then?

[End of Tape 1, Side 2/Begin Tape 2, Side 1]

ASH: It's March 2, 1999, and this is Joan Ash, interviewing Jim McGill in his office at Johns Hopkins.

McGILL: As I think about these things, and my memory sharpens up a little on it now, I think I said that Don Kassebaum, who was Vice President for Hospital Affairs, relinquished that title shortly after I had taken on a vice president title. Actually, I think it may have been a while later. It may have been a year or two or three. But Don continued as hospital director functionally. His title was changed at some point, I think, from Vice President to Hospital Director. So most of the time I was there it was Don that was Hospital Director. He stepped down from that role before I left, and Dave Witter stepped into that role for a period of time.

In terms of my role with respect to the hospital, I didn't have any management responsibility for the hospital day to day. My role was one of a broader financial role, and, I suppose, to some extent trying to insure that at least at the level of senior management and in terms of overall resource allocation that the hospital and the educational units, the three schools, were working in concert. There were always resource allocation issues, with the hospital indeed supporting to some extent the School of Medicine and the School of Nursing in particular, and I recall discussions with the deans and the hospital director working out how much would go to Nursing, how much to Medicine from the hospital. And there were other operational issues that would cut across the educational units, again particularly Nursing and Medicine, not so much Dentistry, and the hospital, and I would be involved in those discussions.

So it was more a facilitating role around issues that cut across the clinical and the educational units, not at the faculty level of the clinicians in the hospital and the schools. I didn't deal at that level. I didn't have any expertise there, but more at the resource allocation or broad working relationship level.

ASH: Because we talked about research funding and we talked about state funding, I was wondering about the clinical funding.

McGILL: Looking back on that period of time, '80 to '86, in terms of clinical funding, those were some of the heady glory days. Certainly, the financing of health providers today is much, much tougher and pinching than it was in those days, although we thought in those days, and, indeed, we felt it in those days, that the clinical side of the enterprise was being squeezed greatly, too. We were providing a lot of indigent care, didn't feel that the state of Oregon was reimbursing us appropriately for the indigent care we provided, and so on. But as I recall those days, the hospital stayed in the black. In fact, I'm sure it did.

But we did spend a lot of time working with people at the State to try to leverage the investment that they were already making in the hospital, and to look for synergies between the hospital, Medicine, and Nursing to leverage additional funding.

ASH: I had forgotten [laughing] there were some good days at the hospital then.

McGILL: Yeah.

ASH: So when you left, how did you feel the systems were? In other words, had your personal aspirations for OHSU been fulfilled?

McGILL: Not completely. I wouldn't claim for a minute that some of the fixes that I thought we needed to do in terms of administrative systems and processes were left in perfect form. I think better form, but not where I would have liked to have had them. And there are a lot of reasons for that. Some, my time being focused on other things, as we talked about earlier, after a year and a half into the job. Part of it, too, that being part of the broad bureaucracies—and I don't say that pejoratively but descriptively—of the State System and the State of Oregon. There were only certain degrees of freedom that we could exercise on the campus.

So things were better, but were they in perfect shape? No. I assume—in fact, I know—that my successors were able to improve on those too. So some of the things were achieved, but not all.

ASH: When you then went to Missouri—just to follow up on your career here, you went to Missouri, and you were part of a larger system as financial or as total administrative? What was your role?

McGILL: I was the chief business/financial officer for this four-campus, 50,000-student public higher education system in the state of Missouri. I was at the system level rather than the campuses, so the analogue would be the Chancellor's Office in Oregon, although that analogy breaks down in that we had a lot more degrees of freedom in Missouri, both on the campuses and at the system within which to work, than we did in Oregon, and that was really a refreshing change. State government in Missouri does not get involved at all, *at all*, in the day-to-day operation of the University of Missouri.

So in many ways in that regard we operated like a private university. We ran our own personnel systems, our own purchasing systems; we invested our own funds, we did all of the banking relationships, insurance, union negotiations, et cetera. All of that was part of the scope of responsibility in Missouri, so it was really very much a broader set of responsibilities I had there. I did have the opportunity, too, to work with an academic health center in Columbia, Missouri, the flagship campus, and we also had a health sciences campus in Kansas City, so I had two in Missouri with which to work. Not day-to-day responsibility, but in working on strategy and resource allocation and funding and so on. So I was able to keep my hand in the business side of academic medicine and other health professions.

ASH: But you didn't have to go and talk to the legislators personally, like you did in Oregon?

McGILL: Oh, I did. Actually, yes.

ASH: You did?

McGILL: Yeah. Part of the role there was to interact with the state—with the funders at the state in terms of justifying the funding that came to the University of Missouri. But the funding there came in a lump sum.

ASH: It wasn't being called on a Sunday to...

McGILL: No, it wasn't being called on a Sunday, no.

ASH: How do you switch from state to state like that and learn a whole new set of characters and personalities? What does it take—if I wanted to take a job like that, what would it take?

McGILL: [Laughing] I don't know. I recall, in my move to Hopkins from Missouri, having gotten a call from an ex-state legislator who had headed the budget committee for the House in Missouri, who lived in Columbia—a guy I'd gotten to know fairly well. He called me, and he said, "Jim, I see you're leaving." I said, "Yeah," He says, "Well, actually, that's courageous." I said, "Courageous?" He said, "Yeah," and added, "Not to put a fine point on it, but," he says, "you're no spring chicken any longer," which is true.

I think what he was really saying is it takes a little bit of, perhaps, venturesomeness, a willingness to try something different, to do some things differently, to get to know new situations, new people; and, indeed, that's it. When I moved to Hopkins it was the same thing. I was quite comfortable in Missouri, but moving here at fifty-four, I really see it as a bit of an adventure and as a chance to get recharged in having to learn new people, new situations. But, you know, the basic business operation at a university is the same any place.

ASH: But you've gone—you were at a health sciences university, stand-alone, at Oregon, then you went into a four-campus system, and now you're at a private university, a

whole different thing, and you are—is the health sciences campus part of what you do here?

McGILL: Yes and no [laughter]. You cannot put together an organizational chart at Johns Hopkins that accurately describes how the place works. It just defies putting on paper. I have no direct day-to-day operating responsibility for the health sciences center at Hopkins; however, I'm very, very engaged in the strategic issues regarding where we go from here with regard to health sciences and in some of the major resource allocation issues. I spend perhaps a quarter of my time at Hopkins working with my colleagues at the health sciences center. And, of course, my background in Illinois and in Oregon and Missouri, where most of my professional career I've been involved, again, on the business end of academic health sciences, has played well here. I know the issues. The nuances are different from one local area to another local area, but the basic strategic issues are the same, and having had experience other places has helped me immensely at Hopkins.

ASH: Their campus is...

McGILL: A separate campus here. It's in what we call East Baltimore. It's perhaps four miles from the undergraduate campus on which we are today. I say undergraduate campus. It's really the arts and sciences and engineering campus.

ASH: So how many campuses are there for Hopkins?

McGILL: I don't know, six or seven. We have a program in international studies in Washington, D.C.; we have a campus in China; we have a campus in Italy; we have major continuing education outposts in three different sites in Washington, D.C., and other places in Maryland.

It's a fascinating institution, a complex institution. When most people think of Hopkins, they think of medicine and the hospital, which are marvelous, absolutely marvelous, first rate, absolutely first rate. But Hopkins is much more complex than that. We have about 16,000 students, relatively small, but only 4,000 of those students are full-time undergraduate students. The rest are professional or graduate students and our part-time program enrolls about half of those 16,000 students. So we have a huge master's degree program off campus, primarily in business and education.

ASH: And where are those campuses?

McGILL: Columbia, Maryland, Washington, D.C. Those are the two large ones. Some of it's done on this campus.

ASH: So in your position here you do have some responsibility for all of that?

McGILL: Right. But Hopkins is very, very decentralized. Funds flow here from the bottom up. Virtually all revenues coming in are captured at the level of the school or college, whereas in most higher education institutions central administration is involved in allocating

at least some of those resources. That doesn't happen at Hopkins. It's very entrepreneurial. Hopkins' central administration is perhaps more of a holding company of a set of guardedly independent divisions, colleges, and schools. A fascinating place.

ASH: Do you think that's because a lot of the funding is extramural?

McGILL: Yes.

ASH: Because it's so graduate-oriented?

McGILL: Yes, right. Fifty-five percent of the revenues at Johns Hopkins are sponsored-programs revenues. Fifty-five percent. And most of that federal.

ASH: But it's still very different from anything you've done before.

McGILL: Very different.

ASH: You've been here how long?

McGILL: A year and a quarter, I guess.

ASH: And you still think it's a challenge.

McGILL: Oh, yes, yes. And the president and I, who's a terrific guy, say to each other, "No one has any power here except the faculty." And it is really true. That's a bromide that's sometimes heard at other places, and to some degree it's true, but it is true to the nth degree at Hopkins. And so—a very bright set of colleagues, absolutely driven colleagues, and where you have your influence and your impact is by bringing ideas and skills and so on to the mix. So it's a different kind of a place.

ASH: A different model.

McGILL: It is.

ASH: Is there anything I should have asked you that I haven't asked you?

McGILL: Let me think.

We've talked about this a bit. If somebody really wants to understand what happened during the Laster years, you should talk to some of those people that served on the Board of Overseers. They have a unique perspective.

ASH: Betty Gray, Don Tisdale.

McGILL: Don may not be around anymore, but Bob Mitchell, if he's still around.

ASH: And Jean Vollum you think would remember?

McGILL: Oh, yes. And you might check the roster of the membership for the first two or three years of the Board of Overseers. Those people were quite instrumental in getting Len ensconced into Portland.

ASH: For the fundraising part of things?

McGILL: Yes, right. And that was crucial. Not only Vollum, but some of the other things that were done, too, in terms of philanthropic support. Betty Gray was a marvelous supporter.

ASH: It just occurred to me that where there were these very good relations in the community, the newspaper didn't seem to be really kind to Dr. Laster. There, I know, were—and Mary Ann Lockwood talked about—it was an appliance, and I can't remember, was it a refrigerator or washing machine, but anyway, there was a big scandal, it seemed.

McGILL: Yes, yes.

ASH: It seemed like someone was out to—maybe it was the press, individuals, I don't know. Did you have a sense that...

McGILL: I really don't have much insight on that. I do not recall that incident. And there was something about his having bought outside Christmas lights that he used to decorate his home.

Frankly—again, native Oregonian—I attributed some of that to the very, very strong populism that pervades the psyche of Oregonians. And it plays out in the way the Legislature works. Very egalitarian. It's very difficult in Oregon to find the power brokers politically. There are some with more influence than others, but in the states like Missouri, and in Maryland now, there are power brokers. There are a handful of politicians that you can go to and you know that if you get their support, you're probably going to get something done. In Oregon it was very difficult to do that.

So Oregon, in my view, is very populist, very egalitarian, and so I always attributed some of this newspaper stuff to that just being part of the mix in Oregon. And certainly in Missouri, too, we had—in Columbia we had two daily newspapers, and we had reporters running all over the place, and I just got numb to the kind of reporting that goes on. It's just part of what happens in a public university.

ASH: So it probably didn't mirror the town-gown relations, it probably was only *The Oregonian*?

McGILL: I don't think it mirrored town-gown relations at all. I think Len, at least in

the years that I was there, had really very, very strong relationships with key people in the business and philanthropic community in Oregon, and he nurtured those relationships, and they were very, very important. And I think they were quite strong.

ASH: Where they come from?

McGILL: Where they come from, right. It's their job to muckrake a little.

ASH: Some of the other—we talked about clinical, we talked about research. We didn't talk about women and minorities, but that's one of the themes, and, in fact, this afternoon—I don't know if I told you—I'm interviewing a woman who graduated in 1936 from the Medical School and then went out to practice in eastern Oregon. But we need to interview Fran Storrs and some others...

McGILL: Oh, Fran, sure.

ASH: She's retired now, too.

McGILL: Jane Siegel?

ASH: She isn't on the list. Should she be?

McGILL: I don't know.

When you mention minorities and women, there was some controversy, I thought misdirected, personally, at Len in terms of lack of attentiveness to those things. Again, I thought it was misdirected. And you may recall that there was a class-action lawsuit brought by women faculty and staff against the whole System of Higher Education in that period of time. That consumed an inordinate amount of time, my time in particular. Len and I talked, and I ended up, basically, being on the point, on the front, for the Health Sciences University in terms of dealing with the attorneys in that lawsuit. It was just something that had to be done. It wasn't the most pleasant way to spend time. You may recall that.

ASH: I remember having to gather statistics on a lot of things, for your benefit, I think.

McGILL: Yeah. And there was a strong—Marion Krippaehne, Fran Storrs, Jane Siegel—committee of people, women mostly, that were particularly concerned, appropriately so, about gender-related issues and equal opportunity and so on. Ann Hoffstetter.

ASH: Oh, yes. She's still on the staff.

Well, I think I've covered everything on here.

McGILL: Shall we go grab a bite to eat?

ASH: Sounds good to me. Thank you so much for giving me this time.

McGILL: You bet.

[End of interview]

## INDEX

### A

academic medical centers, 22  
Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation, 8, 9  
Arthur, Ransom, 4, 11

### B

Barrows, Bill, 5  
BICC (Biomedical Information Communication Center), 7  
Bluemle, Lewis (Bill), 3

### C

Casey Eye Institute, 14  
CDRC (Child Development and Rehabilitation Center), 4

### D

Davis, William E. (Bud), 9  
Doernbecher Children's Hospital, 15-16

### F

Frohnmayr, Otto, 1

### G

Gray, Betty, 1, 16, 23, 24

### H

Hatfield, Mark, 7-9  
Hood, Leroy E., 7

### J

Johns Hopkins University, 8, 22-23  
Jones, Gary, 15-16

### K

Kassebaum, Donald, 3, 10, 19  
Kendall, John W., Jr., 4  
Kohler, Peter, 16  
Krippaehne, Marion, 25

### L

Laster, Leonard, 1, 2, 3, 5-7, 8-10, 11-12, 13, 14, 18-19  
Lemman, W.T. (Bill), 5  
Lieuallen, Roy, 17  
Lindeman, Carol, 4, 11

### M

Magrath, C. Peter, 12  
Mark O. Hatfield Research Center, 16  
McGill, James (Jim)  
    biographical information, 1-2, 9  
    career, 2, 12-13, 20-23  
    education, 1  
Menashe, Victor D., 4, 11  
Mitchell, Robert R., 1, 23

### O

OHSU Board of Overseers, 1, 6, 23-24  
Oregon Health Sciences University  
    administration, 3, 4-6, 9-12, 19, 20  
    buildings, 14-17  
    financial management, 3, 7, 18, 19  
    funding, 7, 16-18, 19-20, 24  
    geography, 14  
    image, 6, 19  
    media relations, 6, 24  
    name change from UOHSC, 2, 6  
    recruitment, faculty, 7  
    town-gown relationships, 24-25  
Oregon Health Sciences University Library, 18  
Oregon State Legislature, 5, 17, 20, 24  
Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE), 5, 17, 20, 25

### P

Parelius, M. Ronald, 3  
Peterson, Robert A. (Bob), 3

## INDEX

### S

School of Dentistry, 18, 19  
School of Medicine, 19  
School of Nursing, 16, 19  
Siegel, Jane, 25  
Stone, Robert (Bob), 4  
Storrs, Frances, 25

### T

Tektronix, Inc., 7  
Terkla, Louis G., 4, 11, 18  
Tisdale, Donald, 1, 23

### U

university consolidation, 3  
University of Missouri, 20-21  
University Hospital, 3, 19-20

### V

Van Hassel, Henry (Hank), 13  
Veterans Administration Hospital, 7, 15  
Vollum, Howard, 7  
Vollum, Jean, 7, 24  
Vollum Institute, 7, 14

### W

Walker, James B., 13  
Witter, David, 3, 13, 19  
women, as faculty, 25

### Z

Zimmer, Gunsul, Frasca Partnership, 14