



2013

# Griego, Elizabeth 2013

Ken Beauchamp

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

---

## Recommended Citation

Beauchamp, Ken, "Griego, Elizabeth 2013" (2013). *Emeriti Society Oral History Collection*. 51.  
<https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/esohc/51>

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

FACULTY EMERITI INTERVIEWS  
UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC ARCHIVES



**Griego, Elizabeth (2006 – 2013)**  
**Vice President for Student Life**

July 26, 2013

By Ken Beauchamp

Transcription by Shameela Maskeen, University of the Pacific,  
Department of Special Collections, Library

Subjects: Student Life organization and staffing, Student Life programs, Pacific students' characteristics.

## UOP ARCHIVES FACULTY EMERITI INTERVIEWS

Elizabeth Griego—Division of Student Life

BEAUCHAMP: This is an interview with Elizabeth Griego. The interviewer is Ken Beauchamp. The interview date is July 26, 2013, and we are recording in Lynn King's office in Student Life. First part is just about your history. So, what years did you serve the University? What were your official titles?

GRIEGO: My first day of work was April 1, 2006, and I retired July 5, 2013. I served the University for seven years and three months. My title was Vice President for Student life, and from the beginning, I also held the title Professor of Education.

BEAUCHAMP: So you negotiated that on entrance.

GRIEGO: Yes I did; the academic appointment was important to me both because of past teaching positions and my love of being in the classroom, and my hope to continue that opportunity at Pacific and keep current with my scholarship. President DeRosa made sure that I knew that the award of academic rank would not be a tenured position, and that I would not have retreat rights. I understood the reasons for those stipulations. It was primarily important to me to have the opportunity to be in the classroom, have disciplinary contact with faculty colleagues, and to advise the division of student life from both academic and administrative perspectives.

BEAUCHAMP: Sure. Yes, and you did. So that makes sense. What circumstances brought you to Pacific?

GRIEGO: This was the second time I applied for this position. You know this story right?

BEAUCHAMP: No.

GRIEGO: The first time I applied to Pacific, I was working at Samuel Merritt University, where I had been vice president for student affairs and academic support services for 11 years. I had come to the point where I was doing a comprehensive job search and I applied to Pacific and a number of other Universities. Gene Pearson chaired the search committee for Pacific, and he is such a great search chair for so many reasons. Three of us were invited to on-campus interviews. After I received the invitation for the on-campus interview, I drove out to Stockton, and realized that it was not going to be possible to commute daily from Piedmont, where I was living at the time and where my kids were happily ensconced in school. I realized that I wouldn't be able to make that drive every day. We had a long family conversation and decided that this was not the time to move our kids out of their schools. I didn't want the campus to go through the whole search process and then withdraw at the end, so instead of going to campus for the

interview, I called Gene Pearson and explained to him that it just wasn't going to work for me with my family circumstances. I subsequently wrote a withdrawal letter, but I remember saying to Gene, you know, my fondest hope is that you will find someone and hire him or her, and then he'll fail, and then my kids will graduate from high school, and I'll reapply and hope to come then to Pacific! We laughed about it, but I think that intention was actually in the letter I wrote and the suggestion never fully left my mind, and I kept the letter! So, I knew quite a bit about Pacific because of my interest over the years since my first application, and also because a former vice president, Judy Chambers, has been so active and well known in our professional organization-

BEAUCHAMP: Oh sure, of course.

GRIEGO: -as has Jess Marks, who was my particular friend over the years. Jess and I spent a lot of time at student affairs conferences together and we were active and both chaired the northern California NASPA professional group. Of course, both Judy and Jess are great advertisements for Pacific's division of student affairs.

BEAUCHAMP: Yes they are.

GRIEGO: I ended up accepting another position that I had applied for concurrently with the Pacific position and worked for the accrediting commission at the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for six years. I learned a lot in accreditation about systems of learning assessment, program review, self-study and governance, all of which served me well after I came to Pacific. At WASC, I worked with a portfolio of 42 institutions and while I enjoyed it immensely, I eventually got to the point where I asked myself, is this WASC job going to be my last job? Or, do I want to have one other position before retiring? I came to the conclusion that I wanted to have at least one other job that might be a capstone career position. Then the thinking became, what will that job be, because there were other possibilities opened up to me through the-

BEAUCHAMP: Through WASC?

GRIEGO: -yes, though WASC and accreditation. While I had been learning with my head through accreditation, I felt it was time to follow my heart, and that thinking led me back to student affairs and the opportunity to work more closely with students. I actually made a list of all the institutions in the Bay Area, because we didn't want to leave Northern California. I had some opportunities at UC Berkeley, but I began to feel that Berkeley was too large to afford much chance to work directly with students. I had worked previously at small liberal arts colleges, but found there was always a limit of inadequate budgets and staffing. I actually made a list of northern California institutions, and I realized -- it was Pacific! About 9 months earlier, Julie Sina, Pacific's vice president of student affairs before me, had asked to meet with me about

likely candidates whom I might recommend for the vice president of student life position that she was leaving. I had met with her at that time and had given her the names of people who I thought would be great candidates. I thought it was likely that Pacific had already made that hire, but I went ahead and called Julie. She told me that Pacific had had a failed search, and when she learned I might be interested, she invited me to meet with President DeRosa in his office the next Friday. I said, Yes sure! So I never ended up writing a letter of application-

BEAUCHAMP: You didn't actually apply.

GRIEGO: I didn't formally apply. I brought my résumé, and I met with President DeRosa that Friday, who turned out to be a very tough interviewer. My memory of that interview was that he asked very challenging questions and in particular, he focused on the Greek system, because I think that had been difficult for student affairs in the past. He wanted to know what I would do, and how I would handle situations, and even though I felt pretty confident about working with Greek chapters and their alumni, the questions were put in such a challenging way that I was beginning to think maybe I don't want to work for this guy after all.

BEAUCHAMP: Yes-

GRIEGO: But it seemed that I passed the president's screening interview because then I came back to campus for two days of interviews and before Christmas, I got the offer. The whole interview process was over in just a few weeks. And I was really pleased and happy to come to Pacific.

GRIEGO: I always had a very favorable view of Pacific because the campus is so beautiful, and also because it was well known for having a strong student affairs function and vision. I saw Pacific's historic liberal arts core with strong professional schools, and that was just the size and kind of mission that was interesting to me. From my experience with WASC, I thought Pacific had the potential of financial stability and an interesting history of innovation, as well as placing value on the functions of student affairs. We had visited Stockton a number of times because my husband's family, who are Mexican-American, lived on Alpine Street. We'd been in Stockton for family, Fourth of July gatherings, and the like, and I had a favorable impression of the city as a place to live.

BEAUCHAMP: Interesting: As you know, in recent years, people's impressions of Stockton...

GRIEGO: Yes, I think definitely more problems developed in the city over the years we lived here. The housing bubble burst while we were here, and the city's financial problems, the recession, and crime problems all contributed to the challenging circumstances.

BEAUCHAMP: So, ok. First impressions of Pacific. You've already talked about the appearance. How about the people you didn't know? Not Judy and Jess, but the faculty and staff, and students that you met when you first came here. Administrators...?

GRIEGO: It was very important for me to feel that I could communicate well and work well with the President. I had heard good things about Don DeRosa, and I previously had asked him to serve on a couple of accreditation teams, but he was just not that interested, really. I think he did not want to get that far off of campus.

BEAUCHAMP: He had...serious issues to deal with here.

GRIEGO: I was calling him in the time of his health issues. Not many presidents turned down invitations to chair accreditation teams, so I was intrigued when he first turned me down and I called back a year or two later and then he told me he had health issues that would cause him to put his energy first toward his work on campus.

GRIEGO: He impressed me as being very thoughtful, very deliberate, strong, and I liked that. And then, from the time I first interviewed with Pacific, I met with Phil Gilbertson. I knew Phil slightly, because he was the WASC liaison for Pacific, and I had met him at some WASC meetings and was very favorably impressed with his thoughtfulness. When I interviewed with him for the vice-presidency, he was good about interesting me in Pacific and in talking about possible shared areas of interest and partnership, especially the strategic planning process Pacific Rising.

BEAUCHAMP: He tried to sell you to come here.

GRIEGO: Yes. He was so clearly engaged and thoughtful about the planning process and how it was proceeding that he impressed me as a provost who would be visionary, hard working, wise, and also a good partner for the division of student affairs. In some institutions there is a wide gap between faculty and staff, and I feel strongly that students are served best when there is a shared vision and when student affairs can work in partnership with academic affairs to collaborate on in-class and experiential learning.

BEAUCHAMP: Shared vision, yes. Critical.

GRIEGO: Shared vision. And in addition to that, I respected Phil's clear commitment to Pacific and also his personal humility. So both Don and Phil impressed me as strong leaders during my interviews. And then, I have to be honest, Gene Pearson was a very good representative of Pacific's faculty. I think Gene may have chaired that search again, or maybe he didn't because it all happened so quickly that the interviews just lined up. Also, the staff in the division of

student affairs impressed me as being competent and hard working, and very caring about Pacific's great students.

BEAUCHAMP: Once you were here, did somebody really stand out as helping with your introduction to Pacific?

GRIEGO: Julie. Julie Sina was still at Pacific serving as university Vice President as she worked for President DeRosa. That was her title. She was very helpful to me. I also knew that Judy Chambers who was then working half-time in Development was a good resource. Judy was very open, but if I had a question about something, I would have called Julie, and Julie really extended herself to me in good ways. And then Joanna Royce-Davis and Steve Jacobson in particular were helpful, as the student affairs experts who helped me get oriented and acquainted with issues and the way things were done at Pacific.

BEAUCHAMP: Know what to do, and where the players were.

GRIEGO: Yes. In the first six months, I spent a lot of time listening and learning, and then after that first semester, I restructured the student life organizational structure. Under the previous vice president, there were sixteen department heads who all reported to her. It was a very flat organizational structure for the division.

BEAUCHAMP: A lot of directs.

GRIEGO: A lot of directs, and that means a lot of-

BEAUCHAMP: Time-

GRIEGO: -time and meeting with people and employee supervision and management. So we reorganized to have a leadership team of four persons who reported to the vice president, with related departments under each of them.

BEAUCHAMP: Each-right.

GRIEGO: The leadership team of four became Joanna Royce Davis as dean of students, who oversaw student health and development, including health services, counseling services, judicial services, the chaplain's office, and academic support services. Steve Jacobson as associate vice president oversaw housing, residential programs, Greek Life, dining services and initially, public safety. Dan Shipp had recently been hired to oversee recreation and the design of the new university center. We added student leadership and involvement and campus events to his portfolio and made him an assistant vice president for student programs and leadership development. And John Carvana was promoted to assistant vice president for

diversity and community engagement with oversight of the career resources center, the Center for Community Involvement, the SUCCESS program, multicultural affairs and CIP.

BEAUCHAMP: The four.

GRIEGO: The four, yes, with the departments lined up under them. That proved to be a good way of organizing and I was grateful to have such a talented group and a close leadership team with whom to work. They were advising me, and me advising them, and we were making decisions in consultation together, and thinking through things together, and then each of the department heads had a little bit more time with someone giving them direct guidance and coaching.

BEAUCHAMP: Yes, and it's also for the four of them, it's a growth experience for them. Managing, more directly.

GRIEGO: Yes. Exactly that.

That worked well. Ok, what else?

BEAUCHAMP: This section is called curriculum and programs, and let me play with it a little bit. It says, describe the changes you observed in the curriculum during the years you were at Pacific. I would say describe that...yes, include that, because the Student Life curriculum is there, but also, more importantly-and there's several questions here that go together-the changes in Student Life programs, during the years you were here, and some of the innovations you brought to Pacific and Student Life, or courses as well.

GREIGO: Well, one of the first persons I met, who impressed me greatly, was Lou Matz. I met him the first meeting that I had on campus after starting work. The meeting was with Provost Gilbertson about Pacific Rising, and I was impressed with Lou's broad scope of thinking and what he was trying to do with general education. At the very beginning, when I came, we were talking about electronic portfolios, and I had been very interested in e-portfolios in my work with WASC, and Lou was very open to considering electronic portfolios for general education. I was impressed with the structure of Pacific Seminars, their themes and inter-connectedness, and the fact that the courses formed a common core for all students to take. I was also impressed that Lou and his advisory committee had formed a committee for each of the Pacific Seminars that functioned as a community of practice for faculty who taught in each level of the seminars.

BEAUCHAMP: Each one-

GRIEGO: -where faculty talked together about what it was that we wanted to teach, and what we wanted students to learn, and how that was going to be organized, and what should be in



the Pacific Seminar reader. I thought that the vitality of the General Education program was very impressive. Having looked at general education in the institutions I served at WASC, I knew how difficult it was to have a coherent model agreed to by the faculty to deliver general education. Many universities, especially the UC's, struggle with how to deliver general education.

BEAUCHAMP: That was a perennial problem.

GRIEGO: Exactly. But general education seemed to be done so well here and it seemed to be truly driven by and cared about by the faculty. The first big issue that I faced in the spring I was hired was somewhat related to general education. The Peer Advising Program had recently changed over, so that the newly-formed Student Ambassador group was doing both Academic Advising and Admission Tours and admitted student programs, and hosting campus events. These tend to be very different skill sets, and in the first meeting that I had with faculty academic advisors, the issue came up that the student Ambassadors, while performing great welcoming and hosting activities, were not always the best qualified to do peer advising. The academic advisors were not happy about losing the peer advisors. One of the first decisions I made was to find budget so that we might have both student Ambassadors and peer advisors, and thus provide additional opportunities for student leadership and different kinds of student leaders for other students to interact with and learn from.

BEAUCHAMP: Yes.

GRIEGO: The Ambassadors tend to be students who are extraverted and social, many of whom are members of the Greek system, and many are active in various student organizations and student government. The Peer Advisors were more studious with a higher number of Asian-American students, and more students who intend to go on directly to graduate school. Having multiple opportunities for student peer leadership, rather than centralizing leadership to the Ambassadors, seemed to work well. It has also been effective to have these two groups work together, especially during Orientation.

BEAUCHAMP: The curriculum, and Student Life Programs.

GRIEGO: My interest, in the beginning, was to see whether it might be possible for senior Student Life administrators, many of whom hold the doctorate and have had past teaching experience, to teach in the general education Pacific Seminars. I found the opportunity personally rewarding, really interesting, and I welcomed the opportunity to be part of the faculty group who taught PACS II. We could share our rubrics for writing, talk about issues, and I very much enjoyed the opportunity to be in the classroom and tie classroom learning to experiential projects and learning about leadership, which was the subject of the Pac Sem II class that I taught.

BEAUCHAMP: Yes, I had the same experience. One of the best parts of the seminar program was the faculty meetings, where we talked about what we were doing and what wasn't working, and why, and what we should be doing differently, and all the differences that people would bring to the table-it was fun.

GREIGO: Yes, really fun, and really interesting, and in my experience, very unusual to have such a voluntary community of practice. It's not organized that way in many other schools, and I can remember telling my colleagues at WASC and at AAC&U that there is a national model at Pacific that other schools should learn from. In Student Life, when I first came, there was also the Pacific Plan that helped Student Life to make sure that we were looking at all areas of students' growth and development. Interpersonal, intrapersonal, social justice, leadership development, and other aspects that became the organizing framework for programs and services that would help students to be successful, and also attend to the learning that went beyond cognitive development in the classroom to include other kinds of learning as well. President DeRosa had become very interested in Emotional Intelligence through his background and perspective as a psychologist and through Pacific's connection with Dan Goleman and his parents. President DeRosa had articulated the concepts of Emotional Intelligence to the Board of Trustees and the Cabinet, and he and the Regents wanted us to begin to explore how we might connect to these concepts at Pacific. He was asking if this might be a particular niche for Pacific: could we use whole-person development as a framing, and use emotional intelligence as a construct if we could thoughtfully measure it, teach it, and develop it in our students.

BEAUCHAMP: Actually do something with it.

GRIEGO: Yes. And do it thoughtfully. He brought an initial group together to begin to explore what this might look like in the classroom, in the co-curriculum, and what would need to be done to develop education and training for faculty and staff. The provost provided funds for a director-level position of someone who was conducting active research in this area. After a failed search we were able to hire a young business school assistant professor who was doing active research in social and emotional competence, Craig Seal. We formed an advisory board for Craig, of which Ken, you were a key member, and additional funds were made available for a consultant, workshops for interested persons, a graduate assistantship, and a teaching position in psychology. One of the projects in which you provided leadership was to incorporate personal interviews in both select student admission groups like Powell Scholars and Legal Scholars and applicants in the borderline student admissions group.

We developed workshops and ways for students to develop particular capacities. They could choose particular areas that they wanted to develop further. The undergraduate and graduate education and business classes taught by Craig were well attended and evaluated highly. Craig was very skillful in developing a research agenda with research partnerships that extended

across Pacific Schools and disciplines. The campus advisory board met frequently to talk about the results of the ongoing research and the programs that were offered. We also developed a national advisory board that included those persons most active in this growing field, including Dan Goleman, Richard Boyatzis, Cary Cherniss, Annie McKee, Scott Taylor, and others. We convened the advisory group on campus twice and participated in thinking and planning sessions with them and they presented their research to the campus and broader community. The advisory board was very excited about what we were doing at Pacific and we were very stimulated by our growing research and the potential to contribute to a national conversation.

BEAUCHAMP: Right--

GRIEGO: This whole venture was growing at the time that Don was beginning his retirement process, and the Regents at the time were very interested in the development of the social and emotional competence venture as a possible signature program for Pacific. It was exciting to think our way through what might be done to implement this approach with integrity and a foundation based on research and tested results. We had a number of retreats together that brought people at the University who were interested together, as thinking partners, to figure out how to proceed. We had faculty in the Psychology Department who, over the summer, wrote critical perspectives to caution us about the use of emotional intelligence-

BEAUCHAMP: Nice critical review, yes.

GRIEGO: -and which served to move us away from the catchy term of emotional intelligence, and more toward social and emotional competence which was meant to be connected to measurement, research and results. Scott Taylor, who had been a faculty member and consultant working with Richard Boyatzis and Dan Goleman and who served on the national advisory board, worked with us as a consultant, and conducted some training workshops for us. I found this to be an interesting and successful initiative because it helped those of us who were involved to think critically together across disciplines, across faculty and student life, about how we might operationalize the opportunity for students to develop their sensitivities and interpersonal skills beyond classroom learning, and it did so with a theoretical framing that Pacific had the potential to contribute to. Craig, working with you and others, developed an assessment instrument aimed at college students that we were beginning to test. All was proceeding well until the president left and a new president came in.

BEAUCHAMP: Right.

GRIEGO: The new president was not interested in continuing to fund the work on social and emotional competence, and neither was the new provost. The provost retracted the funding for social and emotional competence and Craig Seal, the director, accepted a teaching position at CSU Bakersfield and left Pacific. We had to close down the Center. We subsequently used some

of the student assessment and workshops work to morph into leadership development work, particularly with student employee training, but without the funding and direct leadership from a person whose fulltime responsibility this was, the work ultimately languished, and the faculty who were doing research in this area and who were supported by the director and the fertilization of the advisory board, wound down their research and projects. The work in Student Life continued with an ongoing noncredit class of over 250 student employees led by Assistant Vice President Dan Shipp and Kristina Juarez to...

BEAUCHAMP: Assess...

GRIEGO: Assess and use coaching and direct feedback with students around annual personal and work goals that they would set for social and emotional competence. The class became a very robust venture. We offered the class to Resident Assistants, Team Pacific students who worked in the DeRosa Center or the Rec Center, and Ambassadors and Student Advisors. The class was aimed at personal, interpersonal, and workplace effectiveness, with students setting goals, having coaches, and participating in readings during 2011-2012 and continuing into 2012-2013.

Another major initiative for Student Life beginning in the first year that I came to Pacific was the development of a rigorous system of program review. We set the goal of reviewing every department in Student Life every six years. If faculty were to be held to a process of program review for self-analysis and improvement, then student affairs should be also, and especially if we were to make claims about student learning outside the classroom. Program review was a new venture for Student Life, and there was much to be learned: how to write an in depth self-study, the need to set and evaluate annual goals, the importance of gathering comparative data, the reasons for linking the department's work to the academic mission of the university and the strategic plan, and so forth. I introduced the Council on Academic Standards (CAS) to the division and began active training of department heads who were to write their own self studies. We also wanted to involve faculty and other administrative areas of the university in the process of review, and there was work to do to set up this system that would make program review meaningful.

At the same time, I started a strong learning assessment program for all of the departments in Student Life, so that the results of learning assessment might become the core of the program reviews. The first step was to teach the staff how to write assessable learning goals, because in Student Life, they had not had previous experience with this. I worked to train first the department heads and the leadership team, and eventually expanded the assessment work to the whole division. I formed a steering group of those who had the most experience with learning assessment, and this group, whose membership changed over the years, met annually in the fall with each department head and continued to do so all the years I was at Pacific. The

task of the assessment steering group was to review the annual goals and, acting as a consulting team, work together with the department head to craft meaningful and measurable goals. We organized three annual retreats for the entire division, at the beginning of the year, before semester break, and at the end of the year, where we reviewed goals, reviewed learning results, and gave department heads input for their goals for the upcoming year.

Perhaps the most effective strategy that I've not seen done anywhere else was to take the entire roster of 120 staff members, and divide the entire division including campus safety officers, administrative assistants, graduate students, up to the dean of students, into advisory groups for each department. The director of Greek Affairs might have a campus safety officer, nurse practitioner, assistant director of the center for community involvement, the tutor for the SUCCESS program, the rowing coach, and the administrative assistant for the career resource team on her assessment team. Her job was to explain the mission, vision, and goals of Greek Affairs and her goals for student learning for the year, meet once or twice during the year to discuss progress with the team and then, at the end of the year, discuss results and what their own learning had been. Cross fertilizing the student life departments in this way meant that everyone learned about the work of other departments, everyone became invested in one another's results, and everyone could see how the work of student life connected to the goals of the university. No one was going to fail at assessment because everyone became jointly invested in making our work successful for each department. The side benefit was that we knew one another as a division, which helped with student and faculty referrals, and contributed to making the university a more friendly and personal place in which to work. We changed the teams every year so that staff could gain experience with different departments and familiarity with staff other than those with whom they worked in their own department. After the first two years of establishing the assessment model, we were able to rearrange work responsibilities and appoint Dr. Sandy Mahoney as director of assessment, along with her continuing responsibilities in advising and retention, and she stepped up wonderfully to organize the assessment work and especially, took on the training. Every directors meeting had some update for assessment training that Sandy presented. I think the work around learning and assessment helped us focus on our overarching goal to help every Pacific student be successful and to make sure that each Student Lifer understood his or her individual and collective role in that aim.

BEAUCHAMP: Oh, absolutely. Everybody.

GRIEGO: I would say, among those things that I felt were successful when I was here, that the development of a common purpose in the division of student life and the focus on learning and student success were the most important things we did. We were recognized nationally for our assessment model; first, by our professional association, NASPA, with national awards for best

programs and then later, we were recognized by Pacific's WASC accreditation team for both assessment and program review. Most recently, the division was awarded the 2013 Ted Miller national award for the use of CAS standards in program review. I'm really proud that Pacific has achieved the reputation of one of the most outstanding divisions of student affairs in the country, largely based on our collective work and results on student success, learning assessment, and program review. The graduates of our masters program in student affairs are hired by strong universities across the country. We have 100% placement rate within their first few months after graduation.

BEAUCHAMP: Did you consider any other programs developed in your time as signature programs?

GRIEGO: Two that I would mention are the ONE WORD PROJECT, where we asked every entering student during orientation to identify a word that represents his or her ideal self. It had to be a word that those who knew them best would say, "yes, that's your word." We led each student through a reflective exercise that ended in a paragraph about why they chose their particular word and took an interpretive photo of them with their words. The project was entirely student run, facilitated, and photographed. Eventually interested faculty and staff had their photos taken as well, and we have almost 3,000 photos in the ONE WORD data base. The students loved this project! I used the video on many occasions when I was asked to speak: at Orientation and alumni gatherings and with Rotary, AAUW, and other community groups. One wall of the DeRosa Center is covered with One Word photos. Everyone gravitated to the compelling photos and the creative words students had chosen. The project received a national award from NASPA and ONE WORD spread to a dozen other universities like Wake Forest and Michigan Tech and to elementary and high schools from Florida to California to Peru. Students used their One Word photos as their Pacific-recognizable facebook pictures.

And the second project was one on finding purpose. Drawing on Simon Sinek's book Start with Why, we asked students to identify and talk about their life purpose. The amazing Pacific students came up with profoundly touching stories. We commissioned student-made videos about the MY WHY project and the ONE WORD project, and these are some of the most selected links on the Pacific website. We hoped in both projects to encourage students toward greater self-awareness and also appreciation for and sensitivity to, others' journeys and aspirations. Both projects also proved to be a great vehicle to display the diversity of the student body and the seriousness and aspirations of our students.

BEAUCHAMP: Those were great ideas. Ok, shift gears: administration. First question is-and you need to modify it a little bit-in your positions, to whom did you report, and who reported to you? You pretty much have done that; so let's move on to describe your administrative

philosophy and style. We've just gotten a real good sample of it, but articulate what you were doing.

GRIEGO: The primary objective I tried to achieve was to tee-up my vision for the division of student affairs, and to make sure that the vision was a collaborative and collective vision. The idea of facilitating learning outside the classroom and building student success for every student in partnership with faculty and other members of the Pacific community, became Student Life's key aspirations. Our work in assessment and program review was in service of those goals. What was interesting, is that over the years I was here, I did less and less where I was the point person, and more and more investing in and coaching others. By the time I left, I think about half of my time was spent coaching others, particularly staff in the Student Life division. Not limited to the division, but particularly in the division, so that others would have successes of programs and projects that they were working on. My role became that of thinking partner in how to make this venture as successful as possible. I also spent time, particularly with the Student Life Leadership Team and with a couple of individuals who had asked me to mentor them formally, examining approaches and responses when there were problems that confronted them. I did see over time that the Leadership Team themselves adopted a coaching supervisory style with their direct reports. I would say that one of the strengths of the division was developing mutual investment and trust, so that the work of the whole became more important than the achievements of any single person. That thrust was fairly unique in working environments that I had experienced.

BEAUCHAMP: Same philosophy, yes-

GRIEGO: We know that the work of student affairs can be very stressful. Today's students bring significant issues with them to campus, including mental health issues, drug addiction, suicide ideation, physical and learning disabilities, behavior problems. There are no road maps to work in student affairs, much of which is done at night with students on campus by student staff as well as professional staff. I tried to reinforce a strong system of back up and support for staff so that no one would feel left out there on their own. I hoped that everyone would feel the co-investment and support we were trying to build within the division. When we embarked on the reallocation process that the president and provost initiated this past year, we began in the division by saying we believe in what you are doing, everything you do is important, and we will help you make an effective case and tell your story about your work in the best way we can. Each department head was asked to complete a form about the purposes of their unit, how their unit responds to university goals, and provide any comparative data that they might have. We worked on these forms as a division, providing training to support department heads in making their case evidentiary, and helping one another with comparative data and how to use it. I also read and provided formative comment on everyone's form that they were completing-

BEAUCHAMP: Drafts-

GRIEGO: -drafts, so that they could make their case as strongly as possible given the worry and anxiety that attended this process. I did the same thing when we had program reviews: I read every director's program review in draft form, and commented and talked about what else they needed to do, how to make their self-analysis stronger; what needed to be buffed up, and where we needed comparative information, so that by the time a product of any importance got completed, it didn't just have one person's eyes on it. In the case of the reallocation work, the form was first reviewed by the supervising member of the leadership team, then by me, so I had the opportunity to also guide the leadership team what to look for and how to write in a persuasive and evidentiary way. Getting back to your original question about administrative style, I think the clear investment in developing skills and abilities, is just as important as setting a collective vision that will guide our work together.

BEAUCHAMP: Did you see any of this strategy in President DeRosa's leadership?

GRIEGO: I think President DeRosa had this same sort of investment with his immediate Cabinet. For example, the first year that I was at Pacific, he shared with me his reservations about the group of students that were Ambassadors and what he saw them doing and not doing. He let me know that this was an area that needed work without telling me what to do. I believe we made the improvements that gave him confidence in that group. I also remember him talking that first year about his concern that higher education and liberal arts colleges in particular, were enrolling increasingly large percentages of women versus men. He asked me a number of times why I thought this was so, and I know he was concerned about Pacific. He asked me to think about programs that might appeal to and support males on this campus. One program we started at his suggestion was rowing. We also developed strong club sports in men's lacrosse and rugby. These turned out to be very successful programs and rowing, in particular, drew in a large cohort of some 60 students – men and women—who not only rowed together, but also studied and socialized together. It was a good retention strategy. I appreciated the ways the president would raise topics in which he was interested, take time to discuss them, and then let us take it from there. While some on campus experienced him as being a "top down" president, that was not my experience as a person reporting to him. I understood his interests, but I also perceived his support personally and on a few occasions financially. He was always clear and focused, but also ready to listen and advise.

BEAUCHAMP: I think the cabinet shared your experience. I think that was a common experience for them, what you had, but other people just didn't know him.

GRIEGO: It's true that the faculty and staff in general did not know him personally. But his values and his priorities trickled down through the Cabinet. He insisted that the cabinet work



well together. There were times when two cabinet members might have been disagreeing about something, usually that involved resources. Don was known to put the two of them in the room together over issues they could not agree on, and then leave the room to let them talk. But he would insist that a conclusion would be reached, and we knew in Cabinet that we would support whatever the decision was that had been reached. This agreement was partly because we all had the opportunity for honest input.

BEAUCHAMP: You worked it out.

GRIEGO: We did work it out. I had a number of vigorous work differences with Vice President Cavanaugh over the years, usually about resources. Pat opposed the number of video units we planned to install in the DeRosa Center, the firepit at the DeRosa Center, outside furniture the students had selected, the food truck we purchased that has brought in significant revenue, the Native American pow wow on campus, the construction of the community garden, and other what we considered to be key student-oriented projects. Without Don's careful listening and facilitation, I don't know that these differences would have been resolved in what I considered to be the students' favor. Don was simply the best boss I've ever had. I think it was a combination of his authenticity, his honesty, as well as how much he cared about the campus and students and his interest in every detail. I always felt that he was invested in what was best for Pacific.

BEAUCHAMP: Yes. He was not building a résumé to go on to another job-

GRIEGO: No he was not-

BEAUCHAMP: Ok. How did you communicate effectively with the University community? Not the administrative, but everybody else. How were you accessible to the rest of the folks-the faculty in particular...faculty and staff?

GRIEGO: I think being accessible is important, but I don't think people know you're accessible unless you actively convey it by reaching out to them. In the first couple of years, I would go see each of the Deans, and ask them just to give me their evaluation of how Student Life was doing. I didn't want to send them a little form to fill out-

BEAUCHAMP: Oh no, no, no-

GRIEGO: -I just went and had a conversation, and asked are there things that Student Life can do a little better? How are we interacting with you? How's our responsiveness? Are there things you wish we would do? Their responses were very informative to me. Then over time, there were some faculty that I got to know better than others that seemed to be more interested in doing things outside of the classroom. There were certain faculty I had coffee with

regularly just to talk things over with. This helped me think about how student life might support academic ventures and not compete with them. Some examples: Francois Rose organized a program of Japanese music. I wanted to make sure that we supported him financially, but also that student life staff attended and brought students they were close to with them to ensure that the event was a success and to make sure students were exposed to something they might not otherwise attend on their own. The best programs are the ones where there is collaboration across the university. I proposed a University-wide Arts & Lectures fund that was staffed by Student Life and chaired by an academic dean that anyone could apply to for programs that was established in 2011. I have said this many times to many people, but I have never been at a campus where the faculty were so collaborative, and so invested in students. At first, I was a little stunned by the level of participation in events outside the classroom because at many institutions, there is a big gap between Student Life and faculty. So the collaboration was strong long before I came to Pacific but I tried to help it along. I benefited from and enjoyed my friendships on the faculty and the opportunity to meet with faculty over programs, ideas, and issues involving students. Lunchtime discussions often evolved into so much more.

One of the practices that proved most valuable was the Student of Concern Committee we established in the fall of 2006. The committee was based on a case management model. When there were students who talked about suicide, or who acted strangely in class, or were involved in substance abuse, or got into a fight, we would call together the Student of Concern Committee to discuss what we knew and always end with a plan of action of how to proceed with the student. There were consistent members of the committee; almost always, the Dean of Students, the director of counseling services, the head of Residential Life, director of public safety, and then sometimes the faculty advisor, or if an incident happened in a classroom, the instructor, or it could be somebody from Disabilities Services -- whoever knew and was interacting with that student...It wasn't a violation of FERPA, because we weren't revealing a record to someone else, and the problematic student behavior made the discussion a need-to-know basis. I always chaired the meetings because of the level of importance to the student and the community, and there were instances where the result was suspension or even dismissal. The person who could best describe the problem would begin, and we would all add in, discuss the situation, and determine what was most right to do before a meeting was arranged with the student. The faculty-staff partnership on these occasions was important to find the best way to support the student. It was very ... touching, when I thought back about how people willingly gave their time, and how everyone worked to make sure we were going to get this right for the student. Then we would, usually, come back at another time to say, how is this working? What else needs to be done, is there an adjustment, or we'd just report in. But having that kind of partnership in support of students is very unusual at universities. Pacific's caring community is one of its greatest strengths.

BEAUCHAMP: Yes. Unique. Ok.

GRIEGO: Yes. Another way we saw this community in action was when we started the MOVE program. The Mountains, Oceans, Valley Experience, was planned as an orientation activity for all entering students. This program was meant to be a retention activity that introduced students to the university goals of service and leadership, with specific activities planned at sites throughout northern California. Every student was assigned to a small group with a volunteer upperclass student and a volunteer staff or faculty mentor, and usually more than one. At its height, we had forty-six faculty and staff volunteering their time for a weekend, and some of those trips were definitely not luxury trips! Each experience involved guided reflection and writing. Pacific won the national gold medal award from NASPA, Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, for this program. Our colleagues at other institutions just couldn't believe that faculty would give up their weekends to sleep on the ground, eat campfire food, and participate in this program.

Faculty were invited to share their particular intellectual interests. Examples included having the Environmental Science faculty talk about the geology of Yosemite and, Bill Swagerty talk about John Muir, but faculty also talked about music and poetry of place. The service projects might be measuring the growth of old redwoods, testing streams for invasive organisms, clearing trash from the beach, participating in Habitat for Humanity, or building playground equipment in a park. It was a great source of learning outside the classroom, and a great way to introduce students to the broader community as well as to the community that is Pacific.

BEAUCHAMP: In the context-

GRIEGO: -we would say to the students, we want you to have a great university experience here, we want to introduce you to the values the university cares about, and we are going to share with you both what we know from our own profession, and also who we are personally. That opportunity for volunteerism on behalf of students just exemplified Pacific to me. Unfortunately, I think this is going to be the last year for MOVE; I think it's going to be cut in the reallocation process.

BEAUCHAMP: Really?

GRIEGO: It'll be cut financially.

BEAUCHAMP: That's too bad, because it's a wonderful idea.

GRIEGO: It was, and students who have gone through MOVE tell us that they kept the friendships they made in their groups for the remainder of their time at Pacific. They liked

having a group that was in addition to those they lived with or with whom they shared an academic major.

BEAUCHAMP: That, of course, is one of the obvious benefits of those good orientation programs. You build a little social group. Meet people-

GRIEGO: Yes, and become connected.

BEAUCHAMP: -connected and supported.

GRIEGO: The research by Vince Tinto, Alexander Astin, and others is strong in saying that students need to feel a sense of belongingness and connection to their university. Much of what we tried to build in MOVE, in orientation, and in other programs in Student Life were opportunities to facilitate that engagement.

BEAUCHAMP: Damn good idea. What of your administrative activities were the most and least productive, and most and least enjoyable? And those probably go together.

GRIEGO: The most productive – and the most enjoyable – may have been the approaches that we put in place that were division-wide. I felt proud that every department in Student Life formulated mission, vision, values and goals statements centered on student success and learning and that we worked systematically to evaluate them. I'm proud of the model we developed here and the recognition that we received nationally for our work. The working team we developed in Student Life meant that whenever there was a big University event like orientation or the career fair or Reach Out Pacific Work Day, or MOVE, we would have staff from all over the division who would pitch in to make sure that the event would be successful. I think we built a web of shared vision and investment in Pacific. It was humbling to see staff give more than their eight hour day on a very consistent basis, because they found their work to be important: they believed that what they did on a daily basis made a difference in students' lives. So the most important things to me were building the teamwork, professionalism and shared vision of the division of Student Life. This meant that I had to engage in some of the less enjoyable activity of helping a dozen people leave in the first few years I came to Pacific in order to build the strongest team possible.

The other enjoyable activities were building an environment of self-analysis and self-improvement through the program review process and our learning assessment activities. I think we made strong contributions to systems that promoted student retention. Great strides were made on issues of inclusion and social justice so that students of different gender preferences and non-majority ethnicity felt supported and had a center and a place to call home at Pacific. I think we also did a great job with developing and improving our judicial affairs processes to be less punitive and more strongly focused on ethical reasoning and decision-

making. Seeing the development of these areas and their growing effectiveness gave me a lot of joy. Finally, I would have to say that the relationships that I developed with individual students from the classes I taught, or those who worked in our office, or especially student government officers and ASUOP presidents and vice presidents were gifts that I will take with me and keep for a long time. The relationships at Pacific were definitely the highlights of my work looking back. In retrospect, there wasn't too much I didn't like about my job. I have often told people that this was my dream job. Not too many people get to have a dream job. I'm grateful.

BEAUCHAMP: Right-

GRIEGO: I guess one part of the job that was not so enjoyable was the enormous amount of time I spent keeping current on responding to emails. I realize that management by email has become so much a part of all of our jobs and that in some ways it saves time, but it is not as personal or enjoyable as communicating in person.

BEAUCHAMP: Yes, impersonal.

GRIEGO: Although you can make email personal-

BEAUCHAMP: But it's hard-

GRIEGO: -it's a lot of sitting and typing. Pretty much from five to seven each day I answered emails because the appointment schedule was generally back-to-back during the day. I tried to make my emails personal, and to answer everyone if I could...but I didn't always enjoy that, although I could see it was effective so people didn't have to wait for an answer-

BEAUCHAMP: Expeditious-

GRIEGO: The most difficult problem I had at Pacific was during the lawsuit that was brought against us as a result of our adjudication of a sexual assault case. It was a very difficult time for the division, and for me personally as I was serving as the national president for our professional association, NASPA, and through the strategy of the victim's lawyer, I was attacked personally, professionally, and publicly. The lawsuit dragged out over two years, eventually went to trial and every charge was found in favor of Pacific. We absolutely did the right thing at every step in the process. The case was appealed to the ninth circuit and again every charge was found in favor of Pacific. That case has made case law and is now cited consistently in Title IX lawsuits, especially around the issue of whether a victim can choose the penalty she may wish.

BEAUCHAMP: How would you describe the working relationship between faculty administrators during your years at Pacific?

GREIGO: I can't think of a university that has better working relationships, particularly under Phil Gilbertson and Don DeRosa. All of the Deans and the extraordinary faculty that are at Pacific exemplified to me a genuine commitment to this place and these students, and I continually felt impressed and humbled by how willing people are to give their time and talents. It just made me want to work harder and do my best, and support others and make things great here. I have been asked a number of times what would you think would be a place where there is a really good model of faculty-staff partnership, and it was always Pacific for me. Phil and I were always planning to write and talk more about that, and then it got toward the end of his time too quickly, and we didn't quite get to it, but I thought, particularly under Phil Gilbertson, that while there were some things we didn't agree on, these were few in number, and we were always able to work it out. I always felt the strength of that partnership there.

BEAUCHAMP: Ok. You've answered this in some cases, but there are parts that aren't there, so let me do the whole question: during the years that you were involved with Pacific, how would you describe these groups: Students, Faculty, Administrators, Staff, Regents, Alumni, and Donors? We haven't talked about Alumni, Regents, and Donors at all.

GREIGO: Right. Well, about students I would say that the diversity of students, particularly with all of the Southeast Asian students and the growing numbers of Latino students, made Pacific a very rich environment. I love that diversity here at Pacific and particularly enjoyed working with first generation students in our CIP and SUCCESS programs. To see students carry the hopes and dreams of their family with their college education, and know that Pacific is helping them to go on to do great things and change things for their family forever – was just very rewarding. I've been very proud that our Greek system here -- which is generally the last bastion of white, upper-middle class, straight Americans – is completely diverse. The Greek system is very open and students are open with one another. They're ethnically diverse, they're diverse in including gay and lesbian students, and that inclusiveness has been a harbinger or demonstration of the openness of Pacific students to diversity and inclusion.

It's been gratifying to work with the students that choose Pacific and to have them share their hopes and dreams. That kind of openness to possibility seems particularly characteristic of Pacific students and it seems to me that they are very ambitious, serious and hard working. Although they do know how to have fun! On occasion, too much fun! Many of our most outstanding student leaders have chosen to enter the profession of student affairs and I am very proud of that and proud of the army of Pacificans that comes together from all over the country to meet at our national conferences.

Faculty I've already talked about their level of commitment to their teaching and their students. It has been particularly noticeable to me after working with the institutions that were in my

portfolio at WASC; mostly large state institutions where faculty go in and teach their class, and then-

BEAUCHAMP: That's it-

Staff you've talked about. Regents, Alumni...

GREIGO: Regents and Alumni. Regents: I also noted the deep engagement of Regents, and I particularly enjoyed getting to know those Regents who have a national perspective. There are a number that bring national perspective to the Board, and I particularly enjoyed working with Ron Cordes, Walter Robb, and I would say Jose Hernandez for their perspectives. Connie Callahan, Morrison England, and Randy Hyashi were particularly interested in and made themselves available to students. For the most part, the Regents at Pacific stay pretty removed from the day-to-day life of the University. At some institutions, Regents have a faculty or student orientation, and sometimes, ongoing connections. I would have liked to see the Regents have some additional opportunities for campus interaction beyond those with the President and Cabinet.

BEAUCHAMP: Alumni and Donors?

GRIEGO: I see our alumni as being closely engaged following graduation; not particularly with financial support, but Pacific in my time has had some wonderful alumni association presidents who are very involved, very caring about Pacific, very supportive, and doing anything they can to be helpful. I don't think Pacific has always been skillful about communicating well with our alumni. Some examples are the communication that happened – or didn't happen—when football was dropped and in particular, the lack of communication when the large number of fraternities were kicked off campus in the past. There didn't seem to be until recently strong avenues to communicate with and invite alumni in. The alumni reunion in the summer is not well attended, perhaps in anticipation of the extremely hot weather. I am glad the decision has been made to move reunion to the fall and develop a homecoming weekend. I think more thought could be given to programming for alumni and to find intentional ways to bring alumni back to campus for continuing education lectures and other opportunities that might interest them. And we need to do better about reaching out to non-majority alumni and first generation student alumni...

BEAUCHAMP: Ah, ok-

GRIEGO: -that are so unique to Pacific, and I think there are ways to engage them better. We have a large number of active alumni who were involved in the Greek system and other organizations who have remained active, and perhaps these alumni will always be joiners and this is part of why they enjoy coming back to campus and meeting together. I have been a big

supporter of the Alumni Affinity groups organized in recent years by Bill Coen and his staff, including Corrie Martin, and which honor the experiences of alumni of color or gay and lesbian alumni, for example.

BEAUCHAMP: Ok. Were there controversies that emerged during your seven years of service? If you want to, describe them, and who were the major players in the controversy?

GREIGO: There were major controversies about how Pacific positioned itself for tuition and financial aid, and its perspective on financial positioning. This has been particularly salient in the last three years, I would say. Even within Cabinet, and within the Regents, there were different perspectives about how tuition should be set, and how financial aid should be awarded, compared to other institutions. Not surprisingly on the Student Life side that tends to see issues from the human side of how this impacts student success and retention and their families' welfare, we have tended to find ourselves on the side of urging smaller tuition increases and more financial aid.

BEAUCHAMP: Sure.

GREIGO: One of the biggest issues has been about how tuition is set among those schools that we consider comparable institutions. President Eibeck and Vice President Cavanaugh were particular proponents of positioning Pacific to increase its tuition from the bottom of the list of comparable colleges to reach a midpoint among that group while keeping financial aid as steady as possible. The view here – with which I was in disagreement – was that students judge the quality of their education by the price of their tuition. There was very strong student reaction when the tuition was raised without concomitant financial aid increases. It meant that many continuing students could not afford Pacific. The financial aid office scrambled to establish exceptional loans and grants on a case-by-case basis for students who would have to drop out of school because of financial reasons. There were town halls, and organized resistance from the students, and a great deal of time was spent finessing the University's response.

In the last year, consultants from the largest financial aid consulting firm, Scannell and Kurz, were brought in by the president and provost to interview students, administrators, and faculty, and to look at the data that we had gathered. Their recommendation was that we had moved too aggressively on tuition raises; that we should make those more modest, and that, frankly, our reputation was not at the midpoint of the list of schools that we had named as comparable colleges. They advised that it would not be in Pacific's interest to continue the strategy of steep tuition increases because potential students do not see Pacific in the same category as some of the institutions that were on our list, particularly given Pacific's location in Stockton, which is not viewed as positively as comparable universities' cities. The strategy of



gapping continuing students would hurt retention and we found that Pacific's retention was indeed affected for financial reasons in the last few years, despite the work to provide supplemental grants to students at greatest risk. Many, many hours were spent by all of us counseling students in financial distress and helping them find work and loan solutions. But I would say that the strategy of the first two years of President Eibeck's tenure was softened considerably this year after the advice of the consultants.

BEAUCHAMP: Economic-yes.

GRIGO: And there has been a renewed attempt to raise more money for financial aid. The Powell gift and matching opportunities through the Powell gift, have enabled us to garner more financial aid, more scholarship money. We have made a more modest increase in tuition for next year. So this was probably the biggest controversy during my time at Pacific because students certainly found their voice in this matter, organized, and spoke out.

BEAUCHAMP: Oh they did? Good.

GRIEGO: I think there was a lot of learning for administrators at Pacific. I think the next big controversy is the one we are now going through, which President Eibeck first termed Funding Our Future and now changed to Focusing On Our Future. We're in the midst of it now. Administrative and academic departments are being asked for suggested reductions and reorganizations. The communication throughout this process has not always been very clear and there is a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding. I have concerns about the way in which the process is proceeding, and especially regret that we are not starting with a strong vision statement that might describe how Pacific will grow into the future, where we hope to strengthen the university, and what opportunities we see for innovation and curriculum needs. People at Pacific will get behind almost anything that they believe in. They are willing to make sacrifices, if they can see what that vision is going to be and how that's going to benefit the University. Instead, the focus is on making reductions at the same time that the Vice President for Finance has said publicly that there is money to do whatever we need to do. I can't foresee how the process will continue after I leave the University, but in the time that I have left, I'm trying to do two things: work to make sure that Student Life tells its story and makes its case in as strong and as evidentiary a way as possible, and also I have made my feelings known to the President and Provost that we really need that strong vision statement about where Pacific is going to go next, and in what specific ways the money that we will realize from these reductions will be then reemployed. Right now, all that is being understood is that there will be reductions. There is a compelling case that can be made from the strategic planning process to support the core liberal arts of the College and to develop new masters-level graduate programs, particularly in the health sciences and health professions. This case has not been

stated however. I wish we could focus on building for the positive instead of spending two years making the case for reductions.

BEAUCHAMP: Right-

GRIEGO: This is the most difficult and controversial time since I have been at Pacific because there is not a consensus about where we are going as a university. When reductions are being made in such a public process, it is inevitable that fingers will be pointed and people will become self-protective. This is not a recipe for joy and confidence and collegiality. It is painful to observe. I think it will be incumbent on Pacific's leadership to figure out how to make this initiative one that builds capacity instead of creating controversy and setting up a situation where everyone becomes at odds with one another over what these cuts are going to be. I also think it's conveying to students a disinvestment in what's important to them, and I think that's a very big mistake. In some ways I feel guilty that I'm abandoning the student life staff and the University at a difficult time. It's difficult to see things that I see benefitting students being cut or reduced when I think there are opportunities to plan and build and increase student enrollment in selected ways that will stabilize the university and help it to grow and thrive.

BEAUCHAMP: Very good. There's a section on students and you've covered a lot of it, but...what do you remember about the students and their activities during your years of service at Pacific? What stands out about the students? You've talked about diversity, but what stands out otherwise about the students? And did student attitudes change while you were here, during your tenure?

GRIEGO: I don't think I saw much change, except in reaction to whatever the issue or problem of the day may be. The student body continued to get more diverse, enrolling more Asian-American and Latino students.

BEAUCHAMP: Right.

GRIEGO: What's the other part-?

BEAUCHAMP: What's the character of a Pacific Student? It's hard to do that, since they're so diverse, but-

GRIEGO: Well, we talked earlier about the diversity. I also think, in this group of students, the ones that are attracted to Pacific, that there is a strong desire to give back to their communities, and to their families. I think this encourages a seriousness of purpose and directedness in Pacific students.-

BEAUCHAMP: Yes-I agree.

GRIEGO: There's a strong service ethic among our students. They immediately gravitated towards social entrepreneurship when that program got started, and there are very strong and interesting students who have been selected as Global Center Ambassadors, one of the programs encouraged and funded by regent Ron Cordes to facilitate students interested in going to other countries to work on service projects. I know that increasing interest in social service has been documented nationally, but I definitely see it at Pacific, and I see it in many of the students who I think are the most thoughtful and interesting. They have an interest in using their education to do good in the world. They have strong interest in exploring and understanding how we might function better as One World and they have strong interest in sustainability, to leave our world better than what we left for them. They are seeking to understand their own personal responsibility for figuring out some of the major dilemmas that are facing us as a nation and as a world. Many of the projects we have initiated in Student Life over the last few years have responded to student interest in these matters, including building our sustainability and recycling efforts, developing our community garden, organizing service projects in the city of Stockton and throughout northern California...

BEAUCHAMP: Cleaning up the river-

GRIEGO: -cleaning up the river, yes. So to give opportunities for action to those students who are interested, I definitely feel that's important.

BEAUCHAMP: Good. Anything else you would like to discuss?

GRIEGO: I would just say that being vice president for student life at Pacific has been a great position to think big with good thinking partners; to create interesting learning opportunities; to be flexible; to enact caring for students; to be passionate about things that matter; to have fun. I feel really grateful that I got to have a job like this in my career. Not everybody gets one like this; their dream job. I just feel so lucky to have been here at Pacific at this time.

BEAUCHAMP: Yes, as reflected in your behavior while you were here, you loved what you were doing, and it showed. So that made it easy for people to work with you.

GRIEGO: I hope. Thank you for doing this Ken.