

JOHN MOUNT
ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW
AT THE OSU ARCHIVES
2003: OCTOBER 20; 2004: FEBRUARY 6 AND 9, MARCH 4

- Q. Today's date is October 20, 2003, and this is a continuation of the interview with John Mount. John, today I wanted to talk more about the Fawcett years and the beginnings of your administrative role, but before we begin perhaps the logical place to start concerns the search process for Novice Fawcett. It had some unusual wrinkles to it. Would you comment?
- A. Well I was of course at that time Junior Dean and Secretary of the College of Education. I wasn't involved directly in the search process except as Secretary of the College and went to the Faculty Council as Secretary of the five undergraduate colleges at that time. There was appointed a search committee that had faculty on it, which as far as I can recall, was the first time that faculty got involved in the nomination of a person to serve as President of this University. A process where they came up with candidates, a first choice list and a second choice list or an A and B list as we heard it, across the campus. And as far as I'm concerned, I do not know who was on the first list or the second list. You hear things. Dr. Fawcett's name was not one that surfaced among the faculty as I remember it. The thing that I do remember was that, as he was Superintendent of Schools here in Columbus, when he moved into that role he came to the same church in which I at that time was a lay leader. And that was a church up on Henderson Road, Maple Grove. He and Marjorie had been married and they moved to Columbus and lived up in Clintonville in an apartment, and he was

Superintendent of Public Instruction. That was my first acquaintance with Novice Fawcett . And at that time Howard Bevis was in his last years, and everyone knew that he would be stepping down due to illness and age. And so there was much discussion in the community about who would be President of The Ohio State University, faculty being involved. I remember that two faculty persons from the College of Agriculture and Home Economics at that time. But they were very quiet about it. The name Fawcett surfaced because he was slated in the minds of some to be the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Ohio. He was also a President of the Columbus Rotary Club and was a noted educator across Ohio and in public education K-12 and of course here in Columbus. Rather surprisingly to many people, the selection of Novice Fawcett was made and announced at the Columbus Rotary Club. There was much rumbling about a person who did not have an earned doctorate. He was on the Alumni Advisory Board representing the College of Education. And that's what I recall from the search process. I did not know him except as I would see him at church. As the lay leader of the church we did welcome them. But I did not really know him well except through what I read in the paper. He was a very successful and well recognized public educator in Bexley and of course up through Defiance and Akron. His first wife had died and he was a widower at the time he was in Akron. He married Marjorie who was the Director of Speech Instruction in the Akron Public Schools.

Q. To keep this in historical context, it would be unfair I think to characterize the faculty committee that put together the list as a search committee as we today

know search committees, in the sense that typically a search committee of today, the role of the search committee is to recommend a name, and then the appointing authority has the right to reject that name and choose some other name that the search committee put forward. But that wasn't the case with this particular search committee, is that correct? They were simply to compile names, which the Board could choose to ignore.

A. That's correct, yes. They were to suggest names they thought would be qualified to be President of The Ohio State University as I understand it. Again, remember I was a young faculty person at the time and do not want to fabricate even some of the rumors that circulates when people get involved in it. But very well respected faculty people on the committee, that I do recall.

Q. Because you became Secretary of the Board of Trustees not too long after the selection of Fawcett, did you ever get a sense of who Fawcett's strong supporters on the Board were?

A. Oh yes, I knew that before I became in the President's office. Never having thought about being in a President's office. But the fact that the announcement of his appointment at the Columbus Rotary Club where John Bricker and Forest Kettner were members of that Rotary Club. There was no question about that support. Carlton Dargusch, member of the Board of Trustees at that time, and we had as I recall a man from Cleveland who was black and Gorman from Cincinnati, Senator Huffman. So far as the Board was concerned, Novice Fawcett was a dynamic moving figure in the Columbus Public Schools, and he had support from that segment from that community. Not necessarily from the

College of Education but from the Board of Education of the Columbus Public Schools.

Q. I think Fawcett at one point, I think he became Superintendent of the public school system, was the youngest Superintendent of Schools in the State of Ohio.

A. That's right, and as I said earlier, he was identified as a prime candidate to be Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Ohio.

Q. As I recall the history too, Fawcett had served on a committee with Bevis concerning the needs, the challenges presented by expanded enrollments to the education system here in Ohio.

A. That's right. That's correct. And a little sidelight that may not be recorded in your archives is that one of the issues in the Columbus Public Schools and in public schools was the role of fraternities and sororities in the high school. Novice Fawcett looked with disfavor upon sororities at the high school level and here in Columbus. And North High School, for example, Upper Arlington, and actually the Dean of Women, Christine Conoway, was very much interested in the part of the sorority system at the University and at the high school. But it was publicly known that Novice Fawcett did not look with favor upon sororities and fraternities in high school. And at that time fraternities and sororities at the University here were very high in terms of participation of students and actually the credibility of the Greek system. And there were those wondering what Novice Fawcett would think of fraternities and sororities at the University level. In fact, there was discussion about that. The Dean of Women was very much concerned about that. And one of his early moves was to make it clear that his concern was

at the high school level, to quiet any rumors that he might not look with favor upon the Greek system at the University level.

Q. It didn't take very long for President Fawcett to ask you to undertake administrative responsibilities for him, even before you became the Administrative Assistant. How did Fawcett come to know you? What kinds of interactions had you had with him that inspired confidence?

A. Well, I can't speak for Dr. Fawcett of why he looked toward me, except as the discussion process to answer you specifically, I did not have any personal contact or dialogue with him except limited as a member of the church. The first administrative contact is at the time I was actually Chair of the Organization and Policy Committee of the Land Grant College Agriculture and Extension Division. And we had the meeting for that national committee on the campus. I chaired it and made the arrangements locally and asked President Fawcett to welcome them. He did and we of course had dialogue about that occasion. And at that time there was what was known as a Junior Council, Junior Administrative Council, made up of junior deans and secretaries. And again, I happened to be Chair of that group. At the Faculty Council, I was there as an ex officio member, and learned to know the President who presided and he got to know me. But that was very early, were not many meetings. He came in August and September and we started school in the Fall. So there was not great contact with Dr. Fawcett. Actually when he called to ask me to come to his office, I had no inkling at all of why I was going to his office, when he presented the opportunity for me to become his Administrative Assistant. I asked the question of, "Why me?" I'm sure you

observed, Rai, that Dr. Fawcett's appointments were internal. He did not look outside for his appointments or his organization. He said he looked to me because he had done his homework and he said it was known across the campus. He said he talked with the three Vice Presidents at that time. And he had floated some other names, and mine was the only name that had the support of three Vice Presidents. So I came in the back door as they say. I did know Dr. Heimberger and my role in the College, and actually I had been in Dr. Taylor's office at another time in my career, when he and Jack Fullen talked with me about me being appointed to Director of the Development Fund. And that was earlier. And of course Dr. Stradley is really the one who pointed me to be a student in the Stadium Club. And so Dr. Stradley knew me. And actually, my appointment was to be Administrative Assistant to the President, but to work with the Cabinet. One of the persons that Dr. Fawcett looked to in the beginning internally from the College of Education was John Herrick, who was a professional colleague of Dr. Fawcett's in the whole area of planning. So in that autumn of 1956, John Herrick was actually appointed to be Director of Planning for Buildings, and also we called upon quietly to help in the organization of this Cabinet for Dr. Fawcett. I was released by Dean Rummell to work before I actually was appointed January 1, to come and work in the Administration Building, and to do some writing about people and about the organization of Dr. Fawcett's staff. Working with Dr. Herrick really more than any other person.

- Q. So you and John Herrick were involved with the people that Fawcett went to for advice about establishing the President's Cabinet well before your official role came about on January 1.
- A. Yes. Early in January we carried on. His Cabinet, the organization of his Cabinet was following his inaugural speech, is when the Board really approved his reorganization of the administrative staff as I recall.
- Q. Okay. In our previous unrecorded conversation, you had some observations about President Fawcett's administrative style, what he expected of people that reported directly to him. Do you want to comment on that?
- A. Specifically one of the things he asked me to do, when you ask why he selected me, he wanted me to be able to communicate with everybody across the campus, and he specifically pinpointed, "I want you to be able to talk with the janitors here in this building as well as the Vice Presidents, and to bring to my attention those things that I need to know." He made it clear that he didn't want me to bring some things in that were just good news; he wanted me to bring whatever news. He didn't want me to be a "yes" person; he wanted me to point out concerns that I gleaned from my being on the campus and being around this University, at that time for ten years.
- Q. You also made a remark to be about what Fawcett expected of you when he was at the Faculty Club with you.
- A. Yes. Being right next door to his office, we walked to the Faculty Club together and I had the real sense that he expected me to know faculty members. He would ask, "Who is that person?" By the grace of God I was here ten years and I did

know people across the campus pretty well, and when I didn't, I got to know them and actually we had photographs of faculty persons to help us recall names and to know people. And he would see people at the Faculty Council meeting, people who would speak, and I would be assigned to know more about them, especially when he was impressed favorably about them. I remember walking back from a Faculty Council meeting with him, and he spoke, "Do you know that man Corbally?" And I said, "Well, I've met him. He's an assistant professor of the College of Education." And he said, "Let's get better acquainted with him." I invited Jack, John Corbally as we knew him, to have lunch. And I asked him about his expectations in life and where he wanted to be ten years from that date. And he said, "I'd like to be President of the University." And he, as you will recall, he moved into Central Administration to be our Budget Director, and into Academic Affairs, and onto Syracuse and Illinois. That was an interesting role that I had. Of course, I became Secretary of the Board very early. The Interim Secretary of the Board following Carl Steeb's death, and that put me appointing people and I would write letters to everyone appointed, a brief note welcoming them to the campus.

Q. I wanted to develop something. The Vice President that Fawcett inherited, there were two of the three that had particularly distinctive views on things. Jacob Taylor and Fred Heimberger, and the fact that those two belonged with Stradley, supported your nomination for Administrative Assistant must have said something to Fawcett about your ability to get along with people.

A. I was appointed and he did say that both of them, Jacob Taylor and Fred Heimberger, and of course Bland Stradley, who was ill and not as active under Dr. Fawcett as the other two of course. I accept that as a compliment and tried to build upon earning their continued confidence. I had worked with Dr. Heimberger in terms of faculty salaries, again delegated by Dean Rummell, to do some work there. Dr. Heimberger knew that Dr. Bevis had called upon me in terms of discussions about academic standards for students, as we changed from a 1.8 requirement for graduation to a 2 point in my role as Secretary of the College and working with the Registrar's office. It's out of that environment that I was well known, positive or negative I guess.

Q. The Vice Presidents in that era were relatively few in number, but quite strong personalities. The existing history has it that Bevis, particularly in his later years, delegated a great deal to these three Vice Presidents, partly because of his declining health. Jake Taylor in particular was a force. Would you care to comment about Jake Taylor and relations between Taylor and Fawcett?

A. As I've indicated earlier, they knew me and I knew them and judgments were made. Dr. Taylor was definitely a very dynamic force. Many felt he was Acting President without the portfolio under Dr. Bevis' later years. And particularly as it related to campus planning, the buildings, and the matter of the budget. Dr. Taylor was a dynamic person, a very bright person and worked with the General Assembly directly. There was clearly a feeling on the campus of faculty felt that Heimberger should have more of a role in the administration of the University in that part. The Faculty Council had what I would call an ad hoc committee. They

had a committee on campus, planning so to speak, that Jake Taylor used or didn't use. Dr. Heimberger was well regarded on the faculty and the Council on Instruction. There was delegation of responsibility. But specifically I had the feeling without ever having the words come to me specifically, that the Board said to Dr. Fawcett, "You are to be President of The Ohio State University." And some functions, particularly that Dr. Taylor had, Dr. Fawcett moved in very quickly. And one of those early appointments was Dr. Herrick. And there was a clash very early. Dr. Herrick worked with a committee of the faculty, kind of a cabinet for planning. Remember we had to get buildings underway. It was a dynamic time at the institution. And Dr. Herrick brought recommendations to the President and to the staff. I was a recorder at that time. I set in on some meetings that Dr. Herrick had with staff. Dr. Taylor rather ignored that process of development. At a meeting of the administration, as I remember well, Dr. Herrick presented proposals which were well received, except by Dr. Taylor. And he let it me known, Dr. Taylor did, that he felt that was in his area of responsibility, and Dr. Fawcett rather adjourned meeting, as I recall. And I know that he and Dr. Taylor had a meeting and that was generally known among us on the inside. And some discussions were there. And then in the next Board of Trustees meeting, Dr. Taylor submitted his resignation and was hired by the President of General _____, who was a trustee at an earlier time and worked very closely with Dr. Taylor. Dr. Taylor resigned and it was accepted. The Board of Trustees at that very same meeting passed a resolution establishing a policy that no principal administrator,

Presidents and Vice Presidents, should serve in the administrative role beyond the age of 65.

Q. And Taylor was beyond 65?

A. No, he was not. But he was in his 60's. But Dr. Bevis of course was up to 70 and not well in his last five years of service. But some of that fit together, but the matter of such things as who was in charge of the complimentary tickets to football games. Dr. Taylor had that role. And the President I believe under the Board of Trustees concern with several areas that Dr. Fawcett was to be in charge. That is the way he developed his appointment of the administrative structure, where he pulled in Dean Guthrie to be Executive Dean, and Dr. Thompson and Fred Steckler. All of these persons were here in the University setting and became Dr. Fawcett's cabinet, as it was referred to at that time. And my role was to serve as Secretary of that group.

Q. One of your early and unexpected assignments was to serve as Secretary of the Board of Trustees. As I understand it, Carl Steeb was your predecessor. Can you comment about what caused the vacancy?

A. Well, Carl Steeb was a person who we knew well. Carl Steeb was one of those person who helped to create the Tower Club where I lived. And Carl Steeb was of course the Business Manager and Secretary of the Board of Trustees in my days as a student here. When he retired as Business Manager, he continued as Secretary of the Board of Trustees. He was beyond the age of 65 by a good many years. He was approaching 80. And he became ill, really in the early months of 1957. My memory is that he died in 1958. So that year that we were there as

Administrative Assistant and Carl Steeb was Secretary of the Board, and I being Secretary of the Cabinet. And one of the roles of Dr. Fawcett was to build the agenda for the Board of Trustees. I worked as his Assistant and did work with Carl Steeb who really took the minutes. But he had not been one to build the agenda for the Board in previous years. It came in recommendations from Vice Presidents and others, but Dr. Fawcett organized the agenda. It was sent out well in advance. And all major appointments were known by the Board of Trustees in advance of those appointments before a meeting was held. And so in that role I worked with Carl and then he became ill and died in May of 1958. Actually I think it was May 8. And on May 9 I was asked to be the Interim Secretary of the Board of Trustees.

Q. You were already the Secretary for the President's Cabinet?

A. That's correct.

Q. I want to be certain about this. President Fawcett set the agenda for the Board of Trustees minutes. Previous to President Fawcett, how had that been set? Do you have any knowledge of that?

A. Not specifically except that he looked at the minutes, very thick, every leave of absence from the secretary through the faculty recorded in the minutes. Detailed in that way but not very detailed in terms of major policy is my observation of the minutes. If a staff person would take a leave of absence for illness, that was reported in the Board at that time. As you read the minutes, Rai, you'll see they became more brief, more policy oriented. And the Board would approve appointments except for the major appointments.

- Q. When President Fawcett took office in 1956, the University faced some challenges beyond the pressures of enrollment and the shortage of an operating capital money. There were some unusual facets to those years. Can you comment on that?
- A. Well yes, in the 50's the enrollment of course and the need for building a space and the structure, but more subtly was the element of the relationship with the AAUP for example. The University was over-censored by the AAUP before Dr. Fawcett came. We were on probation by the NCAA when Dr. Fawcett came. And so that was one of the challenges in addition to getting classrooms and space to take care of the enrollment here and to have office space and facilities for the faculty in a very significant time in the life of this University.
- Q. As I understand both of those circumstances, the probation, the censure by the AAUP had to do with the dismissal of Professor Darling, who refused to testify before the House Committee on American activities. And the probation by the NCAA resulted when it was revealed that Coach Hayes, football coach Woody Hayes, had made gifts, made loans to needy players in violation of NCAA rules. That's what you're referring to, right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. This is a pivotal period of change in the relationship between the President and the Board of Trustees. So it makes some sense to me about the Board of Trustees before you became Secretary. You had said in an unrecorded interview that the Board had a history of micro-management. Can you comment on that?

A. Well I think that recorded history was correct from my own perspective being at the college level. How we approached the challenges of the day, as we said earlier, in the matter of getting more space and the purchase of land, when I moved into the President's office there were private homes north of Woodruff Avenue. All that land and all those homes were purchased. Jake Taylor had arranged for Oscar Thomas to be the principal realtor in that. Oscar Thomas had been earlier a Director of Development in the ticket office and then moved into the real estate business. The planning for buildings and location of buildings, the residence halls, Dr. Fawcett wanted this to be done in an orderly fashion with careful analysis of meeting the needs and the interest of faculty. Such things as parking. If I may recall a personal experience. My first notoriety in The Lantern was the headline, "Mount Says Faculty will Have to Pay for Parking." There had been a committee appointed and Dr. Fawcett came and I moved over to the Administration Building to work with the matter of space for parking. We had a little tag that we paid fifty cents for and we needed more space. To get more space we had to float bonds and the matter of funding the University through bonding came into being at that time. As Secretary of the Board my signature went on many pieces of paper related to assistance for funding. Dormitories and the General Assembly also authorized bonds for supporting public buildings on campuses. The Development Fund had been underway and was moving very well, but the money that was raised in the Development Fund went to the Treasurer of the State of Ohio. And so the shift to have that under the control of the Board of Trustees. We kept track of how money went to the State of Ohio and

how some things went to the authority of the Board of Trustees back in those days. And the President's Club was developed at that time. It didn't come about just over night but in those late years of the 50's and early 60's. So those were some of the led to the style of President Fawcett as he worked with faculty, as he worked with administrators, and he worked with people of the community, like Mr. Reese, who was the President of the bank. It was a very key factor in establishing the President's Club.

Q. One of the things that you had talked about in the unrecorded interview leading up to today was the micro-management of the Board of Trustees that was different than it is today. Would you care to comment on what you meant by examples of micro-management?

A. Under the late years of President Bevis and of course carrying over to Dr. Fawcett, some Board members felt that they needed to be more involved in a micro-management way in the decisions at the University. For example, Carlton Dargusch, a tax attorney, who was very instrumental in the retirement program for the faculty and staff at the University. And this element of bonding, again under President Bevis and Dr. Fawcett, moving into following that, the bonding actually Mr. Drackett from Cincinnati was very influential in making recommendations on how the University would handle the bonding of Baker Hall, for example. So there was input from Board members and much different than now. We did not accept members on the Board. We did not have committees of the Board as exists now. We did have Board representation on the ag experiment station, as it was known then. You might recall and we had really two meetings when the Board

met. A Board of Control for the experiment station, which the Dean and Director would meet with the Board, and the Director of Agriculture would be on the Board. It would adjourn and then we'd meet as a Board of Trustees without the Director of the experiment station and the Director of Agriculture. We had the Bureau of Labor Research, Bureau of Educational Research. And so there was more involvement then than now as I observe it, in policy making at the micro level. And there would be more surprise appointments to the Board of Trustees, recommendations would go out earlier, there would be discussions with the Board ahead of time, and very frankly we talk about the Sunshine Rule. The Board of Trustees meetings were not as open back in those days as they are now. Weren't expected to be. An illustration that's much different. When Woody Hayes was appointed, John Bricker flew back from Washington to be here. There was seven members on the Board. It could be that a four to three vote behind the scenes. So they didn't all agree. But I must say with Dr. Fawcett we had, in my view, some outstanding Board members. Mr. Tom Patton was appointed. He was an executive and he did not get into micro-management. He expected the policies to be made. Boss Kettering was on the Board when I was Secretary in Dr. Fawcett's early days. And Boss Kettering would come to a Board meeting and as we'd lay out the plans for a new building, he would look at those plans and specifications as he was inclined to do and make some observations. I wouldn't say he managed it but those of us who prepared the agenda knew that the Board would be looking very carefully at many of the details. But I think today, with the magnitude of the operation, they are more dependent upon the recommendations coming through

the channels. In fact, during the early stages, we completely reorganized the faculty rules and developed a handbook that had the policies from the General Assembly of Ohio and had the Board of Trustees policies, and had the faculty rules. They were all in one handbook put together in my early days as Secretary of the Board of Trustees. My title was Vice President and Secretary of the University.

Q. I'm curious. The Board did not have formal committees as they do now.

Everyone was acting as an individual member rather than as a member of a committee.

A. Yes, I would say that. The agenda went to all members well in advance. And matters that would come from the College of Medicine for example, and there was more direct lobbying from colleges, for medicine for example. Dr. Dome was well received by the General Assembly, followed by Dr. Meiling. And so a smaller Board, smaller institution for management, and the actions came, that's the way the agenda had been built earlier. And so there was more planning and structure to the agenda of the Board and the management of the University as we grew under Dr. Fawcett.

Q. End of interview.

Q. Today is January 21, 2004, and I'm continuing the interview with John Mount.

John, one of the controversial issues and events in the Fawcett administration was the tearing down of University Hall, its replacement by a replica. Would you comment on the discussion amongst the Vice Presidents and the Trustees, the context of the controversy, and the outcome.

A. You are correct, Rai, there was a lot of discussion and concern about abolishing of University Hall. Of course the objective was in the beginning to renovate University Hall, so that it might serve the public at the time and in the future. University Hall was an old building. The stairs were dangerous to navigate. In fact, the building itself was judged to be unsafe, would not meet code requirements. My own memory goes back to when I took courses there and sat in the chapel. That was the auditorium at University Hall for meetings. It was the major auditorium for us to meet in my earlier days at Ohio State. I did take math there and I also went there for a psychology course one summer quarter. Very hot, did not have air conditioning. It was a course in psychology. The mice and the rats for experimentation were up on the fourth floor. So it was not a very wholesome environment, a place to go to classes, for many reasons. And that all led to saying that it should be renovated. And then upon moving in that direction, and getting reports from architects and plans to renovate, when the report came in to the President and the Cabinet that the shell was crumbling. It just would not stand renovation. More consulting was done, because it was not an easy decision. And then of course when the rumors of it being demolished flowed in the community, there was a great reaction to how awful it would be to tear down University Hall. To tear down University Hall meant alumni responding. I remember meetings were held. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court came and pleaded with tears in his eyes that the building not be demolished. And of course the results of the consultant's recommendation that it could not be renovated and converted into a modern building from inside and keeping the shell. And so

clearly the decision was made to demolish it with the understanding and the requirements to the architects that it be rebuilt and to make the new building look as much like the old one as possible. And that was done. And actually, of course the manufacturer of the bricks for the old University Hall earned the contract to provide bricks for the new University Hall.

Q. It was a family owned business.

A. It was a family owned business in Mansfield. Connard. And I got acquainted with them well as we had the Mansfield campus. Very much supported by Mr. and Mrs. Connard. He did everything he could to provide the bricks for the new building that would stand for time eternal. So that is my best recollection of the dismantling of University Hall. Those of us who were there and do remember, we remember the steps are no longer there. The monumental kind of steps. That's where I was led to be linked into snakes for example. And some would say the gingerbread is not there. But the clock, the flagpole, and the general façade of the building I think does a pretty good job of replicating University Hall. And it does stand today as an icon in that corner of the Oval.

Q. Any recollection why the steps were not replicated in the new building?

A. No, I do not remember that specifically. I know part of the plans, program requirements, did call for having a room inside the entrance that would serve as an archival kind of a room. I would say that it was the recommendation of the architects not to do that. It was approved and so be it. I do not remember the details of why the steps were not there.

- Q. As I understand it, University Hall was not the only building to come out of this project.
- A. You're correct. We no longer have "the chapel" in University Hall. The auditorium is gone. And in place of the auditorium, and to have a building that would stand and represent the chapel in the discussion, what is now Independence Hall, built across Neil Avenue as an auditorium. And of course the equipment that goes into an auditorium. And that was again built in order to have a building that did in some ways represent a chapel without saying the same.
- Q. And I believe that the chapel, the original chapel, was an addition to the original University Hall.
- A. Yes, I think that is correct. We did have chapel in that building.
- Q. The facility was enlarged.
- A. Exactly. The facility was enlarged. The chapel was enlarged as the student body enrolled, and of course the student body outgrew the enlarged chapel, and we discontinued having chapel. But that's where meetings of the faculty, really that was the best place to have a meeting in an auditorium style. You had Neil Armory that could be set up in auditorium style. Commencements were held in University Hall in earlier days and in the Armory, and in the Men's Gymnasium on occasion, set up to be an auditorium style.
- Q. As I'm understanding this situation through you, the sense that I'm getting is that the Vice President, President's Cabinet, really saw no alternatives as presenting with the facts from the consulting firm. It was simply not feasible to renovate University Hall.

A. Clearly that was the consultant's recommendation and of course it comes from the Vice President for Business and Finance, in those days the folks in charge of the physical plant coming to the Cabinet and to the President, recommended to the Board of Trustees. And I would say the Board, as Secretary of the Board, was a process. It was carefully studied, all the voices heard and it went to the Board without discussion there, they approved the recommendation of the President.

Q. Outside those rooms legal action continued to try to stop the University from tearing down University Hall.

A. Those alumni and citizens were looking at all remedies to save University Hall.

Q. I'm sensing from my interview with you there simply wasn't a decision to regret; it was the only decision to make given the facts.

A. That's the way I see it. And I'm one who, as I think you know, continually worked preserving. Not only the local but the national Association for Preservation of Icons of our society. Persons like John Herrick and others, listened carefully and that was the only decision that could be made under the circumstances, unless we would waste dollars to try to renovate the interior, when the exterior was not able to function as an exterior should.

Q. You, in your service to the University, witnessed other demolitions of buildings, the Armory was a very prominent one after the fire. But there was another building, namely what we know as Enarson Hall, where the outcome of deliberations was to save the building. This didn't happen in the Fawcett administration, but it happened in the Enarson administration. Would you care to comment, perhaps contrast the two?

A. Prior to the Fawcett administration, a student union was built over on High Street, which replaced the function of the building which is now called Enarson Hall. That building was built in the early 1900's and was the first building of its kind for a student union. In fact, the men's union, later Pomerene was built for women. And that student union building was the first building that I entered at this University. As a high school student I came here to participate in a speaking contest, and walked across from actually 11th and High Street, across an open field to what we called the Ohio Union building for the speaking contest. That building, like University Hall, had a room up on the third floor where people would assemble for all kinds of functions, for lectures, speaking contests. Then, as the new union was built on High Street, the old union was used for many functions. Actually, one of the functions was a student health center. That's where Dr. Wilkes, the Director of the Student Health Center, had his office during the Fawcett time. And then a medical student health building was built. And so the old student union became known as the Student Services building, used for various services. When they needed to remodel a building it was used. So it was used for various reasons. Again, to remodel that, a study was made and actually the Vice President for Business and Finance brought to the President's Cabinet the recommendation that it be demolished. It was discussed but it was different. It did have an exterior that would withstand the test of time. It had internal, woodworking, fireplace, it was a place that again, that's where many students remember as I did, a place to get a haircut, to get a milkshake. In the Depression days, when the Cooperative Dorm, known as the Buckeye Club. They slept in the

men's gymnasium and came to Ohio Union to eat. And so it had a history of many memories. It was not easily decided to demolish it. I spoke in terms of saving it. As the coincidence happened, I was scheduled to speak to the student organization at the Student Architect's Club. That was a role I had, to talk to student groups. And on that occasion I did say that there are hard decisions to be made and one was to demolish the old Union, which touched upon my heart strings. I was disappointed in the decision that it was to be demolished. Some student architects picked up that cause with an interest and did research and sent a recommendation into the National Preservation of Buildings, and it was put on the national list.

Q. I can't help but ask, did you have a sense that this might happen?

A. No, I didn't. I really did not. I accepted the decision with heartache, as I said to them. And they picked it up and studied it carefully and submitted it to the National Register. And I was pleased and some of us smiled. And later, when Jennings became President, and the decision was made to remodel it, I made the recommendation when I retired that University College be moved from the west campus to be housed in that remodeled building. So it came to be and then the decision what to call, and the decision was made to call it Enarson Hall. Again, there was much levity as the occasion arrived and the man who sat at the table to have it demolished on one occasion, found it to be named in his honor.

Q. Did Enarson express any opinion one way or the other, because he had no emotional attachment to the building.

A. No, he joined in the levity of how things can happen in a University when decisions are made, and the flow of interest brings a change in decision. So it was a happy occasion. And then by coincidence, when President Jennings retired, an office was set up in Enarson Hall for him. I was asked to move from the office that was prepared for me when I retired back to Enarson Hall, and actually I do have today in my office in Enarson Hall, the desk and the chair and the office paraphernalia from President Enarson.

Q. To clarify my question, would you talk to the student architectural group. Did you have any knowledge that they, the student architects, would undertake the activity that they did, to do the research and apply to the National Register.

A. No, I really didn't because they did not in fact understand all it took to be on the National Register. In my talk to the student architects, I did talk about Orton Hall and Hayes Hall and the stadium being on the National Register, and I did point out that the Ohio Union as we knew it was the first building of its nature in the country to house student activities. It had a great history in terms of its use at this University. I think there were graduate students who really developed the proposal and recommendation to go to the Archives. It gave a project for the students to work on.

Q. One of the issues that did not appear to be controversial in the Fawcett administration but certainly became the major controversy in the Enarson administration, concerned medical practice. Physicians, as I understand it, at OSU were not paid competitively with physicians in private practice in physicians at other institutions, and that one of the arrangements that OSU had was to allow

the physician-professors at OSU, College of Medicine, to have private practice to supplement their revenue at the University. This became a big controversy during the Enarson regime, but was briefly looked at in the Fawcett administration, but never seemed to develop further. Is there anything you can offer on this?

- A. The best thing that I can offer is again, as we consider the times, it was a time when private practice physicians were reaping salaries that were generally known and discussed. Those who were in the University setting one could say were not remunerated in the same way. So there was at that time, the movement of the medical physicians from private practice. They were just moving rapidly up the income scale. There was public concern, talk about it. We had the University professors committed to the practice of medicine and doing some research. But they also wanted to be able to have an income, compete. So it was just a developmental process that happened there. Under Enarson it became more predominant. And Enarson himself in terms of his philosophy thought that we should develop a control of it. As we talked earlier, like University College there was division among the professional people of what was the right way to do. My own situation, I was on the Board of Trustees, in fact Vice President of the Board of Trustees of Childrens Hospital, during the Enarson period. Started during the Fawcett period. Yes, it started in 1960. I was Chair of the Research Foundation for Childrens Hospital. And actually we brought faculty to Childrens Hospital, namely the person who became Dean, Henry Cramblett. He became Dean of the University, Medical School. So it was a matter of concern about how you could best finance good teaching medical faculty in a University setting. In my own

view, it developed into a polarized situation. We had some very fine faculty. People that I knew personally in terms of, my wife oncologist was one of those who was really an opponent to the Medical Practice Plan that was being developed. Another person, a cardiologist who I knew very well, Joe Ryan, very committed and competent physician who were I think, in my own view as I look back, and it's always easier to look with hindsight, they were not consulted and were not taken into the conversation of developing a plan which might be workable. And so it became a polarized situation. There was bitterness among the Board of Trustees. There was a physician on the Board of Trustees who had an opinion. It became such an issue that both Dr. Cramblett and President Enarson, if I may say, lost the battle at the time, but as we look today as time goes around, now we have the problem again of having the private practice physicians who feel that they are underpaid and University faculty people might be overpaid, except the expectations to do research and meet the requirements for promotion and tenure becomes an issue. And so I have said in my observation, that the problem of the Medical Practice Plan was that the process got in the way of progress. By that I mean there was not, I believe, in the early stages, appropriate discussions. I'm a great believer in the miracle of dialogue. There was not appropriate dialogue. There were polarized positions taken where they felt that Enarson was adamantly opposed to physicians and physicians were upset with Harold Enarson. The Provost went, and after the fact in my view, and tried to bring about dialogue, but the minds were closed. The Provost, Dr. Kuhn, met with the faculty and they were almost brutal in their reception to his trying to

- come and develop some mediation on what might be done. Interestingly enough, Childrens Hospital moved. Childrens Hospital did move. And the Department of Pediatrics of The Ohio State University provides the faculty and staff, medical staff, for Childrens Hospital. And it moved along quietly without any great issue.
- Q. I'm curious. The issue was touched on in the Fawcett administration, became a major controversy in the Enarson administration. What raised this? What factors raised this to the level of public controversy?
- A. I think source of income and how you funded the medical faculty in their practice of medicine, the political faculty particularly, that's what I'm referring to. A comparable thing in the University was policies were developed for how much outside work. We had faculty in the Business College under a plan for how much outside work you could do and still be a faculty member and hold tenure. We have a wonderful faculty person who left the University to go into private business at the same time. So in my view, it's a sign of the times and again, I believe if time would have been taken to sit with dialogue, lay all the facts on the table so that the University could meet its mission and faculty could be paid with accountability, but the procedure for accountability was questioned. That's my take on the Medical Practice Plan. When bitterness was developed, that was carried on for years after Dr. Enarson left and Dean Cramblett was no longer Dean, but what goes around, we have a clinical building named for Dean Cramblett in his honor.
- Q. You had mentioned that there was a position on the Board of Trustees at this time, during the Enarson controversy over the Medical Practice Plan. Can you with

hindsight point to particular forces that were driving this issue? What I'm getting at is, were the Trustees driving the issue? Was it Enarson driving the issue? Who was driving the issue?

- A. I believe Dr. Enarson and his trying to be an administrator of integrity drove the issue of having a plan for accountability of income earned by medical doctors as they did clinical work in the University setting, where the University provided them the heat and the light and all the services so physicians could practice medicine and be paid by the private patient. So I believe Dr. Enarson and of course the Dean at that time, Dr. Meiling. Dr. Meiling is no longer with us. There was not effective communication to achieve the goal that Dr. Enarson wanted and that the Dean and the staff of the College of Medicine were developing. One of those institutional internal battles that developed down through the years.
- Q. I wanted to return to the focus on the Fawcett administration, specifically on the influence of Governor Rhodes, who was Governor during much of this time of Fawcett administration. And Governor Rhodes' influence on higher education generally, and if you could comment on the context, the political context that was happening with Governor Rhodes as leader in higher education.
- A. Again, you have spoken well. Governor Rhodes time as Governor and Novice Fawcett's time as President overlapped and of course with the relationship with Governor Rhodes and Dr. Fawcett goes back when Rhodes was Mayor of the City of Columbus and Fawcett was Superintendent of Schools in Columbus. Their relationship in public service goes back many years, it did go back many years

and of course are gone now. But if we look at the Medical Center, as we call it today, Governor Rhodes was very supportive of support for medicine and the physical facilities that we have, many of them came during Governor Rhodes' time. The Dean moving from Dean Doan to Dean Meiling. Dean Doan was very effective in working with the members of the General Assembly. Dr. Meiling generally was a very effective person, both at the local and national level. Dr. Meiling was effective in bringing grants from the federal level, and Governor Rhodes would be very supportive of particularly medical education, as he was supportive of practical education. Governor Rhodes was one who would go back to the beginning of a land grant institution, when we talked about practical and applied education as opening the doors of state universities, and Governor Rhodes maybe was still living in that time, in many ways in terms of access to education and access to medical education. While Jim Rhodes, a Republican Governor, we had a Speaker of the House by the name of Mr. Rife, who was also very supportive of medical education, very supportive of capital funds for education. And our Medical Center, as indicated by having a Rhodes Hall where the Administration of Medical Education is, and Rife Hall, where the basic science building is for medical education. So it was very much involved in the political ramifications of buildings. And I'm of the observation that the Board of Regents did not have much impact upon the appropriations that came from medical education to this University or to the other medical education establishments across the state.

Q. You raised an interesting subject, because it's within the 1960's under Governor Rhodes that the Ohio Board of Regents was created and somewhat altered the landscape of higher education. Can you talk about the social forces that led to this expansion and some reorganization of higher education in the establishment of the Ohio Board of Regents?

A. I'm not sure there was much reorganization of higher education in Ohio because of the Ohio Board of Regents. The Ohio Board of Regents was created yes, under the administration of Governor Rhodes, with the objective of coordinating the political influence particularly for appropriations money for higher education. Prior to that, there was an informal gathering of the Inter-University Council which was made up of the five University Presidents and the Trustee from each University, and the President from Central State and a Trustee of the Inter-University Council would meet informally and discuss how more appropriations might come from the General Assembly for higher education. And as the pressure of enrollment grew, regional campuses then called branch campuses, were growing. The pressure for having more students in medical schools. All of that came along at the same time. There were many people saying there should be some coordination of this. Governor Rhodes being an astute politician, moved quickly and the Board of Regents was established. In terms of reorganization, we went from a seven member Board of Trustees of the University, to nine members. Of course, we moved in getting new state universities, Youngstown State, Toledo became a state university, Akron became a state university, Cincinnati became involved with the state appropriations.

- Q. Penn College became Cleveland State.
- A. Ohio State had a branch up in Cuyahoga County called the Lakewood branch. So the Lakewood branch and Penn College, a private college, actually kind of merged into what is Cleveland State University, where Dr. Enarson was of course President. And so it was I think just a natural response to the tidal wave of students and the demand for more educated people in the profession, particularly in the area of medicine. Governor Rhodes was very much involved politically and took advantage of the sentiment of the public. It was during Governor Rhodes' time that there was a major campaign for support of higher education, under the leadership of the President of the Republic Steel Company in Cleveland, Tom Patton, who later became Chairman of the Board of Trustees at Ohio State. And as Dr. Fawcett met the challenge of under-funding for higher education, as did all of the Presidents, the public of Ohio voted to support higher education, particularly funds that became available for regional campuses. And then the decision of who would administer a regional campus. To use an illustration, Lima was an area of the state that did not have any public higher education, except for Bowling Green up in the northwest and Ohio State was the closest one. Actually by miles, Lima is a little closer to Bowling Green than is Columbus, Ohio. But the people of the Allen County community and Senator Peppel, lobbied the Governor and really came with proposals to Ohio State to have a branch in Lima. And the Bowling Green President felt it should be a Bowling Green institution as a branch there. Ohio State had the engineering and Lima wanted engineering. Several industrial companies up there wanted

engineering. And so Lima is a branch of The Ohio State University. Along at that same time private institutions like Ohio Northern was the higher education institution in that area, a long established private church-related school where they had engineering, had pharmacy, had law. And so there was a public concern and a concern on the part of those people who supported Ohio Northern about having a state university there. Then later came along with Wright State University during the Fawcett era down at Dayton. And again, the University of Dayton was very much a Catholic institution, very much concerned about establishing a state University in that city to draw upon public funds and private funds. On our Board of Trustees at that time was the Chair of the Board of Directors of National Cash Register, Mr. Stanley Allen, who was a very strong proponent of having public education in the Dayton area. At the same time, NCR supported the University of Dayton significantly. I remember when the President of the University of Dayton raised major concern about raising private money from Dayton to support a state University. Mr. Allen and NCR said, "We'll do for the University of Dayton what we'll do for establishing a new state University." And that did happen. I was a point person for helping to raise money in the Dayton area, to find a site, select a name and all of those things. Miami University and Ohio State collaborated in helping to start Wright State University. In early merger times there degrees were awarded by Miami in Education in cooperation with Ohio State. They were awarded in Business or Engineering by Ohio State in cooperation with Miami University. And there would be an interesting study of the development of higher education in this state, by looking at how these

institutions worked together and collaborated. That was the role of the Board of Regents at that time.

Q. Some of these institutions happened before there was a Board of Regents. I'm thinking of _____ first, happened in the 50's didn't it?

A. Again, yes, with the tidal wave of students. Basically President Baker down at Ohio University was the first to move in taking the Ohio University faculty to the community to teach in the high schools. Novice Fawcett became President of Ohio State and Newark, Marion, Mansfield, Lima now have regional campuses. They called upon the state universities to open the doors of higher education in their community. In the case of Ohio State, if the local community would provide the laboratory facilities and library and we could have a University level education, we opened the doors. Dr. Baker was one of the state university Presidents who gave leadership before Novice Fawcett became President even and before the Board of Regents. But Kent State moved in the campus down at Dover and New Philadelphia. And as I say, Ohio State went clear up to Cleveland because the people of Cleveland wanted public higher education.

Q. We were having a conversation about the Ohio Board of Regents. Ohio is one of the states in the country that has more of a coordinating Board of Regents rather than a managing Board of Regents. A graphic example is that each of the public universities in the state has different tuitions. Can you offer some comments as to why we have a coordinating Board as opposed to a managing Board?

A. Again, I'm not a scholar to have researched it in depth, but we again think of the history and when higher education moved west and Ohio was west in the late

1800's, when the land grant colleges were established. In Ohio we did have some private schools, Oberlin, Kenyon, and we had Miami with a separate Board of Trustees. We had Ohio University with a separate Board of Trustees. And so we had those two institutions. Then we of course with a land grant university with a separate Board of Trustees with all of the politics that went into establishing a separate university and a Board of Trustees. Along comes two teachers colleges, Kent with a Board of Trustees, and Bowling Green with a Board of Trustees. And where you have institutions with governing boards and alumni, and Ohio State with a very strong alumni group, you keep that independence and that responsibility for fiscal management and the policies that relate to the institution's mission. And I believe in other states they did not have that. Let us take New York State, which did move into having a central board for the developing college in those days. We did have Cornell University, which is one of the Ivy. And at Cornell, they moved to establish a land grant as a part of it. It was two separate. Almost like in Ohio we had the Board of Control for Agriculture and we had the Board of Trustees at Ohio State. At Cornell, you had the land grant movement and you had the Cornell established Ivy school there, as an illustration. And then outside of that you had all of the developing institutions, Buffalo and across the state. You go to the west, clear west, in California in a developing way and you had Berkeley, and it was the land grant institution. In my day, that's were agriculture was taught. I would have gone to Berkeley to study agriculture economics had the war not interfered. And then they lose out to Davis with the agriculture. In that state the leadership of the governor and the controlling bodies,

they developed a system of state universities and state colleges and community colleges. Illinois is another area like the State of Ohio, however. Illinois, University of Illinois, the major land grant university, then along came Southern Illinois, Northern Illinois. And they have separate boards. Perhaps not as coordinated as we are here in Ohio. North Carolina. So it varies. Texas. There's just different degrees of coordination and control. I guess that's the state's right.

Q. If I understand you correctly, because it's a different political context.

A. Absolutely. Different political context and the source of income and industry. You take the area of North Carolina with the cotton and tobacco and Duke University, along with the University of North Carolina, North Carolina State, you have two strong institutions like the University of North Carolina and North Carolina State, a land grant, and also down there with a Negro college back at that time when there was a land grant. There was a need for coordination and it arrived earlier than it did in Ohio. In Ohio we had private colleges, more than most states, and they organized themselves in the Ohio Private College Association. And again, we had the separate governing boards for each of those institutions, but they have the association that comes together and collaborates in raising and supporting the private college concept.

Q. The political context is important in understanding the evolution of educational institutions and governing structures in Ohio.

A. And I might add, the leadership that comes from yes, the state office, but the leadership of the institution at the time. William Oxley Thompson, his leadership in the State of Ohio, and I do mean the State of Ohio. Moving in to becoming

President of Miami University and then at Ohio State. The pioneers of Miami University never will forgive William Oxley Thompson for leaving them to come to Ohio State. The early historical development left some element of “competition,” rivalry, which sets the stage for political decisions to be made.

Q. In a previous meeting in planning for this session, you had mentioned that Governor Rhodes was head of his own party in supporting higher education. Can you elaborate on that?

A. By that I guess I make reference to the fact that Governor Rhodes had tax increases support higher education in his last term of office really. The leadership of the Republican party, particularly out of Akron and the industrial part of the state, developed what we call in terms of issues, issues to roll back the tax. We had, as it happened in California, propositions to roll back the tax that was ahead of us in Ohio. And it actually got on the ballot, Issues 2 and 3 as they were called, to roll back the tax. By the time Governor Rhodes left the office and people of Ohio were left with a Democratic Governor in Richard Celeste. He moved in to try to protect the dollars that were available for higher education and all of education. That’s the time of my retirement. In the last months of my retirement, just before I was to leave to go out of the country to get away from the office and really retire, I got a call from Governor Celeste asking if I would co-chair a committee to help to defeat Issues 2 and 3. And that meant that you had to get people to vote “no” on a tax issue, which would keep the taxes, not increase but keep the taxes that had been established under Governor Rhodes. As the record shows, the people of Ohio supported keeping the taxes for higher

education. Again, I remember in that role I did talk with Republican leadership at the state. For example, Governor Voinovich was now Senator Voinovich, was then Mayor of Cleveland. Yes, and a graduate of The Ohio State University Law School. Am alumnus. And I called him, actually before I accepted the invite from Governor Celeste. And I talked with then President Jennings and I said to him, “Yes, I am retiring and I’m very much interested in seeing higher education supported, but I would not take on the public appointment without talking to the President,” who I still considered to be my administrator, even though I was retired and had the Emeritus title. At his suggestion we did talk with the people across the state, including Governor Voinovich. I remember specifically, Governor Voinovich says, “John, I would not want to be Governor of the State of Ohio if those issues passed.” By passing would mean to roll back the taxes. Well he later became Governor of Ohio and walked into having those taxes still coming, as a Republican governor. But that’s just some of the background of Governor Rhodes and Governor Celeste and Governor Voinovich in support of higher education in Ohio.

Q. Vern Rife was Speaker of the House.

A. And Vern Rife was Speaker of the House, very definitely, and a very strong political influence. He took advantage of the opportunity to propose and establish a college down in his home community, Shawnee State. That’s the political influence in higher education.

Q. One area that relates to the Board of Regents at OSU did receive some benefit from was the regents professors. Can you comment on those?

A. Well, again, if we look at the leadership, as I said before, we do have a citizenry of the state and we have a governor and state political leaders, and then we have the leadership in higher education. The Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, John Mollett, former President of Miami University, moving into coordinating a very strong personality for the Board of Regents. And wanting to recognize distinguished faculty and to bring other distinguished faculty into our state, the Board of Regents, through their coordinating efforts, persuaded the General Assembly of Ohio to support regent professors, to recognize scholarship. It became again a competitive element approved by the Board of Regents for regent professors. And Ohio State, a regent professor in English. Many expected it might be in the sciences field, but Professor _____ was a scholar in his field. It was really a recognition of high scholarship with support from the State of Ohio to support faculty persons and surrounding equipment, graduate students to bring more credibility to higher education in Ohio really.

Q. There was at least one other professor in the humanities, Robert _____, also received accolades.

A. Yes.

Q. One of the controversies in the Fawcett administration, which was the second longest of any OSU president had its share of controversies, was the controversy over the President's own house. Can you comment on that?

A. Well yes, that was really kind of a small issue in comparison to a need for careful planning of higher education facilities and some of the other elements that we've discussed. Again, this initiative was really by the Board of Trustees. As we

moved to nine Trustees, many things develop in my own mind. The Board of Trustees meeting became more open. The Sunshine Rule, so that when Board of Trustees met, there needed to be a place for the public to observe. In the early days, the Trustees would meet at the President's home, in the early days of Novice Fawcett. It was just not an adequate institutional residence in the minds of Trustees. A Trustee recognizing that fact with the support of other Trustees made a grant, actually proposed a grant of \$750,000 as a gift to the University to build a President's house on the campus of The Ohio State University, located on the west side of the campus, just off of North Star Road. And the Trustee, Mr. Jones, the late Mr. Jones, Fred Jones, even provided funds for architectural renderings of such a facility. Other universities, specifically I can think of Michigan, where President Harlan Hatcher went from Ohio State to Michigan to become President. Creating a more appropriate institutional home for the President. What caused it to become kind of a public issue is the editor of Cleveland Plain Dealer, editorialized that this was not wise use of money, made it appear that it would be almost like state money when it was really private money. That editorial and the tone of the editorial picked up and reported in our Ohio State Alumni Magazine. Dr. Fawcett, seeing many more significant issues on the role of a President of a University, he just said, no way would he go through being the presiding President while a house was built for him. And so the money was not received by the University for a house. Later, the same man gave a very significant amount of money close to that amount for remodeling the clubhouse out at the Ohio State University Golf Course, known as the Keppler Clubhouse.

To go along with Ohio State having one of the finest collegiate golf courses in the country.

Q. One of the opportunities that we have in this oral history program is to address misconceptions. And one concept, misconception is that Fawcett wanted to move out of the house because he was too vulnerable to students. Would you care to comment on that as if that was in fact an issue at the time?

A. In my view, the decision to have a new house appropriate for a University President was not at all an issue of moving away from the students. Novice Fawcett was a person who enjoyed having students come to the home. He talked to the students of that era, many of them in a large university, a surprising number of them were guests in the President's home. President Fawcett had two daughters and one of them came here to Ohio State; the other went to Miami. She started at Miami before President Fawcett became President here. I think maybe not so but anyhow, his own daughters had friends. He welcomed young people into his home. He and Mrs. Fawcett. I use this as an illustration. When Novice Fawcett was tempted, in fact the decision had almost been made to leave the Presidency at Ohio State to become President of the American Automobile Association and move to Washington, D.C., the students wrote letters and waited upon President Fawcett. We had a meeting up of the Board of Trustees up at Wooster, when I think he went to that meeting with the plan to announce his plan to resign and take the job with the Automobile Association, but the students, letters came in urging that he stay on as President. And he declined the job. And it was not an easy decision for him and for Marjorie. My role of being on the

Executive Board and being on the President's staff, I felt the emotion that was going through their minds as they made that decision. I can testify that the students were very, very supportive of Dr. Fawcett at that time. And so this perception that Dr. Fawcett wanted to move the house out, had nothing to do with building a new home out there. Of course, he stayed through a time when, yes, it was a vulnerable place. Clearly, a very vulnerable place in 1969 and 1970's.

Q. You were present at the beginning of a subject that is close to my heart, namely the creation of the OSU Archives. This happened during the Fawcett administration, was not a controversial aspect of the decision. There is a brief paragraph or two about the origins in the Weisenberger history of the Fawcett years, but you know a lot more. Would you add to the record please?

A. Again, a study of the times and legislation and concern for keeping the records as the institution grew older, and people who were pillars in the early stages were dying. In the case of The Ohio State University the Secretary of the Board of Trustees for 50 years had been Carl Steeb. And I have in my journal in Enarson Hall the minutes of the Board of Trustees from the very beginning, as you have them here in the Archives, maybe the two sets. Carl Steeb, I inherited Carl Steeb's records when I became Secretary of the Board of Trustees. And the Board of Trustees and I think many of the University family looked to the Secretary of the Board to keep the records. And then, laws were passed for the preservation of records. We did not have a very good system to meet the challenges at the time. And at a Board meeting Senator John Bricker said we needed to do something about keeping the records. The passing of Carl Steeb

pointed a finger to then Secretary of the Board of Trustees John Mount and said, “This you should assume a responsibility for.” Of course in that role, my being a Vice President to Novice Fawcett, talking about who might be the most appropriate person to do that. The Director of the School of Journalism recently retired and who had developed a reputation for writing about history, especially was writing about Presidents of the country. And he had written the history of The Ohio State University in his role as Director of the School of Journalism. He seemed to be a natural person to chair what we called at that time our historical files. We didn’t use the term archives at that time. It was a personal interest of mine to be supportive. As we moved to develop regional campuses thinking that we should have a system for keeping records. So that was the beginning of it. Without the appropriate location or the resources to do an effective job of developing storage space and keeping records as they should be, we moved from having Jim Pollard being the historian to establishing an Office of the Archives.

Q. Of course the hiring of the first archivist followed the title University Historian to University Archivist.

A. That’s right.

Q. Bruce Harding.

A. That’s right. That University Historian was a part-time position.

Q. Pollard had already retired.

A. He had retired. Yes, he was retired from the Director of the School of Journalism.

We employed him part-time to be the University Historian. _____ Mr. Pollard did at the time of his death, those books.

Q. In other words, it was Pollard who did the first searching for University records. They were scattered throughout the University Administration Building.

A. Actually the files accumulated in the Administration Building in the office of Vice President for Business and where Carl Steeb was. Of course the need of faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, later known as Provost, had files and each cabinet person sent files. In my role as Secretary of the Board of Trustees, I was also Secretary of the Cabinet under Novice Fawcett, until I assumed a line responsibility. Another key place for University records was in the Alumni office. Jack Fullen, being a journalist, and actually I think some of the fine records, kept in kind of a chronological order of the happenings of this University were recorded in the publications of the Alumni Association. They were pulled together when the University Historian, as Jim Pollard collected them, and an archivist was appointed, those records were transferred to the archivist.

Q. End of tape.

Q. This is February 6, 2004, and I'm interviewing John Mount, continuing to interview John Mount. John, I'd like to direct your attention today to your service as Vice President for Educational Services between 1964 and 1968. Now that was a new position created for the University; it never existed before. Can you give us some sense about why that position was created?

A. That's the question that I did ask President Fawcett and he asked if I would be interested in assuming that role. As we discussed a description of the responsibility, Dr. Fawcett was concerned that we had very important areas that

were hanging out a bit loose in terms of administrative responsibilities. The key areas of admissions, reporting to the President the technology that was coming in with the registration of students, and the development of continuing education, and radio and television, nationally as well as at The Ohio State University, and the library. And so the President felt that there should be someone reporting to him who would have coordinating responsibilities for those areas and would be a line person rather than a staff person. And I was in a staff role. He put me in responsibility for being responsible administratively for these areas. There was concern on the part of the professional schools, law, medicine, and the graduate school with selective admissions, areas of the University that they would be effectively administered. That they would also have a voice in who was admitted. Prior to that time, the entrance board as it was called, would make the decision of who would be admitted to medicine, to the graduate school. That pattern was clearly changing, so that there would be a committee at a department level that would review the applicants and really advise the Director of Admissions, who should be admitted. A letter would go from the Director of Admissions, "You are admitted to the College of Law or Graduate School," but based upon the recommendation that came really from the faculty and the administrators responsible. And that was a role that I had, to coordinate that. We brought in some new people, Ted Robinson from Iowa State, Don Cook from Bowling Green, Wendell Ihrig from Battelle in the area of registrar. We worked at trying to get as effective administrative organization, that we could to get the most from

everybody concerned. Financial Aid was another big and growing area at that time.

Q. Okay. Certainly there was an administrative need but you also had some personal reasons for wanting to take on the challenge.

A. Yes, I saw it as a challenge to be, as I say a line officer, rather than a staff officer, in President Fawcett's cabinet. I was Secretary of the Board of Trustees. I continued to be Secretary of the Board of Trustees in that role. But it did provide a professional opportunity and challenge for me which I was very much interested in. I was at the age when other opportunities came to me, and opportunities from other institutions. Dr. Fawcett knew that and this was an opportunity for me to personally grow intellectually and professionally by trying to be an effective person on behalf of the faculty and the staff who were trying to carry out the mission of the University.

Q. This was a time of course of booming enrollments nationwide and also here at OSU, which I believe caused some challenges and problems in registration services. Do you want to develop that a bit more?

A. The challenge of getting the growing student enrollment into the right courses that they needed to fill their academic requirements for a degree. They were growing and they were using the same technology, if you want to call it that, for getting it done. Paperwork, we did have IBM cards. But what it meant is that all the students were coming to the administration building at that time to turn in their registration forms and pay their fees. The waiting for getting in, the long lines. I remember making this observation in the presence of Dr. Fawcett one time, that I

had the feeling that wherever you saw a long line, there was a poor administrator at the head of it. As he asked me to fulfill this position, he said, "Do you want to become that poor administrator or do you want to solve the problem?" And that's when we did bring in some people like Wendell Ihrig from Battelle to use the best technology we could to get students registered with the right course at the right time, and to meet the graduation requirements, and to be admitted in accord with the faculty admission policies, particularly in the professional and graduate schools. We felt we needed to work very closely with the Deans or the Dean's designee for admission, for example. And the secretaries of the Colleges. Each College Secretary was kind of a Deputy Registrar. It would come time to determine whether a person was eligible for graduation and had met all the requirements, we worked delegating this responsibility to meet the requirements with integrity and effectiveness.

Q. You said you delegated this responsibility. I'm not following. What do you mean by that?

A. Well, we delegated the responsibility for a secretary and the staff of the College to determine who was eligible for graduation.

Q. Okay, rather than registration services.

A. That's right. You go back to when I was in school. We felt that Edith Caukins was the person who would determine whether we graduated or not, whether we had our military science requirements in and physical education requirements, all of those requirements that went to qualifying you to be a graduate of The Ohio

- State University. When you delegate, you have to be clear in identifying the criteria and then see that they are administered effectively.
- Q. Even now, one of the common complaints of students is not being able to get the courses that they need to get for graduation. From what you're saying, that problem was a pressing one back in the 60's as well.
- A. And it has been down through the years at major universities. Of course, as happens in our education, we share a lot of experience. Purdue is doing a very effective job. And we look to how Purdue is getting it done and brought some of those ideas to The Ohio State University. There is a science to administration I believe, as there is in other fields. One needs to search for information and do research to find new ways.
- Q. Okay. Continuing education is something that the University has had or had previously for a long time, going back to twilight school and even before. It assumed another dimension here in the 1960's. Can you explain what some of the forces are for the expansion of continuing education here and how that was met, because continuing education fell under your responsibility in educational services.
- A. Yes. When I moved from the college office in 1957 to Central Administration, it was a time when we had twilight school and most of those courses were really taught out of the College of Commerce, as we called it then. And there were people who worked in the business world and would come back and take courses and register at night. It was really carried out by the organization of the department or college that offered the course. Fred Heimberger really was the

Provost, we didn't call it Provost at that time, but he was the Dean of Faculties and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. We talked about it at cabinet. A person by the name of Bob Holsinger who was in the area of speech and communication and actually worked at the radio station where we promoted the twilight school opportunities was the first person that we brought in to be a coordinate leadership to the twilight school program, and was on our staff. It was a time too when the Civil Rights moving along, women wanted opportunities for continuing education. Homemakers wanting courses that they might take when their spouses got home from work. I remember well having the staff of the Dean of Women's Office and alumna, a lady by the name of Jean Riley, who was a community leader, graduate of this University, and a very dedicated person in helping to open the doors of opportunities, particularly for women. We met together and moved to greater opportunities in continuing education. When Dr. Holsinger went back to more direct communication in the radio stations, we brought in Dr. Robert McCormick, who had been in Extension, Butler County, and brought him in to be the Coordinator of Continuing Education. And Extension service provided an excellent background of experience for someone in this role. In my own career, in earlier days from the time I was a student, I worked in extending the opportunities to study. Correspondence courses for example. So Dr. McCormick was the one to give leadership to that area. And it grew. And we say that out of that needs and Dr. Fawcett's own leadership, education never ends, and the Center for the Morrow as we call it, did call it then, it's now the Fawcett Center, was a project in which I was responsible for. With

Dr. McCormick, a key person on the staff, and working with our campus planner, John Herrick, in drawing up the program requirements for it. And consulting engineer, consulting architects specifically I should say, from New York, to respond to our program requirements. And they brought in a design of a building and had it labeled, Center for Tomorrow. A center which would strengthen our continuing education program, and especially our radio and television. We were offering night courses down at Dayton, at the Wright Patterson field. We were beaming courses from a plane, an airplane, a converted bomber flying over the midwest, beaming the courses into the classrooms,

Q. These were both credit and non-credit courses.

A. They were at all levels, from elementary through high school, and credit courses and some non-credit. But basically they were credit courses. They may not count toward a degree, people who are not working specifically toward a degree, but then would change their mind and want to have it applied toward a degree, which again needed to be looked at carefully and analyzed. Actually the Ohio Union, under the leadership there, they had some non-credit courses, courses that might be identified as wine tasting.

Q. Or beer making.

A. Well, I hadn't heard about that. Of course, it probably was so. But there were some non-credit courses offered at the Ohio Union but they were not considered a part of the Continuing Education Program. Continuing education was very much an academic enterprise, with all the courses being taught offered by the departments and staffed with people who had the credentials approved by the

faculty of their respective departments. And as we move on down the road, and I'm _____ up now, when this developed in the 60's under the educational administration at the time carried on through John Bonner and Kathryn Schoen, but Program 60 came into being. That is, anybody 60 or older could enroll in courses at the University, not necessarily twilight, but anytime there was space in a class. And Dr. Enarson picked this up and this became then a policy for all state universities in Ohio, called Program 60.

Q. So that's again here at OSU, because that began with a legislative mandate.

A. No, it was legislative approved but not mandated. That was a recommendation that went to the General Assembly of Ohio. Actually, Dr. Enarson gave leadership to that development. And yes, the General Assembly, and we had a Board of Regents at that time, all of them counted for income institutions. I would say it gave something for a politician in the General Assembly to lift up and create a bill to bring credit to himself or herself. But it grew out of an identified need and opportunities by Dr. Enarson and he was very strong in that movement. But it started back under Dr. Fawcett, the continuing education. And of course the name Center for Tomorrow and we later called it the Fawcett Center for Tomorrow, named in honor of Dr. Fawcett upon his retirement. And today, we refer to that building as the Fawcett Center, the Novice Fawcett Center.

Q. On the subject of the Fawcett Center, that has, particularly at that time, the unusual aspect of being raised with non-state capitol funds. Is that correct?

A. That is correct. Dollars were, relatively speaking, as short then as they are today. And Dr. Fawcett gave us the challenge to build a building with funds coming

from a private source, and some funds that had been laid aside, funds held in reserve to build up, until it totaled approximately between four and five million dollars, held in the Office of the Treasurer of the University and was designated as seed money for the Fawcett Center. And then we did raise money in the Fawcett Center, you see plaques on many buildings. There's one room, a large room, it's called an Insurance Hall of Fame. Insurance companies of the community gave a quarter of a million dollars as I remember to have the Insurance Hall of Fame room in that building. And we had Firestone and Lazarus and many corporations supported the continuing education.

Q. On the subject of the Center for Tomorrow, later known as the Fawcett Center for Tomorrow, the alumni house became an add-on to that facility. Was that planned from the beginning?

A. No, it was not planned. It was a development opportunity. The continuing education and the offices for radio and television and hotel facilities, 96 rooms if my memory is correct, was part of the original program requirements for a continuing education center. And the alumni were in very inadequate quarters, and Mr. Fullen, who was the executive for the Alumni Association and that Board, were developing ideas and plans for "an alumni house." The Board of Trustees of Ohio State and the Board of Directors of the Alumni Association meeting together, determined that it was a reasonable, logical and feasible direction to put alumni, who were a core of people for continuing education, to be housed. And so it was expanded. One wing was identified as the Alumni House. The funds in part came from savings of the Alumni Association to a tune of

approximately three quarters of a million dollars, that it had saved for an Alumni House. So again, that was an add-on very early in developing the plan and specifications for the building.

Q. So it really more an opportunistic development rather than a plan at the beginning.

A. That's correct. And also a development at that time, again with the General Assembly, and they represent the public, feeling that the records of alumni should be kept by a responsible administrator of the University who reported directly to the President, identified as Alumni Records, and used then for development fund persons and the raising of funds for the University. The alumni records as we called them were part of this new wing in the Fawcett Center for Tomorrow.

Q. I see. Because the Alumni House had this new facility, were really physically practically one, the transfer of that responsibility really wasn't very arduous.

A. It was not. And the equipment, I remember a huge piece of equipment in the old alumni house where our IBM cards were kept for alumni, moved into the Fawcett Center. We soon developed more efficient ways and that large piece of equipment was moving out. The administrative responsibility for the records of the alumni at that time did report through the Office of the President, and actually through John Mount. The employment of staff to run the alumni records was done again in consultation with Jack Fullen of the alumni, who worked in cooperative ways to serve the needs of the institution.

Q. As I remember from an earlier interview, at some point, I think in the 1940's or early 50's, the records of alumni moved over to the Alumni Association, where as

previously they had been the bailiwick of registration services in the University Registrar. So this really returned things as they had been previously.

A. So far as the records were concerned, yes. You are correct, it was under Dr. Bevis and Edith Caukins as the Registrar, that Mr. Fullen did persuade the decision to have the alumni records report through his office. As we grew and the needs for alumni records grew, and the concern about who controlled those records, the security of those records, the General Assembly of Ohio said that appropriated funds for keeping records needed to be administered under the administration of the President of the University, rather than under the Association which is a separate entity in itself.

Q. One can assume and hope that the legislature and legislators have many things on their plates. Why did they care particularly about who administered alumni records at Ohio State University?

A. My best answer to that, philosophically and actually, is that the General Assembly represents the people of Ohio. And there were persons in Ohio, alumni in the State of Ohio and across this country, who were not happy with the way the alumni records were managed. Some Deans at this University were unhappy because of a feeling that the records were held too closely by Mr. Fullen, the administrator, when they wanted to have access to their graduates as they called them, so that they could work with their graduates in continuing education and fundraising. These concerns came to the attention of some members of the General Assembly and they actually did write into the appropriations bill that the funds for keeping of alumni records had to be administered by the President of the

University. That was a delegated responsibility to me, as I worked with Mr. Fullen as we made the transition I would hope in an orderly way. Mr. Fullen felt that that was bailiwick that was appropriately with him. So there was some discussion there. And again, where we have again two Boards, a Board of Trustees of the University and some Trustees. I think specifically of the late Trustee Carlton Dargusch and some Trustees, who were very much in accord with the General Assembly, and did meet with the Board of the Alumni Association to discuss this whole transition. So it was done in a way that was truly in the best of the University in the minds of those governing Boards.

Q. Would you add another concern of the legislators?

A. You are perhaps referring to the fact specifically the matter of the security of records. There was a rumor that Governor Rhodes' record had been made available publicly. The Governor was concerned about that. Of course, today with the federal legislation we have the privacy and records are held in even greater security than in some earlier days. Another rumor that I cannot at all feel comfortable in documenting it as a fact, but there were those who felt that a candidate for a public office at a high level had the advantage of having alumni names and addresses to use on a campaign. Again, that was the rumor. Mr. Fullen indicated that that was not so, and I believe him, but perceptions cause legislative action to be taken. That was a perception. Obviously, security measures were taken. Dr. Fawcett was the person who held the integrity of the institution at the highest level.

Q. One of the instruments for continuing education was public broadcasting. This was an era of significant expansion of program and facilities for WOSU. WOSU would be one of the primary beneficiaries of the new Center for Tomorrow. What was driving the expansion of WOSU?

A. WOSU is an educational institution and in some of the early days of WOSU a major portion of the funds for that radio station came from Cooperative Extension. Actually the Farm and Home Hour was WOSU. It was clearly an educational institution. That was developing across the country. Senator Humphrey, the senator from Minnesota, in the national scene, was a very strong person for public education. Laws were developed to have educational corporation and funds made available to public stations like WOSU. One of the very first one was at Pittsburgh. So it was just a natural thing for this institution to grow. Of course television came into being. Again, the facilities for radio were very inadequate on the campus, and then it moved to North Star Road where we had our first television studios. The thrust for continuing education is a major role of radio and television. As I said earlier, we had airborne radio. We had television, one way video, two way voice in our teaching down at Wright Patterson Field. The medical school developed a strong continuing education program down in southeast Ohio and into West Virginia. The foreign languages were taught at that time by radio for public consumption at all levels. One of our very distinguished faculty members in German was part of that, _____ (unintelligible name). And I suspect that one of my joys is seeing the development of radio and television at the time when the Director of

Radio Television, and I made many trips to Washington, D.C., to testify and to get federal funds and some state funds. And of course funds from the budget of the University.

Q. Also reporting to you in Educational Services was ROTC. Can you comment on the issues with ROTC in this period?

A. It was a dynamic time of change and ROTC was of course a required course for all able, those who were physically fit male students down through the years. After the war, and as we moved into the Cold War and into Vietnam particularly, and enrollment growing so that the ROTC programs of Army, Navy, Airforce and the Marines, it was a pressure to have it become an optional program rather than mandated. Again, working through the channels of the academic part of it, the faculty and with the Departments of the Defense. In earlier days the leadership for the ROTC programs were pretty much Army coming without academic credentials. If it was to receive college credit, as it was, it was to meet the challenge even from the crediting agencies moved to have the leadership of the ROTC programs coming with the credentials to be members of the faculty. That developed in those days. Again, reporting to my office and working of course with the Provost and with the Departments of Defense, the credentials were established and the actual selection of those persons to come in and be the professor of Military Science and the professor of Naval Science, met the criteria set by this institution. We've had some very fine leadership in those programs. At that time too, the decision made, coming again through the Council of Instruction and the faculty and through the Board of Trustees, through the

President, fifteen hours of regular academic credit programs could be substituted for ROTC. The men were relieved of taking fifteen hours of ROTC for fifteen hours of Physics or Chemistry or Languages, and those courses which would work toward a degree from the University. And that was a transition. In addition to that, a part of the element of anti-Vietnam would be anti-ROTC, anti-military. And that was developing during that period in the 60's.

Q. This was a particularly prominent ROTC program, both because of the numbers and also because there had been some institutional funds endowed for support of ROTC. Is that correct?

A. As we have talked earlier, ROTC in this country, under military training and tactics in the World War I era leadership for that came really from Dr. Thompson, Professor Orton, and Mr. Mershon. As a committee of three and working with Congress really called the Ohio Plan. So we had a reputation for being very strong in leadership and providing support for ROTC. Texas A&M, Virginia Tech, other institutions developed and actually we moved to compare officers for the military from universities right along with those who came out of the Naval Academy or the Army and of course the Air Force Academy was developed. But they couldn't serve all the needs for the officers. So it was a time when credentialing, academic credentialing, the teaching of leadership in our ROTC courses were under accreditation surveillance, faculty surveillance, clear to the Board of Trustees. So it was a very interesting time. After I moved out of that role it was carried on by Dr. Bonner who gave much time to meeting with the various branches of defense to strengthen that program.

- Q. You mentioned Dr. Bonner. You and he switched largely but not completely, titles. Do you want to talk about the switch and why that's not entirely appropriate because you brought more responsibilities, you carried responsibilities from Educational Services into Student Affairs. Tell us about the dynamics of the transition.
- A. Dr. Bonner was Executive Dean of Student Relations. He did not have the title of Vice President. The reorganization that came late in the 60's, 1968, the change was that I was asked to become Vice President for Student Services. Looking at that organizational chart and the description of Vice President for Student Services, what I took with me was the admission, the registrar, and the financial aid. Of course the Dean of Men, the Dean of Students, and responsibilities of the Executive Dean of Student Relations. So John Bonner's Executive Dean responsibilities became a part of Vice President for Student Services along with the intercollegiate athletics, financial aide, housing, registrar, admissions. The part that I had under Educational Services, that is the ROTC, of course television, radio, continuing education, library. They went with John Bonner.
- Q. They remained in Educational Services.
- A. They remained in Educational Services. And he did then have the title of Vice President for Educational Services.
- Q. Why the switch?
- A. Dr. Fawcett is the administrator and in consultation with the Board of Trustees and whomever else he wanted to consult with, instruction in University, came with that description. At that time I was offered a presidency at another

institution and was prepared to take the position. In fact, I asked the Board of that institution to give me 24 hours to talk with the President of the University and family. In that discussion, Dr. Fawcett asked if I would stay at Ohio State and assume the position of Vice President for Student Services. And the description that he gave to me was just as I reiterated and I said, "Yes," and so I became Vice President for Student Services, and John Bonner became Vice President for Educational Services.

Q. Resuming this discussion about your taking responsibility for student relations. Why would you agree to take a Vice Presidency rather than become a President in your own right at another institution?

A. A question that I've been asked down through the years and was asked at the time. The other institution, when I called back to say that I would stay on and I had been offered what I considered to be a promotion in an area where I had interest. To review my career, I've worked with students, young people, continually in my professional career, first through the Extension Program, in the college program, became a Junior Dean for undergraduate programs at the college level. That's the role I was in when I was called to be Assistant to the President. My interest continued and I was called upon to work with students. I attended professional meetings in the area of student personnel work and my graduate work at the University of Wisconsin was leading me to work in the area of developing curricula for continuing education. That's preparing me in the area of the educational services. But there I continued in that role to work with student organizations, the Ohio States and the honor societies on campus as a volunteer

effort. I was called upon by the Deans to speak to parents' groups, as I was a faculty person here. So I felt it to be a natural emotion for me to do that which I loved, that is working in the area of undergraduate students and their curricular programs, co-educational as well as co-curricular. When I accepted the position of the Vice President for Student Services, I did say to the President, "I believe it's not appropriate for me to continue as Secretary of the Board of Trustees." And I actually asked to be relieved as Secretary of the Board of Trustees." Because I felt that was not an appropriate role, particularly at that time representing student concerns. It was just not appropriate for a line person to be Secretary of the Board of Trustees. And so I gave up that position and continued to have a friendly relationship with members of the Board down through the years, but not as the Secretary.

Q. You took on this position, perhaps during the most turbulent time in University administration and student relations. What problems did you run into in the beginning?

A. I didn't consider them problems. I considered them challenges. Obviously I did not anticipate that which came about in the immediate years to follow. It was a matter of organizing the staff in those areas of student services to be most effective. And across the nation, at institutions of higher learning, the position of Dean of Students was developing, clearly co-educational programs, in residence halls and services to students. Student government at Ohio State and the Dean of Men worked with the "student senate." The Dean of Women worked with the women's self government association. One of the challenges that grew out of

civil rights and equal rights was to have a student government, a student organization, student rules and policies, that were co-educational. So one of the first appointments I made was to appoint a Dean of Students. That person was responsible for the normal programs under both the Dean of Men and Dean of Women, and staffs working together with financial aides and admissions. So it was structuring an administrative team that would serve the University. That was one of the reasons I took the job is the challenge of doing that. Those areas became the point areas for the student unrest that came, the in loco parentis change. Prior to that time, housing off campus where students lived was approved by the University. All the residence halls were approved by the University for students to live in. We shifted from that "in loco parentis" to more independent responsibilities on the part of students. Out of that grew the Vietnam War concern, the civil rights movement for minorities, women. Of course that position in institutions, funds were made available for meetings for Vice Presidents and administrators in charge of student affairs to meet together. Remember we met in New York with about a dozen. About the same universities were represented at that meeting to talk about how universities would cope with the changing policies related to student services, as met earlier in the 1960's, when the Peace Corp. was developed. I sat with twelve institutional representatives in the White House to talk about the Peace Corp. as laid out by Mr. Shriver. And then some eight or so years later I meet with the same kind of people except the problem was dealing with the changing administrative responsibilities in the area of student services.

- Q. Certainly if memory serves me right, Ruth Weimer became the first Dean of Students and was a critical player in this activity. Another person who was important to your administration was Charles Gambs. Can you talk a little bit about how he came to the University and his role, particularly vis-à-vis revisions to the Code of Student Conduct.
- A. Well, Charles Gambs came to the University to become principal associate of Bill Guthrie, who was the Executive Dean for Student Relations prior to John Bonner and the first Executive Dean for Student Relations under Novice Fawcett in the late 50's and early 60's. Charles Gambs and another very key administrator and a good administrator, Rodney Harrison, Director of Financial Aides, were person who came to the University and reported through Bill Guthrie. I was not in on the employment and interviews really of hiring Charles Gambs. But he came with a background of experience in the FBI from Illinois and was an attorney, and had the background for developing policies from a legal perspective for student services, particularly in those changing times. And he then became a member of my staff. As we revised the Student Code of Conduct, growing out of response to concerns that students raised, he was a key person to helping write the policies as they changed in the '69, '70 and '71.
- Q. Certainly you say he's a key figure, but I believe you had said in a planning meeting that one of the emphasis of your administration, philosophy of your administration, was to involve more students. How were students involved in revision to the Code of Student Conduct?

A. You are correct in that I had involved, all the stakeholders is a term used these days in the policies and certainly when you're dealing with student services, a key stakeholder are students. And we did involve students in developing the student conduct policies. We did invite faculty and fellow administrators as they were revised and taken through the channels to the Board of Trustees. Earlier in my experience, in 1959 and 1960, we worked at revising the faculty rules at this University. So again, it's not something that I had not done before. In that time of revising the faculty rules I called upon a young faculty member in the College of Law, with the concurrence of the Dean of Law, and in fact his encouragement being strong, Nordstrom. So Charlie Gambs became the attorney working with various stakeholders and getting the code of student conduct revised that was acceptable hopefully to students and those who had responsibility for administering them. I must say as the revolutionary period, when the protests were developing and people were coming in from across the country to speak, there were a core of people who traveled the institutions speaking against particularly the war in Vietnam, professional people, faculty people from other institutions as well as our own institution. The concern for un-American activities and all of that was a part of the period of time. Charlie Gambs being a former FBI and an attorney, would be delegated responsibility to advise appropriate people. The President, administrators, the faculty advisors to student organizations, about the background of people coming. I remember we did have a Speaker's Rule. That played into the concern for approving people to speak so there was both sides heard. That again was a rule inherited by Novice Fawcett

and those of us who were on his staff, it became a critical issue as you administered the rule and responded to the feeling that many of us had, academic freedom, that anybody should be heard. But on the other hand, when people have known criminal records would come to speak, and the public would know this, the President would be held responsible for the lives and safety of the people on campus. It became a critical issue and a matter of differences of opinion on how it should be administered. But Charlie Gambs, of course the Dean of Students was very much involved in this. Of course, he was President of the Council of Deans of Students. He was a nationally recognized person and gave leadership along with her staff at that time.

Q. This period, particularly in the late 60's, is the one that is marked by extraordinary student unrest and expression of differences between students and University administration. There was a production, a film production, done as part of the University 125th anniversary celebration "Echoes Across the Oval." And in this segment that pertains to the student unrest, there are interviews of students who claim that their frustrations were due to the fact that the administration did not want to listen to them and that their actions of protest, destruction and violence caused people to listen. In other words, this was a tactic with effect. Can you comment on that?

A. Clearly, it was a pattern across all institutions of higher learning with a few exceptions, that students who expressed their disagreement with national policy on Vietnam and students would express that through saying that the University should discontinue ROTC for example and discontinue any research in the

military area. And to be heard, they would rebel on the scene where they lived, with encouragement from people who would traveled across the country to keep it stirred up. Then along with that same time came the civil rights movement with relationship to minorities, as we call today the black students. And along with that some equal opportunities for women, all of those coming to fruition with the basic foundation saying, "We're here to rebel against the policy related to the Vietnam War," but the other elements to join with it. And all of that became a pattern for administrators to deal with. What worked at one place starting at Berkeley, sit in administrative offices would pick up, and so it became a trend across the country. How you dealt with them was a challenge, meetings were held with administrators to be heard. My feeling and that of Dr. Fawcett that we should listen, but when you get in a polarized situation you could sit and listen all you wanted but those who were making the presentations could not listen to some reasoning why some things needed to be done gradually, couldn't be done at the time for various reasons. State and federal law would be one factor of it. The pressure of society generally against the revolution kind of thing. This all culminated at that period of time and those of us who were on the focal point of receiving it worked the best we could and would be accused of not being heard, in the case here black students brought in 19 demands that any reasonable person would say to them that they could not be met, even in a long period of time let alone a short period of time. Some definitely could be and should have been. You would say, "Let's work at making progress." But that wasn't good enough with the emotion at the time and the poor eyes. And of course when you get

people sitting in, there are those who say we need to get the police in to secure and to protect the safety of those who were not sitting in. It became a confrontation as happens when people who are, particularly if they are exercising violence and mixing violent kind of protests along with non-violent, it became a very difficult situation in the life of this University and other universities, culminating with the death up at Kent State, which just escalated the concern.

Q. The impression given by the movie “Echo Across the Oval,” if you believe the students anyway, is that the Fawcett was monolithic in not wanting to listen to students. In fact, there was division in that administration. Do you want to comment on that?

A. In the first place, “Echoes Across the Oval” did not interview Novice Fawcett and others who could speak to the young woman who said they weren’t heard. That was her perception and we need to deal with perceptions. And so I think an honest observer should also say if you look at this with an analytical point of view, that the other side was not heard. And that’s one of the elements that happens in the news media, making documents to show to the public. So that’s a reflection on that particular segment of that “Echoes Across the Oval.” It was interesting that many people who are called upon to talk about what happened in World War I and II and the Depression, but administrators were not asked by the interviewers for opinion about that particular time in the life of the University. They listened to the students and some who had become graduates at the time from that. But coming back again to your specific question about policies within the administration of the University, how to cope with them. There clearly were

different philosophies of how to cope at the time. Philosophies among the faculty. For example, when a speaker was not allowed to speak down at the law school and by the order of the President, a person who came with a known background of being at other universities and accused of critical and criminal record. Some faculty agreeing that an institution should allow anybody to speak. We had a speaker's policy coming from the State of Ohio and nationally that no one should speak to overthrow the government. So a faculty meeting was held and some 3,000 faculty gathered in Mershon Auditorium, and the majority supported the President and there was a strong minority who didn't. So yes, there were differences of opinion and then you come right down to administration. My own feeling is that we acted with what I felt was calling upon security courses more readily than I would have felt necessary. I think if we would have insisted on taking more time to talk without having the police officers and the National Guard standing as a threat to those who would come to talk, in my own view we might have made more effective progress without all the polarization. But I was clearly in the minority among some. And it's difficult to say that you should not have security forces when there is a danger of having people hurt. I understand it. Then you'll get specific incidents. For example, when some happened to be black young women, and a bus driver came in confrontation, and he ordered them to get off the bus, and they rebelled and others joined with them in rebelling against that bus driver, the transportation reported through a vice president for business and finance and he's supporting the bus driver, and the students getting a mass of people saying that the bus driver was wrong, and that's when you had the sit-in in

the administration building and the lock-in of a vice president. Immediately one would say, “Why doesn’t the Vice President for Student Services do something about that and prohibit that from coming?” You had the police who would be coming the power that determined who would come and go. And so it was a very difficult time for me personally and in the life of the University.

Q. In the case where black students took over the administration building, some could argue that Gordon Carson and staff were being held hostage and that this was a clear cut case where some kind of outside intervention was demanded. But there were other incidents where the cases, the reason for outside intervention were less clear cut. Can you comment on that?

A. Yes. Well again, in the case of Gordon Carson, actually after a period of time with Dr. Corbally and two leaders of the black community, NAACP and myself, it was negotiated that the police did not free Gordon Carson. It was negotiated that the students would leave. That’s an illustration. It’s unfortunate that extreme story of Dr. Carson thought his life at stake, he was threatened. But there was no violence that happened at that time. Whereas, you mentioned that occasion where police were called in what I believe we would have been better off not to, particularly when one looks at it with 20/20 hindsight. But I had said earlier, at the time that we had a clear conference with happens across campuses, where organizations of corporations and armed services and all institutions that hire people come together in the Union to set up their booths to interview students who come to visit with them, called Career Day. Again, at that time, you had those who said we should not have any company that manufactured war

equipment or sold to the Defense Department. We also had the black students who were making demands of having more access. Black students took advantage of that kind of setting and piggybacked kind of on the Vietnam issue. They brought into the Union a casket with a pig in it and those who were in administration were pigs, and yes it was an uncomfortable circumstance when they did come in and interrupt in a way. But actually they walked through the Career Center interrupting, and as they walked out, the police grabbed them to arrest them. They fought back desperately and viciously fought back. And the police were just as vicious with their clubs. And so it was a very sad confrontation which I stood there and ached as I could not do anything about it. And I believe to this day that had we just allowed them to walk through and walk out, they would have been very disappointed that we did not make a big issue of it. But we did and so it made the news, but it also brought faculty, people who didn't know the circumstances, all of them seemed to come down upon the institution as being brutal to these black students who were expressing their freedom to demonstrate. And again, it's a call of judgment. Many people feel that Governor Rhodes, who was called out to the National Guard too soon. Rhodes went to his deathbed I believe feeling that he did the right thing. But when we had the National Guard here at campus, and after it happened at Kent State that escalated the situation.

Q. Whose responsibility is it or was it to call the National Guard? Surely the call has to come from the Governor, but is there a University connection to the Governor? Does the Governor act independently or did that vary from the circumstance?

A. I don't know how it happened at Kent State. Obviously they were there. With the escalation and the violence threatened, and actually happen, the broken windows and rocks being thrown and threats, again President Fawcett and Gordon Carson being the person responsible for property and damage, in conversation with Jim Rhodes the National Guard came here. So I think it would be unfair to say that Governor Rhodes sent them here without "invitation" of the President and Vice President Gordon Carson, and with the support of the Board of Trustees.

Q. The prime movers on that decision, if I understand you correctly, for the campus anyway, would have been President Fawcett in consultation with Gordon Carson, who was in charge of security.

A. Yes, and whoever else you wanted to. In my own case, it was a matter of being told that they were going to come. Some felt that I needed protection. People were critical of my going out on the oval and walking among the students. And I had students coming to my office telling me what other students. There were students who were just as much against that as we were, except they were not lifted up in the press. Many students were very much concerned with the interruption of their class work. And so you had confrontation students against students. And that again gives cause to the President and security officers to say let's call in some help.

Q. How did you feel about the Guard being called in? Did you think that the situation had gotten out of hand? That that was the only course of action? Earlier you said you felt the police were called in too early in regard to the Career Day incident.

- A. That's a specific example of a circumstance at that time. I think there was no evidence that those people who carried that casket through were doing violence, and the police could have been outside watching, observing. It's a matter of the Guard and the police overacting, not on the order of maybe anybody at the University. I happen to know that some people in the administration were very upset with that trespassing and interruption and felt that the police should arrest them, and the police did. And immediately when they proceeded to arrest the students who were carrying that out, that's when others joined in the confrontation. That's a specific issue, to have the Guard standing by and exercising judgment in an emotional situation versus over-reacting. It's a very difficult situation, easy to criticize one way or the other.
- Q. In the movie "Echoes Across the Oval," the people who are interviewed are students but there are also faculty involved in the uproar.
- A. Your question was, in that film it showed faculty were involved. Yes, faculty as I said earlier, faculty were wanting to be helpful and faculty wore a green ribbon, the Green Ribbon Committee. We would serve as mediators between the students who did want to have the protests and those who were interrupting and protesting. And of course mediators with the National Guard. The National Guard, they were human beings, men with very little experience in dealing with riotous situations. There was, I think, a very good wholesome discussion that went on. But we also of course had faculty who were agitating it. The Vietnam for example, when a faculty person walks out to the Oval and burns a draft card to demonstrate, that's advocating against the public policy and a freedom of expression. There's no

violence that came then. Of course, the matter of faculty behavior in that case. It was a matter then of an issue between faculty rights and people who disagreed who any action taken there. But as he left the University, there would be those people who would be critical of that, but the majority again I think supported the fact that that was not appropriate behavior for a faculty person. There were small instances like that and with young people, they gathered around, especially those who were anti-Vietnam and others gathered to observe. It would become an occasion where a person like Woody Hayes would come out in the oval and say cease this kind of behavior and let's go back to the dorms and study. And Woody was a popular person at that time. We had just won the Rose Bowl and were national champions and so you had the good things going on in '69, as well as those elements of the riotous kinds of circumstances. It's interesting that some 1,900 students went to that Rose Bowl out there, the first time we went by plane. There were many good things going on in the life of the institution and staff was working at trying to revise policies with the changing times, and to deal with sound civil rights movement. The fact is the black students were not given equal opportunity in terms of the community services as they wanted. We had not recruited and did not have the number of students and opportunities were opened to them as a consequence. But I think in my own view that should have come about in a non-violent way.

- Q. You had mentioned in the planning meeting for this interview that you were under such stress, that both you and Ted Robinson ...
- A. Vice President Provost. The Vice President that was here before Corbally.

- Q. Okay. Were hospitalized for exhaustion.
- A. Yes. We had to live with the environment of smoke and tear gas and 18 hours or so with very little sleep. And of course the emotion, I had not said publicly but a couple of times recently I have made the observation, as I was in World War II as a naval officer, my record reads three bronze stars. But the trauma of what happened on the campus here when it closed down had a greater impact upon my emotional equilibrium I guess as anything that happened. And so yes, I was hospitalized for fatigue. It was a couple three days.
- Q. African American students were a prominent part of the student unrest, and that unrest focused as you said earlier on demands, one of them was the creation of an African American Studies and a Black Cultural Center. In this period there was movement toward filling a position that would come to be occupied by Charles Ross, again a figure of great controversy, but in our planning interview you said even his appointment was a matter of controversy. Would you care to comment on that?
- A. Again, my role in that was to interview candidates for that position. Charles Ross was interviewed, but we did not have a Department of Black History then. He was interviewed by the Chair of the Department of History and others. Some recommended he not be appointed and obviously he was appointed, it seemed through out of the great pressure to have a black person in that role. And he was given appointment with tenure. There were those who really questioned that administrative recommendation, and as it turned out, I think all would concur except Mr. Ross himself that that was a bad appointment. He moved into the

schools in the community and his impact in terms of outreach brought great discredit to the University.

Q. Is it your recollection that some Trustees visited you privately to discuss your fears about the appointment?

A. Yes. I was asked and I said that really I would not want to make any observation, other than to say that I did not in all honesty, I had to admit that I did not support his appointment in terms of the interview, but was willing to work with anybody that received the appointment. His appointment came through channels of a department, not history because the Chair of history did not support it, but it came through Comparative Literature and onto the Provosts, and it was recommended that he be appointed. He was judged to be the best candidate available. He came from Chicago and again, I think if it would not have been the urgency of the circumstances, a person of his credentials would never have been appointed. Hindsight says he should not have been.

Q. The appointment as you say very controversial and was it true that one of the Trustees resigned.

A. It was divided (end of tape) ...

Q. Today is February 9, 2004. This is Raimund Goerler interview John Mount, and continuing a series of interview. John, the tape ended last time when you were talking about the Charles Ross incident. And you mentioned that some of the trustees visited you in your home to talk about the hiring. Do you want to add to that?

- A. Just to make it clear, as Trustees came to my home, actually as I came from the hospital from what they call fatigue, some Trustees called to say they would like to see me. I thought they were coming to do a courtesy visit but they sat on the couch, they did ask about my previous involvement in the interview with Mr. Ross. But I thought about his qualifications and I said I hesitated to say anything other than the fact that I answered their question, did I support his nomination. And I said I did not. I knew that the Chair of History did not support it. Then later at a Board meeting, which was a divided vote, those who opposed it I don't know really, I can't recall about the visiting me in my home. I do know that the person who resigned was not one of those who came to my home. Of course, the career of Mr. Ross speaks for itself here at the Ohio State University community and the community at large.
- Q. One of the people who was one of the angry voices from 1970 was Charles White, who had quite a distinguished career thereafter. Would you care to comment on that?
- A. He was one of those, let us say, dynamic vociferous students who was among those who opposed the war in Vietnam and also was very supportive of the demands for the minority students, later was elected President of the undergraduate student body as we saw him, and later a member of the General Assembly. We visited with him again in that role, and then later as Mayor of the City of Cleveland. I visited with him again in that role, and as happens with former students, one walks down memory lane and our visit together was with smiles in remembering the past and speaking about the good things. I often

remember a conversation I had with one of our Presidents who came to the University and it was a student that represented some dynamic points of view as I say, rather vociferous as an activist. And I remember the newly elected President saying, “John, what do you do with young men like that?” And I said, “Treat them kindly. They may be on your Board of Trustees or in the General Assembly,” and we both smiled and it does happen.

Q. Indeed. Earlier in the interview you had talked about the disturbances on campus culminating in the National Guard occupation in 1970, as the most traumatic of your life. Can we look at that trauma, the trauma of student unrest, and identify specific legacies that came therefrom?

A. Yes, we lift up the legacy that all of us learned, in my view, to quote an author of the *Miracle of Dialogue*, and we learned that we should work very hard, especially administrators, of keeping discussion open as long as we can and that’s a way to avoid what one would say violent unrest. But of that period, of course the reorganization of the governance of the University. I think we talked earlier about the student code of conduct which was revised and the University Senate up until that time and the Faculty Council with elected faculty and some administrators on the Faculty Council had met in the Faculty Assembly Hall for their business meetings. And out of that unrest period came the University Senate. There was much discussed at the Faculty Council involving students and administrators. And so we have a University Senate today. Another development was the creation of the role of an ombudsman, picking up the Scandinavian philosophy of having of an ombudsman. It was happening across institutions in

this country. And we appointed an ombudsman and his name was Dick Hermitage, Dean of the Graduate School and a very prominent person in the University setting. That ombudsman office continued down through until President Gee. Other developments that brought about dialogue and discussion with students. Students really became a part of most every standing committee. The whole procedure for the interviewing of candidates and the recommendations that lead to appointments followed some of the development at the federal level, from the civil rights days to adopting them by institutions, like The Ohio State University. And that's a legacy I believe that still exists in terms of having search committees and having students on committees. The whole area of student governance programs changed from in loco parentis to great freedom in terms of student life. Off campus, extra-curricular as well as curricular. So those are some of the legacies that I believe that grew out of that. Certainly we appointed more faculty, administrators and enrolled more students from the minority sector, both black students, black faculty and staff, as well as women in key roles. I think one of the Vice Presidents at the University at that time and moved through the ranks and became a Vice President for Human Resources and Secretary of the Board of Trustees. I think one of the legacies out of that unrestful time opening the opportunities for people identified as minorities.

Q. You yourself had some responsibility for increasing the number of minority students and hired someone who was quite influential, helpful in that aspect.

A. Yes, Rai, out of that period and there were demands by the students, one of the nineteen demands that came to administration, was to enroll more black students.

And in the summer and fall of 1970, we enrolled maybe 110. We called it Project 100, a minimum of 100 students who enrolled very late in the admission process. And then the question was, how would we provide programs to help them succeed at the University and I was asked in my new role as Dean of University College, to administer the program, which we called the Developmental Education Program. And in the discussion, we agreed that I would hire a very competent person to be the role of Associate Dean, a black administrator, and we hired Dr. William Watson, who presented outstanding credentials. Had been a Superintendent of Schools at a northern black university. The good fortune we had in bringing Dr. William Watson to the campus to be Associate Dean and give leadership to the Developmental Education Program as we called it then. It was really created to help those 100 students and all other students who came with limited academic preparation, to help them succeed at the University. He gave great leadership to that program and then had an untimely death after about five years. And the William Watson Award was created in his memory with gifts that I initiated and stands as one of the high recognitions for faculty, staff and community leaders who exemplify equal opportunities for everyone. That's what Bill Watson stood for.

Q. John, Novice Fawcett was our President with the third longest service, almost second largest which was Howard Bevis. It is difficult to encapsulate those sixteen years with some legacy statements. But can we give it a try?

A. I'd be pleased to. Well first, Dr. Novice Fawcett has, as the record would show, born and reared in a farm up in Knox County and went to Kenyon College and

became an excellent teacher and school administrator and earned his Master's Degree from The Ohio State University in the College of Education. And came then from the Superintendent of Public Schools here in Columbus to become a young president of The Ohio State University. I'm not sure of the record, but he may have been the youngest president to become president of Ohio State at that time. But he was in his early 40's. Then to move quickly, he was one of the legacies of his early years is the Board of Trustees set a limit on administrators, presidents and vice presidents, and then later deans, had to retire from the administrative position when they reached the age of 65. At that time, they could stay on for another five years and when you reached the age of 70, the policy was you had to get off the public payroll. Times have changed since then but a legacy of appointing administrators for terms developed with Novice Fawcett's support at a Board meeting up at Wooster as I recall. Then as we think of Novice Fawcett, I would add this in a summary before listing some of the legacies. I just read a listing of outstanding graduates of The Ohio State University this past weekend, and there are distinguished people there. But as time evolves, I believe Novice Fawcett should be listed as one of the distinguished graduates. He did earn a Master's Degree from this University and of course Doctorates from many universities. But his legacy would stand in higher education, the land grant college level right through to this specific University. He was very much responsible for the administration of the University when we were living with the tidal wave of students. The number of people who were knocking at the doors for higher education. Remember, we only had five universities and one college at the

time he was appointed to his presidency. As he retired, we had twelve public institutions of higher learning, not to include the regional campuses. And he was a part of that kind of development from broad administrative point of view. The Board of Regents came into existence while he was President here. And he worked very closely with the Chancellor of the Board of Regents. With that relationship developed programs to recognize high quality in faculty, research faculty, and it's been expanded and exists today. The first Regent professors were appointed during Novice Fawcett's time. The building, those who are present here in 2004, see a great building surge on campus, but I would say to you, the buildings that came during Novice Fawcett's time in real dollars would exceed what we have today, particularly in the area of residence halls, building that serve the instructional part of the University. Facilities for students and instruction especially. I think that's one of his legacies. That came before with today buildings emphasizing the research element. We know that the President's Club, the beginning of a strong program of development raising monies to enhance the education at Ohio State from the public sector, really expanded during Novice Fawcett's regime, and of course presidents who followed and picked it up, and today we have over a billion dollars raised in a campaign. It all started I believe under the legacy of Novice Fawcett. I would say another legacy that I see for which Novice Fawcett perhaps doesn't receive adequate credit, and that is bringing support to the Libraries, particularly the periodicals. And opening the doors of the printed media as well as opening the doors to the technology of radio and television. Actually WOSU Television started in 1956, the year Novice

Fawcett came to this University. He was not part of the initial creation of WOSU TV, but he certainly was a part of its development and using it for educational purposes with the schools. And involving our faculty in programming in television and radio that extended into the public schools and across Ohio into West Virginia. Those are some of the legacies I think of Novice Fawcett just off the top of my head. I believe he deserves and will be recognized as one of the most significant Presidents in the life of Ohio State. Perhaps you would add some more, Rai, as you think about them from an archivist point of view. We could say that Archives started under the time of Novice Fawcett.

- Q. That is certainly true. One of the things that I wanted to ask you about, if you would include in the legacies, the harmony between the OSU and Alumni Association, both of them being independent organizations but ones that mutually benefit from each other. Would you comment on that, particularly the post-Fawcett period.
- A. I'm very pleased to and let me say, the current strong relationships between the Ohio State University and Alumni Association and The Ohio State University that obviously should exist and does exist, began under the leadership of Dr. Fawcett, one being the very creation of the physical facilities, expanding them and having them become what is part of the Fawcett Center for Tomorrow, earlier the Center for Tomorrow and then now the Fawcett Center for Tomorrow. Upon the retirement of the executive of the alumni under Novice Fawcett's presidency, the first successor was a member of the faculty in Communication, Professor Dick Mahl, which signaled a relationship of Dr. Fawcett's influence upon that decision,

that many haven't lifted up. Unfortunately, Dr. Mahl's tenure was short-lived because of a heart attack. And then Dan Heinlen was promoted to that role and has continued up until January 1 of this year. That was a growing relationship down through the years. I think that should be listed as a legacy of Dr. Novice Fawcett.

Q. One of the things that I didn't realize until talking with you was the relationship between the Alumni Association and the Board of Trustees. Would you care to comment on that?

A. Yes, I think it's worth noting the significance that key people on the Board of Trustees for The Ohio State University during Novice Fawcett's early years, trustees being appointed by the Governor of the State of Ohio, and the Governor makes that appointment without consultation with anybody except the Senate, the Ohio Senate. But I think a wise political leader making an appointment which would be popular with the people of Ohio and particularly alumni, led to the appointment of people like Thomas Patton, President of Republic Steels. Novice Fawcett developed a strong relationship there. Jacob Davis, President of the Kroger Company. Both of them had been President of the Alumni Association Board of Directors. Smith Rairdon was President of the Board of Directors of the Alumni Association, an executive of Owens Illinois in Toledo, and a trustee. And the development of relationship between corporations and trustees. And first let us say citizens of the community and then made it a natural appointment for the Governor. And that has continued down through the years, of people serving as alumnus in an advisory capacity and on the Board of Trustees becoming a trustee.

The most recent Chairman of the Board of Trustees was appointed first on the Alumni Advisory Council and then through the directorship and to the trusteeship, Jim Patterson. So we have a trustee by the name of Longaberger, who will become Chair of the Board. He was first involved with the Board of Directors of the University. So there has been that kind of relationship. I think one of the very first ones that I should mention is that long time alumnus and great distinguished person, Charles Kettering, upon his death in 1958, I recall specifically the Governor at that time didn't follow the precedent or practice of calling the President of the University to ask if there was a suggestion, but Governor O'Neal did that and out of that suggestion came the Chairman of the Board and President of the National Cash Register. And Mr. Stanley Allan became a member of the Board and Chairman of the Board, and was a very strong influence as we moved from the Ohio State University program in cooperation with Miami and Dayton, to creating what is now Wright State and on that campus is the Allan Hall and the Fawcett Hall and the Mollett Hall. Those three administrators had a great influence in the development of Wright State. And my role as Vice President and Secretary of the Board of Trustees, I felt very much involved with them in raising the first few million dollars for Wright State. Again, one of the legacies of Novice Fawcett.

- Q. While governors typically do not consult with presidents about nominees to the Board of Trustees, a true governor does see if there are likely candidates within the Alumni Association. Is that a fair statement?

A. It's a fair statement but I always like to go back to the foundation. First comes an institution of higher learning who creates an environment, programs, to lift up and encourage alumni to grow in key roles in public service. As corporate executives and other roles and it becomes natural for a governor to select those kinds of people to meet on key boards. So I would like to say that it just doesn't happen just by some telephone conversations. It happens because people grow through the influence of institutions of higher learning, like The Ohio State University.

Q. And one could even refer to the University's motto, "Education for Citizenship."

A. Right.

Q. In a previous meeting, John, in a planning meeting, you had talked about the fragile nature of this relationship between two independent organizations. In fact, you even referred to it as a harmony dependent upon people of good will and understanding. I believe in the planning meeting you identified areas of potential concern affecting the harmony of these two independent organizations, The Ohio State University and its independent Alumni Association. Can you refer to those?

A. Again, a specific illustration is the current of what I would call competitive admissions to The Ohio State University and there are alumni across this state and nation who came here under the open admissions role and it was identified by many as the land grant college philosophy, and shifting from that philosophy to competitive admissions or selective admissions, and they would bring their influential pressures through the alumni functions to administration and the Alumni Advisory Board. Some institutions might call it like a Board of Visitors. If there isn't very effective dialog developing, for example, with a Board of

Directors for the Alumni Association meeting with the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, and to not allow polarization on those positions. As I've said, I'm a great believer in the miracle of dialogue. Another illustration is, that just during this past week, a young man who will become an alumnus of this University, spoke as President of the undergraduate student body. Very critical of the lack of emphasis upon undergraduate education in favor of research. I was very pleased to see how our President, current President, responded to that, because she's heard that also from alumni. And she said that she would be very happy to participate in discussion of that issue. So that's an illustration of how there can be a divided house, if there isn't strong communication. Other areas of course relates to athletics. Again, the buck stops at the President's desk. That is, the alumni have a way of expressing their interest and concerns, be it athletics or be it admissions. Strong alumni and strong financial support of the University, thinking that their sons and daughters or grand-sons and daughters should be admitted to the institution, as is the case in many institutions, private institutions. But I must say in my period at the Ohio State University, starting with the leadership of Novice Fawcett down through the years, the integrity of admission based upon open admission policies and competitive admission policies, the credentials of the applicant is what earns their right to be in. Calls from parents or alumni is an area for discourse.

Q. The selective admissions as a potential point of difference between some alumni and University trustees, is it fair to say that one aspect of that is that for many, many years, in the open admissions process, the University in a real sense offered

everybody a chance at a quality education and admitted people who couldn't succeed, or had difficulties succeeding. But they had the chance. In selective admissions, the University's conserves its resources but not everybody has a chance to compete.

- A. Again, I'd like to make it clear from my point of view, in the earlier days, again under Fawcett and Enarson and down the years, there were not the opportunities for high school graduates. When Novice Fawcett was here, as I said five universities and one college, limited resources for regional campuses. What was taught was taught in high schools. And so when the law said, passed by the General Assembly, that all graduates of an accredited high school shall be admissible to a state university. And so not to do so would be a violation of the law. And with the numbers increasing wanting to go to college, one of the first thing was to give leadership for alternatives. As a person who was in the role and had those students and students who were succeeding in the classroom, and some would say, I've never said it but it's been quoted that I said it, but I deny it to this day that I said it but they may have interpreted me that way and one must live by perceptions in how you are interrupted. But as students would come in, the administrator would say to a body of students, "Look to your right and look to your left. A year from now, only one of you will be here." That was a philosophy that was expressed. Because they did come with great need for remedial education. And the University provided that. But as opportunities develop, today I would say yet today, that every high school graduate has an opportunity to enroll in a public institution. And yes, they have an opportunity to

enroll in the regional campuses of The Ohio State University. So as one who believes in keeping the opportunity open, it is there today but it is competitive to get on the central campus, as the developmental processes of opportunity are created. And again, that's an educational process that many do not understand.

Q. You and I have both heard it said that, up until recently defined as the last two or three presidents, research was not an important aspect, theoretical research was not an important aspect of the University. Could you comment on that within the context of Fawcett years?

A. Well again, my comment is that Novice Fawcett is the first President to appoint to a principal administrative role a Vice President for Research, in one professor Al Garrett, from the Department of Chemistry. And we had under Novice Fawcett the Research Foundation and a Board, of which I was Secretary of the Research Foundation Board along with the Secretary of Trustees. And Novice Fawcett's leadership in enhancing the opportunities for the Research Foundation and under the leadership of a principal administrator, Al Garrett, again he deserves more credit than some people today would be inclined to give him in terms of opening the opportunities for research. Of course, research as we know it today, didn't really, that is research from grants outside appropriations, didn't exist in early Novice Fawcett days as they exist today. Our health center under yes, Dr. Meiling, and before him Dr. Done, moving to get research dollars in our health center, with the support of administration and matching money from the general assemblies. So I would list Dr. Fawcett as one who did understand the

significance of research in higher education and the foundation for what we have today.

Q. Another aspect related to that is the fact that OSU Press began a year after Novice Fawcett assumed the presidency.

A. Thank you, that is exactly right. And very important to the Library. The whole area of making resources available to students and alumni and the community at large through continuing education and the University Press and radio and television, was a significant principal in the administration of Novice Fawcett.

Q. In your discussion of Board of Trustees members, you cited several corporations that were represented in the Board of Trustees. So there was some harmony developing, some relationships developing, between the University and businesses, certainly relationships that would benefit us significantly in fundraising, particularly for professorships and scholarships. Did President Fawcett serve on the Board of Directors of private corporations, and if not, why not?

A. The answer is he did not, and he felt strongly that the President of the University should not accept appointments to corporate boards of directors. He had opportunities, as colleagues and my rather close relationship with Dr. Fawcett, said if you wanted to work in the corporate world, join them. Don't allow yourself to be a director and have the elements of conflict of interest be there in perception, if not real. An illustration of that, he had a conversation about, is the American Automobile Association in Ohio, AAA across this country. Novice Fawcett was offered the presidency of that company when he did not become a

member of the local Ohio division of the American Association. And it was a very difficult decision for him to turn down that position. But he did. So he did not accept any appointments until his retirement, what is now SBC, what was it, the Ohio telephone system out of Cleveland. He went on that Board and he went on Nationwide. He was involved with Nationwide. He was invited to one of the earlier things in this city, the Buckeye Federal and Loan, he was on that Board. But that all happened after he became Emeritus. And I say as we move from Dr. Fawcett to Dr. Enarson's presidency, he followed that same policy. He did not serve on a Board of Directors of corporate boards. That did change when Dr. Jennings came. The Board of Trustees, in negotiating with Dr. Jennings and attracting an outstanding educator and administrator, and bringing in a background of business as he did, one of the early appointments was on the BancOne Board. Of course that has happened in private institutions and some public institutions, and it's one of those items of discussion down through the years, of conflict of interest that might be created between a university and corporate boards. When we were accepting money from them, and so a Board of Directors needs to discuss, should we give money to The Ohio State University. And again, the University receiving that money, the legislation says that if one removes himself from voting and participating in the discussion, and keeping the conflict of interest out of the process, it happens today much more than it used to.

Q. End of tape for February 9, 2004.

Q. This is March 4, 2004. I'm Raimund Goerler interviewing John Mount for the OSU Archives Oral History Program. Today John, I'd like to turn our attention to

President Enarson and his administration. It seems logical for me to begin at the beginning, namely to discuss the search process which was different than we have today, but it was also different in what had proceeded. Can you comment on that?

A. My comment there would be that, as history is recorded, the process of governance at Ohio State and participatory governance if we may use the word participatory, involving faculty and students coming down through the 60's and through the last couple of years in the Fawcett administration. And that led of course to the process for selecting the President. And we need to take a look at the Board of Trustees at the time Harold Enarson was selected. The Chairman of the Board of Trustees was Jacob Davis. Jacob Davis' life history, coming from down in Pike County and moving through as a Democrat in various roles in Ohio politics and federal politics. And then of course moving to his role as Chief Executive Officer of Kroger and the Chairman of our Board of Trustees. Jacob also was President of our Alumni Association in earlier times. So you put the combination of the times of participation in all the elements of policy making at the University, the creation of a University Senate and the philosophy of Jake Davis and others on the Board, appointed by a Democratic governor. So the search proceeded. That would be my observation about the process.

Q. Unlike today, there was no professional search firm involved. This was the work of a committee, is that correct?

A. That's the way I understand it. I had moved out of being Secretary of the Board of Trustees and was Vice President for Regional Campuses at that time. That's exactly the way it was. The Secretary of the Board of Trustees at that time was

Madison Scott. He had a significant role in the organization paperwork that went with it.

Q. In terms of the search process, the process to find a successor to Novice Fawcett, was a process set up, as the history book tell us, by Novice Fawcett at the request of the Board of Trustees. Were you involved in that establishment process at all?

A. I would say I was not involved other than to hear about it and being a concurring kind of a voice. But I was not directly involved in it. My role as Vice President for Regional Campuses and as Dean of the University College kept me pretty busy from the political operations having been through that. So I really was not personally involved in that. I observed it and of course I knew Mr. Davis very well and members of the Board, but was not directly involved.

Q. Okay. The change in philosophy to being more participatory, one you said a moment ago was agreeable to particularly Jacob Davis and must have been agreeable also to Novice Fawcett because he set up the process. Also had a downside, namely that the more people you involve and the more open the process, the greater jeopardy of leaks and discouraging of candidates. Did that happen in the process?

A. Clearly so. That is exactly the way it is. When you have a process like that, and as you say, Novice Fawcett set it up. I think one should say he was very explicit in not wanting to dictate who the next president would be, Fawcett was. He was not involved in the process. As the Chief Administrative Officer he was helpful in the service to the committee. But yes, when you have a process like that was, that really led to having more universities use the process of getting outside

cooperation due to the identity. I would just use an illustration. We live in the today, as we look at the past. But several universities have gone through the process of having an outside group make recommendations, and it hasn't worked out. To use an illustration, Tennessee, for example. The search company helped them to get the last two presidents, and each of those have been not very successful. And the most recent one very much so. And so Tennessee has now gone to a process as was used back at the time Enarson. And they are having the problem of open so that anybody who becomes a candidate, the institution where they are currently working becomes knowledgeable at, and what happens is that there are administrators who will not allow themselves to become an open candidate, when they still have a good position. That happened in the case of the search for a successor for Novice Fawcett. And people were identified and because of the openness and having them come to the campus and having the whole world know about them being a candidate, they removed themselves from that process.

Q. Was there anybody who drew a lot of favorable support or you weren't part of the process?

A. I really was not part of the committee and the process. Yes, there was some very favorable and promising persons that were recruited, but the process would mean that they would be more open and they withdrew before it became public that they were a candidate.

Q. I understand President Enarson was a surprise choice. At least I've heard it said. Is that a fair statement?

A. Well, his name did not come forth among those that were enlisted as promising candidates. Harold Enarson's name was not among those publicly announced, whether the search committee and particularly whether members of the Board of Trustees had their eye on him among other good candidates, I don't know. But once they focused in on Harold Enarson, that moved quickly. And of course he was in state and up in Cleveland and relatively new at Cleveland State. But in a major city and in terms of the times of what we call today diversity, but then the need for University administrators to move to "the inner city" kind of programs. Harold had that experience up in Cleveland. Of course, coming with the background of his political involvement, so it was attractive to not only to members of the search committee and faculty, but to Jake Davis was there on the Board of Trustees. Mr. Shocknessy was on the Board at that time and of course he was known in the state for the Turnpike and Democratic politics, but he also was very friendly with many of the Republican party and was a vocal member of the Board of Trustees at the time Harold Enarson came.

Q. It's been said that one of the things that drew people's attention to President Enarson at Cleveland State, was that Cleveland State did not experience the student upheavals that Ohio State had in 1970. Of course Cleveland State was a commuter campus largely. But was the relative tranquility at Cleveland State a factor in the discussions that you are aware of?

A. Not that I was aware of. I would think that any critical analysis of that situation, Cleveland State, a new institution, the outside influences that did roam the campuses, they wouldn't go to Cleveland State, a commuter institution. So

anybody that would make a critical analysis, that wouldn't give the administration a lot of credit for not having problems there. That would be my observation. The faculty, they didn't have them there, but that's positive obviously, but I wouldn't say that it was a focal point for the people who really led the problems on many campuses, moved from one campus to another. Berkeley to the east and to the midwest.

Q. When Enarson came aboard, his style and perhaps his philosophy too, was a contrast with Novice Fawcett. Can you comment on that?

A. Harold Enarson was coming from the southwest. He and his wife both were southwesterners and brought that kind of a culture into the role of the presidency. If one looks again at universities at that time, presidents were bringing in a new style from the traditional. If you study universities across the country, presidents were moving in sleeping in dormitories with students and bringing a different style from having a car with a driver and the rather traditional role of presidents that this University before Fawcett. At the University of Michigan and others, when I was Secretary of the Board of Trustees, meeting with my counterparts at other universities, had some meetings on protocol with the protocol officers from the White House coming to talk about protocol and universities, as you had prominent speakers. The times were changing, and Enarson was a fine example of the changing times, of informality, of style and relationship to campus and the community and in their home life.

Q. Do you think this informality of style helped them with student relations?

A. I would say it was a positive, yes. He visited residence halls and I remember coming back to a staff meeting after visiting, for example, stadium scholarship cooperative dorm, were again the cooperative spirit, students working to help themselves, and that really impressed Harold Enarson. He said, "If all of our residence halls had the spirit of the stadium dorms, we wouldn't have any problems on the campus." And it was a time when Title 9 and was shifting from all the honor societies. You had class honor societies were divided men and women, beginning with the National Honor Society of Alpha _____ Delta for Women and _____ Sigma _____ for men. And _____ for women and on this campus _____ for men. All of those changes came about which fit right in to a philosophy and a culture of Enarson. That had pros and cons. For example, the sororities and he fraternities was a part of that changing time and changing role. Harold Enarson of course was the first President to move into a house owned by the University off campus. Before that was ready for him to move in, he lived in Summit Chase condo and actually out on the apple farm which had been given to the University, a very lovely living quarters, where the Enarsons enjoyed very much and entertained out there in the informal style of barbecues and picnics. That was where faculty especially were invited to functions. It was a different style, without question.

Q. Okay. As I recall, as part of orientation and the student picnic, less formal. By the same token, it's been commented that Enarson could also be aloof. Could you comment on that at all?

A. I never personally heard or used the term aloof with the Enarsons. They were not the kind of people that enjoyed and participated in the black tie events. And so those people who had the custom of having University functions, for example the President's Club, under the leadership of Everett Reese, past President of National City Bank, now BancOne. We would have black tie President's Club functions downtown at the hotel. People observed, I would suspect, that the Enarsons weren't comfortable with that kind of arrangement. And some may have read, and it's been recorded by some, that he was aloof, they may have made that judgment. I would understand that judgment being made but I personally felt that it was more a style and culture. And Harold in his own way of dealing with faculty and some administrative colleagues. Personally I would never judge him to be aloof to any and certainly very approachable and very open, very frank in all the relationships I had with him, as we were working at developing the regional campuses and the mission of freshmen and moving into bringing the first National Merit Scholar Program here. When Harold Enarson came, I think we had merit scholars numbering maybe in the 20's, and Harold Enarson gave me the assignment around the staff table to work at bringing in more top students of the National Merit Scholar caliber. I went about that and we moved to be up in the top five in the country. So I felt that Harold was very receptive. However, I heard and observed that some people felt uncomfortable when they would bring proposals or bring positive results into Harold, they would be interrogated in a way that made them wonder. You have styles of chief executive officers and I've observed with this University in my role where one will interrogate to make

positively sure that everything is correct and a concern that we not over-promote, where other presidents might be of a style when you bring in some recent positive development, you could be concerned that the next time you heard it, it was magnified. Harold was certainly one not to magnify a situation beyond that which it deserved. In other words, he was not of a flamboyant style, and yet he was a very effective writer. Harold Enarson wrote his own speeches. When he would take executive trips, he would write very effectively and was well received in terms of his own communications that way.

Q. I can recall from the Enarson files that he also had extreme attention to detail. I know at least one instance where a letter from him to physical facilities, that he had noticed a crack in the sidewalk walking to Faculty Club and wanted to bring that to the attention of physical facilities. In the planning for this interview, you told me that President Enarson did not cultivate friends downtown, but you also said that he had best friends in Bexley. Can you elaborate on that?

A. I think the record shows that Harold was not the most effective with some of the town element, as we say the town in gown. But Harold enjoyed art, and actually has a home with a lot of artwork. He and Mrs. Enarson had friends in that area. It was basically I think through, again his interest in diversity. I'm sure there are people in the last decade or the last five or so years, think that this University hadn't heard of diversity until now. But Harold Enarson was one who was very much interested in opening this campus up to all segments of our society. Actually the community in my view has benefited greatly from some philosophy that really comes from people whose residence are in Bexley, in terms of chairs

and the social dynamics, would lead one I think to conclude that Harold was comfortable with those leaders of our community. One of the close relationships that I observed that Harold and Audrey had were with Bill and Jane Guthrie. Bill Guthrie was a former, for 25 years, a member of this University staff in key roles, then became the President of Buckeye Federal. And Bill Guthrie really worked at opening the doors for housing for the inner-city, and he lived in Upper Arlington. Down through all the years while the Guthrie's were here and after the Enarson's were here and they left, they maintained close friends with the Guthrie's.

Q. Okay. The beginning of the Enarson administration was also the early years of the University Senate. I've heard it said from some faculty that it was Enarson's successor, President Jennings, who rescued the Senate from dormancy in being more influential in the governing process. Can you comment on that?

A. Again, the Senate was relatively new when Harold Enarson came and I think all parties were sparring a bit about its role. My observation is that there may have been some defensive kind of an attitude that Judge Harold had, and Jennings coming in and having been in the role of faculty and moving through the ranks, he kind of rolled with it and he could take the negative emotion that would come on the floor and smile and roll with it, which was I think a bit more acceptable to faculty and students. That would be my observation. Not prepared to join with those who say that Jennings rescued it, but it was just in the developmental process through the Enarson's. And the role we have now as Faculty Council, it's

much stronger than it was back at that time. Again, the role of faculty, the role of administration on that Senate, and even the student leadership at that time.

- Q. One of the elements of turmoil that happened in the 1960's and continued throughout the 70's and even to this day, was the University's concern for doing more in the area of affirmative action and minority affairs. Can you comment about Enarson's concerns here?
- A. As we said earlier in this conversation, Harold Enarson was very dynamic really in wanting to open the opportunities for all segments of our society. Again, my role as Dean of University College and being responsible for what we called developmental education and my hiring a black Associate Dean and moving to get more involvement of minorities in administrative and faculty roles, those of us in the campus who were moving in that direction had very strong support from Harold Enarson. And again, it started before Harold Enarson came. We had Black Studies and Women Studies before Harold Enarson came. Again, the life of the University Senate was in the developmental process. We lived at a time when the public was not as prepared to accept, the general public in the state of Ohio, were not ready to accept some of the affirmative action that was developing at that time, as they are today, and it continually has elements of controversy. But it was in its role, Title IX and the opening of the doors to the minorities. I remember I brought in a young man from, really from the migrant fields, to be a graduate student. He came on through to earn his doctorate here. And one of the first from the migrant workers to earn a doctorate. Again, Harold was very supportive of that kind of thing.

Q. Of course, his own Secretary of the Board of Trustees as African American. And had led affirmative action studies.

A. He was Vice President of Personnel. In that role more than the Secretary of the Board of Trustees. It was his role as Vice President for Personnel, now called Human Resources. That was Madison Scott, who served as Secretary of the Board of Trustees, both in the staff role and in the line role.

Q. One of the aspects that impacted the University during the Enarson administration was the national economy, particularly in the 1970's we had some very severe inflation. There was a movement on the campus to unionize the faculty, and in the union process, to supposedly strengthen the faculty in bargaining for raises and benefits. It never happened but it happened at other universities in this period. Can you comment on why it wasn't successful?

A. My own observation, where it happened, in those universities that were developing, Youngstown State, Toledo, Cincinnati, moving from being a municipal institution to a state university. That's where the organization in this state and really across the nation, but you take your major universities, Big Ten, it did not happen there, it did not happen here. It did not happen at Michigan or Illinois. Unionization when it comes about is because the majority of the employees, or in the case of faculty, indicate that that's what they wanted, and the majority of the faculty at Ohio State didn't want it. That's why we didn't have it. We had those elements of the American Association of University Professors and leadership there, testing grounds here at Ohio State. Testing at the regional campuses, and as it was discussed among the faculty, it did move forward,

obviously with administration observing it. Of course Harold was present right at that time. He followed Jennings and Jennings set up some committees, budget committees. So the involvement of faculty in policy making without unionization came about. Harold Enarson brought in the person, woman to be Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Q. Ann Reynolds?

A. Yes, Ann Reynolds.

Q. Enarson actually brought two women into administration, higher administration, Kathryn Schoen and Ann Reynolds.

A. Kathryn Schoen was on her way before. Kathryn Schoen was a member of the staff here and was moving through the ranks and Harold was very observant of that. Al Kuhn was more significant in bringing in Kathryn Schoen. I took Kathryn Schoen with me to a national meeting and she was a member of the faculty. She did an effective job and I recommended her highly. Al Kuhn brought her into the Provost's office and it was a natural move to have her become Vice President. A very competent person who earned the right.

Q. Ann Reynolds was appointed Provost the last two or three years, maybe less than that, of the Enarson administration.

A. She followed Al Kuhn. And Al Kuhn was the Provost during the Enarson years and worked very well together.

Q. One of the great traumas in the Enarson administration concerned the Medical Practice Plan. This was a matter that had been touched upon briefly in the

Fawcett years. Never went anywhere significantly, but becomes a major problem and set of activities in the Enarson administration. Why? What happened?

A. From my standpoint it was a result of the economics. And again, the developmental process where faculty in the College of Medicine, particularly the clinical faculty, moving very well in the economic structure. There was concern that came to administration from those who in some ways were jealous of the faculty in medicine who were observed by some to have the best of the two worlds. And Harold and some members of the Board, moving in to have some impact on leveling out that disparity. It became a big controversy. That's my observation. Again, it was a matter of the times and then how you handled it. As one looks back on it, it may have been a result of not taking some faculty along who helped to be a part of solving the problem. Rather, they became rather polarized against moving in the direction which was laid out for them.

Q. In planning for this interview you had referred to a top down process, assuming you meant there weren't really enough consultation with the medical faculty as the process went on.

A. That's what the faculty expressed to me, in my role in having been here a long time and knowing many of the faculty across the campus, knew medicine, would visit with him. That would be the impression that they left with me. And I was not involved in that in my administrative role I was not involved in that controversy. I had close friends among the medical faculty who were very much polarized against the move as it was set forth here on the central campus. I was on the Board of Trustees at that time of Children's Hospital. In fact, the Research

Foundation of Children's Hospital and was a part of approving bringing some faculty to Children's Hospital who were also on the faculty of The Ohio State University. And they did move into a Practice Plan at Children's Hospital without any fanfare, quietly, in a smaller scale. That's my own involvement of observing it.

Q. Was that before or after the great traumas here with the OSU Medical Practice Plan?

A. The faculty in the Pediatrics Department of OSU are also the staff of Children's Hospital. So it was coming along at the same time except lessons are learned out of crises, and I've often felt that when you have a crisis and that became a crisis, a very difficult one for Harold and the Dean of the College of Medicine, Henry Cramblett. Out of that crisis here came some creative things that I think Children's Hospital picked upon and other institutions.

Q. Okay. I need to turn the tape over. I'm getting the end of tape warning. So let's do that. Any concluding remarks about the Medical Practice Plan. In the controversy you were not a participant; you were an observer.

A. My observation is that Harold Enarson and Al Kuhn and the Provost and those who were working, and Henry Cramblett, at trying to work in the best interest of the College of Medicine as a whole, and certainly as a clinical operation. But they got caught up in having some key members of the clinical medical faculty, became very polarized and felt they were put upon. And so communication was brought down, and it moved into the broader community. I believe, as happens in

a situation like that, there was, some would say, blame on both sides, with both sides having very honest motives in mind.

- Q. Another dramatic occurrence was the termination of Woody Hayes following the Gator Bowl incident in December, 1978, and Woody's termination thereafter. Just give us an opportunity if you will to talk about your interactions with Woody, and you were also there at the Gator Bowl when the Woody incident happened and Woody was terminated. Can we begin with talking about your previous relations with Woody as an administrator?
- A. As the record shows, at one time when Earl was Vice President, and athletics was supported through my office, was Director of Athletics and Intercollegiate Athletic Program. So I was involved with the administration and sat with Larkins, Director of Athletics, in that role, and Woody, as we resolved issues that came along. And then of course I moved into another role and did not have direct responsibility for athletics. But again, knew the personnel well. Hugh Hindman became Director of Athletics and was a friend and colleague. I was on the plane and went to the Gator Bowl with the executive party on that occasion, and was there on the scene when it happened as an observer.
- Q. Before we get to that, I wanted to talk about, as you mentioned in our planning meeting, an incident that you had with Woody about receiving a donation for the installation of turf at Ohio Stadium.
- A. Yes, I recall that very well. What I recall is, one of those games where we went up to Michigan and were defeated on turf. And Woody came back feeling that we were defeated because we were not prepared to play on turf. He wanted turf in

the Ohio stadium. Let this be known, and the next thing the public knew, and some colleagues in the campus here, word came out that Woody had arranged to have turf put in. It wasn't quite as public that pay for that turf came from former players of Woody's who said, "Woody, we'll pay for the turf." And Woody negotiated the turf, and of course at that time there weren't too many producers of turf in football fields. Immediately the question was raised, did this go to competitive bid. The calls, as is the case, the calls come to the Office of the President for the Administration, what do you mean bringing in turf without competitive bidding? So Woody was called to explain the circumstances and when we talked about the policies for competitive bidding and proceeded to resolve the issue. We got turf and even though criticized Woody for his aggressiveness in bringing it about, it happened and in my book should have forgotten, except that's the case of alumni wanting to support Woody and his desire to get artificial turf.

Q. I wonder if you'd be willing to give us some account of how your meeting with Woody about this turf issue began because I think it's reflective of your administrative style in a potentially tension filled situation.

A. Well again, in administration of an institution the President gets the letters and the calls and then he delegates it to the person responsible for the area, in this case athletics. So when the President asked me to investigate and take appropriate action, I called Woody and the Director of Athletics, and invited him and Woody to come to the office. As they came into my office, as I greeted them and they sat down my first approach was to say to Woody, "Woody, what happens in the game

of football when a player breaks the rules of the game or your rules?" And Woody looked at me and said, "You take appropriate action." I said, "We've got a little rule bending here if not broken. Tell me about this bringing about a contract for the turf without going through the normal process." And so we reviewed it and so it's a matter of style of whether you make a critical issue of life and death situation or whether you look at it in a way that you could resolve it in a manner in which all people are happy.

Q. The Director of Athletics at that time was?

A. That was still Dick Larkins.

Q. Was Larkins aware of the process that resulted in the turf arrangement?

A. No, Woody had a way of getting things done. He bypassed the Director of Athletics on a few occasions, and Larkins. And that's one reason that Larkins was, I believe, a good administrator, and operated a good program of intercollegiate athletics, followed by Ed Weaver, who had some time in Central Administration and didn't have the same style as Dick Larkins. Then came Hugh Hindman down the road. But again, there's different styles of administration. Woody and Ed Weaver were not on the same page as much as Larkins is of course the one who brought Woody here. And Woody perhaps was not as aggressive in his manner with Dick as he grew, as he had more tenure here.

Q. I interrupted you when you were about to talk about that famous event at the Gator Bowl.

A. Of course, we were all there in the stadium and saw it happen. Very close to the end of the game when it looked like we might be on the move, and moved toward

having a winning situation, when the interception took place and the young man ran by Woody and we observed what appeared to be Woody striking him. As we left the stadium, my concern having known Woody and Ann, his wife, and son with my wife, who also was a friend of Ann's, our concern was to find Ann, who was seated not too far from us. But we met at the water fountain where Ann had a severe cold that day and not feeling very well, and she certainly was not feeling well after that experience and with her son. And so that was our first emotional experience with the Hayes family. Ann, with her head dropped, and saddened by the experience. As I moved out and saw Hugh Hindman and he and I walked together to talk about how Hugh, the then Director of Athletics, my having worked in that area and known Hugh from being Assistant Coach to Woody and moving through the department, talked through what the options were, and clearly the options were that you would offer the opportunity for Woody to resign, which he did not as I understand it. I was not with him of course as he sat with Woody, and Woody was still in a very emotional state of mind and would not accept that suggestion. Hugh, reporting to the President, with the press standing by to see what would happen and Woody was relieved of his responsibility.

Q. In retrospect, do you think the University acted with too much haste?

A. No, I think there was no choice but to do what was done at that time. And Woody brought it on himself, never having admitted that publicly. But I spent many an hour and time with Woody before and after the occasion. In fact, as I talked with Woody about his retirement, Woody was a sick man. Woody was battling health problems. Woody wanted and was his heart's desire to go out a winner. We were

in the Gator Bowl and close to that. Woody, in my view, was not a well man as he continued and coached at that time, and emotion got the best of him. There was no choice but for Harold Enarson to take the action that he took. Again, the nature of football, we live in that big fish bowl of the public media and Woody of course and Ann both went into hibernation so to speak. In due course and time, healing comes about and Woody was invited to speak to the Chamber of Commerce and the ballroom of the Neil House was filled at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce where Woody was the speaker. On that occasion, Harold Enarson and I had conversation with him along with a member of his staff and Harold decided he would not go to that annual meeting. That is was in the best interest not to be there, as Woody was front and center. And again, out of not wanting to make it difficult for Woody, I think it was a part of Enarson's generous spirit of kindness. And I remember returning from that occasion and being invited into the President's office where he has listened to it on radio. And Harold Enarson made this observation that, "That was one great speech" and he would say that a speech professor could use it as an illustration in the classroom setting. I recall that very well. And of course that was one of the most memorable addresses that Woody gave, again praising the University to the fullest, and never a negative word except he did not apologize for the occasion at the Gator Bowl. But from that day on Woody moved on through the rest of his life being a very much loved person in this community at large.

Q. Edward Jennings did a great deal to bring Woody back into the official embrace of the University. Can you comment on that?

A. Again, Ed Jennings moving into the Presidency and going to the Faculty Club as Ed Jennings did, Ed Jennings was one that went to the Faculty Club and when he didn't have a luncheon date to sit with the faculty at the long table, and Woody also would go to the Faculty Club and sit at the long table, the open table, as the discussion for whatever was relevant for the time. They got to know each other that way. I personally talked with Ed about the Gator game situation and I said to Ed, and I said here, that Woody was a sick man. Ed Jennings of course observed Woody and his contribution to this community and this University. During that time, he invited him to be the commencement speaker and awarded him an honorary degree.

Q. That idea was your suggestion to Jennings?

A. Jennings is one who did a lot of listening. Among the people he listened to was John Mount, about that occasion. I don't know how many other people had the opinion and told Ed that Woody was ill. I'm not alone in having that judgment, so I don't want to take credit myself for a decision that Ed Jennings made. Ed was a person who was a good listener and a good observer, and moved I think in his own judgment and his honest motives to recognize a person who he felt sincerely deserved to be recognized for his contribution to this University and to the community.