

University of Illinois at Springfield  
Norris L. Brookens Library  
Archives/Special Collections

## Barbara Ferrara Memoir

### **Ferrara, Barbara**

Interview and memoir  
Digital Audio Files, 76 min., 19 pp.

UIS Alumni Sage Society

Barbara Ferrara, in 2010 the Associate Director of the Center for State Policy and Leadership at UIS, reminisces about her career at the University. A 35 year employee of SSU/UIS, Ferrara discusses her experiences as a researcher and project manager within the University's public affairs division. She recalls a number of projects in which the University conducted research and program evaluation on behalf of Illinois state agencies and her role in these assignments. Ferrara also relates her involvement in campus projects, such as the creation of a series of policy summits and work with the engaged citizenship speakers program. Ferrara documents UIS' efforts to create the Illinois Channel, a public affairs TV station modeled on C-SPAN for the state of Illinois. She remembers working with a number of SSU/UIS faculty and staff including Naomi Lynn, John Collins, Richard Schuldt, Barbara Blankenship, Nancy Ford, Mike Lennon, Cullom Davis, Margie Williams, Charlie Wheeler, Carol Bloemer, and Phillip Paludan. Barbara concludes with her recollections of leading the formation of The Academic Professional Advisory Committee in 1995 at the time of the merger with the University of Illinois; and serving as its first chair from 1996-1999.

Interview by Cheryl Peck, 2010  
OPEN  
Collateral File

Archives/Special Collections LIB 144  
University of Illinois at Springfield  
One University Plaza, MS BRK 140  
Springfield IL 62703-5407

© 2010, University of Illinois Board of Trustees

Narrator: Barbara Ferrara  
Date: October 27, 2010  
Place: Springfield, Illinois  
Interviewer: Cheryl Peck

Q. Today is Wednesday October 27<sup>th</sup> 2010. My name is Cheryl Peck and I am going to interview Barbara Ferrara, who is the associate director of the Center for State Policy and Leadership and a longtime employee and alumni of SSU/UIS. Thank you, Barbara, for doing this interview today. We're going to start out by asking you about when you came to Sangamon State University and the circumstances that brought you to the University.

A. Thank you, Cheryl, for your interest and that of the Oral History Project in my experience through the years. I joined the staff of Sangamon State in February of 1976. I was invited to apply for a position to work as a field researcher on a grant from the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission to, what was then termed, the Center for the Study of Middle-size Cities at Sangamon State. One of my former faculty members at MacMurray College, Burkett Milner, had joined the faculty of SSU after I graduated from MacMurray. He knew I was working on a master's in sociology at Rutgers, but I had quite some ways to go before finishing it and thought I'd like to have the job experience.

Bob Bunnell, who was the grants and contractors director at the time for SSU was in Washington for meetings in Washington D.C., and he interviewed me there. I'm originally from Bethesda, Maryland. Apparently I made a favorable impression on Dr. Bunnell, and he reported back to Dan Johnson, who was the director for the Center for Middle-size Cities, and Burkett Milner that he thought I would fit the bill for this field research job. We did interviews with mayors and county board chairmen and city managers around the state for the Law Enforcement Commission interviewing those local government officials on their criminal justice information needs. We then did a series of reports on those.

Q. What was your understanding at that early time in the University of Sangamon State's public affairs mandate?

A. Well, at the time and I think this has been a theme that's carried through and by the way, this coming February I will have been at the University and all that time in the public affairs arena for 35 years. I've been reflecting back and I think there still is this theme and the *ethos* and mission of the University since the founding to have a special mission in public affairs, to extend the knowledge, to mobilize and extend the knowledge and energy and ideas of the faculty, staff and students of the institution to address the public affairs issues of the day. Whether that's through research or public service or experiential learning, all those aspects and avenues, the idea that public higher education in particular has a special obligation to bring to bear the resources of the institution, especially through the scholarship and commitment of its faculty, staff and students to solving the public affairs problems of the day.

Q. How was public affairs organized in those early years and how did it change?

A. In the 1970s and I'll sort of condense some of this history. Eventually we had four public affairs centers. The Center for the Study of Middle-size Cities, the one I first worked in was headed by a demographer and it focused primarily on local government. The names of the centers evolved over the years. The first fulltime, permanent position I had was I was hired as the first faculty assistant in public affairs of the Center for Policy Studies and Program Evaluation.

At that time in the earlier years the centers had faculty who were on joint appointment, they had release time from some teaching and they had joint appointments in the centers, but there was no staff. Eventually they created this faculty assistant position. Over the years it's evolved and the title has been Assistant Director or Assistant to the Director and then Associate Director and so forth.

The Center for Policy Studies and Program Evaluation focused on the executive branch of state government, and then following that was created a Illinois Legislative Studies Center. That came into existence also in the late 1970s. It focused on the legislative branch and. Then over time, there was a Center for Legal Studies that was created to focus on the judicial branch.

We had four public affairs centers, one for each branch of state government plus one that focused on local government. The titles changed over the years but that was the way it was organized, to concentrate, focus resources on each branch of state government. Not just focusing on Illinois and that is something I think has been important to keep in mind through the years, that we, our work, has been generalizable to all the states and the federal level as well.

Over the years then condensing the history, I'd like to talk about and come back to this point. I'd like to reflect on it and sort of summarize the changes I've witnessed in my 35 years. But just jumping ahead for a moment, over the years because of mergers and acquisitions so to speak within the University, the centers were, we had four centers, they were centralized. Later on, they were decentralized and we created the schools and colleges and so they became dispersed. Then in 1989 the organized resources both in research and media were brought together again and centralized into an Institute for Public Affairs. The title of that entity is now the Center for State Policy and Leadership and the specific units within we retained.

When we created the Institute for Public Affairs, we retained research units focused on the different branches of state government. But then because of budget reductions, staff reductions over the years, they, too, have merged. Now we just have one within the overall Center for State Policy and Leadership. We have one institute that houses the joint appointed faculty and that conducts research. It's now the Institute for Legal, Legislative, and Policy Studies, so you can see that we've combined now all those units into that.

The overall Center includes the internship programs and the media units, the WUIS public radio station, *Illinois Issues* magazine, the Office of Electronic Media that used to be called the TV Office and then our Survey Research Office and then very importantly our Graduate Public Service Internship Program and the Illinois Legislative Staff Intern Program, as well as the Papers for Abraham Lincoln, and then larger more free standing projects such as the Downstate

Illinois Innocence Project. We continue to have an organizational entity within the University where we have the organized resources for focused public affairs work and that entity now is called Center for State Policy and Leadership.

Q. So what you're saying is over time the center itself has become smaller?

A. On an organizational chart it may look that way, and again this is a point I come back to towards the end as I reflect back on changes. The number of people involved in the center, the number of faculty involved in the center, has gotten smaller. In any given year we'll have six to seven joint appointments now. In the past I can remember we would have twelve or fifteen plus faculty on non-instructional assignments released from maybe one or two courses during the course of a year.

Typically there would be one-third non-instructional assignments, NIA's as they were called, so that a person had a one course reduction, say, in the fall or spring semester and be on assignment as a project director or a principal investigator on a project in the center. So yes, organizationally it's now one unit housing many units within it. It would be hard to say the budget... What has grown is not our state appropriated funding since it's been level and decreased in recent years, but the amount of non-appropriated revenue we generate has certainly increased over the years. In recent years we were generating four, five, perhaps as many as six or seven non-appropriated dollars for every one dollar in state appropriated money we received.

For quite some time only about twenty percent of our budget came from the state and now it's even less than that. It's now only fifteen percent, so we have to generate all of the rest to pay for staff and our activities. We are certainly a good investment both for the University and the taxpayers of Illinois in the sense of the return on investment from the Center for the investment of appropriated dollars; we're generating four, five, six times that much.

Q. Who were some memorable people you worked with and some of the important projects you worked on through the decades?

A. I think that's a good way to approach it is to think about some examples of important projects and then to recall significant people in connection with those projects. One of the early ones that I worked on in 1979 and 1980 was a project funded by the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. It had another title in those days but we were hired to, the Center was given a contract to evaluate the CETA on the job training program. CETA was Comprehensive Employment Training Act, federal legislation. We interviewed on the job training, OJT trainees and their employers around the state. This was my first exposure (laughs) to Southern Illinois.

We did interviews all over the state, but I had never been to Southern Illinois before. So that was quite a good learning experience about that part of the state. We did those interviews to determine factors related to success. In other words, kinds of supports that trainees needed in order to be able to be hired on a permanent basis by those employers. So we did those

interviews in person at their work site, and so we were interviewing welders and bakers and the full gamut of kinds of people in various trades.

Then we followed up six months and twelve months later to see if they were still employed. I recall that one of my tasks, very challenging, was to do these longitudinal follow up interviews. We had to track these people down and often they had moved out of state. I can remember many a night in my office up on the third floor of Brookens calling to time zones like California where it was two hours earlier there. I was trying to follow up, and it was real detective work. We always, when we did these interviews, asked for the name of a friend or relative who would always know how to get in touch with them in case they were to move.

That was a project I enjoyed, and I thought it was one we really provided some useful information for the program. John Collins, who was the director of the Center for Policy Studies and Program Evaluation at the time, worked on that project. He was my boss and Rip Redemer in Educational Administration and Hershel Chait in the Management program were the faculty and my fellow research associate was Carol Marshall; that was the project team on that one. In the mid-1980s, 1985-1987, I was co-director of Project Elder Find. It was a long term care research and demonstration project that we did for the Illinois Department of Public Aid.

I negotiated the first partnership agreement between SSU and the SIU School of Medicine. The Department of Psychiatry faculty worked on that project with us. We hired three project staff, a geriatric nurse, Marion Becker, who had gotten a master's in Gerontology from SSU. She and I co-directed the project. We hired an RN and another research associate. The project and staff were housed at Heritage Manor Nursing Home in Springfield.

That was also something that was new, negotiating that clinical research site agreement with the management of the Heritage Manor Nursing Home chain. The project sought to identify nursing home residents who could be rehabilitated and discharged to home or family or moved to a less restrictive setting. We designed and administered various assessment scales and conducted patient and family support activities. At the time there was a project called Child Find and this was sort of a... the title was a takeoff. We were trying to find elders who were in nursing homes who could be rehabbed up to be discharged and who had family or other less restrictive environments in which they could move or be discharged.

There was a real focus on identifying depression in the elderly in those days and cognitive decline that contributed to needing help with activities of daily living. So that was one of the roles of the Department of Psychiatry faculty, who consulted with us, was to try and provide the sorts of assessment and rehabilitation activity. It was our first venture into clinical research, and it was very successful but very challenging from the informed consent process that I worked very hard on with Barb Blankenship, who was grants and contracts coordinator then and for many years.

We were very diligent about informed consent and had to be working with frail elderly in a nursing home. A benefit for the nursing home staff was that we provided training in-house at

no cost to the nursing home staff, professional development training. That was certainly a memorable project and, as an outgrowth of that, Jo Ann Day was our project manager at the Illinois Department of Public Aid. She invited SSU to begin to help design and host an annual series of long-term care research symposiums that brought together all the grantee projects in the state for presentations and exhibits on their projects. I think we hosted those conferences for two or three years, statewide conferences.

Then in the late 1980s, 1989 to 1991, we conducted an evaluation of the CILA program in Illinois. CILA is C-I-L-A, is the acronym and it stands for Community Integrated Living Arrangements. This was funded by the Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. CILA's were alternatives to institutionalization for seriously mentally ill and developmentally disabled people. We designed and conducted a statewide evaluation study of the pilot CILA program in Illinois, and we also produced a public information video and brochure on the program.

We interviewed residents of CILA's in their apartments or whatever their residential arrangements were to assess their satisfaction. We also interviewed their case workers, and these were face-to-face interviews again at their apartments or community facilities. They were very challenging interviews. For some of those who were developmentally disabled and who were nonverbal, we used pictures of faces, smiling faces, neutral faces and frowning faces, as a response scale. So when we were asking them how they liked where they were living and their roommate and their caseworker, the interviewer would hold up a smiley face or a frowning face, and then the person would point to or however indicate how they felt.

Q. Very interesting.

A. Yes. Dick Schuldt who is the director of our Survey Research Office and I often think back to the evaluation of the CILA program as one of the projects that was so challenging, so rewarding also because of some of the creativity involved. Again from the standpoint of respect for human subjects, sensitivity to human subjects and the whole informed consent process and making sure in these cases that the research participants knew exactly what we were asking and agreed to it and didn't feel at all coerced into participating in these interviews.

I interviewed a seriously mentally ill resident who was hearing other voices during my interview with him and I had to continually redirect his attention back to the interview. But I think the quality of the data we provided to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities was really extraordinary. They used the evaluation results to refine the program in their report to the Feds and to obtain funding from the federal government to continue the CILA program. Mike Lennon, who was Executive Director of the Institute for Public Affairs, had a major role in obtaining the contract to conduct the study. John Collins worked on it, Dick Schuldt, Kathy Peterson and Marge Wilkerson were other key staff on it.

Another significant project in the mid-1990s, 1994 to 1996, we conducted an evaluation of the Cardiovascular Disease Prevention Program for the Illinois Department of Public Health. There we designed and conducted a longitudinal evaluation of the Patient Risk Assessment and Education Program of county health departments in the state regarding cardiovascular disease prevention. We conducted interviews; again, these were face-to-face interviews. They were called the healthy heart survey with patients at three county health departments in the state: Jackson County, which is down around Marion and Carbondale, Lake County, Waukegan is where we did a lot of those interviews, and Cook County.

We did those in person and in follow-up interviews by phone to assess these peoples' change in knowledge, attitudes and behavior regarding reducing their risks for cardiovascular disease. So the questions asked about diet and exercise and stress and taking prescribed medication. We also interviewed the county health department staff and managers. Margie Williams of our Nursing faculty was the project director, and Marya Leatherwood in the Management Program was one of the co-investigators. I was a research associate on that and our graduate assistant Heather Mammen who also had a big role on that.

Q. Would you spell her name?

A. Yes, Mammen is M-A-M-M-E-N. Then in the early years of this decade, in 2000 to 2002, I was co-director of the Illinois Channel planning study. I had written a successful grant to the Joyce Foundation and MacArthur Foundation to fund a feasibility study and conduct a pilot operation of a state version of C-SPAN. That is the national public affairs cable television network. We held town hall meetings across the state to inform people of the proposed C-SPAN for Illinois, and we collected public opinion.

We conducted a statewide poll to determine support. We formed a statewide blue ribbon advisory board that had co-chairs Chancellor Naomi Lynn along with former Governor Jim Edgar and former Senator Paul Simon. It was a very impressive board that was helpful in suggesting stakeholders to cultivate and how to gain political and public support for the channel. We invited CEO's of other successful state public affairs TV channels in the country to Springfield, and they gave presentations to the board.

We also hired Terry Martin, who was the project director; he had been at C-SPAN in Washington for a couple of years. His family had moved to Illinois so the timing just worked out great that he was available and had that C-SPAN experience. So we hired him to be co-project director with me on the feasibility and pilot project. Terry and I went to Lansing, Michigan and we visited the Michigan TV operation there and debriefed their manager on how they created their channel and made it such a success.

We also hosted a meeting in Chicago of all the state channels in the country. There were 13 of them at the time, and people swapped ideas and advice. We issued an interim report on the requirements for a successful channel reporting on our research what we had learned from talking with people who had started these other channels. I remember TVW in Washington State and Florida, Pennsylvania. There were quite a number of them that were models. Then we piloted programming and distribution for a year.

We launched the channel in January of 2003 as a separate 501(c)3 non-profit corporation, and it survives today. It hasn't been able to obtain a major source of ongoing major operations funding. Particularly we have not been able to get a line item for it in the state of Illinois budget, so it relies mainly on private donations. But it is successful in its mission to increase transparency and access to Illinois state government by providing unedited, nonpartisan coverage of state government proceedings and public affairs events.

When you consider it doesn't have any ongoing funding other than private donations, it's really remarkable that the Illinois Channel now reaches 132 communities, from Rockford to Carbondale. It reaches over 4 million people and over 1.4 million cable homes. Its coverage has been used by the national C-SPAN network and other national media outlets. We also have all of the programs and events that we videotape at UIS that are related to public policy. We offer the tape to Terry Martin and it's often re-aired on the Illinois Channel. So we get nice, statewide visibility for the Center and for UIS that way.

In addition to Terry, Tess Fyalka worked with us for a while and helped us organize the town hall meetings. Nancy Ford was the Institute for Public Affairs Executive Director at the time we did the Illinois Channel planning study. She was a big help in championing the idea and helping us with coordinating the advisory board and in the early attempts to secure some funding.

End of Tape 1

Begin Tape 2

A. I mentioned Nancy Ford and I wanted to say a word about a little of the history of the Executive Directors. When the Institute for Public Affairs was created, it was officially approved by the Board of Higher Ed. in 1989, December 1989. Mike Lennon had been the director of OPAC, the Office of Public Affairs Communication, and he reported directly to the president, Durward Long. Dr. Long appointed Mike as head for the Institute for Public Affairs. We folded in those media units that had been part of Mike's portfolio in his office and merged the Office of Public Affairs Communication with the research centers to create this Institute for Public Affairs. In so doing, though, we captured the staff and the budget of the Center for Policy Studies and Program Evaluation, the center I was with, and that center got abolished.

We became essentially the Office of the Executive Director of the Institute for Public Affairs, and my title became Assistant to the Executive Director. Mike was lured away to Wilkes University to become Vice President of Academic Affairs there. He was lured away by Chris Breiseth, who was President of Wilkes and was one of the very early faculty in history at SSU. Eventually in 1993, Nancy Ford, who was Director of the Center for Legal Studies, became the new Executive Director of the Institute for Public Affairs. She was an extremely capable person with a JD degree and was a very accomplished grants person who would take on these really tremendous challenges writing federal grants, and she was quite successful.

She got a grant from HUD, Housing and Urban Development, for the Community Outreach Partnership Center. She worked together with Larry Golden on the Springfield Project. She also got the very large Gear Up Project from the U.S. Department of Education, as well as a number

of sizeable state grants and contracts. Nancy had really a very successful tenure as Executive Director of the Institute for Public Affairs. She retired from that position I think around 2002.

In the early part of this decade, 2000, 2001, another very important project was the Illinois Civic Engagement Benchmark Survey. Ed Wojcicki was publisher of *Illinois Issues* magazine at the time, and he organized the project and was the project director. He developed a partnership with the United Way of Illinois as a partner in this project and worked with Dick Schuldt in the Survey Research Office and me on the project. Ed lined up funding from Caterpillar Corporation, from State Farm Insurance, from McCormick Tribune Foundation and the Woods Fund of Chicago. They all provided the funding for what was the first comprehensive statewide study of the types and levels of civic engagement in Illinois.

Our report provided benchmark data about community involvement. It described how people are engaged and why some are not engaged. We conducted a statewide telephone survey and focus groups. Then based on these responses, Dick Schuldt created a typology of civic engagement, seven types of community engagement. We had labels for these various types: community activists, faith based activists, cyber activists, informal socializers and relatively unengaged were some of them. The highlight of the project was Dick's presentation to the United Way of Illinois at the statewide, annual meeting in Chicago to a packed hotel ballroom. There were more than 300 people there in which he summarized our findings and recommendations with a very impressive PowerPoint presentation.

The syndicated Washington Post Columnist, E.J. Dionne, was the keynote speaker who had preceded Dick. We talked with Mr. Dionne later that day, and he was highly complementary of our project. The impetus for it was that Robert Putnam, the Harvard professor, had just published an article in the journal *Democracy*, titled "Bowling Alone: The Decline of Civic Engagement in America." I had seen that and read it and we were talking to Ed and Dick about it. We were pondering whether... we were skeptical about Putnam's assertion that there had been a decline in civic engagement because this period of 2000, 2001 was such a, the beginning of a tremendous change in technology in our lives and the beginning of the ever-present Internet.

We speculated that there hadn't been a decline but a transformation in civic engagement. The transformation of the ways people are involved in their communities and their social networks and the "building and exchange of social capital," to use Putnam's phrase. So anyway we set about measuring it. We created this research study to measure what the level and types of civic engagement were in Illinois and the plan was to make it a longitudinal study. So this was the baseline, the benchmark, in 2000.

We said, "Every five years we're going to measure civic engagement in Illinois thereafter and then track the trend and really see." We found evidence that yes, people don't belong to bowling leagues as they used to, but many people in Illinois are active in their churches and that, really, is a primary vehicle for broader community involvement is through their faith-based activities. But we also found and that is why we created the category "cyber activist," we

found that people were connecting over the Internet. So we didn't think there was a decline so much as some changes in the ways people connected with others in their communities and got together to address community problems collectively.

So our report and I think this was one of the special things about this project, our report offered 68 practical recommendations for how United Way leaders and others could stimulate citizen participation in their communities. One of our more interesting findings was that 1/3 of respondents said they weren't involved in their communities simply because they hadn't been asked. No one had asked for their help. So our first recommendation was, ask people to be involved. Our second was, ask for a limited amount of time because that's the biggest barrier to participation, the time pressure people feel in their lives.

Well, those were 6 projects that as I reflect on the many, many that I have been involved in over the years. What I think made these projects important are number one, the utilization of the research results by the sponsoring agencies to improve the program that we evaluated. It's always particularly satisfying as a researcher, particularly an academic researcher, if you feel as if your work is actually read and used to benefit the people that a program is serving as well as benefiting the program managers and the program staff of the agencies, the people who have to implement a program.

Number two, the quality of the data and the use of face-to-face interviews for data collection was a hallmark of these projects. We obtained true measures of program experiences in greater detail than you would by phone or mail. As a researcher you gain a much greater understanding of how a program works and its effects on people when you interview in person. I'm sure you have that same experience as a reporter and a journalist in your media and PR work. So when you interview not only the program participants or recipients or clients but also their staff and case workers who carry out the program, it's a more expensive method for data collection for sure, but the quality of the data can be much better and your insights as a researcher for writing the report and advising the agency are much deeper.

A change over time while it may be fairly obvious but state agencies now have little if any funding for research and evaluation of program outcomes. We have done less and less of those types of projects in recent years. Relatively few field research studies are done now because of the cost and the technology available. Computer assisted telephone interviewing and now web-based surveys enable much larger samples, but they really lose richness of case study data.

Then I wanted to talk about some important events. Beginning in around 2003, the Center began organizing annual events that were intended to provide greater linkage between the Center and academic affairs and to provide students with access to top scholars in the country on various public policy issues. I think these events together with these 6 projects that I selected as illustrative are the kinds of action-oriented research, program evaluation research that was sort of the hallmarks of some of our research work. I think in a complementary way these events we've done over the years also illustrate the joining of public affairs and academic affairs, the involvement of faculty in public affairs and again, this idea of extending the

knowledge and expertise of the University to the community. These events also were a mechanism for us to bring the community, the public, on campus and for the people in the community to learn more about the University, to meet faculty, staff and students in the University and for us to learn from the public.

I served as Interim Executive Director of the Center from January 2004 until mid-August of 2006. As Director, one of my priorities was to greatly increase the involvement of the Center in co-curricular activities to support academic affairs. One of the things we created was a series of what we called policy summits. These were roundtable discussions and guest speakers that we then combined these roundtable panels with statewide surveys and/or a public affairs courses. They were sort of a multi-format way of bringing together scholarship on a particular topic.

The first was one was a Policy Summit on Politics and Ethics that we held in the spring of 2003. Judge Abner Mikva was the keynote speaker and it was a roundtable that we held in the Studio Theatre. Charlie Wheeler, Director of the Public Affairs Reporting Program, was the moderator. There was a large panel of people in a fishbowl sort of format where if you're familiar with the studio theater, the bleacher seating on risers and the panel was set up on the floor. We had political scientist Alan Rosenthal of Rutgers, Kent Redfield of our faculty, Cindy Canary of the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform, Mike Lawrence former press secretary for Governor Edgar, Howard Peters who was former head of the Department of Corrections and Secretary of Human Services, Senator Howard Carroll, and others from Illinois.

Dick Schuldt presented results of a statewide survey on the public's trust in government and their perceptions of ethics and corruption in state government. Following Judge Mikva's keynote speech remarks, Charlie Wheeler moderated the panel discussion. It was a full house and Charlie Wheeler and I edited a transcript of the proceedings as a report. That was the beginning of a series of Center forums where we would invite classes and students to attend and it was the beginning of this kind of a policy summit.

Two of the most successful were the policy summits on politics and religion, one in 2005 and then the following year, 2006. I worked with Steve Schwark and an interdisciplinary group of faculty to design conferences and a summer online course on these topics of politics and religion. We brought internationally recognized authorities to campus, Pippa Norris of Harvard and James Morone of Brown University in 2005 and Dianna Eck of Harvard and Noah Feldman of NYU in 2006. The online public affairs course in 2006 featured books by these speakers. We had five sections and enrolled a total of over a hundred students in that course.

The conference also included a panel on Muslims in America that we had over a hundred people attend. The Studio Theatre again was packed for these presentations. They were open to the public. The 2005 policy summit included a presentation by Dick Schuldt of a statewide survey we designed on morality policy issues. This survey and analysis has led to a couple of journal articles that have been published on this. The survey asked people to what extent they saw a moral dimension in various policy issues, what and who had influenced their opinion on

the policy issue and their relationship to their religious philosophy, and the role government should play in regulating behavior.

The issues included guaranteed health insurance for all, casino gambling, gay marriage, abortion, homeland security and civil liberties, and campaign finance. This is kind of an issue in political science now, the idea of the role of morality in public opinion on policy issues. So those policy summits done in tandem with public affairs courses were really terrific in lacing together the Center and academic affairs.

We also organized major guest speaker events: an annual U.S. Constitution Day program, Women's Heritage Month series with Lynn Otterson of the Women's Center. Annually women's heritage month is in March, and we would work with the Women's Center to host a major speaker. For Earth Day, we worked with Tih-Fen Ting of the Environmental Studies Department. Among the most memorable of these was the brilliant presentation by Dr. Sandra Steingraber on the connection between environmental contaminants and cancer titled, "Contaminated without Consent." She was the 2006 Earth Day speaker, and we had exceptional attendance and participation by students in that.

These speakers provided exceptional learning opportunities for students who would attend for ECCE credit, the Engaged Citizenship Common Experience speaker series. We just held the eighth annual Lincoln Legacy Lectures, the annual series we began in 2002 in conjunction with the dedication of the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum in Springfield. Professor Phillip Paludan who had just been appointed to the Naomi Lynn Distinguished Chair in Lincoln Studies at UIS, gave one of the inaugural lectures on Lincoln and race, with Mary Frances Berry of the U.S. Human Rights Commission.

This year, 2010, we had our largest audience ever. More than 470 attended, and we returned to the theme of Lincoln and race. Because we were celebrating the University's 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary this fall, we thought it would be appropriate to showcase our own faculty. So we invited Michael Burlingame, the current holder of the Lynn Chair in Lincoln Studies, and Matthew Holden, who holds the Wepner Professorship in Political Science, to give this year's lectures and Cullom Davis, our most esteemed professor emeritus of history and a benefactor of the series, to moderate.

The event was a great success by all measures, with a diverse audience from the community and a large number of students attending. We had 139 students attend plus 46 who viewed the live webcast. All of the events I've mentioned: the policy summits, the Constitution Day, Earth Day, all of those, they've all been free and open to the public. Of course, we always work hard to invite students and classes to attend. We've videotaped all of them, so they are available in the video archives and can be accessed through the UIS website.

We've hosted two national conferences the culmination of I think the Center's, or the University really, the University's public affairs work. Really it's a testament to our reputation nationally as a University that has a strong relationship with state government and has a faculty

and students engaged in public policy research and the concerns of state government. I think it's reflected in our being selected to host these two national conferences.

The first was in May 1997. We hosted the 5th annual Links Conference. Links isn't exactly an acronym but it's the (laughs) shorthand term, or the Links between Public Universities and State Capitals conference. It was begun in 1993 at Cal State Sacramento to bring together academics, policy specialists and policy makers for the purpose of developing stronger linkages between public universities and state governments. The Institute for Public Affairs at UIS led by Nancy Ford took the lead in organizing the conference and the conference grew to over 250 participants representing 30 different states. It was co-sponsored by the National Conference of State Legislatures and the Council of State Governments.

It was the first national conference hosted by UIS and was considered an achievement to be chosen to host it. We were gratified that it was the largest of the conferences of the Links Conferences held so far. Nancy Ford served as conference chair, and I served as coordinator. We accomplished the goal of the conference, which was to provide a vehicle for dialogue to occur on how public universities can do a better job in serving the public interest and providing direct service to their state and communities in a time of declining resources and increasing demand for performance and accountability.

For example, one panel focused on university-based ethics training for public officials. One of the most useful presentations for us was by the CEO of the State of Washington's version of C-SPAN, TVW that I mentioned earlier, who described the startup of their public affairs cable network. We had begun exploring funding for a planning study in Illinois for a state version of C-SPAN here and learned about the hurdles we needed to cross through his presentation.

Then just this year, UIS hosted the tenth annual State Politics and Policy Conference in June 2010 with the theme "political scientists meet political practitioners in the states, how can we help?" Really it resonates with the theme of the Links Conference, this idea of how academics can assist policy makers, policy specialists. UIS was chosen to host this special tenth anniversary conference because it has been the focal point of the renaissance of scholarship in this field of political science since the founding of the *Journal State Politics and Policy Quarterly* in 2000 by UIS professor Christopher Mooney.

Chris and I organized the conference and served as co-chairs. Among the sponsors were the State Politics and Policy Section of the American Political Science Association. More than 200 faculty and graduate students from across the country participated over the course of the three day conference in June with events held at the Old State Capitol historic site, the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Museum, and the UIS campus.

The Conference program included 16 paper panels and two roundtables. We also had a special hour devoted to graduate student poster exhibits. At some conferences the graduate student

poster presentations are sort of ghettoized. They're put off in a side room and nobody really sees too much of them, but we had them set up right in the Sangamon Auditorium lobby at an hour set aside right after lunch on the big day, Friday. The graduate students certainly had a full opportunity to share their work and to get feedback from the faculty at the conference.

A roundtable of former governors including Madeline Kunin, Democrat of Vermont, Jim Edgar, Republican of Illinois, Parris Glendening, a Democrat from Maryland, and Bob Taft, a Republican of Ohio. They kicked off the conference in the historic Hall of Representatives in the Old State Capitol, and it was quite a lively panel. They offered their ideas on how can political scientists make a practical contribution to good government and politics. In a first for UIS, the national public affairs television network, C-SPAN, taped the event and aired the program on the main national channel the July 4<sup>th</sup> weekend.

The conference was a tremendous success both from an academic standpoint and from a reputational standpoint for the Center and UIS. It received extensive media coverage including local, state and national media. Ten local media stories were done about the conference including an advance story on page one of the *State Journal Register* done a month in advance in May. Participants sent us many notes of thanks and praise for the conference. Attendees took away a great impression of Springfield and UIS. We believe the goodwill and scholarly contributions generated by the conference will redound to UIS' credit nationally for years to come. It made all the stress and hard work worthwhile.

Q. I'd like for you to reflect and being one of the longest term employees, 35 years next year is that correct?

A. Yes, 35 years in February.

Q. You have seen a great deal of change and development at the University over the years. I wondered if you might reflect back on what you have seen and its growth and development and direction over time.

A. OK, this is from my perspective, Cheryl, so others will have a different view. Others will be able to talk also about other areas of the University and changes over the 35-40 years in other aspects of the University. Let me talk about public affairs and the changes in public affairs over the 35 years I've been there, and again, this is from my perspective. Others would have a different point of view. I'm also going to be relatively candid in what I have to say.

Q. That's fine.

A. Okay. First, the way we are staffed and organized to carry out public affairs has changed. It's changed significantly. As I've said before in the 1970s and 1980s, there were four public affairs centers: one for each branch of government, plus one focused on local government. Over the years these centers were dispersed, reorganized, and merged. Now today there is just one overall center, and within it there is just one institute in which research on all branches of government and the local and nonprofit sector takes place.

So structurally, there's been a big change. We now have only six or seven faculty on joint appointment in any given year. In years past, we had more faculty on ongoing joint appointments and, in addition, faculty on one semester or one year non-instructional assignments to carry out research as I was mentioning. As faculty have left or retired or have been needed to cover increased course demand, we have not been able to replace them due to budget cuts.

This second major change has meant fewer faculty are now directly involved in applying research in public service through the center than in the past. If they are engaged in public affairs activities, they do so through their departments and colleges. Again, we have maybe a half dozen on joint appointment now in the center, but for the most part faculty are engaged in public affairs activities at a department level. Some argue that "public affairs" is now defused and integrated throughout the curriculum, so the Center for State Policy and Leadership no longer is or needs to be the primary locus of organized public affairs activities in the University.

Some argue that. For example, there's now an undergraduate Engaged Citizenship Speaker Series and a student affairs division office of volunteerism and civic engagement. Faculty are too busy meeting the demands of having expanded the curriculum to offer lower division courses and the addition of online courses to spare as much time for research. The loss of faculty engaged in the Center in policy research is detrimental to the Center, to government, and to citizens, I believe, and ultimately to students whose teachers don't have the research examples to bring to the classroom.

On the plus side, a third major change is that the Center has become more student-oriented. We have always made our outstanding internship programs a priority and have paid close attention to adequate staffing, management and resources for the Graduate Public Service Internship Program, GPSI, and Legislative Staff Internship Programs. They are among the very best things this University does.

Now, in addition, with the various conferences, seminars and guest speakers we bring to campus on a regular basis through, for example the policy summits I mentioned, the Center is generating good content for the Engaged Citizenship Speaker Series that undergraduates participate in for credit. We have commissioned development of public affairs courses to be offered in tandem with our events, our policy summits. So this lacing together of the Center and academic affairs through co-curricular offerings is really an important advance.

A fourth major change, the Center's media units occupy a stronger, more vital position within the University, the community and the state. WIUS Public Radio is a strong link between the University and the Community. It has been since it went on the air in 1974 and has grown into a major cultural resource in the Central Illinois region with a listener base of over 30,000. It is the hub for the Illinois Public Radio Network, which carries the State Week in Review program. WIUS reporters' stories are aired on National Public Radio occasionally, and each year our reporters win national Capitol Beat Awards.

*Illinois Issues* magazine continues to be one of the premier publications of its type in the country. It has a high powered advisory board and a large readership in the Chicago region. So it really helps give visibility to UIS in the Chicago region. The Office of Electronic Media, while it no longer operates the local community access TV channel, it did so for 20 plus years, it's found a new niche now in having built and now operates the UIS Campus Channel. That's a 24/7, closed circuit TV network on campus that provides students and the campus community with coverage of student government association meetings, special events on campus, lectures, arts events, guest speakers, convocations, commencements, and we hope with some funding coming soon to be able to cover athletic events, too. Also OEM, Office of Electronic Media, provides live webcasts of many events on campus and videotapes those programs for archival, video-on-demand access.

Fifth, I must say that I think the change over the 35 years I have to reach the conclusion that public affairs in general and the Center in particular no longer seem to occupy a prominent place in the University. This is a mistake in my view. The institution was founded in 1969 with a unique mission as the public affairs university in Illinois to mobilize and extend the knowledge and expertise of its faculty, staff and students to help solve the public affairs problems of the day.

The Center for State Policy and Leadership is the locus of the organized resources including staff expertise for carrying out this mission. The budget cuts we've had to absorb and the loss of faculty, staff and graduate assistants in addition to a lack of public acknowledgement and support by the University administration often have hurt the Center in recent years. I understand the need to set priorities in an era of fiscal strain and to seek cost saving and efficiencies throughout the University and to insist on greater productivity and accountability for state appropriated dollars we receive. But failing to adequately invest in the Center and its units both in terms of real dollars and in terms of publically articulated support for our work, undermines the distinctiveness of the University in the public's eye and our reputation in the region, state and nation as a focal point for cutting edge work in public policy research and civic education and engagement.

Our democracy is in sore need right now of new, young, ethical leaders who are well educated, principled, and open minded and who are committed to strengthening our democracy and solving the ethical problems facing our nation and world. The Center is a vehicle for helping UIS produce these leaders.

So here are my concluding thoughts unless you have maybe a final question, but again this is my view as I reflect on the 35 years. We need to reestablish the priority of public affairs in the rhetoric and resources of the institution. We participated in the development of the UIS strategic plan. By we, I mean the Center and the faculty, staff and students associated with the Center.

We participated in the development of the UIS strategic plan in 2005. The Center contributes to all of the University's strategic goals, especially of course, making a difference in the world but

also academic excellence and enriching individual lives. In the Center's own strategic plan in 2006, we saw our role as at the core of UIS in educating future leaders and active, informed citizens. But in recent years, public affairs has not been as prominent in the rhetoric about and within the institution.

Before I retire, several years from now I hope, I'm going to work for a resurgence in this institution's commitment to public affairs. I believe in the value of being a small student-centered, public liberal arts university. But our distinctiveness since our founding has been our special mission in public affairs. I've spent my entire professional career committed to fulfilling that mission.

Q. Thank you, Barbara. That was very well said. I have one last question and it sort of wraps everything up. What do you believe is the legacy of Sangamon State University and does it remain in place today?

A. Well, Sangamon State University's legacy is the set of institutional norms that still guide our interactions and practices today. Those norms include an institutional ethos of mutual respect and shared governance. They also include the norm that students come first, and faculty's first obligation is to excellence in teaching and advising. SSU's legacy also includes the centrality of public affairs and a liberal arts education.

One of our institutional norms is that we place special value on engagement with the community, state, nation and world both inside and outside the classroom. SSU's legacy is in serving as an example of how you can create a new institution as President Robert Spencer and the founding faculty and staff did and has its core values remain true 40 years later. Through countless changes in people, resources, politics, transient society and students' expectations, the value the University places on a strong sense of community both within the campus and our interactions as citizens of the world beyond endures. So I would say, "Yes indeed, SSU's legacy remains in place today."

Q. Thank you. Is there anything else you would like to talk about? I know you were the first chairperson of the Academic Professional Advisory Committee.

A. Yes, at the time of the merger with the University of Illinois there was no specific governance entity that represented administrative staff. In the University of Illinois nomenclature, we're referred to as academic professionals. We're in administrative professional appointments as opposed to civil service. At the time of the merger, there was an opportunity, in fact a necessity, to create an academic professional advisory committee that was called for in the statutes to be a conduit between the academic professional staff and the Chancellor. I volunteered to lead a small group; Carol Bloemer and I co-chaired the interim Academic Professional Advisory Committee. We worked, there were five of us, Terri Jackson, Denny Freuh, Carol Esarey, Carol Bloemer and I organized the academic professionals on campus.

We created the structure and operating procedures for a counterpart to the APACs that existed at the Urbana and Chicago campuses. Of course, they represent thousands at those campuses, and at the time we were struggling to count a hundred of us. It was really a wonderful

opportunity to create something that would help forge a professional identity for those of us who were dispersed across campus.

One thing about being a small place, often there would just be one of us in any particular office, and we didn't even know one another across the campus. One whole goal in those early years was to create a professional identity for the academic professional staff on campus and to offer professional development opportunities and to give us a voice in the shared governance system and a direct communication line to the Chancellor.

I also had the privilege of serving as the first from UIS to chair UPPAC, the University Professional Personnel Advisory Committee. That is the joint organization representing APs on all three campuses. We would meet periodically with the President of the University and the Vice President of the University for Human Resources and we would advocate on behalf of academic professionals. We wanted professional development opportunities, we wanted multi-year contracts, we wanted career ladders, we wanted a grievance process, all kinds of things.

We created, not from scratch because our colleagues at Urbana and Chicago were so generous with their time and advice to us, so we didn't have to reinvent the wheel. However, we had to shape that wheel so it really fit the culture and need of APs at UIS. They were different in many ways than the Urbana and Chicago APs. We created a mechanism, we divided the campus into districts, we held our first elections. I was elected the first chair and served for four years until they decided we better have term limits here and get Ferrara out of that chair (laughs).

Then I was followed by some very capable people like Deb Russell and others who followed in my wake, Jerry Burkhart currently. I'm so gratified, I'm proud of how APAC has really developed beautifully since those early years in 1995. It is a very effective representative of APs on campus and has done so much. I'm so pleased to see so many APs from all different segments of the campus participate in those elections and serve on APAC. It's so very important.

Q. Is there anything else you'd like to add to your interview?

A. I suppose just a personal note that when I joined the staff in 1976 and moved to Springfield, I never imagined that I would stay. But the institution really is unique in providing a niche for those of us who are interested and committed to improving our government and strengthening our democracy and encouraging students to, no matter what field of study they're involved in, to become informed and engaged in public affairs issues.

So the opportunity and I imagine others you're talking with for this project, will sound a similar note. This University has provided so many of us with a very unique opportunity for our own intellectual development, our own scholarship and in my case and others, our own professional development and career. Sure it's had its frustrations and we've had to overcome lots of resource and other obstacles over the years. But it really has provided a wonderful opportunity to have a very rewarding career, to work with some very capable, bright and committed people. I'm very grateful to the University for the career I've been able to have.

Q. Thank you very much Barbara. Barbara's last name is spelled F-E-R-R-A-R-A.

End of Interview

1 hour 15 minutes 58 seconds