

11-5-2005

Charles Galloway

Charles Galloway
University of North Florida

James B. Crooks
University of North Florida

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/unf_oral



Part of the [Oral History Commons](#)

Suggested Citation

Galloway, Charles and Crooks, James B., "Charles Galloway" (2005). *Creating a University: UNF Oral History Project*. 10.

https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/unf_oral/10

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Oral Histories at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Creating a University: UNF Oral History Project by an authorized administrator of UNF Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Digital Projects](#).

© 11-5-2005 All Rights Reserved

C: Today is November 4, and we're in the UNF oral history project. We're interviewing Dr. Charles Galloway, Professor Emeritus in the College of Education. Charles, let's start off with your background, your education and professional career before coming to UNF.

G: Okay. I taught elementary school. I began as a sixth grade teacher for a few years. Then I majored in drama in undergraduate and was in drama for five years and lived in Lexington, Kentucky. In fact I was on stage in several plays, all kinds, Shakespeare plays, so forth. I was in a movie once with Pat Boone and Shirley Jones called April Love. So the drama background was a big deal for a number of years. I taught in university school, lab school, at the University of Kentucky. I taught the sixth grade and directed plays in the high school. From there, I went to the University of Florida and got my doctorate. From there, I went to Maryland to work in public schools, to be a superintendent of schools, but a friend of mine recommended me to the University of North Texas. He called me in Maryland and said, the dean and the president's coming to Washington, and if you could go talk to them, they'd like you to be here and so forth. I said, absolutely not. I like it here. He said, well, I told them you would. If you just go down and talk to them. So I went downtown as a gesture to my friend, who I saw just a week ago. Real quickly the dean asked me, what would you like to be doing ten years from now? I said, well I'd love to be at a university sharing my research. My research was, my dissertation, was on non-verbal communication, which they call body language, but we didn't use that term then. I created that. So he said, well, if you wait ten years, we wouldn't want you. We want you now or not at all, frankly, because you'll make so much money as a superintendent or as a public school teacher that we couldn't afford you. So if you'd like to come then give us a call. So I went home and stewed, and I called him a day later and said, what can you offer me? He said, \$7,200. I said, but dean, I'm making \$14,000. He said, well, that's all we can do. I said, okay. So I went as an assistant professor in 1963 to the University of North Texas. I made associate professor in two years, and the third year I was headed toward promotion. I was doing great, and I loved it there. I got a call from Ohio State, would you be interested in a position here? I said, absolutely not. I'm pleased with where I am. The caller said, well, the dean at the college of education at University of Florida, Kimball Wiles, recommended you. As you know, he's an alumnus here. I said, that's right. I said, look, I'll come up and be interviewed. I can't close doors like that, I mean geez, but I had no intention of accepting. I went to Columbus to be interviewed and the dean said, I know you're an associate professor, but we can't offer you an associate because we have people here that have been in school longer than you who are still assistants here. So we can only offer you an assistant professor. Well what is the salary, I said? \$10,500. I said, but look, I'm making \$13,200. He said, well, I can't, sorry. If you change your mind, give me a call. So I went back to Denton, Texas, stewed for three days. I told my then wife, we are making a decision to stay here the rest of our lives. If we don't do this, we're not going to go anywhere. So let me at least open the door and then turn it down in a way I can never regret. So I called the

dean and said, let me make a counter offer, if you could offer me \$11,000 and let me become an associate in a year, then I could see my way through your college. He said, I'll get back to you tomorrow. I know now as an administrator that's the way you talk, you never make a decision under the gun, you always buy time. So the next day he called and said, we'll accept it, only you can't get \$11,000, it has to be \$11,100. We have these three hundred dollar increments. \$10,500, \$10,800, \$11,100. So I said, all right. So I went to Ohio State. I was no sooner there than Washington D.C., the American Association of College for Teachers of Education notified my dean to say we want Charles to do workshops across the country for teaching education and non-verbal communication, teaching non-verbal communication, which was my work. So I became almost immediately noticeable. And quite quickly, it didn't take too long. I made associate professor the second year and made full professor in three more years. So I went from assistant to full professor in five years and became nationally recognized. I was the associate editor of a journal there that Ohio State published called *Theory & Practice*, which won many awards. I later became the editor in another two years. So I was a faculty member and I taught a class, and I created the class, called *The Theories and Practices of Non-Verbal Communication*. It became so popular, Jim, that I had 135 graduate students every quarter for twenty years. I taught over 8,000 students in that one class. I pulled students from everywhere, the College of Medicine, from law and arts and sciences, everywhere. I enjoyed teaching it, it was great curriculum. And I wrote a lot of papers and articles on this topic. But basically it's how we're understood and how we influence other people without words that we don't always get, and how we in turn rely on the information we get from people without words, various gestures and things like that. Vocal tone's a big one. So anyway, I wrote a lot, I became noted for this. So I was at Ohio State and became chair of the department eventually called educational leadership. My department's called educational policy and leadership. I became chair. I was chair for six years. Then after twenty-some years I got a letter from the University of North Florida asking me if I'd be interested in the chairmanship of curricular instruction in the college. And I was getting ready to move somewhere else. I'd been there for all those years. I called and said, yes I would be interested. In fact, Ellie Scheirer, who's in the college, is the one who promoted my name. So I came and interviewed and chose to come and was C & I chair for a year and a half.

C: What year did you come here?

G: 1966.

C: No, 1986?

G: I'm sorry, you're right. 1966 is the year I went to Ohio State. The year I came here was 1989. So I was here and then the dean then, Carl Ashbaugh. The gal

who's at the Institute of Education was the associate dean, Cheryl Fountain. Someone asked me if I would be willing to put my name in for a vice presidency, for the associate vice presidency of academic affairs.

C: Who was the vice president then?

G: Kenneth Martin. They said, there's a lot of people on campus who think a lot of you, and we'd like to see you as one of the candidates. I said, all right, and put my name in, but no idea that I'd be selected, but I was. Adam Herbert was the president and Ken Martin was the vice president. So I served as the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs for some two years or so and when Ken Martin left that office, I became Interim Vice President. I served that position a lot. I was interim several times. I was in that office, I believe, for ten years, nine or ten. Then I went back to the department, the administration department of the College of Education, which was my first love, to serve as chair of dissertation committees and to have doctoral students because we had the doctorate program in the college, and they needed the services. And I had more experience than everybody combined there because I had numbers and numbers and numbers of students who'd graduated under my chairmanship at Ohio State and at the University of North Texas.

C: So you went back roughly in 2000?

G: I think actually it was 1999, to be clear about that. So ten years. Then I served the remainder of the time non-administrative. And I had the most number of students who graduated doctorate program. I chaired more dissertations. That wouldn't be true now because I haven't been doing it for a while. But there was a point when I left that I had more students than anyone.

C: Before talking about your role in administration here, would you share with us how you would compare students here with students at Ohio State and faculty/colleagues here with faculty/colleagues at Ohio State?

G: I think the students here, undergraduate students, are every bit on par with the undergraduate students at Ohio State. I saw no difference. And by the way, I had that time as the chair of C & I to see that in the College of Education. Then my acquaintance with students, so I would say you could hardly tell the difference in the undergraduate. Now, in graduate you could tell a difference because our graduate program here wasn't as well developed. We didn't have a graduate school. I don't know if we still have one. But it makes a big difference.

C: In terms of resources?

G: In terms of resources and in terms of who gets in. See, a good example, we'd

have eighty, in the early days we had 80 to 100 master's graduates wanting to go do a doctorate in my department at Ohio State. We would accept eight. We don't have such numbers as that, we can't choose that well. There was a definite difference. Here the graduate students I saw, of course, were in the College of Education. And I know we have great graduate students in other colleges, but I didn't get to know them. So I can't speak to that. In fact, I felt that the undergraduates here were, frankly, in one way, just to say it, superior. Ohio State was very picky about who it took as undergraduates. It turned down some 40 percent of applicants in undergraduate. But I always felt that undergraduates here, because you know their scores on the SAT, they were wonderful. I remember how proud I was to learn that the average SAT score was like almost 1200 one year.

C: Most of your graduate students were working teachers or administrators in various schools?

G: Yes, at here, see. At Ohio State, we had full-time graduate students who didn't have jobs, both at master's level and at doctorate level. That makes a big difference. When your graduate students are serving in all kinds of ways, as research assistants, as teaching assistants, as associates with experience, so you have a peer influence, among themselves and with the faculty related to them. So that was definitely a difference that way. But undergraduates favorably more toward UNF, but graduate more favorably toward both University of North Texas and Ohio State and Kentucky.

C: What about faculty that you worked with in your college?

G: The faculty were workman-like and conscientious and capable. They didn't have the visibility and credibility that you see at a large university, where such persons are highly published and highly noted, highly recognized with national reputations. Of course you have to brag when you talk about yourself, but when I came up, I said earlier I made full professor in three years. I know the reason that happened, the way it happened. My chair wanted to put my name in, I said, this is too early. He said, you'll make it. And the dean said, what universities can we call to ask if they've heard about your work? And this is pretty impressive frankly, I said, you can call Stanford, you can call Harvard, you can call the University of Chicago and the University of Texas and the University of Georgia. You can call all those and you can ask anyone in that field if they heard my name or my work. I go by my work. And he did it and my work and my visibility, credibility, recognition carried the day. He told me later, I just can't believe it. I mean, people knew about your work and read it, and you've got great credits. So that's how that worked. You have great faculty here, but not to the degree. As I had mentioned to you earlier before we started this, you have, like the College of Education at Ohio State, for the years I was there, was always ranked in the top

five by the kinds of polls that do that thing. Ohio State was second, never first, second, third, third, second, second, third. You know who beat them out every time? Either Harvard or Stanford every single time. But we were the highest public College of Education.

C: Let's talk about working in the vice president's office. What were your major responsibilities?

G: The major responsibility was working with the union and making sure that all the grievances were taken care of against the administration. That's not a savory job. That's unsavory. I'd never had experience in that. In one way I was unprepared for the weight of the negativism from the grievance procedures that faculty had against administrators, against chairs, against deans, against colleagues, against privileges they didn't get, they didn't get an award, they didn't get a promotion and that's always viewed as prejudice. Almost always viewed as prejudice. You know, they don't want me to get this, get that and things.

C: Racial or gender?

G: Well, anything you could think of. Of course, race, gender, not understanding my work, not giving enough credit for what I do, the sacrifices I make, and the kind of work I do here at the university, unappreciated, unvalued, promises made and not kept. And you look into the promises, and you find they weren't made. But the faculty member thought they were for whatever reasons you could invent. Human beings can justify lots of things. So that was a difficult and demanding job.

C: This is an interesting direction because I haven't touched on it before. In terms of the grievances, were there a relative handful of faculty or was it very widespread among faculty?

G: It was not widespread; it was small. It was like saying, there were like four to six to seven people who could cause a lot of trouble. There were persons who would have grievance after grievance after grievance. They'd file one, it wouldn't work, they'd file another one. They were always after the administration. They were anti-administrative. It was just the way it was, that's all I can say. It was a grievance reviewed as a procedure and a way of asserting yourself. And it's of hopefully winning. And by the way, some were. No question. But something I did really appreciate, just to say it this way, people in the legal office here are good friends of mine and I have the highest regard for them. When things would become difficult they would just settle, regardless of my recommendation of whether I thought it was deserving or not deserving or its merit or its lack of merit. They'd just say, you know what, we don't want to deal with it so we'll just pay them off. There was one faculty member who got paid \$50,000 just to settle a

grievance. A lot of that went on. That was how it was, is all you could say. It's disappointing because you're an administrative officer fielding all of this, and it's not pleasant. In fact, I look back now and see a lot of stress on me personally. And I always was honest and straightforward. And I look back now, Jim, and think I should have lied sometimes. I should have said to some of these people, we'll take care of it and never taken care of it. I didn't say that, I justified. I said, well, you know, this is the reason, this is what we did, or this is the way this works, or this is the way this happens, or this is the way the policies are, these are the procedures, and I would describe them. It made no difference. So I wish now all the people that came to my office, I'd say, well, let me look into it. There's an administrative procedure for doing this. I never did it. Let me look into this, and I'll get back to you. It's just something I didn't do. I was naive. I was always trying to be up-front and honest and straightforward and tell it as it was, as I knew it was. But that doesn't work.

C: Were there any happier times in the vice president's office?

G: I liked it when I was the Acting Vice President, during that time, before Alan Ling came. I liked that. And then of course, Alan Ling just died and had that accident. Then I became the Acting Vice President again. The times I was the Acting Vice President were the best times. The Associate Vice President, because the union thing, was very difficult and unsavory. Somebody was in your office every week about something. There were a lot of grievances that had been filed. That's the good part of it, you'd explain something and make it clear, and they don't file a grievance. So you kind of forget those, but that happens. But, you see, the amount of grievance, you have to answer it. So you have to have a meeting, and the person gets to say everything they need to say and they have witnesses and people talk and cases are made. Then you have to write all that up. Then you have to send it to Tallahassee. Then if they're not happy, then they take it over there. So I got to know our current vice president, who was an officer over there for that business, what's her name? She's in the office now.

C: Joann Campbell.

G: Joann Campbell. That's how I got to know her because she was dean at that level, at the higher level.

C: What did you enjoy about being Interim Vice President?

G: I think one enjoys the responsibility, the scope of it. You're in touch with the larger university. You have a full responsibility. You see more of everything. You see the promise, you see the development. Like when you're chair of the department, you get to see the whole department. You may not see the college, but you certainly see the department. You don't have that perspective. But

when you become a dean, you get to see the college's perspective. It's the same kind of thing. There are administrative positions that are narrowly defined; that can be not fun. And I would say the job I had was not fun. I was shocked. And the person who was the predecessor to me told me that would be the case. He's the guy in chemistry [Ed Healy]. He said, when I went over and I applied, he said, Charles, you don't want to do this. This is a terrible job. I'm pleased to get out of it. I'm going back to Chemistry. And I heard that he was great. He did a great job in his role all the years he served. And I found that to be true, and he was very capable. In fact, I don't think I was as capable as he was. But who knows such things. But nonetheless, he was right. I didn't see that. If I'd have known I wouldn't have done it. I would have gone back to my chairmanship because it's not satisfying. But as vice president, it's different. You're at another level. The perspective is larger, so your ownership is larger.

C: It has been said that where a university president can deal with the outside community and over all of you and hand the difficult jobs to the academic vice president, in return the academic vice president has to apportion resources to half a dozen deans who may be in conflict with one another. That didn't trouble you?

G: No. My own experience, maybe they'd tell a different story, you know how that goes, my experience, my memory with the deans were all good. I didn't have any complaints. I didn't have a dean come to me ever. And before we brought David [Kline] on, the vice president after me, the deans were wanting me to be it. And I said, I don't think I'm the right person for this. And I told Adam that, you need as dean an Arts and Sciences person. I've always taken that position. That's why I thought with this past vice president we took a risk with that. I think our destiny is in the programs in arts and sciences. It doesn't mean that engineering, computer science, and health aren't important in education; they are. But their central mission has to be those. That's my view, and I'm sticking to it. So Adam was happy. I think Adam agreed with me, and that's when he went to California to find the best person he could. And he found a capable person in Alan Ling. And I was so delighted with him. He said the nicest thing to me in my entire career that's ever been said, and I'll tell it. We were coming back from a meeting in Orlando, where you know the Board of Regents meet, and we would go once a month. That was required. I had picked him up in the morning as I did every time we went wherever we went. That was just a year he was here. And I'd pick him up, and we'd go and come back. And I'm letting him out now, at his home, and he stopped, and he said, Charles, you have no idea what difference you make in all of this. This whole business and trip and experience works because of you. I want you to know how much I value your company and value you being there and all the rest and our conversations and everything, and I don't know how to thank you enough for that. You know we don't usually get these kinds of personal testimonies about our value. We just don't get it. I've

lived a number of years and I haven't had many of those, and that's the best I ever got. I remember, I was humble, I said, well, thank you. He said, I really, really mean that. I don't know if I could take all this if I didn't have you right there with me.

C: Now this is interesting. He's saying he's "taking" all of this – in quotes – and yet when you were in that position, you enjoyed it. What's the difference?

G: I don't know.

C: We're talking about the job.

G: Yes, I know, but you see you've got to go back. Alan Ling was a scientist. He was a scholar to the highest degree. He used to tell me that he loved working from 2:00 a.m. until 5:30 a.m.; [that] was his best time to work. He could write better, he could think clearer and so forth. I'm not sure that he always enjoyed the administrative trivia and the administrative requirements of the happy face, of the putting on, of the grievings, of the leave takings, of all the things that one has to do. It doesn't mean that he was bad at it, he just didn't enjoy it as much. And when we were there, you know me Jim, I'm more outgoing. So I would pave the way. I would introduce him, we would shake hands, we would talk. I would be ebullient. I would talk during meetings, I seemed to be having a good time. He was quiet. He could ask very striking questions. No question. He would do that. But they were more serious. My experience with Alan Ling was he was misunderstood with the faculty. Not by all the faculty, but some of the faculty because of this. He was a no-nonsense kind of guy. I don't mean I'm a nonsense kind of guy, but by comparison I must appear because I was just more outgoing and happy. So I enlivened the spirit, the atmosphere. When we drove from those meetings I was never tired or downbeat or complaining, never. In fact I can't remember my ever doing that. So we'd talk and so forth. I just think he liked my ebullience, that's all I can say. And then when I was in the office, I enjoyed more the social aspects. I would have loved to have been the president, but you know that wasn't going to happen. That's one of the things that I've experienced. I remember when we did the search for the vice president, I remember one of the more recognizable influential figures in this community said, when we look for a vice president, we certainly don't want anyone from education. So I have, over the years, observed that education does not have the standing that you have in history or you have in language or you have in English or you have in a discipline that's more traditionally honored, and for a lot of reasons we could get into.

C: What happened with Ken Martin's vice presidency from your perception?

G: I think I actually know. The members of the faculty had gone to the President,

Adam Herbert, to say they didn't have confidence in Ken, and that Ken was not prepared, he was unprepared, and he was making some poor decisions and that the very mantle of being the vice president didn't come off very well. He didn't carry it well. He didn't behave well. He was putting the faculty off. That's point one. Point two, and this is really important—Adam began to agree that he was losing credibility because of Kenneth. Because Adam had come in here and ushered Kenneth into the office without the support of the faculty, and there's a whole story about that, but that happened that way. Adam was misled. Adam thought because Ken Martin was the chair of the search committee for the presidency that Kenneth was the kind of person with the kind of status that [would make a good vice president]. He misread that. He thought that Kenneth then was on top in the university, which, not to be unkind, he wasn't. Then when they did a search, they chose a search committee for the vice presidency. [they] chose someone else, and Adam, as he would often do, he disallowed the choice and renewed the committee. And the second committee didn't choose Ken either. But Adam said, I want you to submit three names, and I want Martin to be one of them. That's an old trick. So when they did that, Adam just pointed to Ken. Then after, let's see, a year of Ken Martin's stewardship, it wasn't working. The faculty didn't have confidence. And I'll tell you what Adam said to me on my first review as the associate vice president, he said, I want to thank you for saving my presidency. I was not being viewed well, and I've made a mistake. So you restored some credibility to the office. The faculty took me off the hook, and I appreciate that very much and I'll always remember it, he said. The first review he said that. That was very nice. Now, in fact, I was a little stunned by that because it gave me a lot more credibility than I actually realized I had earned. I didn't know all that. I just went into the office and began to do the job and so forth and thought nothing of it. I was kind of unaware. But I've learned it by bits and pieces. Well anyway, that's the story. Ken Martin didn't have the credibility with the faculty. Initially, I think what happened is I had a honeymoon phase where I did. That happens in all administrative roles, you have a honeymoon phase where you come in, and I was from Ohio State and I had been this and that and people had gone over to the library and looked at my work and saw all these articles and all this research and scholarship, and they said, oh, okay. In fact, several faculty told me that, I looked you up. And that was a favorite trick of faculty members to do that. People would say, boy, you're highly published. So they liked that. Now, again, Adam and I agreed that in searching for a permanent vice president, we agreed, I wasn't the choice. I've always said this, we needed someone from arts and sciences. And as I'm trying to get around to saying, I don't know why I keep pushing this, but when this last vice president was appointed, I knew it wouldn't work. It can't work here. It cannot work here.

C: Well he was appointed over the opposition of [the committee].

- G: Yes, the same way Ken was. Same idea. Same procedure. Same procedure, same lessons to learn, very same thing. They are not different, Jim. They are exactly the same. It was absurd, absurd. I mean it was just absurd to appoint him vice president. I can't get personal here. I went to see him, talk to him and to offer my services and to say, you know, he wasn't interested. And then I said, you know you're a graduate of my department at Ohio State. He graduated from my department when I served as chair. I was there twenty-five years. He said, uh-huh. I said, well who did you know there? And he named two people and I said, those are my best friends. And they were, Frank Sedonis and so forth. The last thing I said was, if you'd ever like to talk, we can have lunch. He never called me. He wasn't interested. That's not his style. Too bad.
- C: You served with Adam Herbert, any other presidents?
- G: No.
- C: How would you assess his record here as president?
- G: High. Good. I think he was the right person at the right time. Boy, he had a vision of what the university needs to be. Because his emphasis is where it should be, which is arts and sciences, the quality students. He was behind the idea of quality students, that we have high standards. I thought he put his resources behind the arts and sciences. It doesn't mean he didn't care about the other colleges, I just thought that was his bias. He certainly didn't have a bias toward education, for example. He wasn't against it, it just wasn't a priority. See, Carl Ashbaugh got fired as the dean of the College of Ed[ucation] by Ken Martin. The only grounds I could ever figure for it was personal. Because there were no other features of it. There was nothing. It had happened without my input. It happened without my knowledge. I mean, it just occurred.
- C: Did you have any input into the firing of Afesa Adams?
- G: I was against it. I was against the firing. I know a lot of faculty were for it, but I was not one of those. No. In fact, I even said, this is a mistake. I know that she's strident and she's aggressive and she promotes her own ideas, and her style isn't friendly sometimes. But, absolutely not. But Adam stepped right in and talked with her and made it work. See, in those early years, Adam wanted to succeed and to work. I mean, he personally wanted and professionally wanted to succeed, but he wanted the university to succeed, and he wasn't going to get caught in something like a racial or gender issue. And of course, as you know, he treated Afesa superbly well in the ensuing years after her losing her deanship.
- C: I didn't know that.

- G: Absolutely. He funded her. She had a year off, and then she had time off over and over again and she had appointments that paid her handsomely.
- C: Was Ken Martin responsible for hiring Donna Evans? She succeeded Ashbaugh, didn't she?
- G: Yes. No, Ken Martin was not responsible for that. In fact, Ken Martin had long gone. I was in the office. The truth is, we didn't know enough about Donna Evans. She had that long string of what appeared to be successes. She had been at Maine. She had been the dean of the College of Education at, it's a university in Detroit.
- C: Wayne State?
- G: That's it. She had been the dean at Wayne State University. She came in here and she just won the day, that's all. To prove that she can do this. She became the dean of the College of Education at Ohio State University.
- C: After she left here?
- G: No. She went to Virginia and became dean there at Virginia Commonwealth, and she was there three years. Then Ohio State hired her as a dean.
- C: Did she leave here voluntarily?
- G: No. She was invited to be placed on the faculty as a professor, Adam told her that. The faculty over there rose in arms and the people who have whatever influence, they went to Adam and made their case. I was not involved in any of that. It's like Ken Martin's being removed. It's like Carl Ashbaugh's being removed. I wasn't involved in any of that. With Afesa, I wasn't involved. Although I spoke just informally with Adam about it and he looked at me like, you don't know what I know. When Evans came, I thought it was a good thing to have a minority being a dean, I have to admit. But I didn't have all the information. But it was clear after about four months that she was not appropriate for the position. To me, it was clear. The way she treated people, the way she related, the way she related to faculty, the way she didn't relate, the way she hid behind certain things and wasn't forthcoming. All of these are traits of administrators that, in my eyes, are not going to work out. Then at Ohio State, I got called by faculty of Ohio State wanting to know about her. But I didn't have anything to do with it. In fact, I refused. When they hired her, they didn't [consult me]. Then they wanted to get rid of her and they wanted me to come up with information about her. I said, that's unprofessional; I will not do that. I will not do that. Some of my colleagues e-mailed me, Charles can you give us [information]. I said, no. If I could, I wouldn't because I don't think that's a professional thing to

do.

C: So Ohio State made the same mistake we did.

G: Yes. Exactly. She was gone. She's just been gone. She had five years. She had a five-year contract that ended, but the faculty wanted her out.

C: Did Kathe Kasten replace Donna, or was there someone in between them?

G: Kathe Kasten.

C: Her track record appears to have been quite good?

G: Yes. We all have our own individual styles and so forth, but the record is a good one for her. Yes, I agree with that. She did well. The college really progressed under her administration. They brought in some money, and they brought in some supporters, community supporters. They did a lot of good things. This is the thing about faculty, you have personal styles and you have different ways of doing things. Even today, she would have her advocates and her detractors. As I would. You could go around asking people about me. You'd have people, oh, Charles was great, and then you'd have, oh, I don't know about him. So that's the just the way that goes. That's the way it goes when you're in those positions.

C: Tell me about the doctoral program in education because you've been intimately involved. Did you help set it up too?

G: Yes, I did, when I first came.

C: What was the initiative impetus behind that?

G: The college wanted to have a doctoral program, and the university saw a chance to have its first doctoral program, and it supported it because the college was so interested. What we wanted to do, the initial argument was that we wanted to prepare leaders for the public school systems in Florida and that we wanted to prepare administrators who would be superintendents and who would be principals and would have a doctorate and would have good preparations. So it's educational leadership. And we wanted a graduate program, a higher graduate program. We had lots of masters students, but it seemed logical that we do this. So the pitch was made and it was approved. We did a self-study program for two years, which was, what we needed and what we needed to do. I was a part of that for a year and a half. It set up policies and procedures to accept students, to have course work, to have a program. But the idea was, behind it all, was practical. To prepare leaders for educational systems. We weren't on the course for preparing professors, as we were at Ohio State. We're not preparing doctoral

graduates to be college teachers or university people or big researchers. It was a practical, practitioner driven kind of thing. See, at Ohio State, we were always promoting our own kind. So we had Ph.D. graduates, but they're going to be like us. It's like in history. You have a scholarship, and you do this and you have a scholar and so forth. That's it. You're producing your own. But that wasn't the case. So anyway, it was very successful. The first cohort, we call them cohorts, we accept twenty-five students. We soon found that twenty was all we could really manage. So every year we accept twenty students, twenty-two, twenty-four depending on the qualifications of the applicants. But the faculty didn't have a lot of experience in knowing what it needed to know in doing dissertation work. A dissertation is somewhat like master's thesis work, but it goes a little bit further. And I had had a lot of experience. A lot. I had forty-five doctoral students graduate every year. I mean, I haven't counted the number, but I think I had eighty or something every year. Here I think I've had twelve, fourteen, something like that. That's it.

[End of Tape A, Side 1]

C: Do you have a sense that your doctoral graduates have made a difference in public education locally?

G: Well, what I've noticed is the ones who get their doctorates, and there are a number of those now, they rise to high places. So those are persons in leadership positions. They're associate superintendents, assistant superintendents, they're in priority principalships that are important to the system. The others have gone on to be superintendents. Quite a number of them, more than I ever imagined, have gone on to be university professors in Georgia and elsewhere and highly thought of. In fact, I had someone, a colleague of mine from Connecticut call me, we have one of your doctoral graduates, and boy, is she terrific. We wanted you to know that Charles. He happened to know me. I said, really? Yes, absolutely. So I would have to say, it's been successful. I'm not sure that the faculty has been as strong as it needs to be to manage graduation rates. They ought to be higher than they are. The philosophy is, in fact, I've even said that to Ph.D. candidates, we'll never work to see you fail. Our job is to make it possible for you to succeed. Our job is to make it work. That doesn't mean we're going to lower our standards. It just means that if you don't do it, then you don't do it. We're not going to fail you. You see you have these natural accomplishments you have to do. You have to pass the exam, the qualifying exam. It qualifies you to do a dissertation. That's why it's called qualifying. You're now qualified to be a candidate to be at the doctorate. That's what it means. And the dissertation is the most difficult, there's no question. And students, and even at Ohio State it was true, if you don't get your degree, your stopping place is the dissertation.

C: That's true probably everywhere, in other disciplines too.

G: Yes.

C: Reflecting upon UNF in the years that you've been here, it has moved from its initial upper level, totally commuter early years into something moving towards where we are now. When you came here, how would you assess the maturity of this institution. This is 1989?

G: From 1989 when I came to the current day, I think we've come a long way. And I think we've done very, very well. I see that the institution is maturing wonderfully. And I see it, and I said this early on, I said this when I was in the office, in 2025 or 2030, we'll have 35,000 students here, 40,000. This university will be the hallmark of the place in the northeast region of the state of Florida, no question. It will rise to be, it already is outstanding, but with its size and with its captured resources, with its place in the scheme of things, with its background and its achievements and successes, which it's clearly had, academically. One of the greatest things you can say about UNF in the academic sense, beyond it's own graduates, which it's had number and numbers of distinguished graduates, is the fact that students come here for two years or three years to go on to other universities for degrees that UNF doesn't offer. But because of its splendid undergraduate freshman, sophomore, junior years of preparation in academics and it's recognized. So I've observed that our students who didn't graduate from here but who went on, went on to very highly regarded universities. They were well prepared and highly regarded. I remember a year in which, in the 1990s, when UNF had students with higher scores on SAT and the other scores than any university, even the University of Florida, and that we were highly regarded for our undergraduate successes and academic achievements. And I think that needs to be even more understood than it is.

C: It's easy for us on the inside to say we're doing an outstanding job. It's got to come from the outside. Who on the outside is telling you this?

G: I think that deans and persons -- see what happens when you in the vice presidency's office and you're going to the Board of Regents and you're coming in contact with other vice presidents, you hear from them. Then when you get to know deans at other places then you hear stories about all these successes and where our students go and how successful they are. I was always proud of that. I glow about that. Even today I promote that. If anybody asked me, and I'm asked, not once a week but it seems like it, what do you think of UNF? because I belong to a country club, I'm seen lots of places and so forth, and I say, it's great, great. Would you send [my child there]? Yes, absolutely, especially the undergraduates. You might, after you get your undergraduate degree, you may want to go to Harvard, you may want to go to Columbia, you may want to go to

MIT, you may want to go to Stanford, you may want to go wherever. I don't mean the graduate programs aren't, but undergraduates, absolutely. They'll be very well prepared. I have noticed in my own contacts with the community, I've never heard any knocks. I don't hear the negatives. I don't hear that. I hear the acceptance of high quality and of success. That's all I can say, Jim. That's just my experience here. And at Ohio State, see, what you had, not all the undergraduate programs enjoyed this kind of talk. Some of them weren't highly regarded, others were. So they varied. I don't think we get that so much here. I think we'd have to say that our College of Health is highly successful. There's nursing programs and other programs. Obviously the College of Arts and Sciences with its many academic programs are well-known. Then our engineering and computer sciences, I mean, come on. We don't have anything to be ashamed of here. Absolutely nothing.

C: Let's talk about the College of Education. You mentioned the doctoral program. We talked this morning about the urban immersion program that's Dean Kasten and started, and every student having to spend some time in an inner city school. What makes the College of Education stand out in your experience?

G: Well, I've often personally thought that I'm not sure that we did such a significantly different job in undergraduate. I was always a little disappointed that I didn't see the evidence of the distinction of an undergraduate degree in the College of Education as compared to anywhere else.

C: But the students are good?

G: The students are good. You begin with that, but I don't think our program was that fabulous. I didn't see that. I just didn't see evidence of that. I think that even our master's program, I did not see that. Our master's program, I personally think was weak compared to other academic programs on this campus. I'll say it again. Our master's program in the College of Education is the weak sister. Well, how can you say that Charles? Well, how many of our students leave and go get doctorates and Ph.D.s? How many of them become, a few do, naturally, because you have good people, but I mean, the degree, I mean a degree, of course, if you hold it makes a difference, but I mean to say what do we do? No. I don't think so. I just really don't think so. Even Ohio State took its undergraduate program in the College of Ed[ucation] very seriously. For example, if you're going to be a student in the College of Ed[ucation] at Ohio State, you had to make a commitment as a freshman. You couldn't make a commitment as a junior. Then they had what they called freshman early experience, where you were placed in schools as a freshman to determine if you really could frankly stand the idea of being a teacher in a classroom. You could be turned on by the requirement. That's just one example, and there are others. And many of my tapes were used in those

programs, my videotapes. The state used my videotapes in the teacher education programs. When I came here, nobody was interested. The state of Ohio, the state department, used my videotapes for undergraduate education programs in universities in the state of Ohio. I mentioned it to a couple [of people in Florida]. They didn't care. They had their own courses, their own things. I don't mean this personally. I don't mean I was jilted. I just mean the fact that, in some ways, I wasn't there long enough. I was just in the College of Ed[ucation] for a year and half. I'm only vice president. But that didn't distinguish itself very well.

C: In the ten or twelve years, there hasn't been that much change?

G: No. Absolutely not. Not that I see or observe or note.

C: You used the term a minute ago about the university maturing. What do you mean by that?

G: By the university maturing, I mean that the university begins to have confidence in itself where the faculty begins to see itself as the university, not just visiting or in or out or so forth. I think that what I've seen is that this university is maturing. How old is it now Jim? Thirty years old?

C: Thirty-plus.

G: Well, we're coming around the bend.

C: Give me some evidence, examples of that.

G: Well we've brought on some good faculty, some new faculty. I like the look of the new faculty. I like what I see. I like the kind of people we've chosen. Now we've lost a lot of good people. I don't like that. I happen to know we lost a person in sociology, and I really thought a lot of her. And there are other departments where we've lost really outstanding people who've gone on to larger universities. We don't want to do that. I think part of that is salary. And part of it, this is almost too harsh, but is a lack of leadership. We need to build faculty. You need chairs, and you need departments where you have coherence, you have identity, where we're working together. I think some of the older, older departments that began here have that. But some of the newer ones don't have that. They're struggling. I see struggling, for example, in sociology. That would be an example. But I see their peers here and there. See, I've always said, and I say it this way and it's not understood, what I'm going to say is so obvious, but it's not understood. Somebody says, well, what makes a great university? What makes it? First is the quality of the students. You absolutely have to have, which UNF did and does and does, you have to have the best students you can possibly manage to

have. Okay, well, how do you get those students? How do you get them? Through programs, great programs. Students come because the program they have heard about it, they know about it, whether it's in history or language, whatever it is. They know. They've heard. How do you get great programs? Great faculty. That's it. You bring in quality faculty who are not only great teachers, which we emphasize here, I understand that, but who are great scholars, who are academicians at the highest level. [They] are the ones who produce and write and who are in the front of their fields. One of the things I didn't like here that I saw as a vice president was too many faculty who were teaching like they had taught twenty years ago, who hadn't changed and hadn't worked and didn't understand that to be a scholar and to be a faculty, you generate knowledge, you generate information, you generate your field. This was a weakness here. Now, we have stand outs. I can name them, and you know who they are, who've done this, but we need more of those. So you need great faculty. Well, how do you have great faculty? Great leadership at the highest level at the university, where, frankly, just to make it clear because it's not understood very well, if you have the president who's a graduate of Yale University, of Harvard, a graduate of Stanford, a graduate of the University of Texas, a graduate of Ohio State University, a great university, who themselves as an individual has standing, who's known. You say his name or her name, ahhh. Now that kind of person brings in great faculty. You don't have great faculty by putting in politicians. Okay? Now you do have money-making capabilities when you put in politicians. So there comes a time in a generation at the university where you might be able to afford those few years. But the endurance and the greater growing history of the university is not made that way. Or if it is, then you make damn sure that your Vice President of Academic Affairs is the best-looking scholar you could possibly manage to get, which is, okay, enough said.

- C: Now, unfortunately the politician president may not be able to recognize that outstanding [need].
- G: Right, that mistake was made. Now Jim, what I've just talked about is absolutely on target. I know it is. My experience, everything I know. That's why I was never interested, I never had the ambition of being the Vice President of Academic Affairs here. Oh, I was happy to serve as the interim, temporary, sure, because we're looking. But I never had that ambition because I didn't think it was appropriate. Why? Not because my academic record couldn't hold up. It's just because I didn't have the visibility, credibility for the faculty itself. It wouldn't have worked. It wouldn't work, and I knew that. In fact, it's one of the reasons I didn't seek a presidency. You're too vulnerable coming from the College of Ed[ucation] to be the president of a university. It can't be. I mean, they even approached me about it. You can't opt for something that violates your best sense of what you know. You can't do that. I don't mean to talk about me

personally. I'm using myself as an example to make my point.

C: In your years here, what are the most important changes that you've seen?

G: The growth of programs. The growth of faculty. The growth of the student body.

C: Any particular events or changes? What you're describing is incremental and obviously necessary.

G: Well I'd like to think that the doctoral program in the College of Ed[ucation] would have paved the way to have Ph.D. programs in arts and science, frankly. I'm surprised that we haven't had somebody step forward. Now that takes resources. Because if you do that, then you need more faculty members. You need faculty members who've had these experiences and could provide the leadership and all. So maybe we couldn't afford it. But I hate to think that. We're getting to a point where we should be able to afford some things. That's why we have the president we have. So that should be going on. All through the early 1990s and mid 1990s, what I saw was growth and the accretion of resources and the development and the credibilities, and all that happened. But now I think we're in a new phase, and I don't see us doing enough. About what? Well, like engineering. We've added a new program, so we're larger. That's a good step. But computer science, the College of Arts and Sciences has eleven departments, does it have eleven?

C: Thirteen now.

G: Thirteen, thank you. It's too many. There's too much governance from the chairs of too much going on. There need to be some recombinations. Resources need to be viewed differently. I don't know what all those marriages are, but they need to happen. We get too administrative driven. I don't trust that. Just like I told you the story earlier, that's how I became the chair of a department. A new dean came to the college and said, you have too many departments. I want you to only, in the College of Education, and we were big at that time, only have four. So all these programs that were separate departments combined. So I could go into that. But curricular structure with the administration that went with media went with this and went with that. . .

C: Looking at the non-academics for a moment—the library, the bookstore, extracurricular things. How do you see these developing at the university?

G: I have my own thoughts. I can't quote anybody yet. I saw when the soccer field got built that that was a precursor for us to having a football team. As much as I hate to admit this, UNF having a, although it will be very expensive, but our going to division one is a precursor to this, it's going to happen. And you get support.

You get outside support. You get monies. You get this, you get that. I think it's a resource. I think that in the early years when Adam was here, we captured a lot of money from the Board of Regents. I think those days are over. I think it's outside now. And I think that as funny as your question is for me to answer it by saying, have a football team, I'm only saying that because I know what that could do. It happened at Ohio State. It happens at all these universities. We can act like it doesn't, but it does.

C: And certainly FAU, Florida Atlantic [University].

G: And where we've failed: our basketball program hasn't enjoyed the kind of respect and the prestige it deserves to be division one now. It's just ridiculous. America's America. If that seems superficial and trite and small minded to say those things, it's true. In the early days, Harvard had a football team. They rode that for many years, and now it's not that important. So Stanford the same way. All these great universities. The University of Chicago, which had the greatest football teams in the 1920s and 1930s, and they gave it up in the 1940s. They gave it up. Alonzo Stagy. So I'm just saying. But these are steps you go through, is what I'm trying to say, in the growth of a university.

C: Do you think this is a necessary addition for UNF to become a major university?

G: Yes, independent of the fact that Tallahassee will support it. See, I'm trying to say here, I'm being a realist, Tallahassee is not the face of the University of Florida, Florida State, and on and on with your South Florida, and you said Atlantic and so forth. Tallahassee's not going to be any kinder to UNF. It's not going to be kind enough to provide the finances and resources to grow in the way we deserve to grow. I've always said this, we're situated in a quadrant. The university. I mean the University of Florida is down there in Gainesville and has Central Florida right below it. And over to the west you've got FSU. We have all this space and place with a growing population. It's just, the sky's the limit. But what, where? Well, that's why I can support the idea of the president we have. Not for long, but for long enough to get the resources to bring in. Sports will bring in things that, frankly, the larger public can identify with. Because not everybody identifies with being an historian.

C: You mentioned earlier, and I want to get to things, mistakes or omissions, you mentioned drama earlier. Would you like to address that?

G: I think we miss a bet by not having a drama program. By not having a major in drama. It's perfect for it. You've got the setup, you've got the resources for it. We've got the theater. I mean why we haven't done it is beyond me. I campaigned for that when I was Vice President. I told Adam once a month – Adam, we need a drama program. We've got many in these other places. So

he always put that down. He acknowledged it was a great idea, but he couldn't afford it. It would be a whole new [endeavor]. I mean, I came from the University of Kentucky where the theater, the community theater, was a big deal there. You would have shows every two months and they'd do it on Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday to a standing room crowd, always. Great theater. In the summer, we did musical shows. And oh, my goodness. I mean, the alumni. The people with money were willing to give to the university if you had that, are unbelievable, who are willing to support theater, it's ridiculous. For us to not see that or do it. I mean, the way I argued for sports, I can now argue for drama the same way.

C: Any other areas that you would argue for that we don't have here as a maturing university?

G: No. We have the beginning of good things, like the College of Medicine. I would step up on the College of Health, which is nursing and all that. I would step it on up. I would have a program somewhere in medicine and begin to move toward creating doctors. I know that's pretty ambitious, but that's next step. Whether that would be in dentistry or whatever. I spoke to the College of Dentistry students every quarter for twenty-five years. So you can have that in dentistry. I don't know all the fields of medicine would be appropriate, but they ought to be thought about. There ought to be dreams being dreamed. There ought to be promotions being promoted. And we may not be able to do it next week, but they ought to be on the drafting board. They ought to be somewhere. So that's one thing. I'm trying to think. Why in the world don't we have architecture? See why am I saying all of this? Because we're rounding the curve now. We're coming around the corner where we ought to be thinking these thoughts. Absolutely. That would be another example. The only thing you have to do is look at a large university and look at what they have. And every university is a little bit different, it has its own, but they are alike in some ways. We ought to look at those ways where they're alike, and that's where we ought to be growing. And I need to study that more than I do, just off the cuff. Those are examples.

C: What about interdisciplinary studies? Environmental studies, or urban studies?

G: Actually, I don't want to get into those too quickly until we get settled on the discipline getting really strong. If you get interdisciplinary too quick, you literally kill your discipline. Sorry, that's overstated, but that's what I think. I see those work when you have strong bases. They don't work when you have weak bases. It becomes a way of copping out. I want on your faculty, I want academicians. I want scholars. I want strong, strong departments. Then you can have interdisciplinary. But if you're premature and try to have interdisciplinary before you have that, no. That's my view and I'm sticking to it. But you see Ohio State again used that confidence it had. Never doubting the faculty, never. Not

doubting its students. Having the superstructure to take care of a graduate school. We need a graduate school. We can't afford one. We have a graduate dean and all the support that goes with that. But to have great graduate programs, you need a graduate school with standards and expectations. You couldn't any more get these dissertations run through Ohio State that you run through here than a man in the moon. Because you've got someone in the office looking at everything. You have one guy doing that. Tom [Serwatka]. That's supercilious. You can't do that.

C: In your years here, who are the most other outstanding people that you would identify?

G: In your department, you have two or three. You mentioned his name earlier.

C: Courtwright, Schafer.

G: That's right. Exactly. And yourself. I mean, there you go.

C: Who would be the most outstanding people in your college? You don't have to answer that if you don't want to.

G: I saw too many people in my college who were self serving, who were looking after their own, who made little to no contributions to the larger university, who taught their courses and went home and wrote their books and did what they did, who didn't see themselves as larger servants of the university. I could name names, but I shouldn't.

C: So in addition to teaching and scholarship, you've added another dimension to what a faculty person should be: a citizen of the university.

G: The things that I said earlier I was at Ohio State. I talked in the College of Dentistry. Talking to other programs, appearing, being a guest lecturer. My credibility is what it was. See I was, this is bragging, but the highest distinction I got at Ohio State University happened the year before I left. I was invited to be one of thirty scholars the university recognized as a group that met monthly for dinner. To be invited into that group, to be accepted, I can't tell you how prestigious it was. When you consider across the whole university you're going to have thirty people and that's all, by the way, the only way you could get in was for someone to die. And someone had. And I was invited. It was an accolade that I didn't even deserve. Why or how I got in beyond my work or whatever. I think some people knew me and knew I had served the university in a larger way, and they knew I had been a part of some programs and things, I guess. I don't know, Jim. Even to this day, I don't know, how I got that. I mean, you've had accolades. And sort of think, how did I deserve that? But that was the case. See, this is another thing-- they had a faculty club. We've tried to do that here,

on a smaller scale . But the faculty club, we went to the faculty club for lunch, at Central Florida, you had all these tables with linen cloth. You could go with a group of people and go, or you could go to what we called the bachelor's table. Often times, I would go by myself. I'm a loner anyway. I would go to the bachelor's table, and I would sit next to Woodrow "Woodie" Hayes, or the dean, or a person in another field and sit and talk over lunch. You'd have maybe eight to ten people there. It was fun. Or I'd go to Connie's. We'd go sit and talk, or we'd have a glass of wine. I didn't do that, but you could. And you were grown-up people.

C: What you're saying, and I'm glad you're saying this, a university culture. A faculty culture. Does it exist here?

G: No. It does in little enclaves, in little places. You see friendships, and you see people get together and do those things. But the larger university that I just spoke of and recognized, no, you don't have that. You don't have it enough. You have it with so few people.

C: Interesting, in the very beginning years here, in the early 1970s when it was so small, it was almost family-like. There was a faculty culture. It evaporated over the years as we grew larger.

G: But just think how big Ohio State is. With over 50,000 students and then all those faculty. You get to meet people, and they know you and so forth. This is a personal story, but it's a story. My wife came from Kansas State University. She came to Ohio State because she heard that the dietetics program—she was a dietician—was one of the best programs in the United States. So she's now meeting with her adviser in September of that year and her adviser said, we have your program and everything and your courses and get your doctorate. But we have to say to you that there's a course we'd like you to take. We advise all students to take it. It's a course on non-verbal communication in the College of Education taught by Dr. Galloway. Just go into that course and learn what he talks about and what he covers. It's been so popular with students. So she tried to enroll. She couldn't get in because it was closed. It was always closed. It was closed every quarter, Jim, for over twenty years. She called me. I said, I'm sorry, I can't admit you because there's a fire code. You can't have students sitting on the floor. So we have to have seats and so forth. I said, there's a certain amount we can hold. In fact, let me suggest you enroll early. So she did. She was in my class during January of the year she came. But the point is, and I'm trying to make a point about university recognition, acknowledgment, it occurred. That was in dietetics, not in dentistry. So that's the kind of thing you want. You want someone to recommend your course or you're teaching a graduate course in history or whatever. People know enough about that. We haven't really been up on this. We don't have the setup for it.

C: Colleges are in their own silos?

G: Yes, thank you. Correct. Good observation.

C: The faculty committee overseeing this insisted on one question that they wanted asked: who are the most unforgettable characters you've met at UNF?

G: Well, in the positive sense the most unforgettable is Adam Herbert. A real character.

C: How would you describe him so that I can write on a piece of paper for someone who's never met Adam Herbert?

G: He has high ideals. He had ambitions of the highest level for the university and for himself within the university. He had a clear vision, a clear idea that excellent academic programs and academic excellence is what serves the freshmen and sophomores who came here. It was very important. He would talk about that more than anything. I think he did that. As I mentioned earlier, he wanted the highest marks of the students, the quality of students that we accepted.

C: What kind of presence did he have in the room?

G: Total. If he walked into a room, everybody turned that way. When he spoke, everybody listened. There was never any small talk going around the table or anybody whispering anything when he was talking or he was in the committee. He had total 100 percent presence and credibility. He was the kind of person, even if you disagreed with him or you wanted to make a point, he was so personally powerful that you didn't bring it up. There were many times that I didn't always agree with him, but I also didn't have the nerve to bring it up. I'd speak to him privately about it but never publicly. He never told me to do it that way, but that's just the kind of respect you had for him. I think the three main people we named in history you'd have to say were characters in your history department. Courtwright, yourself, Schafer. You're all characters, all three of you.

C: What does that mean?

G: Well, you have your own work. You have your own presence. You have your own agenda. You have your own sense of your own success. It's clear. I think as much as anywhere, that was clear. You may not even be able to write about this because it's so close to you, but I'm trying to think, in computer science? For example, we talked about it, Ken Martin was never the kind of character that was memorable, never. I'm trying to think of fields. The dean of the College of Health is a memorable character.

C: Joan [Farrell].

G: Yes, she was. She definitely was. In fact, Carl Ashbaugh, who I mentioned earlier, he wasn't a character. There's nothing memorable about Carl Ashbaugh, nothing. But even the subsequent deans that would not be true of. But it would be true of the College of Health. I think the current College of Engineering dean has kind of a character about him. Let's go back. A thing that happens in university life is that when you talk about characters, there are people that you like that you're attracted to, and there are people who are characters who are not, whom you find offensive. And we had some of those people who I got to meet in the union grievances. [Tom] Mongar and some of those people, who were characters, but who were negative characters. There was a guy who was in the College of Business who ran the union stuff into the ground. He was a character that was forgettable, but he always promoted his own interests. He had a way of doing that.

C: Let's sort of close it with asking the question, is there anything that you wanted to say that I failed to ask?

G: No. I don't have any agenda. That means I have an agenda. I don't. My agenda on this university is growing up is exciting. I think it has a great future. I think the leadership is terribly important. It's out on this president. We'll see. I'm not sure, I'm not unsure. In other words I don't think he's a failure, but I don't see that he's a big success. He's made mistakes academically. I'm sure he's bringing in money, and by God, I hope he is. But we need to move in some directions.

C: Was Anne Hopkins a president for too short a time?

G: She was too self-serving. She was too interested in her own welfare, not her own agenda, her own welfare, her own success, her own survivability, her own immunity from criticism. She became so concerned about having immunity from any criticism or any negativism about her that she literally made herself, without realizing it, incapable of success. Her own fears got in the way. That's how I view her downfall and how I view her lack of achievements.

C: Her health got in the way, of course.

G: Yes. But I don't give that the credibility that others do. I don't mean I don't like her or that I have anything against her. I think she came with great promise and great background. With the background she has, Michigan and at Miami, Ohio, she should have done much better. I would say that about myself. I would say that the grievances came so fast and so furious, and they came in negativity that

I let them bother me too much. In fact, now I wish I'd have said, I can't do this, and step aside. I wish I had told Adam, I'm not going to do this no more. He says, well, then you don't have a job. Well, good, I don't have it. Because on a personal level that got to me. I wasn't the person who should have been doing that because I didn't have a background in it. And I didn't handle it well. I took it too personally. Because I think I should have been successful, and I could see I wasn't. That drove me out of there. In fact, when the time came, that's part of the reason I left academic affairs. I could have stayed on in academic affairs and did what Bill Wilson was doing. I'm the one who got Bill Wilson in there.

C: What did Bill do there?

G: Bill was in programs. He was reviewer of academic programs and their suitability, their durability, their appropriateness in their move and so forth. That's what he did. I'm not sure Bill was the best person for that, but anyway, that happened.

C: Okay. That pretty much covered the questions I have. If you have nothing further you want to add.

G: When we have the big review. Southern Association Conference [SACS], I wrote the centerpiece for that, and it went over very well.

C: The most recent one?

G: Yes. I did that. I feel good about that.

C: I thought Cheryl Fountain ran that one?

G: She did run it, but I mean I wrote up the central essay, coloring everything. She's the one who drafted the end of it. And said, you have more information and so on, I wrote that. The kind of introduction of the university, its past present, the future, so forth, so forth, all that.

C: Did you have anything to do with the Florida Institute of Education?

G: I never did. I was a candidate for that job at Ohio State. The former dean, Ted Sifert, was with the Regents. He recommended me. But I was a candidate. They hired a minority guy who didn't work out and was only around for a year.

C: This was at Ohio State?

G: Yes. In fact, Ted wrote me a letter of apology about that. Still have it. You never know about these things. I was never included. I was never asked to do

anything. You never know quite why or what. I always thought I should have been, but I never was. You know how it is, if something's over here and you think you're qualified, you're destined, you'll surely be noticed, asked, invited—never was. Even to this day.

C: Well, thank you very much.

[End of Interview]

**University of Florida
Samuel Proctor Oral History Program**

University of North Florida Project-12

**Interviewee: Dr. Charles Galloway
Interviewer: James Crooks
Date of Interview: November 4, 2005**