

Interview with President Novice G. Fawcett by Robert Sutton
April 9, 1984

SUTTON: I would like to talk with you today about the founding of the regional campuses and the role of other institutions. You were just starting to say something about Wright State. So let's start with that one.

FAWCETT: There is a gentleman whose name is Bill Angler, now retired and living in Dayton, but who earlier had been the assistant to the head of NCR, an organization which was very prominent in the founding of Wright State University. Mr. Angler came to my office recently and is trying to pick up an assignment that had been started by Mr. Fred Wright who worked at Wright State when it was started and who is now retired and who never got his work completed. He's going to write the history of the institution. I don't know how many people have been to see me over the years about how that institution got started but let me go back and try to fill in, if I can, something about the origin of Wright State University, which I think is a very interesting story. I have forgotten the exact year; it was probably 1960 or shortly thereafter. I was being approached by a number of groups from Dayton, Ohio, like the Chamber of Commerce, like the business leadership and the Wright Patterson Air Force Base people, where we had a graduate program, and others and Miami University which for a number of years had had a branch and one of the high schools and was approaching National Cash Register for a grant of land to build a little building to operate a two year branch instead of in the high school. There seemed to be a good deal of misunderstanding within the community about what they needed or what they ought to do or how to get off the ground. One day down at the General Assembly, when one of the parties was locked in caucus over some issue, John Millett, then President of Miami and I were sitting by because the deliberations were going to affect the appropriations to the universities. At the break for noon we went to the University Club for lunch. While we were there I said to Dr. Millett, "I'm being approached by all these groups from Dayton, simply because we seem to have a graduate center which has been satisfactory there for a number of years at Wright Patterson Air Force Base and I understand you're getting ready to build a building for a branch and we're not about to intrude into that, but why don't we consider making a study of what the city of Dayton and its outlying areas would need over the next 25 years and see whether we cannot jointly develop a two-year operation there including engineering, and our Wright Patterson Air Force Base graduate program." And he said, "That sounds like a good idea." At that time, Mr. Stanley Allyn, who was the chief executive officer of National Cash Register, was on the Board of Trustees at Ohio State. I discussed this with Mr. Allyn and he thought this was a splendid idea—I had said something like this to him, "If I were a citizen in Dayton, a property owner and had intended to live my life there, I would want to feel that in the next 25 years I had access to better educational opportunities at the local level than you have at the present time." That kind of impressed him and the people in the leadership roles in Dayton. He went back and discussed that and out of that came an invitation to me to meet one night at the old Wright residence, a kind of preserved home of the Wright Brothers and I think there were about 25 business and corporate leaders in the community present and I said to them about what I had already stated—if I were a resident of the community I would want to

look at what we ought to be doing to work on for the next twenty five years to serve the educational needs of the community, and they were quite impressed with that. They later than met with Dr. Millett and out of those deliberations came a fund drive—an independent fund-raising drive in Dayton led by Mr. Allyn from National Cash Register. The reason for it was that the University of Dayton, an independent university, had requested the community to get behind the fund drive for them. After some negotiations we concluded we ought to put all that together. We conduct a fund drive and a certain percentage would go to the University of Dayton and the other would go to a fund to buy land and if there was enough to build a building to get Wright State, what was then the Dayton branch or regional campus, off the ground. The fund effort was very successful and the University of Dayton received its share of the money. Then, prior to this we had an unannounced program going, a real estate man to take options on a considerable amount of land where the university is now located. This was done with the cooperation of a real estate acquisition division of National Cash Register. When we finished that drive and paid expenses we had enough money to buy 400 and some acres in this site where we had options. Then we went to the General Services Administration because Wright Patterson Air Force Base was not using a considerable amount of government land. Through various procedures we put, I think it was something like 125 acres more of land with this land. We had options on to develop a campus area of about 615 acres, or 625 or some such figure. There was enough money after we bought that land and after we received the grant of the additional land from the General Services Administration to build on building. Remember now, we had no state assistance with any of this. We constructed this one building for the branch campus, which later became Wright State University and we named it Allyn Hall because he had been the key figure in all these plans.

SUTTON: Was this still going to be a joint venture with Miami?

FAWCETT: Yes, I was just about to comment on that fact. John Millett and I had agreed that we would—unusual, as it seemed to people in higher education these days—have two universities help found the beginning of some kind of institution. Miami was to provide the programs in education, business and the social sciences I believe, and we were to take responsibility for the science and the engineering developments as they would evolve and also relate these to our graduate programs at Wright State University, I mean at Wright State Patterson Air Force Base. The state recognized this effort and I believe it was in the next capital improvements appropriation that we received money for one or two additional buildings, at which point the state began to take a sharp interest. Also prior to this, our director of campus planning at Ohio State—Dr. Herrick—had developed a 25-year campus plan for this 600 and some acres of land. The educational programs were developed with very great care so that any course taken there was allegedly equivalent to any course taken at Miami in their respective areas, or any one taken at Ohio State in math or science or engineering or pre-engineering. I remember also that at the time we were doing this I had as my personal representative at a lot of those negotiations Dr. Moulton, Dr. Edward Moulton, who had just retired as Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. We worked very carefully with Miami University and there was some apprehension on the part of the people of Miami University whether or

not this mammoth Ohio State University would go and just swallow up them and their interests. Well, I assured them that we had no interest in doing that at all. So there was a period in which we operated with great caution; Miami had a director of its programs there and Ohio State had a director of its programs there. I had argued with Millett that there should be one person in charge of that but I did not win that so we had some interchange and occasionally some conflict but we worked really quite well together which was a unique thing in the country for two universities to help found a new one. Then that campus began to develop and there was a change in the administration in Ohio. Governor Rhodes had been elected and he had an interesting platform, which of course I didn't agree with in founding all the technical institutes all over the place and converting all of the municipal universities into state universities and so on. But in that program he had one to develop, I think we were given a year or something like that, Wright State into a full-fledged freestanding state institution. Well it was probably two or three years premature but we decided to support that because all we were trying to do was help them try to get an educational facility that would help them meet their own needs. Both universities worked very well together in helping that institution to get to the point where it could stand on its own. And even as I say it started a little too early, it went quite well because in the interim Dr. Millett was elected the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. I remember very well that as soon as he left Miami and came to the Board of Regents he then approached me saying we ought to have one leader on that campus which we achieved by going out and recruiting a person—Dr. Greg Golding from Purdue University out of Engineering to head the campus. Then it began to evolve as any other state university form that point on, but we felt that we played a very key and fair role at Ohio State. We weren't interested in annexing it. We wanted to be free of the branch responsibilities if we could, and if they wanted to and the state assumed responsibility for delivering that into a free standing institution that was fine as far as we were concerned. We did everything we knew how to support and help that institution to get started and it had had a remarkable history in a way. If you went to that campus today you'd see three-fourths or more of that old campus plan we developed for 25 years down the road in place. It has become a fairly well recognized university and I'm very proud of the record Ohio State had in starting and then freeing it to stand on its own.

SUTTON: Now that was quite different from any of the other branches I've heard of for any of the state universities.

FAWCETT: Yes, it was. It came at the end of the branch movement and again I ought to go back a little on that. I don't know if it's recorded how the branch movement got started at Ohio State. I do remember that. I may have little voids in my memory. When I went to the university in the summer of 1956, Ohio State had no off-campus branches. Oh, it had some extension centers and academic centers in different places for course work, but we had no branch movement. At the end of World War II, after the universities—there were six in the Inter-University Council at that time—had helped provide during the bulge some extension branches at the high schools. The agreement at that time was that as soon as the war was over and as soon as you could accommodate them they would liquidate all those branch efforts and get the campuses back into shape. There was one institution that did not do that and that was Ohio University. I found out

about this through President Beaumann at Kent State University, who had adhered strictly to the university agreement and closed branches in places at Canton and areas around there that operated during that period. I also discovered that through the aggressive nature of Ohio University in the branch movement. They were at that time still operating on Portsmouth, and there had been an announcement that Ohio University was going to establish a branch in Lancaster, which was really close to us than Ohio University. Furthermore, I had a rumor to the effect that Dr. Baker was approaching and talking with the people in North High School in Columbus a few blocks north of campus, to establish a branch of Ohio University there. I have never seen anything in writing about that but I know what the rumor was, and I know the person he approached, who is no longer living. It seemed to me that we could not, at Ohio State, permit other state institutions, of what I thought were of lower academic quality than ours, to encroach on us in that manner. So, one of the first things I recommended to our Board was that we have someone make a study of Ohio State's responsibility for branch campuses in light of what had been taking place during the previous several years. I went, as you will recall, to Dr. Kenneth Arisman from the College of Education, who had some interest in this. I've forgotten how his appointment occurred, but we appointed him to conduct the study. The study was completed in early 1957, and a report was made to the governing board. Our first effort to block off encroachment came by responding to a request from Newark, Ohio and one from Marion, Ohio to establish academic centers in their high schools branches. We announced that we were going to do this, and we did. This began to block off the Ohio University spread over the state. That's a little exaggeration. Bowling Green had some relationships with the people in Lima, which apparently did not please the people in Lima, and Mansfield, Ohio had some courses through Bowling Green, which were not apparently satisfactory. We were approached to put branches in those two communities. I knew both superintendents of schools and I talked with them. It was true. People in the community wanted us to do that and Bowling Green indeed wanted out of it, so it was an amicable arrangement with Bowling Green. We went over and studied the Lima operation, and the possibility of a Lima branch, which we did establish, and Mansfield in the same way. Both of those became rather prosperous off-campus branches of the university.

SUTTON: I think you once said something that your personal desire was for a more central location than scattered at Lima and Mansfield.

FAWCETT: Yes. It became clear to us, as we were in the process of developing those branches, that there would not in the foreseeable future be adequate enrollment to support very many of them. At the same time we were beginning to develop facilities on all of our campuses through capital improvement funding, to accommodate larger numbers of students. So, there was a very interesting history to the Senate Education Committee's "logrolling" with respect to Senator Pepple in Lima who was determined that they were going to have a full-blown university. We would initiate it and they would later have a full-blown university in Lima that would do about everything. I've looked at thousands of stacks of paper that are alleged to support such a concept. But in the Senate there was a Senator Gardner from Mansfield didn't have. We have proposed, if we were going to build facilities, a place in Allen County to put one, where Lima is located, because of the

supporting population base. There would be a good reason to support one somewhere between Mansfield and Marion, in Bucyrus or somewhere that would be in commuting distance of all of them. It could be a reasonably good-sized operation. That simply did not pass; it did not receive favorable consideration because of these two men. They went after the appropriations in their own communities for buildings and they got them. So we went out to Lima with the cooperation of, I've forgotten the name, an elderly gentleman with lots of money. He gave a very large cash gift. We acquired the land and built the building and named it for him. We had a fund drive in Mansfield. We acquired the land and got an appropriation for building there. We got an appropriation and got the land and had a fund drive in Newark and Marion at the same time before we got enough land to build a building that would be permanent in nature in both communities. So we had four freestanding regional campuses. We had helped Lakewood, Ohio in their request to establish a branch in the high school there. We really did not want to extend ourselves that far but there was no state university up there at that time to take over that responsibility. Later, when Cleveland State University was founded we were able to turn that over and get out of that area. Our idea was to sometime get out of all those and do at Ohio State what we thought the university was supposed to do. But they got to be permanent in nature. If you were to go out there today and try to take the Ohio State image out of those regional campuses and establish a community college, or whatever you want to establish, you'd have a terrible time. We did such a good job selling our program over the years that they don't want to withdraw. They like to think that the courses they take are Ohio State courses, and I can understand that. If you were going to start over in the state of Ohio, it'd be the wrong way to do it. But all this was taking place concurrently with the establishment of these two-year technical institutes. Legislation kept evolving that enabled the state to do a lot of those things—more than they should have. And even if you ought to take in all the branches of the university, all the state community colleges, all the technical institutes and set up a regional, two-year program, which would have general education and technical education available to all the people in these various regions. You could do that with very little cost and literally no building. I've been involved in a study conducted by the state going over that problem a few years, and that would be a very viable solution if it weren't for the feelings of the people. We had two requirements in our branches. One was that the academic work had to be equivalent in quality to what was on the Main campus. Secondly, we would not go to a community unless that community first invited us to come, and then conducted a fund drive to have something of their own in that development. And they really have been rather remarkable developments.

SUTTON: Now, one of the things that occurs to me, I'm not sure if it's right, is that though the local campuses do, as you say, very much want the name of Ohio State and the influence of Ohio State, in a number of instances, they've wanted to be more independent and simply run their own staffing for instance, choose their own staff. They seemed in relation to our department to want to do that rather than to let us on the central campus have a decision-making relation with them. There must have been a tension there all the way through, or has there been?

FAWCETT: Well, that leadership I think came from the people who wanted to establish independent institutions. I can remember the Senator, the later Mr. Gardner from Mansfield even told some of the people up there, "Some of these days we'll have a university just like Ohio State: we'll belong to the Big 10," all of that sort of thing which was nonsense but was a part of the political environment of the time.

SUTTON: But, he must have been saying something that the community itself responded to.

FAWCETT: There really has never been any studies done on any communities in Ohio you see, because we had no legislation that enabled you to establish a junior college or a community college or anything else up until all of these things began to evolve concurrently.

SUTTON: So in a way these were learning exercises for what you were able to do very successfully at Dayton with Wright State.

FAWCETT: Yes, it was all background to that. I think we may have helped with another one or two. I don't remember what they were or where they were. I think that's about all of them though, but this story's not very carefully recorded anywhere that I've ever seen. It was a job to go through all of the steps that were necessary to found those regional campuses, to employ faculty. Then you had the problem of when they would become tenured, if they did, and all this sort of thing—that all evolved finally correspond exactly with the rules and regulations of the central campus.

SUTTON: There is such a drive in some people's minds that each one of the state universities had its own area, including Ohio State University, where it almost in some people's minds seems to be the University of Central Ohio rather than the Ohio State University. Did the founding of these regional campuses influence that problem? It seems to me that it is a problem now; of did they ease the problem?

FAWCETT: Well, I never really thought once about that. There was never any question in my mind but what these campuses, as long as we were operating on what would be an integral part of the Ohio State University, not as Central Ohio State University, because we worked all the time to extend our influence on a national and an international basis. There were people who wanted to keep talking about our being the Central Ohio University, but that wasn't the nature of Ohio State. It was a land grant institution. It was the principle graduate institution in the state; in fact the only state institution giving PhDs until all of this began to happen (and I remember we opposed that, and we didn't win it but we won some of it).

SUTTON: Yes, I remember a faculty meeting where Governor DeSalle was speaking and he was speaking about giving PhDs on the other campuses and I remember how quickly you responded to that.

FAWCETT: I don't recall the incident, but we had a very firm position at Ohio State. We were the only one doing any significant research at that time. I think that the PhD program got very seriously overextended in our state. I think it still is, but they have some good programs in some of the other institutions. They're not comparable, in my opinion, to Ohio State.

SUTTON: Are you aware of the same kind of matter with respect to the branches of the other universities, for instance, Kent State and so on? Were those also influenced by legislative action and that kind of thing?

FAWCETT: The increased enrollment, which a few of us understood and some of us didn't, was such a powerful influence to get people into school somewhere. You just simply could not at that time build campus facilities fast enough to accommodate this onslaught of enrollment. We're over that now and past it and you can back up and take a new look, if you had the leadership to do it, and probably save a good many millions of dollars a year.

SUTTON: But that was the driving force, the sheer number of bodies?

FAWCETT: Oh, yes, and with the open admissions law in this state, you had no alternative; you had to be prepared to do it or get out of the way of it.

SUTTON: I think I'm going to go on a little bit and ask you how you found the leaders for these regional campuses. There must have been some rather unusual criteria necessary. A dean of a regional campus is not all the same as a dean of a college.

FAWCETT: He's a director, really.

SUTTON: They call them deans now.

FAWCETT: I know they do, that's evolved since I was there.

----End of Side A----

FAWCETT: ...was director of those campuses. The central university had one administrator who represented the president in serviced those campuses, and he recommended to the president the person or persons to consider to direct those campuses. We started in the very beginning to be sure that we would have a good academic person with some knowledge of the business operation, of the service, of that institution. That worked quite well in three-fourths of them at least. Sometimes, you had a local person who you could use, and in the early stages we did that. I remember in Lima, Ohio we had Dr. Reed—I believe he's still living—who at one time had been the superintendent of schools in Lima and then had gone on someplace else and then he retired and came back there to live. He was extremely interested in this development, a very able fellow. We got him to direct the Lima one for a considerable period of time. It was very acceptable to everyone concerned. In a period of a few years though, we came back more and more

to selecting a person who would have generally the same qualifications as a dean of a college would be expected to have, because there were certain decisions that had to be made out there out of the context of the rest of the university by the very nature of it being in a different kind of community. I think for the most part the directors, or, as you say now, the deans of those campuses were competent people.

SUTTON: I was curious as to whether you had a different definition, you and your director, for all the campuses: whether you had in mind a certain kind of person you wanted there.

FAWCETT: I remember one time when they changed the title in the law that created the Board of Regents so that the executive was called Chancellor. We kind of laughingly considered calling each director of our branch campuses Chancellor, but of course that was discarded quickly. It would have infuriated the political leadership of the state and it wasn't worth the risk you would take. But I think there was just a good deal of common sense and good judgment used in selecting somebody who could represent and respond to the community while tying the academic program into the university. I can't name all those people. We had a person in Newark who was with the schools in the early days of that one. Then I sent a young PhD who had worked with me over at the university over to direct that—Dr. Barnes, who has since retired and had some industry over there. I know who is the dean now. We had a good young man in Marion that the community and the people all supported. He served for years, may still be serving for all I know as the head of that campus. You will remember Jim Heck, Dr. Heck's son, up at Mansfield, and there have been a succession of people since then. I haven't kept up with that. But I think in general they've taken people who have academic respectability, and some experience in managing enterprises of one kind or another and who understand the academic procedures.

SUTTON: Now somewhere in this fits in, maybe it doesn't but it seems to, is the founding of the university college on the central campus.

FAWCETT: That's a very different, separate kind of problem.

SUTTON: And they finally came together.

FAWCETT: Yes, at the end. We had been operating like this for a long time. But you see when that early concept of University College was established, there was no statute that provided for establishing technical institutes, or technical programs, or two-year programs. Our faculty at Ohio State had an aversion to any kind of a two-year academic program for transfer—you remember all of this—that sort of thing. But central Ohio, with its growing base of population was reaching the point where it did not have access to enough general education and to literally any technical education. Prior to that law, I had worked with the Chancellor. Since we had the space where University College is, it seemed that we could establish the center there, for the first two years of some of our undergraduate programs. If there was no development in the technical field, we could also establish a technical institute, a two-year technical institute at that site, since there

was lots of parking and very good access for traffic. In the course of the development of University College, in its initial discussion stages and so on, two or three interesting things happened. One, we got the technical institute statute, and two, we employed as the academic vice-president Dr. John Weaver from Iowa. Weaver had a background at the University of Minnesota as a faculty member early in his experience, and they had a two-year general college that he had a great deal of dislike for. He thought what we were talking about was something like that general college, and I think he very skillfully, though appointing various kinds of committees, steered us into, with faculty consent, into the “portal of entry” we called it, institution for our campus, and away from the concept of a regular general college that would have some education attached to it. Along the way and coincident with this, came the establishment of the Columbus Technical Institute, which did remove somewhat the need for our providing the technical programs in central Ohio.

SUTTON: There must have been some kind of accommodation worked out there, because I noticed that we don't have any authority seemingly to issue a two-year certificate or completion of a university college.

FAWCETT: Well I think you may have now, because of the establishment of the agricultural/technical institute in Wooster.

SUTTON: Oh, that one.

FAWCETT: Is that the only one?

SUTTON: I think so. I had the impression that we either were bound by law or by some kind of agreement between institutions so that we would not issue a certificate here.

FAWCETT: Well, that evolved largely as a result of the faculty not favoring Ohio State giving any kind of two-year degree. Right or wrong, that's the way it came out. I think it was wrong but a lot of the faculty thought it was right. That institution just came down to being a vehicle for heavy enrollment for just channeling freshman through it until they got to the sophomore or junior level, and then going in to the other colleges.

SUTTON: Then, that of course overlapped with the reorganization of the other colleges on the campus.

FAWCETT: Yes, that's right. They all came together. That became, that was a very interesting problem, as I think I discussed with you once before. I believe it was probably the most massive academic reorganizations up to that time that had been attempted by any university. This became a very interesting and very useful step for the institution to take policy-wise. I remember when I went to the university, the late Dean Alpheus Smith, who had a great academic reputation on this campus and all over the country, had been advocating that something be done to break up the large College of the Arts and Sciences that had developed to the point where it was absolutely unwieldy. Here again, the first splinter of that effort came during Dr. Weaver's administration. The

Vice-Presidency, instead of getting the whole problem out in front of the faculty and trying to solve it, they settled in with this idea of creating the College of Biological Sciences out of that came the establishment of that one college. That was just a first step and a very small preliminary step to the larger problem, although it remained intact after the whole reorganization was completed. I can remember yet going to what was then faculty council meetings, over which I had the responsibility of presiding, which were three o'clock meeting which usually lasted until five, and these would go until eight or whatever. It was a very serious and sincere study of the whole university structure. I was very impressed with the interest of everyone in that, and the desire to do something but it come out with a result that was generally acceptable to all the people on the campus—or as many of them as you can ever please with any major venture.

SUTTON: I remember one day picking up John Ramseyer in my car as he was starting off to a meeting, and as he got out of the car he said to me, "I am going to a meeting that Novice Fawcett wants me to go to with Fullerton. I think he thinks it's good for my constitution to fight with Fullerton every week or two." I think it had some relation to this. You must have had an ongoing committee for a long time there, not just in the faculty council but a steady committee of some of the leaders of the campus. Do you recall this?

FAWCETT: Well Jack Corbally and I had.

SUTTON: I think it was fairly late when Jack had succeeded to that post.

FAWCETT: Yes. We never could get this study off the ground, as much as the campus seemed to want to try something. We never could make any headway with it. I shouldn't say this, but there was a group of people in that old college of the Arts and Sciences who cultivated a relationship with Dr. Heimberger, who was the academic vice-president...

SUTTON: And had come out of that college.

FAWCETT: ...and Dr. Heimberger was a magnificent human being. He and I often disagreed philosophically on matters. When there would be a critical problem related to this whole thing come about, you would find this clique of people in the Arts and Sciences with whom he had been associated with while he was in the college getting together and finding any way to block a movement in that respect. I've been told that many times, and that's not a criticism of them. They believed in what they were doing, but one of the leaders in that was Jim Fullington, who for years had been the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and was very close to Fred Heimberger, who one time had served, I think, as the acting dean and then as the Dean of one of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences. So there was a little group of—I think they liked to be called the humanists, although they weren't all humanists—who wanted to preserve what they had always had. That may not be a fair criticism, but that was the feeling I had, and it was not until we had that change in the academic vice-presidency that we got an opportunity to get an overview of the needs of the whole university in this respect.

SUTTON: I think I can recall echoes of some of those faculty council meetings (I didn't attend, I wasn't a member; but I heard about them) that would say that some of these same people were opposed also to the development of the University College.

FAWCETT: Yes, I think that's true. Well, it took away a large part of this massive enrollment and some of the people who thought they were in charge of all of those students. I remember the old guidance and counseling program. The Arts and Sciences had to be split up and divided. There was no place for the Dean because the old arts college was disappearing. There were Deans of new colleges being proposed. So you know, it was a vested interests kind of discussion and opposition, I always felt. When it was all over, it came out very well. The Dean of that college, Dr. Fuller, left and went to the Farleigh Dickinson as the president and I never really heard much more about it.

SUTTON: Now, you did create a position then of Dean of Deans (I don't know what you called it) an executive Dean for the several colleges of Arts and Sciences, and now it's called Vice-Provost. He didn't have a title at that time.

FAWCETT: I don't recall that.

SUTTON: I think you put Larry Hearson in there.

FAWCETT: I don't think so. They were free standing colleges that reported to the university the way any of the colleges in the past had. I don't remember anything other. There may have been somebody in that staff who was working to continue to be sure that we provided the proper guidance and counseling services. You had to divide up the registration. There were mostly mechanical problems, but if they have somebody in that role now I'm not aware of it and they very well may have.

SUTTON: They may have by now. But I was remembering, when Denny Hall was built, there were spaces provided and one office remained for someone who seemed to have an overview of the several colleges.

FAWCETT: Well, we had several of these little bridges that had to be preserved across as we evolved and developed and got these colleges going, but I don't think they were permanent, or they shouldn't have been permanent positions.

SUTTON: In recent years, Dr. Wilke had been called Vice-Provost.

FAWCETT: Who?

SUTTON: Dr. Wilke, Thomas Wilke, since your time, and I just thought that that had grown out of an earlier position.

FAWCETT: I don't know that.

SUTTON: But it wasn't in your mind, when you organized things that way?

FAWCETT: No, no, not at all.

SUTTON: They were to be freestanding colleges just like any others?

FAWCETT: Absolutely right. We had the undergraduate colleges and the pre-professional colleges and the professional colleges, the three groups you'll remember. I believe it's still that way, probably will be for another 40 or 50 years.

SUTTON: There's now a move that will have students come in from the first or second year to certain colleges, several colleges that you speak of. Only now I understand this year they've begun to realize that's an awful load and maybe it ought to be someplace else. There's an ebb and flow in that now as to whether the students should be pulled off for the first two years.

FAWCETT: Well I have a grandson who is in his second year at the university, in the stadium dormitory, and I know he is just not going through the steps of being admitted to the College of Administrative Sciences after two years at the university. So it must be that this is the direction in which they're moving.

SUTTON: Yes, well Administrative Sciences in particular is holding to that because they have all the work they can handle and they seem not to want to get them much earlier. Some of the other colleges from what I've learned in the Council of Academic Affairs in the last few years, would like to have people come to them maybe a year earlier so they can get them ready to move on in.

FAWCETT: The beginning of the second year?

SUTTON: Yes, the beginning of the second year. But then immediately there sets in this counter feeling that maybe they'd be better off not to have them. In regard to the reorganization, the academic reorganization, which, you said, took a long time, you, pointed to one kind of force, which was simple inertia.

FAWCETT: That's always present.

SUTTON: People are happy with what they got and can't imagine being happy with someone else. So they fight it. In the case of the College of Education, which have far too many things piled into one package historically, that college underwent considerable division, so far as I can make out without anybody being very unhappy about the fact that they were being divided off. Can you speak of the matter of this ripple effect on reorganization? Did any of the other college or is the college of education unique in that regard? Is it the only one that had to be splintered?

FAWCETT: Yes, that was true in the College of Agriculture, dramatically, because of our chemistry and the biological sciences, and so on. It's true in medicine, in a way. There were great changes taking place in terms of the manner in which they were organized internally, but a part of this did not grow out the reorganization structure, but

out of a need of what a college was doing, or was designed to do, at the time these things took place. I was just thinking about the College of Agriculture, which had always had this Board of Control, for the experiment station, which later became the Ohio Agriculture Research and Developing Center. There was not reason to have it. In fact, they just changed it in the last year. I tried to get that changed for years in the system. It was just an appendage, meant nothing, and there was no reason for it to be there. The strength of the agro-business people in Ohio did, I think, have some position in creating a two-year agricultural technical institute, with some recognition.

SUTTON: Did that come in your time, or some time after?

FAWCETT: It came after I left. It was being proposed, but there was a strong feeling that they would never get that through the faculty. But since it was at Wooster, instead of here, there must have been some concessions along the way, but I am not familiar with them. I understand that it has worked out very well. And the extension, the whole agriculture extension, evolved dramatically through the years, with women in their extension efforts, home economics, home making and home advising and so on. The development of large urban areas as versus the old agricultural country extension agent concept that was responsible for all that involved and had to evolve, and creating a lot of internal splintering off of things, within a college as well as two other colleges. So, I think that happened in a lot of other places. I remember that biochemistry, that was given by agriculture and by chemistry, was at the seat of a strong feeling on the part of a lot of people, that you simply had to have a separate College of the Sciences, so that there could be interdisciplinary operations at a point and so on. All that is a very complex problem, and yet, I think that it had worked out quite well.

SUTTON: I do not know if it is true of other campuses, that there is some ease of cooperation. For instance, the veterinary medicine and agriculture, and the College of Medicine. There are overlapping areas there. You must early have taken some steps to promote that kind of intercollegiate cooperation. Did you go on an ad hoc basis, or did you have a general plan?

FAWCETT: No, I think that good leadership in anyone of those colleges could see quickly the need for doing a great many important things. Many of them were attempted after we had a clean plan of organization. You see, in agriculture there's only less than half of ones credit hours for degree is given by the College of Agriculture. So we've had this interplay among colleges historically. The College of Administrative Sciences, as you just got through indicating, a couple of years of that work, was done at other colleges. Still is, and I don't see anything wrong with that as long as the communication is satisfactory.

SUTTON: Well, we've had the same thing with education and the College of Arts and Sciences and all the rest.

FAWCETT: Oh, sure you have. And whether or not when you certify somebody to teach mathematics, they've had any mathematics (I mean solid mathematics) other than

just the teaching of mathematics. That's been one of the criticisms not only at this college but at colleges generally.

SUTTON: Well, that particular department of mathematics the relation seemingly for a number of years have been fairly good, and even in the sciences remember Dr. Moulton was very active in encouraging the cooperation between the sciences and science aviation. I was just thinking about things that those of you who were centrally placed might have been able to do to promote these relations over the campus. But your response seems to be that this was done as the occasion arose.

FAWCETT: Yes, it really had to be, because education was and still is changing very rapidly and you had to react to the need.

SUTTON: It must be the case that you were fortunate with a number of deans you had, that they were the sort of people who could cooperate.

FAWCETT: Oh, yeah. I think some of that cooperation was an outcome of the fact that we kept an active agenda for members of what we called the Administrative Council. Under the rules and regulations of the University, the deans and central staff people met regularly and worked at these matters.

SUTTON: And then you kept them gently, or not so gently, aware of needs.

FAWCETT: Oh, of course. Some of those needs would evolve out of discussions, or out of a college dean's great concern over some matter. These were all just hammered out in meetings of the Administrative Council.

SUTTON: These would surface there.

FAWCETT: Yes.

SUTTON: So the Administrative Council was quite central.

FAWCETT: It was an action group. Indeed it was.

SUTTON: I think you had told me earlier that you had created that.

FAWCETT: I can't remember. I don't know of any activity of that group as such prior to my being there. I do know that I saw this as one point in the administrative organization in the university when I proposed that reorganization, among other times, in my inaugural address. We created the cabinet under the rules of the Administrative Council. We had, I had at least and I hope others did, a definite point of view about how they would operate so that you could achieve constant communication and so that you could draw upon the best intellectual resources available to you to make those decisions.

SUTTON: And then this did carry through in the way you had in mind.

FAWCETT: Yes it did.

SUTTON: The ideas would surface but also any needs would come to the surface with it.

FAWCETT: That's right. We always had an open place in the agenda for any kind of problem we needed to deal with, and we dealt with a lot of those.

SUTTON: Now you had an open place in the sense that a dean could bring in an idea, or so that you could bring in an idea, or both.

FAWCETT: Sure, both.

SUTTON: I can imagine then all the circumstances in which a dean presented you with a problem, which you then managed to get on the agenda...

FAWCETT: If there was a relationship to other colleges, or if what was being proposed would have an impact on the other colleges. We never launched those independently without discussing them carefully with all members of the Administrative Council in session. We didn't negotiate that with two or three deans.

SUTTON: Because it would have implications for more than those two or three deans.

FAWCETT: That's right.

SUTTON: So that decisions of that sort we're talking about were made as a university decision, rather than as a small group.

FAWCETT: If there was a public announcement necessary after that, of course the president has to assume responsibility for that. You met with members of the Administrative Council and got the information that was necessary before you made a public announcement. And then you took responsibility for that. If it didn't work it was your problem, and if it did it was to your credit.

SUTTON: I sense from some of the things that Dr. Meiling told me that a man as active as he, a man as active as Roy Kottman was, would at times not see things eye to eye.

FAWCETT: With the president?

SUTTON: No, with each other.

FAWCETT: Oh, Oh, of course.

SUTTON: What's the role of a president named Fawcett in that situation anyway?

FAWCETT: Oh, as a mediator. I've done that lots of times. When you had aggressive, able people like those two people were (and there were others) they had some very good ideas. Sometimes, for reasons that weren't clear to them they had to be stopped, you know, in their tracks with a move of some kind because each had a lot of strong constituencies at stake. You had to deal with that. You had to understand that, to be sympathetic with it, but you didn't have to make a university decision based on a drive or a pressure movement. I never was reluctant to make those decisions, whether they liked it or whether they didn't.

SUTTON: Oh, no. If you were you shouldn't have been in the chair.

FAWCETT: That's right. I've had attempts on the part of some of those people to reorganize the administration of the university, rename...