CHAPTER ELEVEN

The Administration Of Ralph G. Harshman
1961-1963
EACH PRESIDENT of the institution now known as Bowling Green State University was confronted, upon assuming office, with a different set of problems. In the case of President Williams, it was the task of building an entirely new institution. With President Prout, it was the strengthening and developing of the programs already started, and the meeting of the many problems arising during the war and post-war periods. To President McDonald fell the tasks of expanding, improving and systematizing the business and educational administration, strengthening the academic program, building a faculty of real university caliber for graduate and undergraduate instruction, raising faculty salaries to a level high enough to make this possible, and gaining national recognition of Bowling Green as a strong and rapidly developing state university.

President Harshmann’s tasks were two-fold. In the first place, he had to carry on and develop the existing programs and operations, and to do this in such a way as to prevent any serious interruptions or delays. This in itself was a tremendous task, but it was not all. As we have seen, for a variety of reasons, both faculty and student morale were at an all-time low at the end of President McDonald’s term in office. The new President, therefore, had the task of building a new spirit of cooperation, and a renewed pride in the University, faith in its future, and confidence in its administration.

Trustees Committees

The members of the Board of Trustees were, by this time, fully aware of the serious problems confronting the University with respect to faculty and student morale. As a result, at their meeting on June 24, 1961, they appointed an Advisory Committee of three men to make a study of student, faculty and administrative relationships. The members of this committee were from outside Bowling Green, and were well known in the field of higher education. On September 23 of the same year, this committee submitted two reports, one for the press, and one confidential and not to be published.
After receiving and studying the reports of the Advisory Committee, the trustees on November 3, 1961, authorized the appointment of three committees, a Faculty Study Committee, a Committee on Student Affairs, and a Committee to Screen Presidential Candidates. The first two committees were to study and make recommendations concerning the improvement of faculty and student government and relationships. The third committee was in recognition of the fact that Dr. Harshmann was approaching retirement age, and all concerned, including Dr. Harshman, felt that the search for his successor should start immediately.

The Faculty Study Committee

At first, this committee was composed of 11 faculty members. Later, due to the resignation of one member from the faculty, this number was reduced to 10. In addition, five subcommittees were created to study different phases of the general problem. Each of these subcommittees consisted of two members of the central committee, plus three or more elected from the faculty at large.

This committee submitted its final report to President Harshman on February 1, 1963. At its meeting held on October 4, 1963, the Board of Trustees, on the recommendation of the new President, Dr. William T. Jerome, III, gave general approval of this report, without binding itself to accept all of its details. Since the work of this committee was carried out during Dr. Harshman's administration, with his support and cooperation, the major features of its report are summarized in this chapter.

Reasons for Faculty Discontent

Years of experience as a college teacher and administrator have led the author to believe that a certain amount of faculty unrest is both normal and beneficial. However, by the end of President McDonald's administration, faculty discontent had gone far beyond this stage, and had reached a point that seriously endangered the immediate future of the University.

This situation was undoubtedly due to a number of causes, but by far the most important was the feeling that the administration of the University was too highly concentrated in the office of the President. This concentration was a natural result of the history of the University. In the beginning, when the institution was very small, the President was largely a one-man administrator. There was no actual delegation of power and authority, although there was a great deal of informal consultation and discussion with both individual faculty members, and with the faculty as a whole. As the institution grew, there was less and less of this informal participation. From time to time, as we have seen, additional administrative officers were appointed, various committees and councils were organized, and machinery was set up which was intended to give the faculty a greater opportunity to participate in the discussion of University policies and administrative functions. Al-
though all of these brought about some decentralization, the government of the University still remained largely in the hands of one man, the President.

During President McDonald's administration, with the addition to the faculty of many members, a large number of whom were from institutions with greater decentralization of power, there was a growing conviction that Bowling Green State University was too large for any one man to administer, and that future development demanded that the abilities of the entire staff be used in policy-forming, in planning, and in administration. Considerable progress, as we have seen, was made in this direction during President McDonald's term in office, including the inauguration of faculty councils and the adoption of a new faculty charter. However, as we have also seen, these had failed to bring about the degree of decentralization that many faculty members regarded as both desirable and necessary for the future development of the University.

Report of Faculty Study Committee

In the introduction to its report, the committee stated nine guiding principles which they had followed in its preparation. Two of these dealt with the decentralization of administrative functions. These were as follows:

That there must be within the university organization clear delegation of authority to area administrators, deans, department chairmen, and others, to exercise powers commensurate with their offices, functions, and duties; this means, in effect, that there must be decentralization of authority in the decision-making process to the level closest to problems as they arise.

That in a mature, well-run university, much of the academic administration, from the department level, to the level of the academic deans, and to the Office of the Provost should be conducted in orderly fashion without much direct involvement of the Office of the President.

A second principle was stated as follows:

That faculty participation in the process of screening and evaluating key administrative personnel is fundamental to good faculty-administration relations in a mature university.

We have already seen that the faculty was asked by the Board of Trustees to participate in the evaluation and selection of a new president at the time President McDonald was chosen for that office. The faculty for a number of years had had some part in the selection of department chairmen, and the committee felt that such procedures should be extended to all key administrative personnel.

Some of the most important recommendations of the committee had to do with the University Senate. In the past, membership in this body depended
upon rank or office, and its functions were largely confined to studying, dis-
cussing, and advising. Throughout most of its history, the President of the
University was the Senate chairman. The committee report contained the fol-
lowing statement:

In this report, a definite stand is taken that a Senate shall be organ-
ized as a body to represent the faculty and to include specified ad-
ministrative officers, for the purpose of policy making in certain limited
areas . . . and for the further purpose of making studies and offer-
ing recommendations to administrative officers and the Board of
Trustees on any matters germane to the academic welfare of the
institution and the faculty.

The committee report listed eight specific areas in which the Senate should
have power to frame policy, and stated that studies and recommendations may
be made on the request of the administration or any full-time faculty member.

It was recommended that membership in the Senate should no longer de-
pend entirely on rank or office, but that the faculty members should be elected
by the faculties of the Graduate School and of each of the undergraduate col-
leges. The majority of the committee believed that this change would result in
greater efficiency and interest by reducing the size of the body, and by con-
fining its membership to faculty members better qualified for and more in-
terested in the overall problems of the University.

For many years, the faculty had felt the need of some recognized and
approved method of communication with the Board of Trustees. On two oc-
casions, in the history of the institution, the Board had asked for faculty coop-
eration. The first of these was when it asked President Prout to appoint a faculty
committee to work with the Board in choosing his successor. The second was the
appointment of the three faculty committees on November 3, 1963, and this
had followed the confidential report of the Advisory Committee.

The faculty seldom took the initiative in communicating with individual
trustees, or with the Board as a whole, and it did so only in emergencies, and
with a feeling that it was highly irregular and might even be dangerous. On a
few occasions, requests for a hearing before the Board were refused. One
of these was when the question of a successor to President Williams was under
consideration. The first time (as far as the author knows) that representatives
of the faculty were invited to meet with the trustees to discuss University prob-
lems was at the end of President McDonald's term in office, after the faculty
had resorted to petitions, and had requested a hearing.

Obviously some better and approved method of communication was need-
ed. To meet this need the committee recommended that:

When deemed advisable, the Senate may . . . address . . . com-
munications to the Board of Trustees, provided that all such com-
munications be transmitted to the Trustees through the Office of the
President. In cases where the President is not in sympathy with the
communication, he shall forward it to the Board with his statement
of disapproval, or he shall return it to the Senate with a written statement of his objections. If a communication is returned to the Senate, the Senate may . . . decide to resubmit the communication to the Trustees . . . Following such action, the President is under obligation to submit the communication . . . to the Trustees for a final determination.

Improvement in Faculty Morale

The two years of President Harshman's administration brought about a great improvement in faculty morale. There were several reasons for this change. One of the most important was the realization, by the faculty, that the Board of Trustees was aware of and alarmed over the existing situation, and was trying to do something to bring about more pleasant and more efficient faculty-administration relations.

Another important factor was their confidence in President Harshman. They felt that through his years of service at Bowling Green State University, both as teacher and administrator, he understood the existing problems, and shared the faculty belief that the future development of the University required some decentralization of administration through the delegation of duties, responsibilities, and authority.

Although the final approval of the committee report by the trustees did not come during his administration, President Harshman started the process of decentralization by delegating more authority to the deans, and by inviting faculty cooperation in the selection of department chairmen and new deans for the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Education.

The Committee on Student Affairs

The second of the three important committees authorized by the trustees at their meeting of November 3, 1961, was the Committee on Student Affairs. This committee was composed of 16 members, six from the administrative staff, four from the teaching faculty, and six from the student body. The six students were all seniors. After a number of meetings of the whole committee, it was divided into six subcommittees, each of which investigated a particular aspect of student affairs. Each subcommittee included at least one student member. After completing their studies and discussions, the subcommittees reported to the committee as a whole. The final report was submitted to the trustees on May 15, 1962, and was approved by them (in general, not in detail) on January 10, 1964.

Reasons for Student Unrest

The Committee on Student Affairs was authorized by the trustees to study the entire field of student and University relationships, to attempt to
determine the causes of student discontent, and to make recommendations for the betterment of student regulations and student-administration relationships. The committee was set up following the disturbances that occurred in the last year of President McDonald's administration, and after the trustees received the report of the Advisory Committee.

In order that the reader may better understand the existing situation and the recommendations of the Committee on Student Affairs, it seems advisable to summarize here some of the major causes for student discontent. This discontent did not begin during President McDonald's term in office. It had been gradually building up for some time, and had its origin in changing conditions and attitudes throughout the country and in northwestern Ohio.

Historically, two widely differing philosophies existed in America concerning the relationship of a college or university to its students. One of these may be summarized in the statement that the university should act in loco parentis. College students, the argument runs, are still immature, and need guidance and control. The other philosophy holds that college students of today are no longer children, and that they should, as part of their education, be permitted freedom to govern their own conduct, make their own decisions, and even make their own mistakes. All of this is a necessary part of the process of growing up.

The first of these two philosophies prevailed from the beginning of the institution. For many years, it was in agreement with the thinking of the parents of its students and with the students themselves, since most of the latter had grown up under rather strict discipline at home. In recent years, both home conditions and the attitudes of parents and the public have been rapidly changing. Young people of today have had more contact with life and are more mature than in the past. They are permitted more freedom at home, and both students and many parents believe that this freedom should be continued (and even increased) in college. The basic cause of students' discontent was their feeling that there should be fewer regulations governing student conduct, that the regulations should be less strict, and that the students themselves should participate both in their formulation and in their enforcement. It should again be noted, in passing, that this demand for greater freedom and participation was not confined to the Bowling Green campus, but was part of a national movement, as witnessed by the many demonstrations and disturbances on college campuses throughout the nation.

Committee On Student Affairs

In general, the report of the Committee on Student Affairs indicates that it felt that the organization and administration of student affairs on the Bowling Green campus were, in general, satisfactory and that no major changes were needed. This attitude may have been partly because the committee was heavily weighted with faculty members and administrative officers. There were 10 of
these as compared to six student members. It is more probable, however, that their judgment was sound, and that student unrest rose largely from three causes: (1) the ever present (and often healthy) tendency of college students to criticize the existing order, (2) the lack of understanding of the part that students were actually taking in the administration of student activities, and, (3) their failure to take full advantage of the machinery provided for student participation.

The whole committee and the various subcommittees did, however, make some minor recommendations with respect to the machinery for student participation. Most of their recommendations had to do with the methods of obtaining more effective use of the existing machinery, and with the development of a better understanding of this machinery and the opportunities it afforded for student participation.

With respect to student government, the committee stated:

The Committee feels that the Grant of Powers for Student Participation in University Government is largely a cogently constructed and clearly stated document. It appears to the committee that if all individuals and groups involved . . . follow in good faith the spirit as well as the letter set forth in it, there is no need for change of the basic document.

The committee has found, likewise, that the Constitution of the Student Council and the Student Council Bills are fundamentally sound; however, a few . . . changes seem desirable.

Only a few of the specific recommendations of the committee need be considered here. At the time of the student disturbances in the spring of 1961, the B-G News was the target of considerable criticism. This was to the effect that it was a laboratory for the Journalism Department, rather than an organ for the expression of student views, and that it was subject to censorship by the faculty advisor and the administration of the University. The committee stated that the advisor had not acted, and did not act, as a censor. The committee felt that the B-G News currently was a free press. However, they suggested several changes to produce a better understanding on the part of both students and faculty. These included the creation of a Publications Committee in order that there would be no implication of Journalism Department control. This committee would assume final responsibility for the B-G News. They recommended that authority over the paper should be vested in the editor-in-chief with the cooperation of the editorial board, and that reviewing authority should be vested in the Publications Committee.

The three-man investigating committee appointed by the Board of Trustees specifically instructed the Student Affairs Committee to study the University Union, since there had been much criticism of its operation. This criticism was largely three-fold: (1) the students did not have enough part in planning its operations and activities, (2) the activities were too cultural and
educational and did not consider the interests of the students, and (3) too many outside organizations were scheduled to use Union facilities. As a result of these criticisms, the committee suggested a number of changes. They recommended that the Union Activities Council (composed of students and faculty members and administrative personnel) should establish standards and policies to guide the Union activities program, and serve as an advisory group to the Director of the Student Union. They also recommended that student activities and other University activities should be given priority in the scheduling of University Union facilities, or that a quota should be established that limits the number of non-University activities held in the University Union.

The committee also emphasized that the enrollment at the University was rapidly outgrowing the facilities of the Union, and stated that expansion of the University Union facilities or substitute facilities for student activities and social life must be given primary consideration.

One of the major criticisms voiced by the students was to the effect that the regulations governing student conduct were too stringent; that the students had no voice in determining the regulations; and that their enforcement was too strict. The report of the sub-committee on discipline contains the following statement:

We, as a committee, feel that student discipline cases by and large have been well handled by the various responsible administrative officers. However, the general attitude toward discipline might well be improved through a clearer statement in printing of disciplinary policy and by the creation of a student-faculty court on discipline or a university committee on student discipline.

The report of the committee emphasized the fact that the students already had a large part in carrying out the disciplinary functions of the University. It mentioned the Student Court, the Interfraternity Council, the Panhellenic Council, the Association of Women Students, and the judicial boards in the men's residences, all of which would exercise judicial functions.

The committee included a paragraph concerning the drinking regulations, which had, for years, been a major source of student discontent. They did not recommend any change in these regulations, but stated:

The policies regarding drinking should be made clear to the entering student . . . from the catalogue or handbook. Policy implementation should parallel the rules as stated.

The subcommittee report ended by pointing out the need for continuing study of the desires and needs of the students regarding discipline. It enumerated three specific problems needing study:

Extension of hours for women with regard to weekends and during exam week; keeping dormitory regulations at a minimum without jeopardizing study and rest hours; and emphasizing need for proper moral decorum on campus.
Improvement in Student Morale

The morale of the student body improved greatly during President Harshman's two years in office. Some changes were made in the regulations governing student conduct, but this was not the main cause of the improvement in the relations between the administration and the student body. The work of the Committee on Student Affairs was a factor, since it showed the student body that the trustees, administration, and faculty were interested in their problems and were making an effort to improve relationships. The presence of student members on this committee also gave the students some degree of the participation in determining policies and regulations which they so strongly desired. All of these helped, but they did not constitute the greatest reason for improved conditions. This was, without question, the confidence the students had in President Harshman. They knew that he had always been interested in the students and their activities, and they felt that he would consider their problems with understanding and sympathy. It was not the changes that were made in the regulations, or even the hope of further changes in the future, that brought about the improvement. It was rather the feeling of the students that the regulations were being enforced more reasonably. Perhaps the University was still acting in loco parentis, but, in the opinion of the students, it was a more understanding, benevolent, and liberal parent.

Campus and Buildings

The growth and improvement in the physical facilities of the University during President McDonald's administration continued without interruption and at an accelerated pace. Three new buildings and an addition to one old one were constructed during President Harshman's administration. These were McDonald Quadrangle, a dormitory for women, completed in 1962; the new Administration Building (1963); a dining hall or Commons (1963); and a large addition to the Fine Arts Building (1962). Two other buildings were under construction, and completed in 1964. These were Harshman Quadrangle, a large dormitory named in honor of President Harshman, and an addition to Kohl Hall. Both were completed in 1964. Plans also were started during these two years for an addition to the central heating plant. This was necessary because of the increase in the number of University buildings, completed, under construction, and planned for the future.

For many years, it had been evident that the old Stadium was not only too small, but its location blocked the development of the academic area of the campus. To meet this situation, the University, in the fall of 1961, purchased 171 acres of land, east of the existing campus, to be used for a new stadium, and for the development of other athletic facilities. An architect was employed to develop preliminary plans for a stadium. Four additional acres (consisting of 17 lots) were purchased during President Harshman's
administration, bringing the total acreage, as of August 31, 1963, to 906, including the airport. Thus, the campus in slightly over a half century grew from a little more than 80 acres to nearly 1,000.

Dr. Harshman Elected President

When President McDonald submitted his resignation to the Board of Trustees he suggested that Ralph G. Harshman be elected acting president. At the same time, he recommended that the office of Provost be revived, and that Paul F. Leedy, Director of the Library, be appointed to the post. He further recommended that Donnal V. Smith, Assistant to the President, be appointed Dean of Students to succeed Dr. Elden T. Smith, who had resigned to go to Ohio Wesleyan University, where he is now President. All these recommendations were followed by the trustees, with the result that the University was able to continue without any interruption in its progress.

Several other changes were made during these years. President Harshman's title was changed from Acting President to President, and made retroactive to September 1, 1961. A. Robert Rogers was appointed Acting Director of the Library to fill the vacancy caused by Dr. Leedy's becoming Provost. William E. Harrington became Acting Dean of the College of Education, and Archie H. Jones was appointed Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

Two other changes were made, both of which will undoubtedly have much to do with the future development of Bowling Green State University. The first of these came in the fall of 1961, when the Board of Trustees was increased from five members (the number from the beginning) to seven. Then, by Act of the General Assembly in 1963, the number was again increased from seven to nine.

The other change was even more important, not only to Bowling Green State University, but to the whole system of higher education in Ohio. This was the creation by the General Assembly of the Board of Regents to coordinate and direct the state system of higher education. The influence of this board has already been great, and it will undoubtedly be even greater in the future.

Perhaps the greatest and most important change in internal administration was the fact that President Harshman delegated more responsibility and authority to other administrative officers and bodies than had ever been done in the previous history of the institution.

The Faculty

During this period, the teaching faculty grew at a slightly slower rate than the enrollment. In 1961-62 it numbered 252, and in 1963-64 it was 292. This was an increase of approximately 16 per cent as compared with over 18 per cent for the total enrollment. The proportion of doctorates represented
on the faculty also decreased somewhat. In 1961-62, 61 per cent had doctorates, while in 1963-64 the corresponding figure was 51 per cent. This decline was due to the fact that most of the new appointments, during these years, were to the rank of instructor, and many of those appointed had completed all requirements for the doctorate except the dissertation, and were working on that.

A number of salary increases, for the academic year 1961-62, were made by President McDonald before his retirement from office. Relatively few additional increases were granted during President Harshman's two years in office, since only limited funds were available for this purpose. However, a number of adjustments were made to correct inconsistencies and injustices, which many members of the faculty believed to be present in the salary structure. Most of these changes were in the three lower ranks. For associate professors, the maximum salary increased by $1,000, and the minimum and the mean by $600 each. For assistant professors, the minimum increased by $500, and the maximum and mean both remained approximately the same. In the case of instructors, the maximum increased by $700, the minimum by $200, and the mean by $500.

The salary figures for 1963-64 are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$9,300</td>
<td>$12,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>10,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>9,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to compare these salaries with those paid in 1914 (the first year of classes) and see the change that occurred in a half century. In 1914 the faculty was not ranked and teachers of college classes received approximately $1,900 for the academic year.

The Academic Program

Few changes occurred in the academic program of the University during the two years of President Harshman's administration. No new colleges, schools, or departments, were created. Only minor changes were made in the course offerings. The only changes in the degrees offered occurred in the Graduate School, which dropped the Master of Science and Master of Science in Education degrees, and added Master of Business Administration and Master of Fine Arts. The Graduate School increased its offerings on the master's level by adding curricula in American studies, business administration and earth science. English remained the only major for the Ph.D. degree, but other fields of specialization were being developed. In general, the emphasis during this period was on the improvement of existing programs (especially in the Graduate School), rather than on expansion.
On-Campus Enrollments

On-campus enrollments were still limited, during these years, by the number of available living accommodations. The completion of Conklin Quadrangle in 1962 made it possible to increase the number of men from 3,239 for the first semester of 1960-61 to 3,813 in 1962-63. During the same period, the number of women enrolled increased from 2,990 to 3,691. The total on-campus enrollment during the first semester was 6,229 in 1960-61 and 7,504 in 1962-63.

The enrollment by colleges in 1960-61 was Education, 3,075; Business Administration, 1,221; Liberal Arts, 1,613; and Graduate School, 328. In 1962-63 the corresponding figures were Education, 3,854; Business Administration, 1,270; Liberal Arts, 1,842; and Graduate School, 524. The College of Education was still the largest, but the Graduate School showed the greatest rate of increase.

Off-Campus and Summer Enrollments

The number of students in the University branches and in extension classes changed little in these two years. During the first semester of 1960-61, 675 students were enrolled in the branches and 171 in extension classes, making a total of 846. During a corresponding time in 1962-63, the number was 779 in the branches and 118 in extension classes, for a total of 897. Neither funds nor faculty was available for a greater expansion at this time.

During this period, the number of students in the summer sessions, workshops, and special programs increased by over 70 per cent from 4,751 in 1961 to 8,401 in 1963. This growth was due to expanded offerings, and was possible because enrollments were not limited by dormitory facilities.

Fees and Expenses

The nonresident fee, which was $150 a semester in 1960-61, was raised to $175 in 1961-62, and remained at that level throughout President Harshman’s administration. No other changes in fees were made during this period. The charges for board and room also remained the same and, as a result, the total necessary expense for a year at Bowling Green did not increase, except for nonresidents of Ohio.

Trustees

The first woman served on the Board of Trustees from 1928 to 1935, and the second from 1936 to 1941. After 1941 no woman was appointed for 20 years, or until 1961. This lack of female representation on the Board caused considerable criticism since, for many years, the majority of the students were women, and even today women constitute approximately half of the student body. This feeling led to the appointment of Anita S. Ward of
Columbus in 1961, and of Virginia S. Stranahan of Perrysburg in 1965.

For many years, the alumni of the University had been asking for representation on the Board of Trustees. Their hopes were finally satisfied when in 1961, Judge John W. Bronson of Gibsonburg, a graduate of the University, was appointed to the Board. Although Judge Bronson served only one year, since his appointment was not confirmed, he made significant contributions. Not the least of his contributions was the fact that he opened the door for other alumni. Sumner Canary, a former student, although not a graduate, was appointed to the Board in 1961; and, in 1963 another graduate, Robert E. Dorfmeyer of Rocky River, was added to the group.

Although there is no legal requirement, a precedent has been established, and it is hoped that the Board will always include both alumni and women.

Electing A New President

The trustees, at their meeting on November 3, 1961, authorized the appointment of a Committee to Screen Presidential Candidates. This committee, when appointed, represented a further improvement in the method employed in choosing a head for the University. The first three presidents, Dr. Williams, Dr. Offenbauer and Dr. Prout, were chosen by the Board of Trustees alone, but in the case of President McDonald, the trustees appointed a committee composed of members of the teaching faculty. The committee to find a successor to President Harshman went even further. It introduced two new elements by including the administration and the alumni of the University.

The committee was composed of three faculty members, President Harshman, a second administrative officer, two alumni, and three members of the Board of Trustees.

The work of this committee, which started at once, was completed on June 25, 1963, when Dr. William Travers Jerome III, Dean of the College of Business Administration, Syracuse University, was tendered the presidency of Bowling Green State University. Dr. Jerome accepted the appointment, and assumed office on September 1, 1963.

At the same meeting, President Harshman was granted the title of President Emeritus, with duties as administrative consultant to the Board of Trustees.

Other Events

During President Prout's administration, Bowling Green State University and its women graduates had been interested in obtaining approval of the American Association of University Women. Apparently, negotiations were nearing a successful conclusion at the time President McDonald assumed the presidency. However, the picture soon changed, and negotiations were dropped,
since President McDonald felt that the AAUW should not act as an accrediting agency.

When President Harshman assumed office, the picture had changed again. The AAUW had ceased its accrediting activities, and had agreed to accept the accreditation of the regional agencies, in this case the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Application was renewed, and Bowling Green State University received approval early in President Jerome's administration. Although the final approval did not come during his term in office. President Harshman made the application and, even after his retirement, continued the negotiations with AAUW until a favorable conclusion was reached.

At their meeting of October 1, 1962, the trustees authorized the establishment of Channel 70, educational television and the inclusion, in the budget for 1962-63, of the cost of a building to house this station. In July, 1963, the President and other administrative officers moved into their new quarters in the recently completed Administration Building. On July 22 of the same year, the trustees met for the first time in the board room of the new building. One action taken was the giving of a new name to the old administration building: University Hall.

Summary of President Harshman's Administration

The contributions of Dr. Harshman as president were much greater than the length of his term in office would indicate. Since he was nearing retirement age, everyone knew that his administration would be short and, under such circumstances, the University might well have fallen into a period of stagnation. This did not occur. President Harshman, because of his long service as teacher, Dean of the College of Business Administration, Dean of Administration and Vice-President, was thoroughly familiar with the operations of the University, and was able to take over and continue without interruption, both the carrying out of existing operations and the planning for the future.

However, his ability to carry on without any break, important as it was, did not constitute his greatest contribution. He assumed office at a time of real crisis, when both faculty and student morale were at an all-time low. Only the confidence of all concerned in his ability, broadmindedness, and sense of justice enabled him to quiet the troubled waters and to turn the thoughts of the University community from the grievances of the past toward the promises of the future. Probably no other man on the staff could have done this so well. Certainly no stranger could have won the confidence of the faculty and students, and have accomplished so much in so short a time. He took over an institution torn by controversy, arguing about the mistakes of the past and doubtful about the future. He left it still aware of problems, but with a general spirit of willingness to cooperate in solving those of both the past and the future, and with faith in this future. Without President Harsh-
man's administration, the new President's task would have been much greater, and his success would have been delayed and possibly endangered.

The University, in the first half-century of its history, faced four serious crises. The first of these was Ohio State University's claim that the new Bowling Green and Kent institutions had no legal right to do anything except offer two-year diploma courses for the training of elementary teachers. The second was the attempt to change the school into a mental hospital. The third was the serious threat of political interference and control which came at the time of the selection of a president to succeed President Williams. The fourth crisis was the unrest of the faculty and students at the end of President McDonald's administration which could have had very serious consequences for the future of the University.

President Harshman's two years in the presidency were a fitting culmination to his long years of loyal and devoted service to the University. The University was indeed fortunate that he was available at this time of crisis.

A Half-Century of Progress

Bowling Green State University has been fortunate in its presidents, as each was fitted for the particular task he had to perform. President Williams laid a solid foundation, and guided the institution from nothing to a university comprising a strong College of Education, a small College of Liberal Arts, a smaller College of Business Administration, and the beginnings of a graduate program. President Offenhauer, in his short administration, started to give the faculty a greater part in determining policies. President Prout guided the University through the difficult war and post-war years and left it with three fully organized undergraduate colleges and a growing Graduate School. President McDonald greatly strengthened the academic program, raised the faculty to high University qualifications and salaries, systematized and strengthened the administration in all areas, and greatly improved the physical facilities. President Harshman continued, without interruption, the progress started under his predecessors and, by greatly improving both student and faculty morale, made it possible for his successor to begin his administration under favorable conditions. Under the guidance of these four men, Bowling Green State University, in the short period of 53 years (49 of classroom instruction), grew from nothing to its present status as a strong state university.

Few institutions in the country (except its sister institution at Kent) have gone through all the stages from normal school to college to university in so short a time. The author considers himself uniquely fortunate in having been closely associated with, and to have participated in this development. The title of this history might well be From Normal School to University, or A Half-Century of Progress.