Q. I’m Deb Ballam. Today is July 23, 2013, and I’m interviewing Susan Hartmann, whose birth date is?

A. May 3, 1940.

Q. Welcome Susan, it’s good to see you.

A. Thank you.

Q. Could you describe the positions you held or the roles you played at Ohio State, and in what units and over what time period?

A. I was Director of the Center for Women’s Studies from 1986 to 1992. I have been a professor of History from 1986 to 2011. I was professor of Women’s Studies from 1986 until about 2002. And I was Faculty Athletic Representative from 1995 to 2003.

Q. Could you talk about your family background and experiences that shaped you prior to you coming to Ohio State?

A. I grew up in St. Louis. Both my brother and I were first-generation college students. We both went to Washington University. It was expected that we would go to college. My parents weren’t intellectuals, but they were avid readers, and they expected us to go to college, so we did.

Q. It seems there was something about that generation of parents that didn’t go to college but just expected their kids to.
A. Well, it was that period, that post-World War II period, of that tremendous expansion of higher education, that really made it at least a middle-class phenomenon.

Q. People could envision the reality of it for their kids, I guess.

A. Right.

Q. Could you talk a little bit about how generally you identify yourself, both how you see yourself and others see you, in terms of the different kinds of identities, gender, race, religion, etc.

A. I think basically I’m just a white woman. I see myself very much as a teacher, secondly as a writer, a sports person.

Q. I know you are a tennis player. Is that your main sport?

A. Well, I ran for about 30 years and then I ran out of cartilage and had to give that up.

Q. Do you still do tennis?

A. I do. That’s why I’m tired. I played this morning.

Q. How has being a female shaped your life?

A. It gave me low expectations. I would say, it gave me low expectations. I don’t feel that I’ve had a lot of, that I’ve experienced a lot of discrimination. As a woman, I think that was primarily a matter of timing, when I became an adult and when I pursued my career. But the thing of being a woman, it made me feel all the more grateful for what I was able to do. Again, I think because of low expectations.

Q. It gave you low expectations for yourself or you felt others had low expectations?
A. No, it gave me low expectations. I never expected to go to graduate school or get a Ph.D. or be a professor.

Q. So then how did you wind up making the decisions to do this?

A. It was largely circumstance. I did always like school and I graduated, I went to Washington University. Within the space of three months I turned 21, got my degree, and got married. And I had known for about the last couple of years that I was going to get married when I graduated. And I looked for a major that would give me something to fall back on. So I got my teaching certification. I got married, my husband was in law school at the University of Missouri in Columbia. I got a job teaching high school. And he was in law school but he was also working part-time. He was working at the University part-time, so we weren’t totally dependent on my salary. I decided I still liked school. I thought, “Oh, I’ll get a master’s degree in History.” So I started to take one course each semester in the evening after I finished teaching. And then my husband saw an advertisement for NDEA Fellowships, National Defense Education Act Fellowship. They funded mostly science programs. They came right after Sputnik. They funded mostly science programs, but they also funded people working in modern U.S. history. And so he said, “Why don’t you apply for one of these?” I went to the office and my first question was, “Do you ever give these to women?” And they said, “Yes, we do. In fact, we have a couple of women in the program.” I applied and I like to joke, the rest was history. They provided three years of support. So it was beyond the Master’s. So all of a sudden I had the opportunity to get a Ph.D and I did.
Q. How interesting. Had U.S. History been your area of interest before that?
A. I liked everything. I mean, I really loved history. I liked art history but I thought that wasn’t very practical as something to fall back on. So yes, I’d always loved history.

Q. People talk about having these grand plans for their lives. But I have to believe most people think it happens like that.
A. Well, I was of that generation of women who didn’t. We expected to get married and have children and maybe work if we had to or for extras.

Q. Yes, that’s true. That was interesting.
A. Very circumstantial. If that program hadn’t been available, if I hadn’t, I guess, if my husband hadn’t seen the flyer. I didn’t see it. I don’t know what my alternative life would have been.

Q. You got your Ph.D at Missouri?
A. I did. I got it fast because he was graduating from law school and was moving on. We both moved to St. Louis. I continued to follow him. I got a job at the University of Missouri, St. Louis campus, which was a very new campus. I got a job teaching evening classes. That’s what they offered me. When I noticed what the men who were teaching the same number of courses were getting, I went to my department chair and asked if I could get a raise. And he said, “Well, I actually tried to get you a raise but the President pointed out that you’re married, we don’t how long you’re going to be here. Your husband could leave at anytime.” He didn’t say these words but it wasn’t worth the investment in someone. And I said, “Okay, well thanks, I do appreciate your asking.”
Q. How many years were you there?
A. I was there for 20 years.

Q. Oh, you taught at that particular campus until you came here to Ohio State?
A. I did.

Q. Did things change over time at that campus?
A. They did. They changed a lot. For one thing, the campus grew. I published my book and got mostly treated equivalently with the men. Not exactly. That was a time where I experienced what I consider to be sex discrimination. I thought that men were getting promoted to full rank, to full professor, before I was. And I thought that our resumes were really equivalent. But yes, it became a place I liked a lot. I felt very happy there. I liked the students. I liked everything.

Q. And you came here in 1995?
A. ’86.

Q. That’s right.
A. I was at the University of St. Louis, Missouri, from ’66 to ’86, and then I came here. And that too was kind of coincidental. Two things happened. One, I was sitting next to another historian coming back from a meeting and he wasn’t at my school. I don’t know what the conversation was but he made the comment that now was the time in my life, if I was ever going to move, that I would need to do it. I was 46 years old then, I guess, 45, because at some point you’re kind of dead meat. You’re too old to move. So that was kind of in my head. And then Leila Rupp, who I knew through the historical profession because we worked on some of the same topics, asked me if I would apply for a position here. And it was
Director of the Women’s Studies Center and a professorship in the History Department. And I did and I got it. It wasn’t easy to move. I was pretty happy there. My parents lived in St. Louis and they were getting older. But by that time I was divorced, not entangled with anybody, so I could move easily in terms of personal relationships.

Q. So you came here in ’86 as Director of the Women’s, it wasn’t a department yet?
A. No, it was the Center.

Q. And how was it in that position?
A. It was fun. It was stressful. I really worked hard. I spent so many hours. But I had the opportunity, and the people around me, we had the opportunity to really build something. We did a lot of hiring. We re-did the curriculum. We created a journal of a National Women’s Studies Association. They had never had a scholarly journal. We did that here. And we got a Master’s Degree in Women’s Studies through. So it was just very rewarding. It was stressful. There was a lot of politics, especially among the students and the graduate students especially. They saw Women’s Studies more politically and less scholarly than I did and other faculty.

Q. And you probably really laid the groundwork for the Center becoming a department. Did Sally [Kitch] come after you?
A. She did. She followed me.

Q. And one of her charges was to move the Center to a department, [but you had] laid a lot of the groundwork.
A. Yes.

Q. How big was the program when you came and how big was it when you left?
A. I don’t know. I know we were teaching 4,000 students a year when I left. I don’t know how many we were teaching when I came. There were only four faculty when I came. By the time I left, I don’t know, there were probably eight or ten, I don’t know. Hiring was a challenge because we could not give anybody tenure. So those first years I was running around all over campus talking to men who headed schools and departments, trying to get them to agree to a joint appointment for a new hire, who would be half in Women’s Studies and half in something else. And it was challenging, but it was also rewarding. There were some who were just, I would say, had no interest whatsoever. The Social Sciences were pretty much like that. And so I went around them, and we hired a sociologist through the Ag School. Ag, Economics and Rural Sociology, Kathy Rakowski. We went to [the College of] Social Work to get another sociologist. We got someone who did science in a way with a joint appointment with the Nursing School. So I kind of liked that puzzle, trying to figure out who you could work with and who you couldn’t. Black Studies was always very cooperative and I really relied on them, because we made a really, really determined effort to get women of color. And at that time it was African-American women faculty members. And they were just wonderful, Manning Marable was there for a while. And then Ted McDaniel.

A. And I guess one more thing I should maybe say in the context of building the department is, G. Michael Riley. He was Dean of the College of Humanities and
he was just enormously supportive of what we were doing. I mean, I just can’t imagine anybody being more supportive. So that was really a foundation on which to build Women’s Studies.

Q. Supportive leadership makes a huge difference. Did you participate in the administrative meetings at the College of Humanities with Department Chairs and the Center Directors?

A. The Executive Committee, absolutely. We were treated just like everybody else.

Q. Riley probably made that happen, too.

A. Yes, he did. And that was really good because it really did connect you and it connected me with people that, we did make joint appointments with some of those departments, primarily History and English. Maybe somebody else, I can’t think right now.

Q. Okay. So what was the climate like in the Center for Women’s Studies, both within but also in terms of how the rest of the University interacted? For the individuals in the Center?

A. I think Women’s Studies had quite a bit of respect. I don’t think everybody in the University thought it was legitimate in terms of scholarly enterprise. But I think that it was respected and partly that was because our faculty were respected in their own departments. So in some sense I think it was good to start out that way [the Center not having the ability to tenure faculty and therefore its dependence on securing joint appointments with other units that did], because our faculty had greater visibility because they were all over the place and other people could see the work they were doing, the quality of their work. That doesn’t mean that we
didn’t struggle. When we went after the Master’s degree, that was a lot of work and a lot of pushing. I think that probably the same thing [happened] with the Ph.D, [but] I wasn’t as involved. I wasn’t head of the department then. But I think the environment was just pretty good here. We didn’t take up a lot of resources.

Q. They always like you when you don’t do that.

A. And it might be that we just weren’t big enough for anybody to care about resisting what we were doing.

Q. Now you also were in the History Department during that time.

A. Yes, I was.

Q. How was the climate? Because there still weren’t a majority of women in History.

A. Oh heavens no, probably about a third, maybe a little over a third. When I came, there wasn’t another full professor, female full professor.

Q. You were the first?

A. Well, I think they had one several years ago, before I came, but there wasn’t one and there hadn’t been. And there weren’t many women, period. It was pretty male. Leila Rupp was promoted a couple of years after I got there. So that was great, one more person. And then in the ’90s we went through a period of hiring people at the senior level, and we got more women at full rank. What happened to make the History Department, I think, much better, was Warren Van Tine. When he became Chair he really made an effort. He designed searches and search committees to make sure that women and African Americans, we were still at that point really kind of nearly focused on African Americans in terms of diversity. I say that with a little embarrassment but that’s how it was. And when he was Chair
we hired a bevy of young Assistant Professors, women. So that really changed the department a lot. It’s still not, I don’t think we reflect the percentage of women in the profession and we’ve lost a lot of faculty generally to retirement. I think there’s only one woman at full rank now.

Q. Oh really?

A. Well, several of us retired. But we also just promoted a bunch. Judy Wu was just promoted and Alice Conklin was just promoted and Stephanie Shaw. So it will get better again.

Q. So as the only full professor for at least a short period of time, what was that like? The numbers of women graduate students were starting to increase, I assume.

Q. It was starting to increase some but not, I don’t have the numbers, but we do have them somewhere. I don’t know, I think perhaps I was so busy with Women’s Studies that I didn’t, I do believe though that I did attend all of the [History Department] meetings and did all that because I really wanted to. And History was always my first love anyway. I did want to be rooted in that department. But my appointment there was only 20 percent, and that was understood to be fulfilled by teaching one course.

Q. One course a year?

A. Yes.

Q. So for six years that’s all the teaching you did.

A. One a year.

Q. Yes. You stopped being a professor in Women’s Studies in 2002. How did that happen or why did that happen?
A. I wanted to be able to devote myself full-time to History. I knew I had about ten more years that I would be teaching and I just wanted to do that full-time. And Women’s Studies was going in directions that didn’t appeal so much to me. I mean, I think they’re fine and I have no, I don’t want to be critical of them, but they were just not my cup of tea. Theoretical, a lot of attention on representation and popular culture. And I think that’s fine but that’s not what I’m interested in.

Q. Could you talk a little bit about the eight years you spent working on the Athletic Department issues?

A. Well, that was really interesting. I think it wasn’t quite as out of control as it is now. I’m kind of aghast at how it is now. I enjoyed the contacts that I had with faculty from other universities who were doing essentially the same thing that I was doing.

Q. And were you the faculty rep to the Big Ten? I can’t remember.

A. Yes, it’s to the Big Ten and the NCAA, yes. That involved four or five Big Ten meetings a year. And then the NCAA, we had just one meeting a year but the faculty reps also had a separate meeting. And then I was on a couple of committees that really involved me much more in the NCAA. On campus, my main responsibilities had to do with the academic progress of students and violations of NCAA rules.

Q. Any kinds of rules?

A. NCAA. Most of the violations were in the areas of coaches doing things that they weren’t supposed to do. Making a phone call on the wrong day. So they were in the area of coaches doing something like that or what we called, what’s the word,
it was getting extra benefits, students getting things that they shouldn’t be getting from somebody. And I overlapped pretty much with Andy Geiger. And he was very good about compliance with NCAA rules. We had an Executive Compliance Committee. And we met every week. And the Associate Athletic Directors, someone from Financial Aid, someone from Academic Affairs, and stuff would come up like, “I saw X driving a Humvee. Somebody find out where he got it.” It made me wonder if they were still doing that when we had the problem a couple of years ago. Because there was a lot of scrutiny on the high-profile athletes. What impressed me - I hadn’t really realized before I took that job—was the scope of athletics. We have, like, 36 teams. We have as many women’s teams as men’s. And that kind of opportunity for all those athletes, it was 800 or 900 athletes. The opportunities a school like Ohio State was able to provide for, not the star basketball or football players, but all of these athletes who played field hockey or fenced or played lacrosse. And they were great kids. It was fun to get to know some of them.

Q. While you were at Ohio State did you have concerns in your unit or at the University in general about equity issues?

A. Yes, all the time.

Q. Can you talk a little bit about that and what made you aware of it?

A. I think what frustrated me most was that everybody would pay lip service to equity and not go about it in the most obvious, simplest ways to do it. It always seemed a struggle. It seemed to me the University put a lot of money in committees and programs and administrators and where they should have put the
money was on the backs of people who were willing to get things done. That is, department chairs, units that had good records and that would hire. And then take money away from units that didn’t. It’s not hard to figure out how to do it. I didn’t have any training when I came here. I had a lot of people helping me but I think that we did a great job in finding minority candidates and getting them. But that wasn’t a characteristic across the board. And other units or people would express interest, cooperation, commitment, but when the chips were down, they made it hard. I heard of Valerie Lee, maybe we can take her name out of this, retract her name or whatever, but I found her teaching over at Denison [University], and I arranged for her to teach a summer course at Ohio State, to see if we liked her and she liked us. She did. And so I got a position, got the English Department interested [in offering her a joint faculty position with Women’s Studies]. I had to push some. And finally they agreed but they wouldn’t give her full rank. She was at full rank at Denison. They made her come here as an Associate Professor. And that kind of thing. And then they realized how great she was. She became their Department Chair and, you know, she’s everything. But that’s just kind of a small example of the drag on trying to do something. And we have all these officers. I just read in the paper that the Medical School now has a diversity officer. You don’t need a diversity officer; you need somebody going around to Medical Schools and finding people you want to get here. I’m sorry.

Q. I know we’ve made that argument for years of, reward the units that are doing it. That’s where the leadership, I guess, is so important. I mean, you did it in your unit. You were committed and you did it.
A. Right, and it wasn’t just me. It doesn’t take a genius to know how to do it. It’s like, I mean …

Q. It seems like an easy solution. Think of all the person hours we spend on these things.

A. Yes, I know. So I think the University has done a lot better. That’s obvious if you look at numbers. But I think it’s not easy and it takes a lot of energy out of people who want to see it happen. It takes too much energy out of them. They should be able to be doing something else with it.

Q. The Women's Place’s latest report shows the number of women department chairs has actually declined. The number of women department chairs.

A. Is that right?

Q. The numbers of women full professors has gradually increased. Were you here when we celebrated having 100 women full professors?

A. I can’t remember it.

Q. That had to have happened because I didn’t come until ’85. I think that was early 90’s. The old CAEW used to have a celebration every year for women who had been promoted to anything. I remember the year finally we hit the 100 mark. We have quite a few more now.

Lots of the data is greatly improved. But it seems like it was just a huge struggle to do anything.

A. Yes, to get stuff like maternity leave and stopping the tenure clock. I was on a committee that Debbie Merritt chaired. Gosh, we had to go to a million meetings
and spend a year and a half. And we got it and it was great. But that ought to be something that you can do easily. It’s so obvious.

Q. Was there any pressure from above when you were the Center Director to do these things?
A. What do you mean?
Q. To hire, any of the hiring you did.
A. No, the pressure came from our own commitments within Women’s Studies. I had been involved in Women’s Studies before I came here or I wouldn’t have had the job. And you know, those of us who were involved in feminism, for me it was in the early ’70s. That’s where I learned most about race and discrimination and everything. Once you learn those things, you just take them with you. And you take those commitments with you.

Q. Having never been a chair it always seemed to me that if the chair was committed things happened and if they weren’t they didn’t happen.
A. Exactly. It’s just like Warren Van Tine [who did make it happen].

Q. Could you talk about the most powerful experience you had at Ohio State?
A. Oh my gosh, I should have read those questions over.
Q. There might be many powerful experiences you had.
A. No, I can’t think about anything really. I should have been thinking about it. My retirement was pretty awesome.

Q. Talk a little bit, if you don’t mind, about your retirement. I know the word from the students in the History Department because as you know I was a grad student
in History, is that if they really wanted to finish their Ph.D, they needed to get Susan Hartmann as their advisor.

A. Well, thank you. I felt very proud of that. I do. About, I don’t know, 20 of my former students, and they were not all students who I was their primary advisor. Some of them had Leila for their ‘s major advisor. But I think about 20 of them came back and did a conference. Did you know about it?

A. Yes, I knew about it. I wasn’t able to go but I knew about it.

Q. And Birgitte Soland, my colleague, she was kind of the point person in the department and she really put everything together. But the students organized a mini-conference and they presented their work and it was just wonderful. It was wonderful that so many of them came back. And then there was a reception in the History Department afterwards and then there was a dinner. It was just quite wonderful.

Q. It was a powerful tribute.

A. It was powerful, yes. They came from California and New York and I don’t know how far south. Maybe Tennessee. But that was powerful. I’m trying to think of what else was powerful [Later I recalled that Women’s Studies getting approval for its M.A. and Ph.D. programs were powerful moments. When the Senate voted approval of the Ph.D. program, the WS faculty went out into the parking lot and opened a bottle of champagne].

Q. I think it illustrates how you really thought you were a teacher first and then a writer. Because you obviously are a great scholar, too. But the fact that the students were so devoted shows your impact as a teacher.
A. They were great. They were wonderful. And I will take credit, along with Leila, for building a really strong Women’s History program. It’s fallen off now but we both, the two of us, attracted really good students. They have gone off and done really wonderful things.

Q. Did a woman named Carol Rose remain in Women’s History at any point? I was an undergrad in ’72 and she taught the very first Women’s History course that Ohio State ever offered. She wasn’t tenured faculty; she was an instructor.

A. I thought Warren always took credit for that.

Q. It’s possible it was in his name. She was an instructor. I think she went off to law school. She didn’t stay I just always wondered whatever happened to her. I was proud to have taken the very first Women’s History course.

A. Yes, yes. I taught the first Women’s History course in two places, at Boston University and the University of Missouri, St. Louis. Those were both probably right around, I think ’71 in Boston and maybe ’72 at Missouri.

Q. I don’t know how it was for the faculty who taught the first one, but for students who could take that class, it was really powerful to be able to take such a class. Now everybody just takes it for granted and that’s good. We want them to be able to do that.

A. That’s right, yes.

Q. Did you personally work to effect institutional change around equity issues? You’ve talked a little bit about the hiring, which is certainly a powerful way to affect issues.
A. The other thing that I got involved in was the round of curriculum revision that took place, I believe it was in the early ’90s, could have been the late ’80s, I don’t remember. But it was a major revision of the General Education requirement. And they were pretty far along when a couple of us in Women’s Studies realized that there wasn’t any diversity. And we worked with department chairs from other units and we got the diversity requirement. Mary Margaret really worked hard on that. She was Assistant Director in Women’s Studies for a long time. Mary Margaret Fonow, who ought to be interviewed.

Q. We’ll have to try to interview her sometime.

A. But we did that. These revisions were going along, an entirely new set of general education requirements, and we got a social diversity requirement put in there. So that’s probably what I see as the biggest thing. Also, I worked on that committee for stopping the tenure clock for childbirth or adoption.

Q. Was that curriculum committee, was that the one chaired by Gerald Reagan from Education?

A. I think so.

Q. It was a massive revision.

A. Yes, I do believe now that you say that, yes. It was a massive revision.

Q. And I’m thinking the social diversity, a lot of, this is just my impression, that a lot of white men wound up taking the women’s studies classes, to fill that, so they could meet women, but then they really were impacted by the class.

A. Right, and that’s why our numbers, I said we [Women’sStudies] were teaching probably 4,000 students, and that’s why, because of that requirement. We did get
a lot of men and a lot of them, they often would say that their girlfriends or their mothers made them take it. But no, that had a direct impact on Women’s Studies. We weren’t cynically promoting it for that reason.

Q. Well, I think it had a direct impact on a lot of men, too, a really positive one.

A. Right, and I think that has survived the revisions since then.

Q. It’s interesting how just one thing like that can really have a serious impact.

A. Well, yes.

Q. Could you talk about allies? You talked about Warren Van Tine as an ally, Mike Riley as an ally. Were there other allies who really supported change around equity issues that you knew of?

A. Around equity issues.

Q. And also obstructionists, people who obstructed.

A. Well, that was just about everybody. Not so much obstruction as just passive. They were just sitting passively in your way and you couldn’t move them. My memory is just so, obviously the leadership in Black Studies and most women on campus were sympathetic. People like Debbie Merrit, I thought she was really effective in the stuff that she did. I don’t know. My memory is not good.

Q. Of course the ones who would have impacted you most I assume would be in Humanities.

A. Yes.

Q. Of course, you just retired two years ago. What do you think remains undone relative to progress for women and other diverse groups at the University?
A. I think we have to do better numbers across the board, students, faculty. I’m not close to how people are feeling about climate, but things you hear about and read suggests that those are issues that we need to work on. I’m appalled at what is happening in terms of female coaches in athletics.

Q. Could you talk a little more about that?

A. Well, I don’t have numbers but I look across at basketball games and we’ve had two male, now our second male coach. And their assistants are mostly men. I think that just shouldn’t be. And other coaches I’ve noticed, and I don’t know if I’m going to be able to come up with names right now, that men have replaced women. As coaches of women’s teams. So I think that’s an area that I don’t have numbers but my impression is that we have lost ground in terms of female coaches. You say we have in terms of Department Chairs.

Q. Certainly in terms of Vice Presidents we have.

A. Yes.

Q. All of those are really functions of leadership values.

A. Exactly, exactly. We have way too many Vice Presidents, I think. I think the curriculum is pretty good. I think that, certainly Women’s Studies seems to be thriving, as far as I can tell. And that gender is being taught everywhere, maybe not in the sciences but it’s really being taught around campus.

Q. Which changes did you see in women students over the, you were here about 20 years?

A. I can think of changes in students in general. But I’m not sure that I could say that they were specific to women. We all know that our students are so much better
prepared. They’re better readers. They’re better writers. But I don’t have a sense of female students changing. I’m sure they have but I don’t know off hand. I didn’t know a lot of undergraduates. My first six years here I taught graduate courses in the History Department and that was it. That’s all the teaching I did, because I was administering. So I didn’t have undergraduates for a long time. Do you think the women have changed?

Q. I think based on, and I did have a lot of undergraduates, I would say that overall, I was in the College of Business, I think women became more confident and more assertive.

A. I think you would see that in Business. And you probably have a lot more than you used to, didn’t you? Or not?

Q. You know it’s pretty much stuck at about, at least at the point I retired, about 40 percent of undergrads.

A. And it was that in 1990?

Q. I think it was pretty much, it’s pretty much been 35 to 40 percent. It hasn’t changed that much. I think the numbers in the MBA changed some, although still not a huge amount. But it could be a function of the students overall, just better qualified students. But it got to the point in Business that there were lots of clubs. I don’t know, probably Humanities had a lot of clubs. There’s lots of clubs and it got to the point almost all of the Presidents were women. So then they would say, “Well, what are we doing wrong for these guys?” They were still 60 percent of the students.
A. That actually reminds me of something that I think, I don’t know if this is history but I think it is a severe problem, and that is that women do all of the service. Obviously, they don’t do all of it but there’s an extreme difference overall in terms of who services on committees, who holds positions in the department, and I think it retards our female associate professors from moving up.

Q. I’m always appalled when I hear that somebody is an associate and was just named to some administrative position. Do not do this.

A. Right.

Q. When I was at The Women's Place, women would ask if they should take administrative positions while still associate professors and I would tell them "Do not do this. You have to be promoted to full [professor].”

A. Right, we have one who just served as graduate science chair. We have 100 graduate students. This brilliant associate professor was chair for three or four years, and now a different associate professor is going to be undergraduate studies chair. The chair says, “Well, there’s nobody who will do it.” No, because you’ve got ten or fifteen men who really don’t do the work. And if you make them do it, they’ll screw it up. They won’t do it. Students will get hurt. I think that’s a problem and I’m not sure how you solve it.

Q. I think it is, too.

A. I think you could bear down. We’ve tried to bear down with new standards for determining raises, evaluating people, but it still has not done enough to make those men who don’t contribute to the service load really feel something. What they do get are the benefits of writing another book.
Q. What topics should we have covered that we didn’t? Is there anything you can think of that we ought to have for the history of women at Ohio State University?

A. I think we’ve talked just about everything that I can think of. I’m sure I’ll think of a million things tonight. If I think of anything important maybe we can attach it.

Q. This isn’t on the list of questions but you were a powerful player, a powerful person, a powerful woman to have at Ohio State. Because I think when you came I was still an assistant professor and it was wonderful having you. What do you hope your legacy will be from Ohio State?

A. My students aren’t at Ohio State anymore but obviously I think that’s my biggest legacy. I do feel that I’ve done just about everything I can to promote diversity. That doesn’t mean that I’ve done a lot more than other people but I feel that that’s one of the things, a very important thing that I’ve done here. I do think I came to Women’s Studies at a critical time and I’ll take some credit. I won’t take a lot of credit but I’ll take some credit for the fact that Sally [Kitch] was able to take that [Center] and [turn it into] a department [with a] Ph.D. program. And Mary Margaret Fonow was really central to everything that I did. She became Assistant Director, I think, the second year that I was there. She was just wonderful. So I think those are, I don’t know that I had a great impact on athletics. I think it was just too big for one person to do that. [What I need to add is the firm foundation that the previous director of the Center for Women’s Studies had established. Marlene Longenecker had created a lot of respect for the Center both on campus and in the community. One of the first things she arranged for me was a road trip
with the wife of the governor, Dagmar Celeste and the wife of the OSU president, Mary Eleanor Jennings.]

Q. In athletics, did they replace you with a whole office now? You had a particular position that’s still there.

A. Yes, and John Bruno holds that position. I think he’s probably stayed on too long. I believe that that’s a position that should really rotate.

Q. I’ll ask this in the interview so that it can trigger your memory later but do you have any memorabilia, photos, newspaper articles, files, reports, anything that the Archives could copy to keep in the records here, that you would be willing to share?

A. I don’t think I have anything systematic. I’ve left the Women’s Studies stuff for the Archives. I do have an office that I have to clean out one of these days.

Q. Even just things on your conference, do they have that here? The conference that honored you when you retired? That would be a great thing to have.

A. Yes, there’s a very embarrassing slide show. My students were digging around at Washington University, and the thing that they found was a, I think they found two photographs, of me at a dance. And one was the ROTC queen. I think the other is Homecoming. I think that was the most embarrassing part of the slide show. There is a program. Certainly I could send that over. That’s very nice.

Q. You mentioned Mary Margaret [Fonow] as someone to interview. Who else that we haven’t thought about?

A. Is Sally [Kitch] on the list?
Q. They are both in our document. Actually, everybody in that document I would hope could be interviewed. Other than those two, can you think of anyone else?

A. People around Women’s Studies?

Q. Just anybody. I’m even thinking we should start interviewing people like Warren Van Tine. This has been wonderful. Thank you so much.

A. Thank you.