
Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects

Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects

1991

The public service aspect of William and Mary's mission: 1906-1972

Kathryn Jean S. Patterson
College of William & Mary - School of Education

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Other Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Patterson, Kathryn Jean S., "The public service aspect of William and Mary's mission: 1906-1972" (1991). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539618822.
<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-jpy3-qz98>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9207760

**The public service aspect of William and Mary's mission:
1906-1972**

Patterson, Kathryn Jean S., Ed.D.

The College of William and Mary, 1991

Copyright ©1991 by Patterson, Kathryn Jean S. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**THE PUBLIC SERVICE ASPECT
OF WILLIAM AND MARY'S MISSION:
1906-1972**

**A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the School of Education
The College of William and Mary in Virginia**

**In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education**


**by
Kathryn Jean S. Patterson
July 1991**

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ASPECT
OF WILLIAM AND MARY'S MISSION:
1906-1972

by

Kathryn Patterson

Approved July 1991 by



John R. Thelin, Ph.D.
Chair of Doctoral Committee



James M. Yankovich, Ed.D.



Roger G. Baldwin, Ph.D.

© Copyright by Kathryn Jean S. Patterson

For David

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	vii
Abstract.....	ix
CHAPTER 1: THE PROBLEM.....	2
Justification for the Study.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Significance of the Study.....	6
Hypothesis.....	7
Subsidiary Research Questions.....	8
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	10
Public Service as a Traditional Aspect of Mission..	10
Extension and Evening School as an Aspect of Public Service.....	13
Public Service as a Continuing, Viable Element of Mission.....	16
Faculty Support for Public Service.....	18
Institutional Motivation for Public Service.....	20
CHAPTER 3: PROCEDURES.....	23
Definitions and Delimitations.....	23
Research Design and Methodology.....	24
Specific Data Sources.....	25
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS.....	26
Vocationalism in the Lyon G. Tyler Era.....	26
J. A. C. Chandler and the Beginning of Extension...	29
John Stewart Bryan: Shaping the Ivy League Image.....	46
The Pomfret Presidency: Service Mission on a National Level.....	73
A. D. Chandler: The Return to a Broad Service Orientation.....	81
Paschall's Presidency: A Tradition of Responsiveness.....	93
President Graves: Resolving the Issue of Continuing Studies....	122
The Office of Special Programs.....	129
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS.....	135
Summary: Factors Influencing the Public Service Mission.....	135
Rival Conceptions of Learning: A Theoretical Framework Reexamined.....	139
Subsidiary Findings.....	140

Implications.....141
Recommendations for Further Study.....145
REFERENCES.....146
DOCUMENTS.....152
INTERVIEWS.....156

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the willing cooperation of those who participated in interviews. I would especially like to thank two former William and Mary presidents: Dr. Davis Y. Paschall, who was generous with his insights and encouragement, and Dr. Thomas A. Graves, who offered his candid perspectives. I am also grateful to Dr. George Healy, former Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. Richard Brooks, former Dean of the School of Education; Dr. Don Herrmann, former Dean of the School of Continuing Studies; Mr. E. Leon Looney, former Director of the Extension Division; Mr. Carson Barnes, former Director of Conference Services and Special Programs; Dr. Robert Hanny of the School of Education; Dr. John Selby of the Department of History; and former members of the Board of Visitors Mr. William R. Savage, Mr. Ernest W. Goodrich, Mr. Willits H. Bowditch, and Dr. E. E. Brickell. I would also like to thank Professor Ludwell Johnson of the Department of History for the use of his personal collection of documents on Continuing Studies.

My appreciation goes to the staff of the University Archives and the Manuscripts and Rare Books Department of The College of William and Mary, since they were unflinching generous with their time and expertise.

Finally, I am most grateful to my committee members, Dr. John R. Thelin, Dr. James M. Yankovich, and Dr. Roger G. Baldwin, for their guidance during the dissertation process as well as throughout my course of study at the College.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ASPECT OF WILLIAM AND MARY'S MISSION:
1906-1972

ABSTRACT

Teaching, research, and service constitute the three commonly articulated missions of American colleges and universities. The purpose of this study was (1) to examine whether public service is a viable element of the college mission or a marginal activity and (2) to analyze the forces that shape the public service responsibility of a given institution. The specific aspect of public service addressed is the college's role in providing continuing educational opportunities for adults in the surrounding community.

The College of William and Mary in Virginia was selected as a case study because of the wide variations it has undergone in character, purpose, and leadership. It was hypothesized that the interpretation of William and Mary's public service responsibility changed significantly with the shifting emphases in institutional mission. Also investigated was the possibility of a relationship between increased prestige and selectivity and diminished provision for continuing education. The scope of the study was from 1906, when the College became state-supported, to 1972, when credit-bearing extension courses were discontinued.

External forces that were found to shape the service aspect of mission were political, military, economic, and

demographic. Internal forces influencing the public service mission included changes in presidential leadership and disputes over the college's primary identity. The competing images of William and Mary were those of the prestigious liberal arts college renowned for its colonial heritage and the state-supported, service-oriented institution with a legacy of teacher education and broadly-based educational opportunity.

It was concluded that the public service mission is not constant but changes over time as an institution evolves; that public service is not a static list of obligations but a dynamic response to the circumstances that shape the identity of a college; and that the key to the type and extent of public service is the perception of the constituencies to be served. More study is needed on individual faculty initiatives in public service, the role of the student in the service aspect of mission, and the development of partnerships between colleges and corporations in addressing public needs.

KATHRYN JEAN S. PATTERSON

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA

**THE PUBLIC SERVICE ASPECT
OF WILLIAM AND MARY'S MISSION:
1906-1972**

CHAPTER 1: THE PROBLEM

Justification for the Study

Teaching, research, and service constitute the three commonly articulated missions of American higher education. Veysey (1965) notes that of the three specific conceptions of the university that emerged between 1865 and 1890--practical public service, abstract research, and transmission of culture--the goal of practical public service is acclaimed as the one genuinely American contribution to educational theory. Crosson (1983) counters that the idea of direct service to the larger society is not unique in American colleges and universities, but that the extent to which we have realized this ideal in specific programs and activities is unparalleled.

Rudolph (1962) observes that the public service aspect of mission in American colleges and universities was first conceived as a means of justifying societal support of higher education. With state fiscal support of higher education came the assumption of an obligation to serve the state in return (Cubberly, 1967).

Has public service remained a viable element of mission in American institutions of higher education, or

has it become a marginal activity, a distant third after research and teaching? One purpose of the study is to analyze and re-examine the role of public service in American colleges and universities, with an emphasis on extension and continuing education. Within this analytical framework, a case study focuses on the interpretation of the public service mission at The College of William and Mary, a small, highly selective, public liberal arts college with university status.

Statement of the Problem

The Background

When The College of William and Mary became a state institution in 1906, the College "set up new ideals and aims for the future and entered upon a period of direct service to the state" (Heatwole, 1916, p. 99).

Extension courses were first offered at William and Mary in 1919, the first year of J. A. C. Chandler's presidency. Chandler proclaimed that "our business is to educate the people, and if they cannot come to the College we should go to them" (Report of Self-Study, 1964, p. 252). Williamsburg historian and columnist Parke Rouse (1973) notes that in 1919, the College had an on-campus student body of 1,269 and an off-campus student body of 2,489. Such a proportion illustrates the large constituencies of the College beyond the Williamsburg campus, most of whom were being served by the extension divisions in Norfolk and Richmond. An announcement of the

beginning of extension services in Newport News in 1919 characterized this new service as the realization of "the long cherished desire . . . to have the College function in the twentieth century life of the state and nation in the same vital manner in which it played so illustrious part in our earlier history." The pamphlet promises "something of value to every intelligent adult citizen of Newport News" (Announcement, 1919-20).

By 1955 the enrollment for the Evening College division in Norfolk was a "record number of 329 students" (Virginia Pilot, October 3, 1955). A 1959 report on Higher Education in the Tidewater Area of Virginia affirmed that "the practice of offering courses by extension . . . is well established in the Nation and in Virginia and has been found to provide a very useful service," adding that The College of William and Mary renders a great service . . . by providing residence courses in the evening and on Saturday morning on the campus. During 1958-59, 527 persons took a total of 154 graduate and 644 undergraduate courses in the Evening College. Most of these were taught by members of the regular faculty.

(p. 44)

The College of William and Mary's 1964 Report of Self-Study provides a brief overview of the history of the Evening College division established in 1952 "to serve the

needs of residents of Tidewater communities and military personnel stationed in the area and to enable them to obtain residence credits" for academic courses (p. 249):

The Evening College was designed to serve, and does in fact serve to some degree, a variety of legitimate educational needs. Certain of these needs clearly fall within the scope of those which it is the purpose of the College to meet. Others are dubiously relevant to the aims of a residential liberal arts college. (p. 250)

Suggesting that some other arrangement might better meet the continuing education needs of the surrounding community, the report criticizes the standards of the courses, adequacy of instruction, and the overall usefulness of the program.

A 1970 presidential address by Davis Y. Paschall, however, asserts the centrality of continuing education as part of the institutional mission:

the College must be an effective unity and force in improving the society of which it is so vital a part. The latter purpose is specifically implied by the realization that the College is a State institution, and obligated to serve . . . the region as well as the state and nation. (p. 2)

Paschall maintained that the College could continue to

meet the educational needs of the region while maintaining its "distinctive characteristics as a residential institution of excellence."

By 1972 the Extension Division had, in fact, been discontinued, and a different conception of adult continuing education was developed through an expanded Office of Special Programs (Report of Self-Study, 1974). In contrast with the earlier broad interpretation in providing educational opportunities for area residents, the 1974 study noted the "necessarily restricted community-service teaching program" and emphasized instead the intellectual contribution of a variety of research facilities and cultural events (p. 11).

The Question

What forces, personalities, or events were responsible for the changing conceptualization of the public service role of William and Mary?

Significance of the Study

The College of William and Mary is a significant case study because its public service responsibility in the area of continuing education appears to have been reinterpreted as the College increased in admissions selectivity and prestige. The contribution of such a study to the field of higher education is not only to interpret a previously underexamined aspect of institutional history but also to illustrate public service as a highly productive, individualized aspect of

mission that shifts in focus as an institution evolves.

Another factor that makes William and Mary a significant study is that although it is renowned for its colonial heritage, it has also followed pattern of evolution typical of many American colleges since it reopened in 1888 after seven years of being closed: from normal school to teachers' college to state college to university. The College of William and Mary had regained state economic support--and thus ensured its survival--by pledging to train public school teachers. From 1960 to 1962 what are now Virginia Commonwealth University, Old Dominion University, Richard Bland College, and Christopher Newport College "combined briefly but importantly with the parent institution to form the Colleges [emphasis added] of William and Mary, one of the most ambitious ventures in the history of higher education in Virginia" (Graves, 1976). In 1967 The College of William and Mary gained modern university status, but instead of continuing as a large state university system, the College fostered an identity as a small, highly selective liberal arts college. Between the heritage of its colonial past and the prestige of its present selectivity, William and Mary was for a number of years an outward-reaching, service-oriented complex.

Hypothesis

The interpretation of William and Mary's public service responsibility has changed significantly with the

shifting emphases in institutional mission.

Subsidiary Research Questions

Can a parallel be drawn between increased selectivity and prestige and diminishing provision for continuing education, or was it simply a recognition that continuing education needs were being met by other institutions in the area? Can this hypothesized relationship between service and selectivity be demonstrated?

Has the undergraduate curriculum also reflected the changing emphases in institutional mission? That is, when the College offered more widespread extension services, did the undergraduate curriculum include more courses of an applied nature?

Finally, what do the notions of institutional saga and charter reveal about William and Mary's varying response to the public service aspect of its mission? Sociologist Burton Clark (1970) has defined saga as the historically based, somewhat embellished understanding of an organization's development and the collective memory of unique accomplishment. Saga is the mixture of legend and fact, of exaggerated and accurate history, that colleges and universities cultivate over time (Thelin, 1982). The closely related concept of institutional charter has been defined by Kamens (1971) as the distinctive reputation, traditions, and legitimacies associated with a particular campus; charter is the implicit notion that members of an institution have of what is appropriate and

characteristic. In short, saga and charter are historical dimensions of an institutional personality that merit study because they underlie beliefs and influence decisions.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Summary of Previous Research and Theoretical Considerations

Previous research relevant to the study may be organized around several themes: public service as a traditional aspect of mission; extension and evening school as an aspect of public service; public service as a continued, viable element of institutional mission; faculty support for public service; and institutional motivation for public service.

Public Service as a Traditional Aspect of Mission

Teaching, research, and service constitute the three commonly articulated missions of higher education. Clark Kerr (1963) observes that "the eternal themes of teaching, scholarship, and service, in one combination or another continue" (p. 152). Veysey (1970) notes that of the three specific conceptions of the university that emerged between 1865 and 1890--practical public service, abstract research, and transmission of culture--the goal of practical public service is acclaimed as the one genuinely American contribution to educational theory. Crosson (1983) qualifies this somewhat by stating that while the idea of direct service to the larger society is not unique

in American colleges and universities, we have realized this ideal in specific institutional forms, programs, and activities to an extent that is unparalleled elsewhere.

Public service has been affirmed as an integral aspect of institutional mission, but the interpretation of what constitutes public service has varied widely.

Rudolph (1962), for example, states that the concept of public service in American higher education was first used in a general sense to justify societal support of higher education and was closely related to the educational mission. Rudolph presents various interpretations of service to society over the years: educating students to fulfill leadership roles and responsibilities first in the ministry and later in law and medicine; promoting an educated citizenry; and producing the knowledge essential to industrial, technological, and social advances through research.

From the beginning the American college was cloaked with a public purpose, with a responsibility . . . to give more than it received--not more than it received from the society which it served, but more than it necessarily received from the particular young men who were being prepared to do society's work. (p. 178)

This obligation to society is echoed by Malcolm Moos, who observes that Thomas Jefferson included in his 1818 goals

for the University of Virginia the idea that public universities should "contribute to the health, subsistence, and comfort of all the state's people rather than only to the prosperity, morality, religious piety, and intellect of the individual, tuition-paying college-goers" (1982, p. 3).

The Morrill Act of 1862 established the first land-grant colleges, further defining the service function and social responsibility of American higher education (Harrington, 1977). Rudolph observes that the state universities and federally endowed agricultural and mechanical colleges that followed represented higher education of a "more popular nature than the old-time college with its religious orientation and adherence to the classical course of study" (p. 188), and Moos states that "the primary objective was to use public higher education as a preparation for work more than for artful leisure or character formation" (p. 5). Veysey, however, cautions that not everyone welcomed the emphasis on practical professional and vocational training, and that many believed colleges could serve society best by retaining their emphasis on the liberal arts, taught from a moral point of view (p. 238). Within this interpretation of service, Veysey notes that "emphasis was placed upon utility in a sweeping social sense rather than in a precisely vocational one" (p. 72). In The Unsettling of America: Culture and Agriculture, Wendell Berry sharply

criticizes what he terms a lowering of educational standards from Jefferson's ideal of public or community responsibility to the utilitarianism of Morrill and a shift in public value down from usefulness to careerism (1977, p. 147). Nonetheless, Crosson (1983) calls the land-grant college "the most celebrated and successful example of the articulation and fulfillment of the service ideal" (p. 22), and British educator Eric Ashby (1971) hails it as "one of the very few major innovations in higher education since medieval times" (p. 16). Williams (1989) warns against the traditional view of the land-grant movement as the inevitable response of a democratizing society and demonstrates instead that it owed its viability to the sustained political efforts of key individuals.

Extension and Evening School as an Aspect of Public Service

Good and Teller (1973) and Portman (1978) summarize the evolution of university extension and evening school and examine the goals and significance of these developments in American higher education. According to Carey (1961), the concept of "university extension" originated in England with the 1850 Oxford Commission. The idea spread to Cambridge and then to the United States through educational journals. A number of American colleges, including Harvard and Rutgers, adopted the idea of extension, and William Rainey Harper of the University

of Chicago went so far as to incorporate extension as one of the five major divisions of the university, giving it equal status with the "University Proper" (Carey, 1961). According to Rudolph (1962), the extension movement had in part been a public relations gesture and an effort to extend the influence and popularity of the university into the surrounding communities:

This search for greater usefulness took the form of short courses of lectures, somewhat watered down in content and reduced in intellectual sophistication, delivered by leading members of the university faculty. . . . By the first decade of the twentieth century the extension movement had been recognized as an instrument of influence in achieving a greater measure of legislative financial support for the state institutions. (p. 364)

A landmark in extension as a central aspect of the college mission is the "Wisconsin Idea," hailed by Lincoln Steffens as "the true birth of the pure idea of universal university extension." In his 1909 article "Sending a State to College," Steffens observed that the University of Wisconsin served the state as the "instinctive recourse for information, light and guidance" (p. 132). At first very utilitarian and limited to agriculture, the extension division eventually offered courses in the arts and

sciences as well. Veysey (1965) observes that the University of Wisconsin was "pictured as a kind of living reference library for the state as a whole" but cautions that "this particular legend, like most, mingled truth with exaggeration . . . Wisconsin's contributions to extension were major. But university extension had been a widespread fad of the early 1890's, and Van Hise simply rejuvenated it and extended its scope" (p. 108). Nevertheless, Rudolph maintains that no other university came as close as Wisconsin "in epitomizing the spirit of Progressivism and the service ideal" (p. 365).

Another landmark in extension was the 1914 Smith-Lever Act providing land-grant institutions with federal funding for Cooperative Extension Services. Portman explains that agricultural extension had dominated university outreach programs for years, and the Smith-Lever Act freed the university extension movement from this responsibility and allowed general or university extension to develop independently of cooperative extension (1978, p. 94). Derek Bok observes that colleges and universities eventually provided services that extended beyond professional and vocational training to special programs offered during the evening hours for adults to pursue intellectual or career-related interests (1982, p. 62).

Although early in the century the service emphasis was on agriculture and cooperative extension, by the 1960s

the urban crisis demanded attention (Harrington, 1977). Lyndon Johnson called for institutions of higher education to address problems facing the country during his "Great Society" era. When Title One, the Continuing Education and Community Service section of the Higher Education Act of 1965, was passed, educators hoped this statute would do for adult education what the Smith-Lever Act had done for agriculture; federal funding was inadequate, but this legislation is still considered a landmark in postsecondary adult education (Harrington 1977).

Public Service as a Continued, Viable Element of Mission

Levine (1978) notes that institutional commitment to public service continues today in a variety of forms: field study and experimentation; extension and off-campus courses; technical, vocational, and recreational services; close business and government ties; and research of social problems. According to Crosson (1983), colleges and universities also provide public service by making their facilities available for cultural and civic activities; developing special training programs for business, industry, and government; and creating extension programs, technical assistance centers, and special units to address social and policy problems. Moos (1981) also cites the working and research relationships universities have with companies and industries and with government and public administration. According to Roskens (1985), "whatever the form or content . . . the important point is

that public service is a responsibility that permeates every segment of every institution" (p. 85). Ashby, however, claims that although it was inevitable that the American university would have applied its energies to industry and to government, "this involvement--unlike involvement in agriculture--has implicated the universities in activities which do not command unanimous social approval" (p. 16). Bok's viewpoint is that traditionalists, multiversity enthusiasts, and activist reformers have all believed that universities ought to serve society, but they have differed in their estimate of the burdens these institutions could carry and the ways in which they could make their most important contributions (1982, p. 66). Bok points to criticisms that

universities must begin to cut back on social problem-solving and devote more time and effort to teaching and scholarship for their own sake. Otherwise, by taking on more and more "relevant" tasks that other agencies could just as easily discharge, they would soon be unable to maintain high standards of quality in the vital functions that they alone could perform. (1982, p. 66).

This is the nature of the objections offered by Wilson (1972):

I would caution that neither our whole system of higher education nor any of its institutions should engage in the futile endeavor of trying

to be all things to all men . . . we run the risk of damaging the integrity of the academic endeavor and fragmenting its basic purposes.

(p. 207)

Scott (1989) observes an increase emphasis in the university's role today in economic development and international trade and asserts that "we now see the need to consider market as well as mission in setting priorities" but warns against a distortion in the mission-market balance (p. 7). Jones, Oberst, and Lewis (1990) suggest that a possible solution to improve our nation's industry and competitiveness in the world marketplace is an adaptation of the land-grant model so successful in agriculture earlier in this century.

The distinctions between direct service activities, educational programs, and clientele have become blurred according to Crosson (1983), and "the concept of community service becomes intertwined with notions of continuing education, lifelong learning, and community-based education" (p. 29). Bok (1988) characterizes continuing education as a form of community service and "a way of giving instruction at little cost to those who could not afford to come to college or who felt a need to continue studying for cultural or vocational reasons" (p. 119).

Faculty Support for Public Service

Lynton and Elman (1988) characterize the professional assistance of the faculty in community service "as serious

and demanding an activity as teaching and traditional scholarship" (p. 148), and Re (1968) has urged that the "public service mission be accepted on a level of priority with teaching and research and that it be a commitment rather than merely an acknowledgment" (p. 83). Corson (1968) also calls for more favorable recognition of faculty members who participate in service. Johnson (1984) reports that faculty members indicate a willingness to participate in external service programs but are skeptical about the rewards and recognition afforded such participation. Such an attitude suggests that although service is a valid component of institutional mission, it is far from being a central one. Calling adult education a peripheral activity, Portman (1978) states that "service is not just one of the three major functions of the university. . . . It is clearly and accurately described as the third function . . . As a third and often marginal activity, it suffers from confusion of purpose" (p. 170). Although a 1973 Commission on Non-Traditional Study portrays the continuing education of adults as having "an old and distinguished tradition in American universities" (p. 61), Jencks and Riesman state that "teaching adults in evening school has never been as well paid or as respectable as teaching late adolescents" (p. 38). Bok concludes that most members of the university community merely tolerate continuing education courses provided they are taught by someone else and at times and places that do

not interfere with the regular academic schedule (p. 119). Stern (1980) observes that universities "continue to slight" continuing education and regard it as adjunct to their basic purpose (p. 9), and Harrington (1976) and Crosson (1983) also acknowledge criticisms of extension courses as an extraneous activity having low status within the university hierarchy.

Institutional Motivation for Public Service

Institutions of higher education have an obligation to serve society because of the financial support they receive--direct appropriations as well as indirect tax support. Whether service is used in the broad sense of the fulfillment of teaching and research or in a more direct sense of assistance to groups beyond the campus, the concept of service has been used to justify claims for public support throughout the history of American higher education (Crosson, 1983, p. 1). Derek Bok (1982) explains that state universities receive most of their operating revenues from public funds supplied by the taxpayers, and that although private institutions receive less direct government support, they still obtain a large proportion of their income from government grants for student aid and research as well as benefiting from tax exemptions. "Because of this massive public support, universities have reason to acknowledge a reciprocal duty to make their services available" (pp. 64-65). Moos (1981) also notes the obligation of state universities to

serve the general public that supported them, and Roskens (1985) observes that "state universities have forged a continuing, vital partnership with the citizens of the states that support them" (p. 85). Roskens appears to echo Steffens' depiction of the Wisconsin Idea in his assertion that "the university campus, is, in fact, the entire state (p. 85).

In addition to the financial obligation, Wallenfeldt (1983) maintains that it is the "responsibility of boards to see that their institutions do not become self-serving, narcissistic ivory towers that are isolated from the realities and needs of society." That is, the college community can maintain a broader perspective through a concern for service beyond the realm of the campus. According to Derek Bok (1986), state universities' willingness to perform community services "reflects the peculiar traditions of this country and the desire to earn the goodwill of legislative appropriations committees" (p. 30). In addition to attracting new sources of financial support, other motivations for public service have been listed as sharing resources and promoting understanding (Levine and Weingart, 1973). Ben-David (1972) has observed American universities' need to obtain maximum support from as many sectors of the community as possible and to respond to the demand for courses of study of benefit to the community. Institutional motivation for public service, then, encompasses both fiscal and

altruistic dimensions.

CHAPTER 3: PROCEDURES

Definitions and Delimitations of the Study

As the review of the literature has made apparent, the term "public service" in higher education has had varying interpretations: the preparation of students for responsible citizenship and leadership; service through education in the liberal arts; service through research; individual faculty initiative in exercising civic responsibility; and professional assistance of the faculty in an official institutional capacity. Crosson notes that most interpretations of the public service role share these concepts: (1) an assumption that a contribution to society results from teaching, research, and scholarly activity; (2) the acceptance of an obligation and responsibility to help solve or ameliorate social problems; and (3) a recognition of the social importance of knowledge (1988, p. 7).

The definition of public service used in this study is one articulated by Crosson in 1985: "direct programmatic relationships between institutions of higher education and external groups for the purpose of bringing knowledge resources more directly and effectively to bear on the identification, understanding, and resolution of

public problems" (p. 4). The specific aspect of public service addressed in the study is the college or university's role in providing for continuing educational services for adults in the surrounding community, including extension courses and evening college courses.

The scope of the study is from 1906, when The College of William and Mary became a state-supported institution, to 1972, when credit-bearing extension courses were discontinued at the College. The study is not intended as a comprehensive history of extension services at The College of William and Mary, nor is it an exhaustive chronicle of all public services offered by the College. The focus is on continuing educational service, although other types of public service are explored when they are the dominant theme of service in a given era of William and Mary's history. The study addresses the formal response of the members of the Board of Visitors, the faculty, and the administration to the institutional service mission rather than informal or individual initiatives.

Research Design and Methodology

A case study of The College of William and Mary between 1906 and 1972 provides the framework for an analysis of how the public service mission has been interpreted and redefined over time at one institution, focusing specifically on continuing education. The case study is then interpreted in terms of the enduring issue

of service as a viable part of mission in American colleges and universities. The research method is a systematic analysis and interpretation of this historical period through an examination of published writings, organizational records, and personal accounts.

Specific Data Sources

The principal data sources for this investigation are documents from the Manuscripts and Rare Books Department of the University Archives of William and Mary. Published writings include college catalogues and bulletins, house histories, William and Mary News, The Flat Hat, Alumni Gazette, yearbooks, reports of self-study, local newspaper accounts, published addresses by William and Mary presidents and guest speakers (e.g., Charter Day speeches), publicity office releases, and state and federal government reports.

Organizational records include committee minutes, presidential memoranda, president's office papers, minutes of the Board of Visitors, departmental reports, accreditation documents, and annual reports.

Personal accounts include faculty and administrative files, personal correspondence, manuscripts, and oral histories and interviews.

Triangulation of these sources bring into balance the accounts from official published documents, unpublished organizational records, and personal interpretations of the period being studied.

CHAPTER 4

The Public Service Aspect of William and Mary's Mission

Vocationalism in the Lyon G. Tyler Era:

"A Struggle for Permission to Live"

Because of insufficient operating funds, The College of William and Mary was closed from 1881 until 1888, when the General Assembly of Virginia approved an annual appropriation of \$10,000 to the College based on a new service-oriented mission: to train male public school teachers. One member of the House of Delegates who helped to push this bill through the legislature was Lyon G. Tyler, who became president of William and Mary when it reopened in 1888 (Kale, 1985). Throughout the years Tyler continued to seek additional state appropriations, but the Finance Committee of the State Legislature was reluctant to support any institution not wholly owned or controlled by the State. The State did give William and Mary an annuity for current operating expenses, but even that was threatened twice, according to Tyler:

I became convinced that the safety of the College depended upon its absolute transfer to the State, and urged it upon the Board, and a bill in 1906 . . . placed the College

on a plane where its real prosperity began. Until then we were attacked without just foundations of course, as an Episcopal institution receiving special favors from the Legislature. The truth is the struggle up to 1906 was for permission to live. (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1902-1919, p. 423)

State Support and the Obligation for Service

The 1906 transfer of The College of William and Mary to the State had been sponsored by the College in an effort to increase its resources. With this financial support came an obligation on the part of the College to serve the state, service the College provided by continuing its role in training teachers for Virginia's public schools. "It is not too much to say," Tyler claimed, "that the great educational awakening of the public school systems in the state was to a considerable extent made possible by the leadership of men trained at William and Mary" (pp. 424-25).

A number of prospective teachers were admitted each year as "state students," with the State paying their college tuition in return for their signing this pledge:

In consideration of receipt from the State of Virginia of Free Tuition in the Teachers' Course, and other advantages incident to appointment as a State student of The College of William and Mary, and In compliance with the

requirements of law, I hereby pledge myself to teach in the public schools of Virginia for a period of two years. (President's Papers, Lyon G. Tyler, 1984.19, Box 12)

Dependent upon attracting students planning to teach, William and Mary gained a reputation for being "a fine place for a needy student" (Lambert, 1975).

Challenges in Maintaining an Adequate Enrollment

Tyler succeeded in gradually increasing the college enrollment in order to qualify for greater state appropriations, but with the entrance of the United States into World War I, enrollment dropped. A number of students left William and Mary for the armed forces or war-related industries, and enrollment decreased from 234 students in 1916 to 149 in 1917 (Godson, 1989). In a 1918 letter urging a prospective student to enter college, William and Mary Registrar H. L. Bridges observed that the College had "already contributed to this conflict about four hundred of her recent alumni" and that "maintaining at home an intellectual force" was also vital to the nation (President's Papers, Tyler, 1984.19, Box 12).

Helping to offset the wartime drop in enrollment was the admission of women to the College for the first time in 1918, making William and Mary the first coeducational State college in Virginia (Vital Facts, p. 18). Tyler had long supported educational opportunities for women, but the impetus for admitting women was Tyler's desire to

secure funds for William and Mary under the Smith-Hughes Act passed in 1917 to promote teacher training in such vocational subjects as agriculture and home economics (Godson, 1989). Tyler had first proposed a department of agriculture to qualify for the Smith-Hughes funds (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1902-1919, p. 355), but that attempt proved unsuccessful and in the end William and Mary was designated by the State Board of Education to receive funds under the Smith-Hughes Act to establish teacher training courses in home economics (p. 361). In Tyler's final annual report to the Board of Visitors in 1919, he proclaimed "the experiment of admitting women . . . fully vindicated" (p. 420).

During the course of Lyon G. Tyler's presidency, financial exigencies and a dwindling wartime enrollment had led to the development of two service-oriented, vocational aspects of the curriculum: the college had reopened in 1888 with its new mission as a normal school, and three decades later a course of study in home economics was implemented and women admitted in order to gain appropriations under the Smith-Hughes Act. These functions existed alongside the traditional, classically-oriented liberal arts curriculum of the ancient college.

J.A.C. Chandler and the Beginning of Extension

The curriculum of The College of William and Mary became increasingly vocational during J.A.C. Chandler's

presidency from 1919 to 1934. New subject areas included library science, shorthand, typing, business administration, and such preliminary courses as pre-medicine and pre-engineering. Chandler explained in his first report to the Board of Visitors his philosophy that "a college is place where a student must find himself, and a part of his work should be cultural and a part should look towards some definite vocation or profession" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1919-1934, p. 12). Eleven years later he reported to the Board that "the primary purpose of the college is still cultural" and that "every effort is being made by the faculty . . . to strengthen the curriculum" but that the vocational coursework would continue. While he opposed branching out into all vocational fields, the vocational fields in the curriculum at that point "seem to justify themselves by the service that they are rendering" (p. 292).

Rival Conceptions of the College Mission

The presence of such practical courses of study illustrates one of the rival conceptions of higher education articulated by Veysey (1965), that of "education for utility" or practical career preparation. The role of William and Mary as a classically-oriented liberal arts college was overshadowed during Chandler's presidency by his early promotion of the practical, service-oriented aspects the college mission. Nevertheless, both of these rival conceptions, education for utility and education

for liberal culture, endured in the curriculum--it was the relative balance that varied. In the last few years of his presidency, Chandler supported the faculty's desire to reorganize the curriculum, "emphasizing the liberal arts instruction readjusted to modern life" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1919-34, p. 272). In his 1931 report to the Board of Visitors, Chandler explained that he had been working toward financial stability before enacting major changes in the curriculum and assured them that "the one thought that has prevailed throughout the session on the part of the faculty has been to strengthen the primary purpose of the College, namely, the training of our young people in the liberal arts and sciences" (p. 359). Chandler's failing health kept him from kept him from seeing any such curricular change implemented.

The Beginning of Public Service through Extension

The emphasis on service that characterized the Chandler era was most strikingly illustrated by the establishment of extension courses in the first year of Chandler's presidency. Although not presently heralded as one of William and Mary's "priorities," or firsts, these extension courses were in fact the first offered by any college in Virginia. A 1920 article in the Flat Hat student newspaper offered this summary of the development of extension at William and Mary:

For many years prominent educators have realized that, in some manner, courses should

be offered which would enable those not able financially to attend college, to gain a more advanced education than that offered in the secondary schools. . . . Finally several universities began to give night courses, which plan proved a success from the very beginning. But in Virginia no such plan was tried for a long time. It remained for William and Mary, whose priorities in educational and other lines will easily fill a small volume, to try out such a plan. (October 8, 1920, p. 5)

Classes were offered in Newport News, Norfolk, and Richmond that first year, and the early catalogue listings included such subjects as psychology, education, English, Spanish, transportation, government, business law, and accountancy. In his 1920-21 message to the Board of Visitors, Chandler reported 28 classes in extension with an aggregate enrollment of 628 and projected that with more professors, extension enrollment could reach one thousand (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1919-1934, pp. 23-24).

By the following year, in fact, the extension enrollment had increased to 907, surpassing the regular on-campus enrollment of 855 (p. 51). More extension locations had also been added--Hampton, Portsmouth, Gloucester, and Cape Charles--and Chandler was still emphatic that "our extension work is suffering for want of

sufficient instructors" (p. 62). It is not surprising, then, that extension courses typically formed part of the teaching load for regular William and Mary faculty members during Chandler's presidency. When Charles F. Marsh joined the economics and business administration faculty in 1930, he was told of the president's plans to have him commute to Norfolk three days a week and teach on campus in Williamsburg three days a week. When Marsh protested that his contract stipulated only one extension course, Chandler countered that he would honor the contract, but that it would be a one-year contract. Given the implied threat, Marsh conceded: "So I commuted by Greyhound bus Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays. . . . I got there in time for a ten o'clock class and taught two classes, then I taught three classes up here on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays" (Marsh, 1974). Richard L. Morton, who "arrived in 1919 as the entire history department," recalled a similar experience:

In those early days we all had to go teach extension, teaching classes at different times in Richmond, Newport News, Norfolk. . . . I'd teach history, government--all of them. The president wanted me to substitute one day for a class in ocean transportation down in Newport News; I refused. He said, "I'll go myself."
(Morton, 1974)

W. Melville Jones recalled the negative effect extension

had on the faculty in terms of time and travel, citing the hardship of traveling on poor roads--often late at night and in bad weather--eating dinner en route and rushing to catch ferries. "We developed extension work all over the state, and that, without doubt, was draining the faculty . . . of the effectiveness it should have on this campus" (Jones, 1974). This conclusion was shared by accounting professor Wayne F. Gibbs, who related his experiences teaching in Newport News and Norfolk two to three times a week:

I used to leave here at 4:30 in the afternoon, after I'd done a full day's work, drive to Newport News--at that time you had to take the ferry across--rush over to what is now Old Dominion and taught classes from 7:30 until 9:30. Then we'd get in our car, catch the 10:00 ferry coming back. We'd leave the ferry dock down there about 10:30 . . . and it took me just about an hour to drive that [last] thirty miles. . . . no wonder we didn't have any time for research. (Gibbs, 1975)

Faculty members commuted to extension sites not only by car and ferry but also by train. Responding to a 1920 letter requesting that William and Mary classes be established in Suffolk, Chandler addressed the issue of travel before specifying course offerings: "It is on the assumption . . . that our professor could leave Norfolk on

the Norfolk and Western at about four or five o'clock in the afternoon and get back to Norfolk that night on the late Norfolk and Western train" (President's Office Papers, J.A.C. Chandler, 1982.45, Box 18).

Former Board of Visitors member M. Carl Andrews recalled an editorial he wrote for the Flat Hat as a student in 1927:

Very frequently it was rough on [the professors] to go some place at night . . . and then come to teach the next day. Students are pretty sharp; they could tell that the man was tired. And I wrote an editorial entitled "What Price Extensions?" That was the one and only thing that Dr. Chandler ever got after me about. The funny part of it was that half of the faculty must have come to me off-the-record, saying the editorial was just what they needed. (Andrews, 1976)

In his editorial Andrews claimed that "even an impersonal observer can see some serious defects in the system" and elaborated on the hardships imposed on the faculty by extension:

These men return to college tired not only in mind but frequently in body and the results are not hard to see. . . . The regular pay student of the college must be considered. If instructors cannot have a sufficient time for

research and study on courses they are to teach, how can their students gain the best instruction? . . . Are students getting what they pay for and what the state pays for in the form of complete instruction in courses pursued? (Flat Hat, February 11, 1927, p. 4)

Andrews concluded his editorial by recommending that the number of extension courses assigned to a professor be limited or that some professors teach extension only. Yet the practice of having regular William and Mary faculty members teach the extension courses was a strong selling point, although local instructors did teach some of the courses. The 1919 Richmond extension catalogue assured prospective students that

The teaching staff consists in part of the regular professors of the College of William and Mary who are specialists in their respective lines, holding the highest academic and professional degrees from the leading American universities . . . and successful business men of Richmond who have volunteered to give special lectures on subjects upon which they are able to speak with authority. (Bulletin, XIII, 4, November 1919)

Another source of popularity for the extension courses was the wide array of classes available. Extension courses offered specific vocational preparation, as well

as cultural enrichment. Sometimes both goals would be claimed in one course of study:

The secretarial program . . . will include the cultural and technical subjects which are necessary to develop secretaries of broad vision, that is, technicians of the highest order [and] to provide, as a basis for secretarial service, the broad and liberal equipment which is so vital to those who must assist eventually in shaping the policies of our Nation and our business institutions.

(Bulletin, XIV, 8, October 1920)

The most enduring function over the 52 years of extension at William and Mary was the coursework for the certification and recertification of teachers. The other most constant aspect of extension was the high proportion of business courses offered each session, most notably in accounting. Other functions were more fleeting: A 1922 Flat Hat article entitled "William and Mary Aids State Convicts" noted that the College was cooperating with the Penitentiary Board at Richmond in an instructional program for inmates (April 28, 1922, p. 2).

The majority of William and Mary's early extension work was concentrated in Norfolk, Richmond, and Newport News. According to the first extension catalogues, the organization of college-level evening classes in these cities was a realization of

the long cherished desire of the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary to have the college function in the twentieth century life of the state and nation in the same vital manner in which it played so illustrious a part in our early history. At the same time it cements more closely the close ties which already bind the state's oldest college to the metropolitan section of Eastern Virginia. (Bulletin, XIII, 3, November, 1919)

The essential mission of extension was to provide educational opportunities for those whose situations would not allow for full-time study at the campus in Williamsburg. In addition to the courses for public school teachers and the business courses, one broad goal stated in the first extension bulletins--which promised "something of value to every intelligent adult citizen"--was to give all citizens "the essentials of a liberal education in their own city" (Bulletin, XIII, 3).

In his June 1930 report to the Board of Visitors, President Chandler applauded the successful development of the extension division after more than a decade. Extension centers had by then been established in eleven communities: Richmond, Norfolk, Newport News, Portsmouth, Hopewell, Suffolk, Surry, Stony Creek, Gloucester, Waverly, and Oceana. Ninety-five extension courses were

being offered, with a total of 1,457 individuals enrolled (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1919-1934, pp. 270-71).

The Growth of Extension and the Development of Divisions

By 1930 the Richmond and Norfolk extension centers had both developed into divisions of The College of William and Mary. The Richmond Center had been incorporated with the Richmond School of Social Work and Public Health, while the focus of the Norfolk Division was on providing coursework for the first two years of a liberal arts education. The two divisions each had a full-time director reporting to the president of The College of William and Mary, who in turn reported to the Board of Visitors the details of the divisions' curriculum, enrollment, and budget. The same essential rules governing student conduct on campus in Williamsburg governed students at the divisions as well; for example, during the 1930-31 school year two students were required to withdraw from the Norfolk Division, and one student from the Richmond Division, for infringement of the honor system (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1919-934, pp. 289-90). One aspect of this uniformity of operation was that it afforded little autonomy to the directors of the divisions. For instance, the director of the Norfolk Division, Dr. W. T. Hodges, was reprimanded by the president on the request of the Board for having a student dishonorably discharged from the Division rather than following the established procedure of referring such

cases to the Honor Council of the division.

At this time the extension division of The College of William and Mary had a director, an administrative staff of five, a teaching staff of eighty-four, and a student enrollment of 1,732. Thirty-seven members of the teaching staff were full-time faculty members on the Williamsburg campus who taught part-time at extension sites. Of the remaining forty-seven, sixteen were full-time resident faculty in Norfolk or Richmond, and thirty-one were Norfolk and Richmond residents who taught extension part-time (p. 295). The student body of 1,732 included 206 in the Norfolk Division, 220 in the Richmond Division, twelve students doing supervised teaching through extension, and 1,294 extension students in eight communities: Cape Charles, Dendron, Gloucester County, Hopewell, Newport News, Norfolk-Portsmouth, Richmond, and Williamsburg. (Students enrolled in extension courses offered through the Norfolk and Richmond Divisions and through the Williamsburg campus were counted separately from those enrolled on campus.)

The most popular course taught in extension was English, with twenty-eight sections offered in the 1930-31 school year. Other courses included eight sections of accountancy; seven sections each of art and history; six sections each of education and sociology; five sections of mathematics; four of French and psychology; three each of biology, business administration, government, and

philosophy; two sections of biblical literature, chemistry, Greek, journalism, and salesmanship/advertising; and one section each of economics, German, physics, public health, Spanish, public speaking, commercial law, mechanical drawing, and typing (pp. 296-97). New offerings in extension the following school year were two courses in music and eight in drama. Other new developments during the 1931-32 school year included a more-than-doubled enrollment at the Norfolk Division (from 206 to 455), a new cooperative program in engineering at the Norfolk Division with Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and one new extension location, Mathews County (p. 344).

Enrollment dropped in the 1932-33 school year in the extension division as well the campus at Williamsburg: Extension enrollment dropped from 1,980 the preceding year to 1,660, a decrease of 320; enrollment on the Williamsburg campus fell slightly from 1,682 to 1,602. As Chandler reported to the Board, "the last two years . . . have been very difficult on account of the financial condition of the country, forcing curtailments" (p. 407). Tappahannock and West Point were added as extension locations, and shorthand, archaeology, and business law were added to the list of courses taught by extension. The directors at both Norfolk and Richmond reported their divisions to be thriving in spite of the Depression-era cutbacks. In fact, the Norfolk Division had outgrown its facilities, and the Board of Visitors approved their

request for an expanded physical plant: a gymnasium, a lecture room building, and a stadium (p. 459). In applying for a \$240,000 loan from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works for the building project, College officials stated that "the present student body of 375 would reasonably grow to 600 with these added facilities" and offered this justification:

The Norfolk metropolitan area contains a population of approximately 300,000. No college other than William and Mary Norfolk Division operates within 45 miles. . . . This Norfolk Division was set up in answer to the insistent demand of the people of the Norfolk area. It has their backing and support and affords an opportunity to a great number of students to avail themselves of the advantages of higher education while living at home.

(p.465)

A building project of this magnitude underscores the commitment of the College to its divisions, divisions that had developed from extension centers.

The Justification for Extension: Practical and Philosophical

Why had William and Mary, traditionally identified as a small, liberal arts college, assumed the responsibility for providing educational opportunities for students other than traditional full-time, resident students on the

Williamsburg campus? Most obvious is the fact that during this period of time, William and Mary was the only public institution of higher education in the eastern part of the state. President Chandler stated that although the primary purpose of William and Mary was to serve the state as a whole, "the college will, of course, render its chief service to Tidewater, particularly since no other college is located in this section" (Chandler, 1921). A 1922 Flat Hat article noted that the College was well located to serve a number of communities:

Because of the convenient location of William and Mary in the center of a circle which comprises the largest population district of the State, it is to be considered that she is advantageously placed for carrying on this work, which will insure the offering of sound education facilities to large numbers of Virginia's men and women, who have not been, or do not plan to attend a college as resident students. (March 3, 1922, pp. 1, 7)

The second reason that William and Mary assumed responsibility for extension is that this type of service was compatible with J.A.C. Chandler's philosophy of education. In Chandler's interpretation, the provision of postsecondary courses for adults in the surrounding area was an appropriate and essential component of the public service aspect of the college mission. "Our business is

to educate the people," he stated in his inaugural address, "and if they cannot come to the college we should go to them" (Chandler, 1921).

Enrollment on the Williamsburg Campus

Known as a "dedicated populist" (Rouse, 1973, p. 170), J.A.C. Chandler also supported admissions policies on the Williamsburg campus that were inclusive rather than exclusive. For example, he was enthusiastic about providing educational opportunities for first-generation college students: "We want the sons and daughters of our farmers, merchants, and artisans who heretofore have not gone to college . . . to have the benefits of a college education" (Chandler, 1921). In making higher education widely accessible, Chandler acknowledged an obligation for public service that the College had assumed with the beginning of state support in 1906.

The reciprocity of state support and state service at William and Mary actually dates back even earlier than 1906: The teacher education extension courses offered by William and Mary may be viewed as a continuation of the normal school function assumed by the College when it reopened in 1888 with a state appropriation. Chandler emphasized the prominence of teacher education at William and Mary when he noted that in the student body of 615, there were 260 students were training for the teaching profession:

No more splendid service can be rendered

by this college, to the State, and to the nation, than to furnish each year many men and women well qualified to teach our youth. As a part of the plan for training teachers, we are emphasizing extension courses and summer school work for those already in the profession. (Chandler, 1921)

Not all of the choices J.A.C. Chandler made can be ascribed to his philosophy of education--many were shaped by the externally imposed forces of that era. Just as Lyon G. Tyler had adapted some aspects of the curriculum to a dwindling wartime enrollment, Chandler's early decisions were influenced by a large postwar student population. Douglas Freeman (In Memoriam, 1934) noted that Chandler "went to Williamsburg while the troops were still coming home from France" (p. 5). Assuming the presidency in the post-war years, Chandler led the college through a period of accommodating returning veterans and increasing enrollments. As Freeman observed, "It was a period of immense opportunity, for the funds of the Commonwealth were ample during the years when the press of students demanded a rapid expansion of the old college plant" (p. 5). Another external force shaping Chandler's choices was an economic one: The latter years of his presidency coincided with the Great Depression. Chandler could hardly attempt to impose any degree of selectivity in admissions when maintaining a steady enrollment was

essential to the college's financial solvency; state appropriations were linked to enrollment totals. Chandler did formulate a selective admissions plan for the 1933-34 school year, the last year of his presidency, but did not live to see the effects of this policy. For the first time, prospective students were to rank in the upper half of their graduating classes and meet certain requirements of personality and character (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1919-1934, p. 413).

John Stewart Bryan: Shaping the Ivy League Image

The selection of a new president in 1934 entailed more than the choice of an individual--a clearcut choice of the direction the college would take was at stake, too. Writing earlier to the members of the Board of Visitors in his capacity as member and Vice-Rector of the Board, John Stewart Bryan had explained that

The important problems that confront the Board are not only the choice of a president, but of no less importance is the problem of deciding what the future line of development for William and Mary shall be. These two considerations are inextricably interwoven. (Memorandum, May 23, 1934, President's Office Papers, Bryan, 1979.35, Box 8).

Whether William and Mary would focus on liberal arts or on teacher education was at issue, and Bryan urged the Board members to consider not only which direction would be best

for the college but also where "the highest service to the Commonwealth of Virginia lies."

The training of teachers for Virginia's public schools had been the service rendered by the college in return for state support since its 1888 reopening. As Bryan pointed out, however, by this time four other normal schools had been established in Farmville, Fredericksburg, Harrisonburg, and Radford (Editorial, May 1934, President's Office Papers, Bryan, 1979.35, Box 8). Bryan's argument was for a broader conception of service to the state:

It is open to grave question whether the larger usefulness of William and Mary in service to the State and the Nation does not lie in emphasis on the field more specifically of a Liberal Arts college. . . . The other field [teacher education] being adequately occupied, the historic background, the present equipment, the faculty and the student body of William and Mary may combine more effectively to serve the spirit of man and the advancement of education by steadfastly holding to the ideal of learning for learning's sake which animated the first founders of this college and have kept it alive during its long and distinguished career. Emphatically in support of the liberal arts emphasis was Governor Jonathan Pollard, who wrote to Bryan urging him

to accept the presidency:

There is real danger of the election to the Presidency of a man who, in the minds of the public, will stamp the institution as another 'Normal School.' In my opinion you can avert this calamity and are probably the only man who can do it. (Letter, June 4, 1934, President's Office Papers, Bryan)

In his cautious acceptance of the presidency, Bryan conceded that "an opportunity exists to give to William and Mary the distinctive place in American education that it would undoubtedly have attained once more had Dr. Chandler lived to carry out the plans he had formulated" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 62).

In contrast to Chandler's scrutiny of virtually all details of the College's operation, newspaper publisher Bryan planned to delegate routine responsibilities to the deans and fiscal officers:

I shall do what I can in the limited time that I can devote to this work, and when I have advanced it as far as I can, I hope I shall be able to help the Board of Visitors find a younger President, and then I shall return to my own business. (p. 63)

In reality, Bryan was to remain president for eight years and radically alter the image and emphasis of the College.

Liberal Arts and Selective Admissions

The essential elements in Bryan's approach to reshaping William and Mary's image included (1) strengthening the curriculum, (2) improving the college's standards and reputation, (3) enriching campus life, and (4) balancing the composition of the student body.

Strengthening the Curriculum. In his first annual report to the Board of Visitors, Bryan announced the adoption of plans for a new curriculum "following a long and exhaustive study by the Faculty, in accordance with the plans that Dr. Chandler originally outlined" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 151). Bryan emphasized that "a degree from William and Mary could not maintain . . . its historic value, and at the same time allow as much credit as had been given to merely implementative studies, such . . . as typewriting" (p. 151). Having sought the advice of the Dean of the Faculty at Dartmouth, Bryan was convinced that William and Mary's new curriculum was in line with that of leading colleges in the nation. With the addition of new faculty members for the next academic year, President Bryan worked to build up the departments of history, biology, psychology, philosophy, government, English, library science, and especially the department of fine arts (p. 194). Midway through the first year of the new curriculum, Bryan reported favorably on the students' level of scholarship and expressed this desire:

William and Mary hopes and purposes to make

a degree from this institution conclusive evidence that a student has learned to study and to think, and has also been awakened and stimulated along some useful and fundamental phases of human endeavor. (p. 195)

Emphasizing goals of a college education that encompass more than mastering a body of knowledge, Bryan articulated these aspects of character development: "how to develop wisdom, leadership, judgment, good taste, fine perception and civic responsibility" (p. 194). Challenged to justify the additional expenses incurred in strengthening the curriculum, Bryan pointed to the elusive nature of measuring the benefits of college:

It is not possible to appraise the service rendered the student body of an institution solely by the foot rule of per capita costs. Education must be regarded as dealing with forces that cannot be weighed or measured with scientific accuracy . . . there never has been a method devised that could definitely weigh or even approximate the spiritual units in a professor, or the capacity of any given youth to lay hold of opportunities offered him at an institution of learning. (p. 196)

Improving the College's Standards and Reputation. In Bryan's estimation, strengthening the liberal arts curriculum at William and Mary was the way to restore the

college's reputation. When Bryan announced his resignation in 1942, he reminded the Board that he had been "urged to take this office by [those] who felt that the future of William and Mary could never be realized by placing the major emphasis on the work of the department of Education" and that the college's future was "indissolubly bound up in the past record of this College in teaching Liberal Arts. . . . It was a clear denial of destiny for this College, with its incomparable record and tradition, not to follow its original purposes" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1940-46, p. 196).

One goal of the new curriculum of 1935 had been to establish a closer relationship between related fields of knowledge; by 1940 Bryan reported on the topical majors available as fields of concentration, "new fields which cut across departmental lines": pre-journalism, contemporary culture, nature and development of scientific thought, and man's position in nature and society (p. 34). What was significant to Bryan was that "these programs place William and Mary abreast of similar forward-looking developments in other leading colleges. . . . They have important points of originality and are carefully adapted to our own needs."

In describing the interest the students were taking in their work under the new programs of study, Bryan offered this intriguing indirect measure:

On Saturday night before examinations . . .

the dance had to be called off. Furthermore, the movie theatre has been so empty during the examination period that the audiences hardly paid for the cost of the picture. That it has been an expensive proposition to the College for the students to work so hard is evidenced by the fact that we had to keep the large generator running all night in order to furnish them with the midnight oil. (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 331)

Enriching Campus Life. In addition to strengthening the liberal arts curriculum and improving the college's standards and reputation, Bryan enriched the cultural, intellectual, and recreational aspects of campus life, giving it "some of the old Richmond cultural flavor," according to one faculty member of that era (Marsh, 1974, p. 33). During the first year of his presidency, he arranged for visiting lecturers and speakers, symphony concerts, a Christmas party, concerts, art exhibits, drama, and broadcasts. "I think we have increased our prestige and are widening our fields for financial support," Bryan observed (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 102). Recreational facilities developed during Bryan's presidency included the addition of a boathouse and canoes at Lake Matoaka, a riding stable, tennis courts, a second football field, an addition to the gymnasium (Minutes of the Board of

Visitors, 1940-1946, p. 198).

Balancing the Composition of the Student Body. In his efforts to increase the applicant pool and raise the quality of the student body, Bryan addressed the issues of admissions standards and the male/female ratio. In addition to Bryan's efforts to make the curriculum and the campus life more attractive, a development external to the campus did much to broaden the appeal of William and Mary to prospective applicants: The Restoration of the colonial capital funded by John D. Rockefeller brought widespread attention to Williamsburg and served to advertise the College. "I have no doubt," President Bryan later acknowledged, "but that one of the most compelling forces behind the increased enrollment has been the effect that William and Mary produces on visitors who come to this part of the world to see restored Williamsburg" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 326).

Midway through his second year in the presidency, Bryan cited higher Scholastic Aptitude Test scores and an increased number of students on the Dean's List in his report to the Board as evidence of the success of higher admissions standards in achieving a greater proportion of academically well-prepared students:

The action of the Administration in exercising very careful supervision over the students who are admitted to William and Mary has had a demonstrable and striking effect in improving

scholastic standards. Approximately one hundred students were refused admission this year on the ground that it did not seem to the Administration that the applicants were qualified to get full returns for their expenditure of time and money. The results of this decision from the Scholastic standpoint have been abundantly justified. (p. 194)

Bryan had sought the guidance of Gordon Bill, Dean of the Faculty at Dartmouth, on admissions (Lambert, 1975), and the admission policy adopted by the College represented a trend in higher education at that time:

to admit those students who show the mental development, sustained interest, character and personality which will enable them to succeed in the curriculum which the College offers. It is believed that these qualities cannot be determined alone by the scholarship marks in the preparatory record, or by the specified courses which the student takes in the preparatory school.

The student's [upper half] standing in his class, continuity of courses which he has pursued, his professional or vocational interest as stated on his application blank, an evaluation of his ability and definiteness of purpose by his principal and teachers, and

his social relations as indicated by character references, provide valuable information in determining admission to college. When it is shown, therefore, that a student, on these criteria, has ability to succeed in college, he is received and his college curriculum is so planned that he can progress in college without being compelled to take prerequisite courses to fill high school specifications. (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-1939, p. 224)

Bryan hailed the selective system of admission as a means of "weeding out undesirables" (p. 311) and drawing to William and Mary "students who are worthy of the best traditions of this ancient and honorable institution" (p. 279). He rejoiced that "this College is no longer a haven for those students who could not enter and successfully complete the course at the University of Virginia or Washington and Lee" (p. 279). Bryan also alerted the Board to the urgent need for more competitive scholarship funds to attract students of outstanding ability:

The example of Harvard, Yale and especially the advantage given the University of Virginia by its large scholarship fund, make it absolutely essential that William and Mary take some step to secure for her student body the stimulus and the advantage

of brilliant students, not only for the competition that they would inspire, but for the reputation that they would give the College. We should . . . bring back once more to the halls of this College the type of men that William and Mary sent out in other days to light up and lead this country. (p. 253)

One source of alarm to the Board and to the administration was the increased proportion of women in the student body. Fearing the perception of William and Mary as predominantly a women's college, alumni were sending their sons to other institutions (p. 252). The Boston Alumni Association wrote to the Board in 1934 urging that the number of women students be reduced. A former Board member termed this recommendation "a consummation devoutly to be wished, but hard to control," attributing the higher proportion of women to the Depression--"Parents with boys and girls to educate are pretty certain to send the girl to college and make the boy go to work"--and to a lack of dormitory space for men. He predicted that a new dorm, a new stadium, and a strengthening of the law school would remedy the imbalance ("Robert M. Hughes Comments on Boston Alumni Plan for William and Mary Changes," Virginian-Pilot, June 27, 1934, p. 4). Bryan attributed this growing disproportion of men to women--"a menace to the future of this College" (p. 279)--to three factors: higher scholastic standards that

disqualified men the College would have "imprudently accepted" in the past (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-1939, p. 279); strong competition for male students at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Virginia Military Institute, the University of Virginia, Washington and Lee, Hampden-Sydney, and the University of Richmond (p. 252); and the diminished appeal of a college emphasizing liberal arts in a time of increased career orientation:

With the rapidly changing fields of employment which are open to young men who have graduated from college, parents and guardians are eyeing with unusual intensity the question of how far the student will be equipped for some definite place in life. (p. 480)

Bryan had addressed this perception earlier by emphasizing the value of a broad liberal arts education as a preparation for any career rather than highly specialized training in a narrow field (p. 312).

At a June 1937 meeting, the Board of Visitors passed a resolution to establish a three to two acceptance rate of men to women (p. 288). Registrar Kathleen Alsop had been handling admissions until Bryan, wanting a man to be in this visible position, accorded the responsibility to J. Wilfred Lambert, whom he named Dean of Freshmen (Lambert, 1975, p. 60). Still addressing the issue of increasing male enrollment in 1940, a committee formed for this purpose reported to the Board their advances in more

active recruiting, developing brochures and leaflets for publicity, studying enrollment trends, providing more scholarships, and enlisting greater alumni support (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1940-46, p. 8). Bryan reiterated that "It is thoroughly understood that the restoration of a preponderance of men students is a most important objective for this college" and concluded that the advertising and recruiting efforts had been successful: "The present reputation of William and Mary and its appeal to men students are markedly higher than at any time in the past six years" (p. 33).

Just as the number of male applicants appeared to be increasing for the 1941-42 academic year, many prospective students began instead to join the military or seek employment in war industries. To counter a predicted drop in male enrollment, Bryan established courses on campus "designed especially to serve the defense needs of the country, which we hope will tend to stabilize the thoughts of young men who are anxious to discharge their full civic and military duties" (p. 116).

An inordinate amount of discussion in the meetings of the Board of Visitors focused on this quest to increase the proportion of men in the student body. Finally a resolution was adopted in December of 1941 to decrease the number of women admitted in order to limit the percentage of women enrolled to forty per cent. Since this ill-advised strategy would actually reduce tuition income,

the committee proposed to recover some of the loss by cutting instructional staff. Although Bryan assured the Board in 1942 that "the rise or fall of women students at such a time is without relation to the long view of enrollment" (p. 176), by the next year President Pomfret would state that "we are confronted with the problem of institutional survival . . . Our men students have been gradually whittled away" (p. 251).

Service-Oriented Aspects of the Bryan-Era Curriculum

Marine Biology. Not all new developments in the curriculum related to the liberal arts. In 1936 President Bryan proposed establishing a course of study in marine biology:

When we consider the very large number of families who owe their living to the fish and oyster industries, it is an unescapable obligation on the Commonwealth to provide those people with a sound knowledge of the field from which they derive their livelihood. (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 253)

Included in the resolution passed the following year to establish such a course in connection with the United States Marine Laboratory at Yorktown was the acknowledgment that it would benefit not only the Commonwealth in general but also a large number of families connected with William and Mary (p. 259). In his 1939 annual report to the Board of Visitors, Bryan

urged that a department of marine biology be established not only for the service of our students, but for the further purpose of spreading a general appreciation of the State in the need of preserving Virginia's seafood industry. With the extraordinarily widespread field for investigation and study afforded by the York River and the Chesapeake Bay at our very doors, it is obviously a loss of opportunity and service for William and Mary not to enter this field. (p. 463)

By the next annual report in 1940, William and Mary had been granted a \$5,000 state appropriation per year for the next two years to develop a Department of Aquatic Biology (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1940-46, p. 40). In 1942 Bryan emphasized the recognition William and Mary would gain for providing this service and reiterated a measure of self-interest, too:

The families of nearly fifty per cent of the students from the Tidewater counties draw their livelihood from the sea; therefore, the study and development of a proper approach to the protection of the fish and oyster industry is not only of scientific but of vital concern. I believe that we may look forward to a better understanding on the part of the Virginia legislature and the public, with the consequent

improvement of this industry as a result of the work now being done by William and Mary. (p. 177)

Teacher Education. The fundamental service to the state by William and Mary had long been teacher education, a field largely overshadowed by liberal arts throughout Bryan's presidency but viable nonetheless. Grudgingly referring in 1938 to teacher education as one of the "purposes which we have had forced upon us and which we must continue to carry on," Bryan acknowledged the implied contract between the College and the State as well as a written contract with the Matthew Whaley School: The College was obligated to pay the school approximately \$20,000 a year for the next ten years as part of the teacher education program (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 331). This figure represented ten per cent of the State appropriation for the support of the College of William and Mary (p. 463).

William and Mary in the National Defense. Beyond the obligation for service at the state level, William and Mary was also called on at the beginning of World War II to participate in programs for the national defense. In 1942 the College offered these courses (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1940-44, p. 180):

Camouflage

Home Nursing

Internal Combustion Engines

**Introductory Map Reading and the Interpretation
of Aerial Photographs**

Military Chemistry

Telegraphy

Military and Naval Strategy

The Law of the Sea

Plane and Spherical Trigonometry

Health Education

Safety and Emergency Education

It was possible for a student to apply a limited number of these courses to the baccalaureate degree requirements (p. 210). As indicated earlier, the College's motives in offering such courses were not only in the spirit of service but in self-preservation--to maintain the highest possible male enrollment. The Richmond Alumni Association had articulated these dual objectives in 1941 when they adopted a resolution urging the College to add

such special courses as will enable the College to perform a worthy part in the program of defense and at the same time make it possible for the young men in its student body to continue the normal course of their education until their services are actually needed in the armed forces of the United States. (p. 112)

The Extension Division from 1934 to 1942

J. A. C. Chandler's far-reaching program of service to the state through extension continued throughout

Bryan's presidency, although Bryan did not share Chandler's enthusiasm for the program. The predominant theme in extension during this period was the growing perception of the Norfolk Division and the Richmond Division as separate entities from the parent college in Williamsburg. The divisions were not always regarded favorably by the faculty in Williamsburg, who perceived them to some extent as outposts; for instance, Harold Fowler, who joined the William and Mary history faculty in 1934 and later became Dean of Arts and Sciences, recalled that a faculty member's being reassigned to the Norfolk Division was referred to as being "sent to Siberia" (Fowler, 1974)!

At any rate, the two divisions had distinct functions: The Norfolk Division was conceived to provide the first two years of a four-year liberal arts education, while the emphasis at the Richmond Division was on vocational and professional education along with selected courses in liberal arts. In addition to these functions for their regular daytime student body, each division also offered a variety of evening extension courses for students in the surrounding area. In the 1934-35 school year, the Norfolk Division enrolled 341 day students, and the Richmond Division 369; that year's extension enrollment total of 745 included students taking extension courses through the divisions as well as those taking courses through the parent college (Minutes of the Board

of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 120).

The Norfolk Division. In his 1936 report to the Board of Visitors, director of the Norfolk Division Dean W. T. Hodges pointed to increasingly higher standards of admission and retention at the Division. In Hodges' words, the student body had become less "high-schoolish" and more "college-minded" (p. 248). Hodges also indicated a number of activities that signaled the forging of a separate identity from the college in Williamsburg and the genesis of an independent college. For example, the Division began producing its own yearbook, and the faculty members began to become involved in the community, purchasing homes in Norfolk, joining civic luncheon clubs, and giving monthly public lectures (p. 248). By 1938 the Norfolk faculty had become more involved in civic concerns and the students were enjoying extracurricular activities typical of many college campuses: athletics, a student newspaper, social clubs, a dramatic club, a Glee Club, a current events society, radio programs, a science exhibit, and a Greek festival (p. 409). A 1938 article in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot termed the thriving Division a revolutionary development in local education:

As late as 1930, Norfolk, second largest city in the State, was wholly without facilities for college instruction, except for the adult education classes that had been conducted here since 1919 by instructors from the College at

Williamsburg. In September of that year the parent college at Williamsburg opened its Norfolk Division with 206 students. It begins its ninth year with an enrollment which, when it reaches its maximum, will be larger than that of Randolph-Macon College, or Hampden-Sydney, or Roanoke or Emory and Henry.

The College of William and Mary at Williamsburg joined with the city of Norfolk in a far-sighted act to remedy the emptiness. For that act of education statesmanship, the city of Norfolk will ever be grateful to President J.A.C. Chandler who launched it and President J. S. Bryan who has carried it on.

(Virginian-Pilot, September 22, 1938, p. 6)

Not publicized were the tensions between Dean Hodges of the Norfolk Division and the administration in Williamsburg. In reference to Hodges' disregarding rules prohibiting Division students from taking more than two years' work, Bryan warned the Board that he "would feel compelled to recommend that drastic action be taken" if Hodges continued to disregard directives (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 483). This tension was increased by the fact that the Division operated at a deficit on and off through the years, a deficit in part attributed to the Division's need to add faculty and increase salaries in order to maintain standards required

by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1940-46, p. 27). President Bryan objected in 1940 that

The cost of operation has continued to be a drain on the college of William and Mary. . . . While too much praise cannot be given to Dr. William T. Hodges for the energy and intelligence with which he has administered his office, yet praise is not the equivalent of cash, and the Board will have to decide whether it will continue to operate at a deficit. (p. 40)

Charles Duke, the college bursar, warned of the need to reduce expenditures at William and Mary by \$12,000 during the 1940-41 academic year in order to operate without a deficit, and by another \$10,000 to absorb the deficit at Norfolk (p. 81). A letter from Duke to Hodges illustrates a conflict in enlisting support:

Dear Billy:

I have certified your requisition to the Greenbrier Farms, Inc., for shrubs in the amount of \$41 because I do not think it proper except under the most extraordinary circumstances to disapprove any departmental or Division orders. . . . However, I feel compelled to remind you of the financial difficulties faced by the Norfolk Division, and the great

need for expenditure for books. . . . I do believe that it would be better not to spend any more money in this direction at present at least. If it is any consolation to you, we have not been able to spend a penny for this sort of thing for more than two and a half years here at Williamsburg. (Letter from Charles J. Duke to William T. Hodges, January 24, 1941, President's Office Papers, Pomfret, 1982.55, Box 7)

Far more serious than the financial skirmishes was a major scandal at Norfolk that threatened the integrity of the parent college as well. Norfolk Division faculty members informed Dr. James W. Miller, Dean of the Faculty at Williamsburg, that Dr. Hodges had been falsifying students' transcripts; he had dropped failing grades from the record, raised grades, and given credit for courses never taken. Dean Hodges admitted that the charges were true but refused to resign (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1940-46, p. 86). A special committee investigated the possibility of severing ties with the Division, but the State Attorney General advised that if the College violated the conditions establishing the Division in 1930, the property and any improvements made would revert to the City of Norfolk without any compensation to William and Mary (p. 103). The committee ultimately concluded that rather than severing the

relationship, The College of William and Mary should strengthen the Division by supplementing the liberal arts courses with vocational instruction, by providing terminal courses for students not intending to transfer to four-year institutions, by incorporating programs for the national defense, and by establishing a permanent advisory committee of Norfolk citizens (p. 111). With Charles Duke appointed as the new director of the Norfolk Division, Dr. Hodges became director of adult education and evening instruction at the Division (p. 136).

In the wake of the Norfolk Division scandal, The College of William and Mary was suspended by the Association of American Universities. The Association insisted that Hodges' connection with William and Mary be completely severed and stated that as a businessman, Charles Duke was not qualified to head the Division. One member of the investigating committee also objected to John Stewart Bryan's division of interests as newspaper publisher and college president (p. 164). Subsequent conferences by Dean Miller and President Bryan with committee members of the American Association of Universities revealed that although there were other grounds for complaint against the Norfolk Division as well as the Richmond Division, "the compelling and final cause for the suspension . . . was the fact that Dr. W. T. Hodges had not been definitely repudiated by the College of William and Mary" (p. 179). After a leave of absence,

Hodges finally retired, citing health problems as the reason. Parents were alarmed by the College's suspension. The United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa refused to hold a planned ceremony on the Williamsburg campus until the College regained its accreditation (p. 179), an ironic turn of events for the institution that had founded Phi Beta Kappa in 1776 (Vital Facts, p. 9).

The Richmond Division. The School of Social Work and Public Health was established in Richmond in 1917 and was consolidated with the extension division of The College of William and Mary in 1925. As Dr. H. H. Hibbs, the Division Director, reported in 1934 to the Board of Visitors, this was the only accredited school in the South Atlantic States offering professional training for social workers and public health nurses. Since its prestige and usefulness had increased during the Depression years, Hibbs cited the operation of the Division as an important service that William and Mary rendered the State (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 149).

The Division also included a vocational school of art; training for teachers of retailing, store services, and distributive trades; courses for teachers of industrial arts and vocational education; and a number of extension courses in the liberal arts (p. 411). Concerned about degrees in liberal arts offered by the Richmond Division that "would not have passed the test at the Mother College in Williamsburg," President Bryan proposed

in 1939 that the Division be renamed the Richmond Professional Institute of the College of William and Mary (p. 457). With the negotiations for the change in name came an agreement with the State to assume a proportion of the cost of training social workers without charging that work directly to the College of William and Mary (p. 464).

Following the 1941 scandal at the Norfolk Division, Dean Miller suggested a reconsideration of the College's relationship with the Richmond Professional Institute as well (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1940-46, p. 164). A special committee chaired by Dean Miller concluded that it was impossible to sever the ties between the Institute and the College immediately but that in the interim, clearer regulations were needed to define the authority of the President and the Board in relation to the Institute (p. 195). The American Association of Universities also questioned the advisability of the administration of a professional institute by the College. In turn, Dr. Hibbs challenged the Association's jurisdiction in matters of professional schools and cited other accredited universities having affiliated professional schools (p. 202).

In summary, while President Bryan was shaping the image of William and Mary as a selective liberal arts college on the home campus, he was fulfilling the College's obligation for service to the state primarily by making accessible the largely vocational and professional

courses of study at the Divisions and through extension. Charles Duke articulated this dual identity shortly after he became Division Director at Norfolk: "Here in Norfolk is an opportunity for William and Mary to enlarge and broaden her field of service with great credit to herself and without in any way impairing her traditional ideals and purposes" [emphasis added] (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1940-44, p. 188).

No analysis of the Bryan era would be complete without reference to the rumors that John D. Rockefeller, Jr., would endow William and Mary as a private college. Many felt that without the mandate for service to the State, William and Mary could become an Ivy League college. Shortly before he assumed the presidency, Bryan referred to this in a memorandum to the Board of Visitors:

Naturally, the Board of William and Mary would like to see for this College a wide and rich future in the field of liberal arts. Such a field, for example, as is occupied by Harvard, Princeton or Yale. But such an ideal is difficult of attainment and extremely costly. It would therefore be beyond any possible hope of achievement unless William and Mary could secure a large and adequate special endowment. . . . Suggestions from a number of sources have come to the members of the Board which makes it seem highly probable that such

an endowment can be secured. (Memorandum on the Future of William and Mary, May 23, 1934, President's Office Papers, Bryan, 1979.35, Box 8)

Five years later an article in the Times-Herald claimed that

The question of "independence" arose following the alumni address at the William and Mary finals last June at which Vernon Geddy, Vice-President of the Williamsburg Restoration and an associate of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., said the College alumni could obtain the necessary endowment if they made the effort. Following Geddy's address, it was reported that the General Education Board of New York, a Rockefeller Foundation for distributing financial aid to education institutions, had a residuum of \$8,000,000 which it proposed to dispose of in a short time. (Times-Herald, September 5, 1939, quoted in Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1934-39, p. 481)

Bryan found such rumors to be not only groundless, but in fact harmful to the College in its quest for endowments from other sources and for greater appropriations from the State (p. 481). One alumnus wrote Bryan that "our college will be embarrassed, I think, until she gets a divorce from the State of Virginia" (Letter from William I.

Marable to John Stewart Bryan, June 22, 1939, President's Office Papers, Bryan, 1979.35, Box 8). Bryan responded that no offer for a large endowment had been made and none was in prospect. The following year Bryan explained why a committee had been formed to seek special endowments to build up the law school:

The genesis of this action was to test the weight of the widely-current statement that a large sum of money was waiting for William and Mary, if only the college would plan to carry out some undisclosed course of action in the field of instruction. At this time no definite offer, nor even suggestion of such prospective gift had been made to the President or the Board, but even so the possibility seemed worth exploring. (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1940-46, p. 6)

The Pomfret Presidency: Service Mission on a
National Level

John E. Pomfret's presidency was dominated by wartime accommodations, with events at the national level overshadowing state-level concerns.

Responding to Wartime Exigencies

In the first year of his presidency, Pomfret found The College of William and Mary "confronted with the problem of institutional survival. . . . Our men students have been gradually whittled away" (Minutes of the Board

of Visitors, 1940-46, p. 251). After John Stewart Bryan had spent years building up the male enrollment to bolster the College's image, the male enrollment for the 1943-44 academic year was diminished by the draft. After all the effort expended to limit the number of women enrolled during the Bryan era, the number of women became disproportionately high once again: The 897-member student body for the Fall 1943 semester included 666 women and only 231 men (p. 291). One faculty member summarized the effects of World War II on the College as having decimated the faculty, reduced the student body, and caused grave financial stringencies (Miller, 1975, p. 20).

As a means of providing not only a type of wartime service but also a source of income to offset the diminished civilian male enrollment, the College also accommodated an Army Cadet Corps and a Navy Chaplain Corps. "I am confident," Pomfret stated, "that the resources of the College are such that we shall never lack an opportunity to perform a service for either the Army or Navy during the war" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1940-46, p. 252). Accommodating the military units involved shifts in dormitory space and costly adaptations in building use, but Pomfret voiced his support:

The cost of all these alterations and repairs has been somewhat shocking to a President who had wished to curtail expenditures in every direction, in order to expedite debt repayment.

On the other hand, it is far more honorable for the College to sustain every sinew in the war effort than to spend its ingenuity in saving pennies. (p. 291)

Miller (1975) observed that these activities had little to do with the College as an academic institution; instead, "what it did really was to occupy space" (p. 20). Pomfret would later remark that when he was president of William and Mary, he was running not a college but a hotel (Lambert, 1975, p. 132).

A Postwar Influx

With the wave of World War II veterans arriving on campus, the male enrollment reached 1,175 on the Williamsburg campus in the 1946-47 school year (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1947-53, p. 1) and 1,300 the following year (p. 48). Many faculty members welcomed the maturity and sense of purpose displayed by the veterans as students (Fowler, 1974, and Jones, 1974). One scheme suggested to handle the swollen enrollment was to establish a coordinate college for women on the Eastern State Hospital land, leaving the traditional campus for men only (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1947-1953, p. 36). The College was experiencing a surge of popularity with women and had to turn down several hundred out-of-state applicants "of the highest calibre" in the Fall of 1947:

If the pressure of Virginia women continues

we shall next fall be in the unhappy position of refusing to admit the daughters of our out-of-state alumni. Such a policy will be greeted with deep resentment in spite of our explanation that we are a state institution. (p. 49)

Pomfret considered the overwhelming popularity with women to be a temporary fad, however, noting that Vassar, Smith, Wellesley, and Bryn Mawr experienced similar "rushes" every few years (p. 82) and further observing that "one suspects that our popularity rests in the fact that we are cheaper" (p. 84).

Addressing once again the need to compete for male students, Pomfret called for more scholarship funds and new dorms (p. 109). Just as the World War II veterans were graduating, the male enrollment was further affected by the Korean War draft, with 75 students called to duty by the Fall of 1950. Once again Pomfret observed that "the male enrollment of the College will directly depend upon the course of foreign affairs" (p. 176). The issue was numbers, not selectivity:

The Admissions Office has strained every resource to admit a large section of freshman men. It has accepted every qualified high school graduate, and I have placed at the disposal of the Admissions Committee every dollar that could be spared from the scholarship funds. (p. 204)

The Extension Divisions during Pomfret's Presidency

The most salient aspect of the extension divisions during this era was the extent to which they could boost the College's enrollment totals. At the peak of the postwar surge, for example, "The Greater William and Mary" full-time and part-time enrollment totaled approximately 6,000, only 1,781 of whom were on the home campus. Nine hundred were at St. Helena, a temporary "G.I. Extension" established at an old Navy installation in Norfolk to accommodate the post-war enrollment increase and later incorporated with the Norfolk Division. Pomfret contrasted the 6,000 student total with the approximate average of 4,000 students each at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the University of Virginia, and the University of Richmond (p. 1).

Despite the appeal of greater numbers to secure greater state appropriations, many favored a separation of the Norfolk Division and the Richmond Professional Institute from the parent college. According to Pomfret, William and Mary alumni were either hostile or indifferent to the relationship (p. 191). A 1951 report by the Commission on Reorganization of the State Government found no reason other than proximity for the divisions to be attached to William and Mary since their work was so different (p. 190). One faculty member stated that the divisions were incompatible with the College at Williamsburg with its aspirations for recognition as a

leading liberal arts college:

We'd like to think of ourselves as being in the league with places like Swarthmore, Haverford. . . . I never saw much evidence that either the Board nor anyone on the Williamsburg campus were greatly interested in the branches. Covering them seemed more like a relatively passive obligation dictated by the state. I certainly began to think the set-up would be neater and more logical if we just operated as a single entity out of Williamsburg. I think Dr. Pomfret shared that view and was beginning to lay the groundwork for proposing such. (Marshall, 1975)

In fact, the directors at Richmond and Norfolk each requested separation from William and Mary and transfer of control to the State Board of Education, and Pomfret gained Board approval to arrange such a transfer (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1947-1953, pp. 190-91). Accreditation was also at issue: Although the divisions started being accredited separately after the 1942 Hodges scandal, a negative report on a division would still affect the main college. After the Southern Association gave Richmond Professional Institute an unfavorable report in 1951, Director Hibbs admitted to the Board that "It is quite within the bounds of possibility that the Southern Association will place an asterisk against the name of the

College of William and Mary with the footnote 'not meeting Standard 15'" (p. 246). This standard specified that the standards for the regular nine-month session of a college should be applied to the other activities of the institution.

The move toward separation was obscured, however, by Pomfret's resignation in the wake of an athletic scandal (p. 236).

A Faculty Statement of the College Mission

Pomfret had done much for the faculty, raising their salary level and encouraging as well as participating in research and scholarly activity (p. 240). One former dean of the faculty credited Pomfret with preserving the qualitative progress Bryan had made (Miller, 1975, p. 19); another faculty member listed as Pomfret's greatest contribution the "genuinely scholarly atmosphere" he fostered (Marsh, 1974, p. 34). Ironically, the William and Mary faculty attracted national acclaim with a statement condemning the overemphasis on athletics during Pomfret's presidency. The statement made the front page and editorials of the New York Times and the Herald-Tribune, and Acting President Miller concluded that

The faculty achieved its purpose of restoring the prestige of the College. . . . At the present moment the College of William and Mary is now held throughout the state and nation in higher honor than ever before. . . .

The Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has told me that he regards that action of the faculty in adopting its statement as an event of the greatest importance and greatest value to the colleges and universities . . . throughout the nation (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1947-1953, p. 242).

Charging that an exaggerated athletic program had steadily diminished the academic standards of the College, the statement articulated the faculty's perception of mission:

William and Mary exists to educate intelligent, informed, and balanced graduates, able to make sound judgments and to discriminate among values, and prepared to follow their various careers as responsible, progressive citizens of their communities. To this end a curriculum has been carefully planned--and is being constantly revised--to provide a thorough course of study in the humanities and the natural and social sciences. Entrance to this program pre-supposes high standards of admission, and its successful completion demands a high level of achievement. If this educational goal is to be fully attained, it must be the primary purpose of all college activities; all else must be contributory and

subservient. Anything short of this goal would be unworthy of the ancient traditions and honorable history of the College. (pp. 236-37)

A. D. Chandler: The Return to a
Broad Service Orientation

During the last year of Pomfret's presidency, the Virginia General Assembly had ordered a study of the state-supported institutions of higher education. Consultant Fred J. Kelly of the U.S. Office of Education recommended that William and Mary cultivate an innovative and superior liberal arts program to serve as a model for Virginia's private liberal arts colleges:

Let the orientation of William and Mary be more toward the private colleges . . . in recognition of the immeasurable contribution of the private colleges to the State's welfare. . . . The State can well afford to maintain at William and Mary a proving ground where carefully devised procedures in liberal arts education will be tried out and evaluated not only for the benefit of the students there but for the influence such try outs may have on the other liberal arts colleges in the State. (Higher Education in Virginia. Report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to the Governor and General Assembly. August 13, 1951, p. 24)

In contrast to this view of William and Mary's best

means of service to the State, A. D. Chandler re-established during his presidency the broad educational service orientation that had characterized the presidency of his father, J.A.C. Chandler.

An Expanded Conception of Educational Service

Although A. D. Chandler conceded that the College was fundamentally a liberal arts, undergraduate college, he pointed out the expression of "other educational values" in evidence at the College and its extension divisions:

These educational values may be found in the fields of business administration, education, jurisprudence, home economics, physical education for men, secretarial science, and in provisions for pre-professional training in dentistry, engineering, forestry, medical technology, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, public health service, veterinary medicine, and . . . the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1947-53, p. 263)

Acknowledging that "there is a tendency on the part of some who would like to have William and Mary limit its service to public education" (p. 320), A. D. Chandler nonetheless expanded the extension program offered through the home campus as well as through the divisions, explaining that

If the College of William and Mary is to give the service in Virginia that it has

given in the past, it will have to grow along with the state. If not, then it will continue to give a proportionately diminishing service as the State develops in size and services required. (p. 320)

George Oliver, serving in 1952 as Head of the Department of Education, Director of Extension, and Coordinator of Divisional Activities, lauded Chandler for his broad conception of educational service:

President Chandler has expressed a philosophy of education which recognizes a major responsibility of an educational institution to be the rendering of effective service to its constituents. As an institution supported by the people of Virginia, he has conceived the educational mission of the college of William and Mary, therefore, to be that of providing appropriate educational service and opportunity to the people of its region, the state which supports it. (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1953-58, p. 180)

In addition to philosophical considerations, demographics affected the educational service mission of the College: As a result of higher birth rates during World War II and in the years since 1946, public schools enrollments increased at an unprecedented rate. Responding to the resultant shortage of public school

teachers in 1953, the College re-established a major concentration in education, a concentration discontinued during Bryan's presidency. The Board reaffirmed that the College was still required by the State legislature to provide for teacher training, since this had been a condition named by the State in assuming the support of the College in 1906 (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1947-53, pp. 470-71).

After the resumption of the concentration in education, demands on the department of education grew: More undergraduates were preparing to teach; more graduate students enrolled in the Evening College, Saturday courses, extension courses, and in the Summer Session; and demand for consultative services and in-service training grew. To meet these increased demands and to coordinate the educational services of the Williamsburg, Richmond, and Norfolk campuses, it was recommended in 1957 that a School of Education be established. By 1961 this was accomplished (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1960-62, pp. 171-73).

Just as A. D. Chandler echoed his father's emphasis on educational service, he also embraced his goal of high admissions standards. Observers characterized A. D. Chandler's policies as "always deliberate imitation and adaptation" of his father's (Fowler, 1974). Making frequent reference to his father's "Dartmouth Plan" of selective admission, A. D. Chandler saw by the end of his

presidency an acceptance rate of one in eight (Godson, 1991, p. 18). Maintaining an adequate proportion of male students continued to be a serious concern. Professor Gibbs of the Business Administration Department claimed that the undergraduate curriculum was not sufficiently appealing to male students, citing the Bryan-era change from School to Department of Business Administration as one example of the college's inability to compete with other institutions to attract men. "William and Mary also suffers because it is generally known it concentrates on the Liberal Arts," Gibbs claimed (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1953-58, p. 358). President Chandler pointed to the "excessive foreign language requirement of twelve to eighteen semester hours" as a serious competitive disadvantage: "Men generally do not like to take foreign languages [and] feel that they are of little value to them" (p. 360).

Greater William and Mary and The William and Mary System

With the stated goal of providing educational service to Eastern Virginia, Chandler devised a comprehensive plan. First, he had the Board rescind the authority given under Pomfret's presidency to separate the divisions from the College; instead the divisions would be strengthened and considered once more an integral part of the College (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1947-53, p. 322). The Board passed a resolution to this effect, reaffirming the educational "responsibility of the Greater College of

William and Mary to the youth and adults of the State of Virginia and the Tidewater Area, in particular, and of the nation, in general" (p. 409). Considering the Norfolk Division and RPI to have a natural affiliation with the College at Williamsburg in terms of origin, location, and tradition, Chandler considered each institution an essential component of a comprehensive system providing educational opportunity for citizens in Eastern Virginia (p. 409). In fact, he accorded the Williamsburg campus no special recognition in his description of the The William and Mary System as "three affiliated institutions of higher education" and the individual campuses as "units" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1953-58, p. 10). George Oliver observed "a general feeling of being participants in a single educational enterprise" and concluded that "each unit . . . accepted its contributing role" (p. 180).

Chandler characterized The College at Williamsburg as essentially an arts and sciences college offering, in addition to the central core of liberal arts, programs in selected pre-professional and professional fields. The pre-professional programs included medicine, medical technology, public health service, dentistry, nursing, engineering, and forestry. Professional training was offered in law, business administration, marine biology, and teaching. The Norfolk Division offered the first two years of the four-year arts and science program of the

College at Williamsburg as well as one and two-year programs in basic general education and science courses included in pre-professional preparation for medicine, dentistry, pharmacy and nursing. In addition, the Norfolk Division offered vocational training in business practice, secretarial science, distributive education, medical secretary courses, and laboratory technology training. Offering no program in liberal arts, the Richmond Professional Institute was composed of seven professional schools--art, business administration, distributive education, music, occupational therapy, clinical and applied psychology, and social work--and four divisions: applied social science, applied science, general education, and engineering (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1947-53, p. 407).

Despite Chandler's rhetoric of The System as three affiliated institutions providing comprehensive educational service, the Board of Visitors jealously guarded the reputation of the College at Williamsburg and were concerned that graduates from the Divisions could be mistaken for graduates from the home campus. For instance, debated at length was the wording of diplomas issued by Norfolk. "The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division" prevailed over "The College of William and Mary in Norfolk, Virginia" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1953-58, pp. 240, 244). In 1959 when a faculty representative from Norfolk broached the subject

of separation from William and Mary, the Rector of the Board of Visitors pointed out that the Norfolk Division could add little to the tradition and prestige of the College at Williamsburg, while the prestige of the name "William and Mary" lent a great deal to the new and struggling college at Norfolk; the Rector complained that "whatever they did that was not good, it reflected on the name 'William and Mary'" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1958-60, p. 339).

The Evening College and the Expansion of Extension

Chandler encouraged the strengthening and expansion of the extension program on campus as well as off. Evening and Saturday courses offered on the Williamsburg campus were organized in 1952 as the Evening College, "in line with the educational policy of the College of William and Mary of meeting its broader responsibilities by serving the educational needs of the community of Williamsburg and the surrounding areas" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1953-58, p. 168). The primary function of The Evening College was to offer residence credit for graduate and advanced undergraduate degree students in education and for service members from area military installations. A 1952 article in the Alumni Gazette offered this perspective:

Yielding to the pressure of demand created by military personnel and fully employed persons in the Williamsburg and Peninsula area, the

College announced that it would offer evening classes for full college credit for the first time in its 260 year history. . . . The program, formulated after long discussions with authorities at nearby military bases, includes courses in economics, English literature and grammar, foreign language, history, philosophy, psychology, biology, physics, fine arts, sociology, education, physical education, and government.

The response to the College's evening program was gratifying. From all over the Peninsula area, interested men and women--including some husband and wife teams--showed up to register for classes.

The evening students will receive full college credit for their work. The credits can be transferred to other colleges or applied toward a degree at William and Mary. (December 1952, p. 5)

The Coordinator of the Evening College insisted that these courses were taught in most instances by regular members of the faculty using the same materials and schedules as in the day session under the supervision of the respective department heads to insure uniformity of instruction and compliance with the academic standards of the College (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1953-58, p.

168). Nevertheless, critics would later argue that this was more an ideal than a reality. A financially self-supporting unit receiving no state funds, the Evening College held membership in the Association of University Evening Colleges. The fact that it was a separate entity from the main college was stressed in the Evening College catalogues: "Admission to the Evening College shall not be construed as automatically admitting the applicant to the day session or to any other division or branch of the College of William and Mary" (Evening College Catalogue, Fall 1958-59).

Most of the students served by the off-campus extension courses were also public school teachers and military service members. A 1956-57 extension catalogue labeled "The Greater College of William and Mary: Norfolk-Williamsburg-Richmond" listed courses "designed to serve the educational needs of residents of Tidewater communities, and teachers, military and industrial personnel in the area." By 1959 extension locations included Hampton, Newport News, Warwick County, Portsmouth-Norfolk County, Princess Anne County, Southampton County, Henrico-Richmond, and Hopewell.

The Tidewater Report and the Colleges of William and Mary

Extension was an important issue addressed in "Higher Education in the Tidewater Area of Virginia," a report initiated and financed by the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce, authorized by the State Council of Higher

Education, and conducted by staff members of the United States Office of Education. Conclusion No. 9 (p. 16) of the study was that a plan for the coordinated provision of extension courses was lacking in the Tidewater Area and that there was no guiding policy to develop such a plan. Recommendation No. 13 was that duplication of extension courses be avoided and that no more than one institution offer extension courses in a given field in the same area. Noting that William and Mary had six extension centers and offered extension courses at approximately thirty additional locations, the report listed extension enrollment figures for 1957-58: Seventy-four classes enrolling 1,127 undergraduates and 161 graduate students, a total of 1,288 (p. 44). The favorable press given to William and Mary's extension program in the Tidewater report served to strengthen the Board's support of that aspect of the College's educational service mission, and they later authorized the development of non-credit extension courses in response to requests by industrial, civic, educational, and service organizations (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1958-60, p. 395).

The survey staff made a final radical recommendation, the infamous Recommendation No. 16:

There should be developed . . . a Tidewater College System to be operated under the present Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary, renamed as the Board of Visitors of the

Tidewater College System. . . . As vacancies on the Board occur, appointments [should] be made in the direction of developing a regional Tidewater representation and interest. (p. 18)

Maintaining the existing William and Mary System was vetoed by the survey staff for "not meeting the demands of the dynamic metropolitan Tidewater Area for more extensive education and training programs than can be provided by a predominantly liberal arts college" (p. 65).

Recommendation No. 17 specified that the central office of the Board of Visitors and the headquarters of the chief executive officer should not be located on the campus of any of the constituent colleges (p. 18).

Three months later the Board of Visitors, the State Council Director, and the state consultant from the United States Office of Education met at William and Mary to discuss the Tidewater report. The Board declared itself "informally agreed, in principle" to implement amended versions of recommendations No. 16 and No. 17 (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1958-60, p. 389). Although the name "Tidewater College System" did not become a reality, the concept did (Kale and Smith, 1990). Under the provisions of House Bill No. 466 offered in February of 1960, The College of William and Mary, the Norfolk Division, the Richmond Professional Institute, and the new junior colleges to be established in Newport News and Petersburg (Christopher Newport College and Richard Bland

College) would constitute The Colleges of William and Mary (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1958-60, p. 422). In May 1960 an expanded Board of Visitors named A. D. Chandler chancellor of The Colleges and elected presidents for the colleges in Williamsburg, Norfolk, and Richmond; by September of the following year, the two junior colleges were opened (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1960-62, p. 491). Kale and Smith (1990) detail the extent to which the identity of the original College of William and Mary was submerged under this arrangement:

The College's extensive property holdings had been transferred; its longtime historic seal had been supplanted; its president for the first time did not have direct access to the Board of Visitors, the governor, or the Virginia General Assembly, but "reported" through an administrative chancellor; it was on a par organizationally with four other colleges comprising the legislatively created system . . . and its historic identity was compromised and threatened. (pp. 72-73)

Paschall's Presidency:

A Tradition of Responsiveness to Educational Needs

The Disestablishment of the Colleges

The first two years of Davis Y. Paschall's presidency were in the shadow of A.D. Chandler as chancellor of the Colleges of William and Mary. Minutes of the Board of

Visitors during that period reveal a cumbersome process of addressing five sets of budgetary and personnel concerns and calling the heads of each institution into the meetings separately. A committee discussion to rename the Norfolk Division in 1960 typified the awkwardness of the interrelationships during that period: "The Norfolk College of William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary" was the final choice (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1960-62, p. 102).

Members of the General Assembly and the State Council began to have second thoughts about the William and Mary system, and "behind-the-scenes political pressure began to mount" (Kale and Smith, 1990, p. 76). Paschall voiced his support to the State Council director for restoring William and Mary to its historic role and for making Norfolk College and Richmond Professional Institution independent (p. 77), and in 1962 the system of Colleges was distablished. Some Board members protested that insufficient time had elapsed before the reversal, but many faculty and administrators had considered the system of Colleges unsound, impossible, unworkable, and intolerable from the outset (Jones, 1974). Addressing the General Assembly in January 1962, Governor Harrison concluded in an often-quoted passage that the College of William and Mary deserved to have its separate identity restored:

A college with so rich a promise . . . that

has withstood the ravages of wars and fires does not have to compromise its identity and character, or bargain its name for support by this Commonwealth. . . . To the contrary, it should enjoy a new birth as a truly great undergraduate institution of liberal arts and sciences, strengthening and improving the advanced programs it now has. (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1960-62, p. 549)

Image, Prestige, and Institutional Identity

Trying to clarify the image of William and Mary to the Governor in 1960, the Chairman of the State Council for Higher Education, Dabney Lancaster, acknowledged the conflict inherent in a state-supported college with a liberal arts identity:

With a national reputation as an institution which places supreme emphasis on the arts and sciences, it may be difficult for the citizens of the Tidewater area to envision it as a college dedicated to urban or regional educational needs. . . . There is a divided desire in the region between the wish to preserve the College at Williamsburg in its respected and historic character, and the desire to have post-high school educational programs oriented to the needs of a metropolitan center. (Minutes of the Board of Visitors,

1960-62, p. 478)

Lancaster conceded, however, that the College's "vigorous and continuous efforts to meet these dual objectives have been highly commendable."

In the discussions prior to the 1962 disestablishment of the Colleges, General Assembly member Lewis McMurrin remarked to the Board that William and Mary alumni held an image of the College as an eighteenth century Ivy League College--though McMurrin doubted the College could achieve that level of prestige again--and that Colonial Williamsburg promoted the image of the College as a small, liberal arts "showplace" for tourists (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1960-62, p. 431).

The conflict inherent in being a small state-controlled liberal arts college was highlighted in the attempt to formulate a statement of aims and purposes for the 1964 Self-Study Report required by the State Council and headed by the arts and sciences faculty. The Visitation Committee pointed out that reference to the College's being a state institution was inadvertently omitted in the statement approved by the steering committee. Later revisions included an articulation of state support and the consequent obligation for service.

The composition of the student body shaped and was shaped by the image of the College. Viewing William and Mary as having "always enjoyed recognition as a national institution dedicated to the liberal arts," alumnus Shore

Robertson (1961) protested the enactment of a seventy to thirty in-state to out-of-state ratio as a threat to the "cosmopolitan atmosphere" of the College (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1962-63, p. 218). The Board would later characterize this as the tension between meeting an institutional obligation to the constituency of the State that supported it and preserving the traditional nature and character of the institution to the best educational advantage (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1964-66, p. 313). The Board had approved raising the proportion of Virginia students from sixty or sixty-five percent to seventy percent because of the improved quality of the Virginia applicant pool; they justified the thirty percent out-of-state proportion "for the obvious educational and cultural impact on the life of the Virginia students" (p. 313). The male to female ratio continued to be a concern, fluctuating with the availability of dormitory accommodations (p. 316); by 1970 the balance approached fifty-fifty (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1969-70, p. 381). The 1970 annual report of the admissions committee to the faculty emphasized that in addition to SAT scores, a student's class rank and counselor or faculty recommendations were important criteria for admission; furthermore, the committee was addressing the issue of "the inequitable distribution of poverty-minority students" and was attempting to determine special talents to attain a more heterogenous student body (Appendix 1 to

Faculty Minutes, November 10, 1970).

Alumnus Shore Robertson cited another factor damaging to the College's image--its low salary scale: The average faculty salary at William and Mary in 1962 was \$6,884, contrasting with \$10,200 at the University of Virginia and \$9,300 at the Washington and Lee (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1962-63, p. 218). President Paschall resolved the salary issue by appealing to the State Council for comparability status with Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the University of Virginia in peer groupings for faculty salary averages rather than with other four-year State teacher training institutions that differed radically from William and Mary. Paschall conveyed the uniqueness of William and Mary in making his appeal:

The College takes pride in its history of the training of teachers for the public system, emanating from the actions of 1888, yet it does not proclaim to be, nor is it regarded as, a teacher-training institution as such, but as its Royal Charter of 1693 stipulates, a College of "Good Arts and Sciences," this inherent factor making it different from sister four-year institutions having teacher preparation or professionalized or vocational training some recognized as basic to their purpose. (p. 290)

William and Mary subsequently became the only institution categorized as an emerging university, and by 1967 the

College was included in the state university grouping (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1966-67, p. 387). William and Mary had developed a unique identity as a small, state-supported liberal arts college classified as a university--claiming university status for the sake of salary level and added degree programs, smallness for the sake of selectivity, liberal arts for the sake of prestige, and state support to justify a broadly-based service orientation. On the College's two hundred seventy-fifth anniversary in 1968, syndicated columnist Russell Kirk observed that "Although nowadays William and Mary really is a university . . . it preserves its ancient harmony and humane scale. . . . Any genuine college of liberal arts and sciences should be a place of dignity, tradition, quiet and academic leisure" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1967-69, p. 268).

Even the subject of parking places reflected the growing complexity of the College. A Board member remarked that if the institution was going to maintain university status, they would have to plan to "allow automobiles for students whether desired or not. . . . We are no longer a small liberal arts college, and . . . we cannot expect to handle the students the way we did twenty-five years ago" (p. 381).

President Paschall recognized that despite the university status of William and Mary, the Arts and Sciences faculty continued to view liberal arts as the

primary identity and itself as "The Faculty" of the college (p. 290). Still, in a 1968 reorganization, Paschall redesignated the departments of arts and sciences as the College of Arts and Sciences, reporting to the Vice-President on an equal basis with the five Schools. One Board member remarked that

The real issue here is that the College of Arts and Sciences has been the heart of William and Mary since its founding. They divine from this change . . . that it no longer will be the heart of the operation because they will give up the dominion which they historically had over these other undergraduate activities. (p. 415)

Another Board member countered that

By the same token at one time this College was primarily the college for the training of teachers and at least fifty percent of the Division Superintendents of Schools in Virginia were William and Mary men. They don't want you to even mention that today. (p. 415)

In addition to these rival conceptions of institutional identity was the issue of jurisdiction and control over the undergraduate degree. Although the Arts and Sciences faculty had traditionally assumed this control, it was threatened under the new organizational scheme by an overlap in degree programs with the School of Education as well as other schools. A history professor voiced concern

that the schools would gain a disproportionate influence in the College and seek partial or total control over the baccalaureate degree; "he asked for vigilance and a strong stand by [the Faculty of Arts and Sciences] to prevent the erosion of its long held prerogatives" (Faculty Minutes, October 8, 1968). Some felt that Business more than Education was seen as a threat to the College's liberal arts emphasis (Healy, 1991). Quittmeyer (1984) provides a lengthy account of this issue. Most significant to this study is that the question of control over the undergraduate degree was the basis for objections to proposals for residence credit to be offered at military installations and for undergraduate degrees to be offered through extension, an issue to be addressed more fully below.

Public Service Through Expanded Educational Opportunities

A Philosophical Basis for Service. A statement of mission and purpose adopted by the Board in 1966 articulated the College's obligation for service:

The College must, as an educational institution, be an effective unity and force in improving the society of which it is a part.

The latter purpose is specifically implied by the realization that the College is a State institution, supported by public funds, and is, therefore, obligated to serve certain functions and elements of constituency designated by

legally constituted authority. This implies a consciousness of public responsibility and a readiness to provide educational leadership and services to the region as well as to the state and nation. (Paschall, 1970, p. 2)

Paschall drew support for this conviction from Section 15 of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of Virginia:

That free government rests, as does all progress, upon the broadest possible diffusion of knowledge, and that the Commonwealth should avail itself of those talents which nature has sown so liberally among its people by assuring the opportunity for their fullest development by an effective system of education throughout the Commonwealth. (Thomas Jefferson, 1779, quoted by Paschall, 1984)

Educational Service Through Extension and the Evening College. It was through a greatly expanded extension program that the College fulfilled a vital aspect of the College's public service role during Paschall's presidency. As a student waiter to President J. A. C. Chandler, Paschall recalled hearing of professors traveling by train as far as Dublin, Virginia, to teach extension courses (Paschall, 1991), and during his own presidency, Paschall actively promoted a widespread extension program. The year before Paschall was named president (1959-60), the Extension Division enrollment was

1,622, and the Evening College enrollment was 885. A decade later, extension enrollment had grown to 6,065, and Evening College enrollment to 2,813 (Paschall, 1970, p. 29). In his five-year report in 1965, Paschall observed that graduate work in education had become the predominant program in the Evening College, and he listed as major areas of study in the Extension Division general education, professional courses in such fields as education and business, and special courses requested by industry, the military, and other agencies. ("Five Year Report," Alumni Gazette, October 1965, p. 22).

In a 1967 Alumni Gazette article featuring the Extension Division, Director of Extension E. Leon Looney noted that one important contribution of extension was that it served as a springboard for students to continue their studies and complete degree requirements at a four-year institution (Alumni Gazette, December 1967). Similarly, Hanny (1991) observed that extension often served as a pipeline to bring degree-seeking students into the School of Education.

Conflicting Perceptions of Extension. Throughout the sixties, a number of other colleges and universities offered extension work in the Tidewater area as well, although this overlap had been criticized in the 1959 Tidewater Report. The Director of Extension in 1960, Donald Herrmann, had warned A. D. Chandler that if William and Mary did not approve certain programs requested by the

school systems and the military, these organizations would "immediately contact the University of Virginia. . . . Such a request would provide an excellent excuse for the University to remain in the Tidewater area for extension services" (Letter from Donald Herrmann to A. D. Chandler, January 27, 1960, President's and Chancellor's Office Files, A. D. Chandler, 1982.65, Box 12). A superintendent during that era, Dr. E. E. Brickell (1991) recalled a meeting with Looney, Herrmann, and Paschall about extension in which he observed "a spirit of wanting William and Mary to get the extension market over UVA and Tech"; they even considered posting signs at extension sites reading "Another Extension Campus of The College of William and Mary," and Brickell recalled getting so carried away with wanting to seize the extension market at Fort Lee that he proposed buying a school bus to transport soldiers to Richard Bland College.

Maintaining William and Mary's share of the extension market was a serious concern to Paschall since he linked extension with legislative support. Referring to the University of Virginia's extension center in Hampton in 1964, President Paschall pointed out that "other institutions will simply meet the needs 'right under our nose,' and we will lose certain support of the community because William and Mary will not meet their needs" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1964-66, p. 18). According to Paschall, an institution perceived as

unresponsive would suffer in the General Assembly, because a college with more extension branches would garner more support for its parent budget in the Assembly (p. 19). When making his annual state budget requests, Paschall would display a large map of Virginia with lines drawn out to all the locations of William and Mary extension courses (Paschall, 1991, and Paschall, 1970, p. 29). The College of William and Mary as a whole benefited from this broadly-based support:

The College built a constituency that was reflected so strongly in the General Assembly that the collective impact in support of William and Mary's budget enabled the College to build an entire new campus; to inaugurate desperately needed departments, schools, and programs--many at the graduate level; to more than double faculty salaries in a brief period; obtain books and equipment galore; and to keep tuition low. (Paschall, 1984)

The competition for the extension market led to a number of criticisms, however. One administrator objected to the "uncoordinated, competitive, confusing nature" of the programs available from William and Mary and other institutions in the area:

We offer economics and education courses in forty separate locations. . . . We thus cut deeply into the potential enrollments of

Christopher Newport College, Hampton Institute, and Thomas Nelson, drawing people off into courses which under most circumstances will not ever be allowed to count toward a degree-- though few who enroll in them realize this.

(Memo from Warren Heemann to Carter Lowance, September 7, 1971, President's Office Papers, Graves, 1981.90)

This observation underscores the criticism that some courses were not even approved by the faculty and were consequently not transferrable into a degree program (Brooks, 1991). Neither was it possible to obtain a degree solely through extension work offered by William and Mary, although students could take up to thirty hours of academic credit that could be applied to residence degree programs elsewhere (News Release, January 6, 1972, President's Office Papers, Graves, 1981.90, Box 6, Continuing Studies Folder). A state-level report on continuing education also pointed to the "danger of competition among extension organizations that could encourage unplanned expansion at the expense of quality and sound long-range development" (Senate Document No. 16, 1970, p. 11, copy in Ad Hoc Committee on Continuing Studies Folder, Dean, Arts and Sciences, 1982.70, Box 2). That report also characterized continuing education's role as "a department store dispensing a variety of loosely related services and by-products of the academic

establishment" and, in a related issue, attributed its low status to a lack of power and prestige in the academic world (p. 4).

Some felt that the standards and requirements were lowered in an effort to garner a share of the market. The climate in the state at that time was described as one of entrepreneurship (Healy, 1991) and fierce competition (Selby, 1991). E. Leon Looney, Director of Extension during that period, stated in retrospect that instead of overcompetition, there existed cooperation among representatives of various colleges; for example, Looney would meet for lunch regularly with representatives from George Washington University and the University of Virginia to discuss what courses they planned to offer. In any case, school superintendents would tend to seek programs from their alma mater (Looney, 1991). Some faculty members talked of "deals" being made with school districts to secure that part of the extension market; others stated categorically that extension courses were inferior (Johnson, 1991) and that the standards "just couldn't compare" with on-campus work (Fowler, 1974). Finally, a history professor protested Dean Herrman's "unilateral change" of one course from Extension to Evening College status, thereby making it a course that would count toward a degree. "I find this to be an alarming state of affairs and a serious threat to the integrity of the William and Mary degree," he stated

(Letter from Ludwell Johnson to Mel Jones, December 19, 1969, Johnson, Personal Papers).

Those closest to the extension program, however, deny questionable practices categorically and attest to the integrity of the program. For instance, in seeking approval from the Arts and Sciences on prospective adjunct faculty members, administrators in the Extension Division would host gatherings on campus to give the on-campus faculty an opportunity to meet them; drawing only fair participation after a period of moderate success, this practice was discontinued after the mid-sixties (Looney, 1991). This limited success is unsurprising in light of one administrator's blunt assessment in retrospect that most of the Arts and Sciences faculty "didn't give a damn" about extension matters anyway. In contrast, Don Herrmann (1976) underscored the support of those served by extension, stating that "everybody loved us except the people on our own campus." As for allegations of conflicts of interest, Looney (1991) labeled this as unfair criticism but acknowledged that appearances could be deceiving to those with only a superficial understanding of a given situation. For instance, a secondary-level administrator would teach a course for elementary level teachers but not for the secondary level teachers that he supervised, or a Norfolk principal might teach a course in Virginia Beach attended by Norfolk teachers, but not teachers from the school he supervised.

As a measure of "quality control," the director or one of the two assistant directors of extension would visit each extension class during the course of the semester to observe (Looney, 1991) and to demonstrate that "someone at the College cares more about them and their educational interests than just collecting tuition and handling paperwork"; the miles they traveled for these site visits averaged 6,000 a month (Alumni Gazette, December 1967). In contrast with Looney's assertion that students could secure a broad, liberal education through extension courses, however, Hanny (1991) argued that the sum of part-time "cafeteria line" coursework was not equal to the whole of a full-time educational program.

In retrospect, Paschall would also maintain that criticisms of the quality of extension courses were not justified, observing that the teachers of extension courses were well qualified and the students mature and highly motivated, and pointing out that the Dean of the College also "kept a sharp scrutiny" of these courses (Paschall, 1976). Aware of the concern for the quality of instruction, Paschall requested increases in faculty salary for extension courses in 1965 and again in 1970 in order to attract more associate professors and professors from the regular William and Mary faculty to teach in extension (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1964-66, p. 417, and 1969-70, p. 349). At the same time, Hanny (1991) observed that extension teaching had long attracted

regular faculty members because it was lucrative, but that as Paschall succeeded in raising the faculty salary levels overall, the need to seek additional compensation through extension teaching was diminished.

The most serious point of contention over extension was the issue of residence credit for extension courses. Langley Air Force Base requested in 1964 that William and Mary establish a Residence Center with an evening program expanding the extension courses already offered on base (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1964-66, p. 18). Again, proponents of extension maintained that if the College did not offer such a program, another institution would (p. 444). In fact, eventually Virginia colleges began to lose out to such out-of-state institutions as Saint Leo and Golden Gate in providing courses on base. Attention had been directed to the residence center issue with the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Governor Harrison designated the University of Virginia as the agency to administer Title I of that Act--Community Service and Continuing Education (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1966-67, p. 12). Given the coordinated and expanded system of extension offerings being developed statewide as well as the emerging system of community colleges, the State Council vetoed the establishment of residence centers on military bases at that time (p. 213).

The state-level decision notwithstanding, the Arts and Sciences faculty at William and Mary had been alarmed

at the prospect of off-campus residence centers awarding William and Mary degrees over which the Arts and Sciences faculty would have no control. Harold Fowler (1974) strongly opposed any credit for a degree at William and Mary being earned off-campus, summarizing the issue as one of protecting the validity of the William and Mary degree. Mel Jones also objected to offering residence credit on military installations: "It became obvious that something had to be done about . . . these so-called extension educational centers." He protested the fact that "the people at Fort Monroe could obtain a degree without ever coming up here at all" (Jones, 1974-75).

The School of Continuing Studies. By 1968 the Extension Division, Evening College, Summer Session, and the Virginia Associated Research Campus (VARC) in Newport News were all coordinated within a single organizational unit, the School of Continuing Studies. President Paschall observed that continuing education at the undergraduate level was becoming a major aspect of higher education across the United States. Expecting a corresponding growth at William and Mary, he also envisioned a greater emphasis on noncredit programs, conferences, and institutes. Paschall even projected budgetarily the construction of a Continuing Education Center to be located on the former Eastern State Hospital land adjacent to the present location of the Law School (Paschall, 1970, pp. 19, 29).

Paschall intended, however, for the VARC graduate programs to be the primary focus of the School of Continuing Studies. The Virginia Associated Research Campus (VARC) had been established in 1962 as a joint venture of William and Mary, the University of Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute, with the Medical College of Virginia and Old Dominion later joining the arrangement. In 1969 the Governor named VARC as an integral campus of William and Mary to satisfy accreditation requirements of the Southern Association and to provide for residence credit for graduate courses at the Center (Paschall, 1970, p. 31).

The resolution establishing the School of Continuing Studies emphasized the role of William and Mary in graduate courses at VARC and the role of Christopher Newport College in undergraduate course offerings on the Peninsula (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1967-69, p. 126). The presence of Christopher Newport College had sharpened William and Mary's identity with graduate study and its image as a residential rather than commuter institution (Paschall, 1970, p. 6), but it also diminished the College's share of the traditional extension enrollment, an effect intensified by the establishment of Thomas Nelson Community College and the expansion of extension courses by Old Dominion University (Paschall, 1970, p. 6, and Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1969-70, p. 94). Carter Lowance (1976) observed that the

establishment of Christopher Newport College had in some ways supplanted the former extension service of the College, and John Selby (1991) pointed out that if the College had interfered with Christopher Newport College's undergraduate extension offerings, it would be in direct competition with the branch it had established.

Re-examining William and Mary's Role in Continuing Education. This decline in the College's extension enrollment caught the attention of those at William and Mary--the Arts and Sciences faculty in particular--who had continued to raise questions about the School of Continuing Studies since its inception (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1969-70, p. 247). Questions arose not only over the College's role in continuing educational service but also over the coordination and articulation of Continuing Studies programs with other programs on the main campus (p. 247). In addition, the lenient admissions standards to the School of Continuing Studies contrasted with the increasingly selective standards of the College for the regular student body.

Vice-President of the college Mel Jones sought Board approval in 1970 for a college-wide committee with representatives from the Schools, Arts and Sciences, and the administration to address these issues. The Board agreed to receive policy recommendations from the committee and passed a resolution that reaffirmed the concept of lifelong learning as a rapidly growing aspect

of contemporary higher education; the responsibility of colleges and universities to meet the educational needs of employed adults of the community pursuing their studies on a part-time, commuting basis; the fact that William and Mary had been providing for such needs for half a century; and the State Council's recommendations in the 1968 Virginia Plan for Higher Education that William and Mary expand its educational services on the Peninsula; the Governor's recent transfer of the responsibility for VARC to William and Mary; the increasing population and growth of business and industry in Tidewater; and a conviction that "William and Mary, by reason of its resources and location, should respond to the educational needs of the Tidewater area in offering programs, courses, and services suitable to those needs" (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1969-1970, pp. 247-48). In short, the Board appeared to perceive the role of the study committee as one of articulation and coordination--not as a challenge to the very existence of the School of Continuing Studies. The committee, chaired by Professor Roherty, included three more members from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; one member each from the Schools of Business, Continuing Studies, Education, and Law; the assistant vice-president and coordinator of Christopher Newport College; the director of VARC-SREL; and eventually the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Continuing Studies, and a faculty member from Christopher Newport.

Mel Jones (1974) singled out the issue of residence credit on military installations as the primary impetus for establishing this study committee. Committee member Ludwell Johnson, a professor of history, identified three sources of pressure to create off-campus degree programs: (1) The commander of Langley Air Force Base had been told to secure an on-base degree program, according to Dean Herrmann of the School of Continuing Studies; (2) the School of Continuing Studies staff were attempting to build up their program; and (3) President Paschall argued that extensive development of continuing studies on the Peninsula was essential for political support (Johnson, Personal Papers, Notes for Faculty Meeting, January 12, 1971). The degrees proposed for these off-campus programs included a Bachelor of Liberal Studies and a Bachelor of General Studies (Selby, 1991). Johnson characterized such degrees as consisting of "a miscellany of courses taken at various places plus 'resident' credit courses given on the installations" and questioned why, if the College was responsible for serving Virginia citizens, so much effort should center on a transient military population (Johnson, Personal Papers, Letter to Paschall, June 12, 1970). Finally, challenging the Langley commander's claim that the Department of Defense insisted on on-base residence credit programs, Johnson wrote directly to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird (Personal Papers, Letter, February 9, 1971)! Nathan Brodsky, Director for Education Programs

and Management Training in the Department of Defense, responded that there existed no such requirement and that service members were encouraged to attend courses offered at colleges and universities in the area (Johnson, Personal Papers, Letter, February 23, 1971).

In a March 1971 statement issued on behalf of the study committee, Johnson concluded that "to award residence credit to the extension courses at Langley Air Force Base would be a major change in educational policy and a drastic redefinition of the character and purpose of the College" (President's Office Papers, Graves, 1981.90, Box 6, Continuing Studies Folder). Other conclusions set forth in the sixteen-page statement may be summarized as follows:

1. When the State assumed control in 1906, the College changed from a teachers' college into a residential liberal arts institution (p. 2).
2. The College is expected by the people of Virginia to function primarily as an undergraduate, residential liberal arts institution (p. 2).
3. In 1906 there was no other public institution of higher education for white undergraduates in eastern Virginia; therefore, the College sponsored extension courses and the eventual development of other college to meet the educational needs of the area (p. 3).

4. By combining the proposed residence credits with transfer credits, a student could presumably receive a William and Mary degree without ever setting foot in Williamsburg (p. 4).
5. William and Mary would not be justified in competing with its own branch college, Christopher Newport, for the extension market. Other public and private institutions are also available in the area (p. 9).
6. Even if the Department of Defense did demand on-base programs, it did not necessarily follow that William and Mary had to be the college to meet that demand (p. 13).
7. Most of the agitation for the College to offer such an undergraduate residence credit program was generated by a desire to keep alive an extension program that arose many years ago in response to an educational vacuum on the lower Peninsula that is now being filled by Christopher Newport College and other institutions in the area (p. 15).

Another committee member, Director of Extension Leon Looney, countered that "To say 'Let Thomas Nelson, Christopher Newport, or Old Dominion do it' is not a responsible answer" (Johnson, Personal Papers, Memorandum from E. Leon Looney to the Ad Hoc Committee on Continuing Studies, April 22, 1971). Furthermore, Looney asserted

that "True continuing educational activities are college wide and must not, if they are to be effective, be subject to the ivy-towered attitudes and vested interests of faculties and/or schools." Doubting that the committee would be able to reach a consensus on the appropriate role of the School of Continuing Studies, Looney recommended (1) that a panel of nationally recognized authorities on continuing education be brought to William and Mary and (2) that an advisory council with representation from each school and faculty be established to advise the Dean of Continuing Studies, a suggestion incorporated in the committee report.

Meanwhile, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Arts and Sciences Faculty chose to appoint a separate committee to study the role of the faculty in any program of continuing studies at the College (Faculty Minutes, February 9, 1971). This ad hoc committee, comprised of seven Arts and Sciences faculty members, presented its findings to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at a meeting on April 9, 1971 (President's Papers, Graves, 1981.90, Box 6, Continuing Studies Folder). Like Johnson's earlier report, this report also emphasized that William and Mary had long been the only public institution of higher education in the eastern part of Virginia and had sponsored widespread extension courses, divisions, and branches to fulfill educational needs, but that to continue to assert a responsibility for higher education

throughout the area would be a costly duplication of services (p. 2). The committee also pointed out that the Board resolution establishing the School of Continuing Studies in 1968 had emphasized graduate programs and special conferences and non-credit courses in specifying the School's functions:

- (1) "to coordinate graduate offerings of other state institutions at VARC, develop graduate programs of the college to be offered at the Center. . ."
- (2) To develop such courses and programs at the graduate level or in continuing education, such as conferences, short-courses, or non-credit courses, which may be needed by the adult population of the Peninsula and which are not presently available at the College.
- (3) To coordinate functions of the Evening College, Extension Division, and Summer Session (January 6, 1968, Board Minutes quoted on p. 3 of committee report, emphasis added by committee).

The committee also pointed to the declining extension enrollment of the College, concluding that this had pressured the School of Continuing Studies to try to "provide whatever service any citizen of the area called on the college to provide" (p. 4).

As for the proposed residence-credit program at Langley, the report addressed the concerns of the college-wide committee over the precedent this would set

for other residence programs and the implications for admissions, curriculum, degree requirements, faculty appointments, and the adequacy of library and laboratory facilities for these programs (p. 5). The ad hoc committee approached the issue by defining "residence" in these terms: the availability of library and laboratory facilities, faculty offices and office hours at the location, faculty and students present at the course location at times other than the scheduled course, and faculty appointments through the William and Mary department or school concerned (p. 9). Other recommendations were that William and Mary continue to offer extension courses not otherwise available through other institutions and that the College develop more non-credit courses and increase the regular courses taught at night on campus in Williamsburg (pp. 10-11).

The majority report issued on May 4, 1971, by the college-wide, Board-appointed committee (President's Papers, Graves, 1981.90, Box 6, Continuing Studies Folder) recommended that William and Mary's off-campus activities emphasize those functions for which there has been established a clearly defined and verified need, which are compatible with the College's "established role as a coeducational and residential college of liberal arts with selected programs of high quality at the graduate and professional level," and which cannot be carried out appropriately by Christopher Newport and other

institutions serving the Peninsula. The report also recommended establishing an Office of Short Courses, Conferences, and Institutes in the School of Continuing Studies, strengthening the graduate degree programs at VARC, and continuing (though gradually diminishing) credit-bearing extension courses not otherwise available through other institutions. The committee's response to the issue of residence credit off campus was that it would be up to the faculty responsible for the degree program in which such courses would be included to determine whether the courses met its standards for residence credit; furthermore, the College

should not undertake a broad-scale offering of undergraduate residence credit courses off-campus [since] lack of educational resources and radically different circumstances and conditions make it impossible to offer an off-campus undergraduate educational program on a broad scale equivalent to the regular session and on-campus programs of the College. To attempt such would be to lessen the quality and integrity of an undergraduate William and Mary degree [emphasis added].

Committee members Roherty and Looney opposed the majority report and issued supplemental statements of their own (President's Office Papers, Graves, 1981.90, Box 6, Continuing Studies Folder). Roherty affirmed the need

for degree programs through Continuing Studies and protested that the majority report was not attuned to the major currents in Continuing Education nationwide; moreover, he denied that the goals and purposes of the College were as clearly established as the majority report assumed. Charging that the committee had confused the authority of the faculty to set degree requirements with the authority to determine the boundaries of the campus, Roherty maintained that issues of residency were the province of the Board. Looney concluded that if the restrictions suggested in the majority report were enacted, the College's continuing studies program would be rendered ineffective, an outcome he found incongruous with the prominence of continuing education in colleges and universities throughout the nation. Professor Johnson immediately countered with a supplemental statement of his own to address the issues raised by Roherty and Looney and to reiterate the inadvisability of "attempting to prop up an archaic and moribund operation created in the 1920's to meet circumstances that no longer exist" (Johnson, Personal Papers, Memorandum to Vice-President Jones, May 10, 1971).

President Graves: Resolving the
Issue of Continuing Studies

When Thomas Ashley Graves assumed the presidency of William and Mary in 1971, the future of Continuing Studies was both "the number one decision to be made" (Healy,

1991) and "a 'hot potato' in terms of public relations" (Graves, 1991); the campus was divided and the Board was split over this issue. According to Graves, the presidential search committee had not approached him openly and specifically on this issue, but individual faculty members had; Graves stated that it was understood, given his background, that he would emphasize a primary identity with liberal arts and favor discontinuing extension as not being a part of the mission. Others also perceived that this issue had been an off-the-record aspect of the interview process (Herrmann, 1991, and Looney, 1991).

Graves assigned the responsibility for recommending a course of action for Continuing Studies to George Healy, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs who arrived on campus at the same time as Graves (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1970-72, p. 226). At a November 1971 Board meeting, Healy presented his conclusions in a lengthy confidential report (p. 272). Following are the essential conclusions Healy reached:

1. I do not believe that anyone can argue in 1971 as in 1921 that, unless William and Mary extends its educational effort off campus and into the evenings and summer, the people of the area will not be served educationally. . . . Actually the classic argument based on service is not heard much anymore. What instead is claimed is an

important variation of it, based more upon presumed political advantage to the College than upon service to the people. This argument essentially states that unless a state college like William and Mary is visibly offering requested service to the local constituencies, political support based in these localities will erode, with dire effects upon budgets.

2. I do not believe that we should be unduly beguiled by the consistently profitable operation of the continuing studies program. . . . the financial argument seems a minor one. The question thus becomes . . . a straightforward matter of educational quality: Do these programs enhance the College educationally? Do they advance us toward the goal of academic excellence? Would we be a better college if these programs were expanded? I can only conclude negatively.
3. Extension students as a group are not of comparable academic quality to our regular students; the faculty, by and large, is not as able and certainly not as committed to their tasks--which are very much part time, and usually taught as overloads and thus often at lower energy levels; and the absence of libraries and other academic facilities does

adversely affect and limit the conception and teaching of courses.

Based on these observations, some of which paralleled those voiced earlier by the ad hoc Arts and Sciences committee, Healy made the following recommendations:

1. Concerning the present functions of the Extension Division (i.e., undergraduate and graduate credit courses taught by a traveling faculty to students largely admitted through an open-door policy, at locations usually remote from supporting academic facilities) my recommendation is simple and unqualified: I urge that they be phased out as rapidly and as completely as possible [emphasis added].
2. The present academic services of our Extension Division can be better presented if they are subsumed within the programs of Christopher Newport College, for undergraduate work; and in the Evening College at the Williamsburg and VARC campuses, for graduate work.
3. I would hope that [VARC], which is so conveniently located in respect to both the civilian and military population centers of the peninsula, might be considerably expanded, to become a vital, well-staffed, and well-equipped graduate center for selected fields of study.

The Board of Visitors approved the recommendations

and agreed that they should be implemented (p. 283). By September 1972, the beginning of the next school year, the reorganization had been completed and the School of Continuing Studies disestablished (p. 394).

Healy acknowledged that ending the off-campus extension credit courses offered by William and Mary "would inconvenience some people, who might prefer to take a course at Ft. Eustis than drive the few miles to CNC or VARC" but did not believe that inconvenience constituted a denial of public educational opportunity (p. 279). From his perspective twenty years later, he reaffirmed that it had been best to have a fast, clean break with extension rather than a drawn-out process (Healy, 1991), but what neither Healy nor Graves anticipated was the magnitude of the public reaction to the decision. "We were not as sensitive to the potency of the decision as we might have been," Graves (1991) acknowledged, adding that their newness and lack of close ties in the area had smoothed the way for the acceptance of their decision:

It would have been impossible for Paschall to [end extension] because with his school superintendent background, this would have been viewed as treason, a betrayal of trust. This issue of extension was the most important and the biggest issue facing the college. By and large, discussions and consensus pointed to the direction we should take. . . . In

retrospect, I firmly believe it was the right decision for William and Mary and its ability to serve the Commonwealth, right in the long run for its constituencies. (Graves, 1991)

However, what was perceived by one observer as a "latent consensus" to end extension (Selby, 1991) was dismissed by another observer as the work of a "small group of malcontents" (Barnes, 1991). Most would acknowledge the role played by Arts and Sciences faculty in effecting this change, yet even the School of Education was divided on this issue. Dean Brooks of the School of Education had a close association and identity with the liberal arts faculty, having taught previously in the Psychology Department, and he favored ending extension (Brooks, 1991) but managed to soothe feelings on both sides (Healy, 1991). Others on the Education faculty, especially those who had long-standing ties with area superintendents, supported extension (Looney, 1991).

Aware that the decision to end extension could appear to be a renunciation of responsibility, Healy tried to convey a notion of consolidating services rather than abolishing them (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1970-72, p. 280). Graves and Healy met with legislators, State Council staff, military commanders and educational directors, and public school superintendents to discuss the changes (p. 283) and assure them that William and Mary would not vacate any area they had traditionally served

until arrangements had been made for a transfer of functions (News Release, January 6, 1972), but this "disestablishment" of the School of Continuing Studies precipitated a protest nonetheless. For example, Graves received a petition from public school teachers ("We most politely but urgently do plead and implore you to reconsider the phasing out of the Extension Division") and letters from superintendents protesting the "curtailment of services" (President's Office Papers, Graves, 1981.90, Box 6, Continuing Studies Folder). The Tidewater group of the Associated Superintendents of Eastern Virginia had long held their monthly meeting on campus; when Graves and Healy attended their meeting to explain the elimination of extension, former superintendent and Board member William R. Savage recalled that he and superintendent E. E. Brickell "gave impassioned speeches" against the decision, as though education itself were threatened (Savage, 1991). Warning Graves that he was not only obliterating solid political bases, but also eliminating educational opportunities, Brickle recalled imploring Graves not to go through with the decision (Brickle, 1991). Finally, columnist Wilford Kale's choice of words left no doubt about his perception of the decision:

Colleges throughout Virginia are moving to fill the educational void created recently when the College of William and Mary abandoned its vast extension program. Several persons

on military bases which will not longer be served by William and Mary extension programs were upset with the "to hell with the military attitude" that they felt the announcement carried.

"Honestly, I cannot fathom the reasoning behind the William and Mary decision," Langley education director [Robert] Dewey said.

(Richmond Times-Dispatch, January 12, 1972, article in President's Office Papers, Graves, 1981.90, Box 8, Extension Folder)

Similarly, other news articles used such terms as "abolish," "restrict," and "eliminate" rather than the favored "redistribution of responsibilities." Although it was true that extension courses were available through many other institutions in the area, the increasing prestige of William and Mary had kept the demand high for William and Mary extension courses; many valued an affiliation with William and Mary (Savage, 1991).

The Office of Special Programs:

Continuing Studies on a Non-Credit Basis

. . . About 1972, one man with assistance of a secretary was permitted to occupy office space at the VARC in Newport News and told that he could establish some special programs, the courses to be on a non-credit basis, but that "it" would have to "pay its way" in terms of revenue support.

The man demonstrated such enormous imagination, creativity and hard work in devising courses on a non-credit basis that the program grew to an enrollment in excess of 2700 last year. (Paschall, 1984)

Carson H. Barnes, Jr., became director, Office of Special Programs, later expanded to director, Conference Services and Special Programs. . . . Under Mr. Barnes' leadership, Conference Services has shown tremendous growth. In 1987, Mr. Barnes began to expand the program, appealing to a wider, more adult audience. The revenue in the 1987-88 year was \$160,000; last year it was \$500,000; and this year it is expected to approach \$700,000.

Conference Services and Special Programs have truly become efforts of which the College of William and Mary can be proud. (Flat Hat, May 24, 1991, p. 2)

The School of Continuing Studies had included an Office of Special Programs at VARC, but it represented a relatively small aspect of the program since the emphasis was on credit-bearing courses. In 1971-72 only nine courses were offered through Special Programs (Barnes, 1991).

Many of those objecting to the continuation or expansion of the Extension Division had nonetheless supported the notion of non-credit-bearing continuing

educational opportunities. Healy acknowledged the value of continuing education in terms of service to the State (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1970-72, p. 270) and in his report pointed to an "almost endless variety of exciting possibilities in continuing education that could be presented entirely outside of the academic credit-hour system" (p. 279). Graves insisted that the disestablishment of the School of Continuing Studies was not intended to weaken the College's commitment to provide educational service for area adults, and he proposed an expansion of Special Programs (p. 394). In short, "publicly and often" Graves and Healy declared their "intent to expand activity in this area" but by July 1972 had "not done much to implement the rhetoric" (Memorandum from George Healy to Carter Lowance, July 19, 1972, President's Office Papers, Graves, 1981.90, Box 6, Continuing Studies Folder). In November 1972 Graves informed the college community that an expanded Office of Special Programs would be located at VARC because this would augment the College's presence on the Peninsula, because many of those served by Special Programs would be Newport News and Hampton residents, and because office space was readily available at VARC (Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1970-1972, p. 471). Carson Barnes, who became Director in March 1973, offered some contextual insights into this choice of locations. First, when the cyclotron research that had been conducted at VARC became

obsolete, William and Mary was left with an underused facility for which they had to demonstrate a need; next, Barnes, as the former Dean of Students, was "sent to Siberia" in this way (Barnes, 1991). At any rate, the location proved conducive to Barnes' overwhelming success in developing Special Programs since he was left alone to devote his total time to that endeavor.

Essential to recognize is that although the administration cited Special Programs as an aspect of public service, it was a different public being served. That is, the students taking non-credit courses through Special Programs constituted a different population from those--primarily public school teachers and military service members--who had attended the credit-bearing extension courses (Barnes, 1991). In addition to the credit/non-credit distinction, courses in Special Programs provided for personal and cultural enrichment as well as professional and vocational skills; extension courses had to a great extent provided for professional certification and training.

It is tempting to conclude that the end of teacher certification opportunities through extension signaled a subtle breaking with an earlier teacher training mission of the College, yet this was not the case since this function continued to be fulfilled through the Evening College and the Summer Session on campus in Williamsburg. When considered in conjunction with the full range of

other offered by the College, it is clear that the decision to end extension was not, after all, a denial of public educational opportunity or an abrogation of responsibility. The obligation of the College, as a State-supported institution, to provide for public service continued to be affirmed. A description of the objectives of the College drafted in 1973 in preparation for the 1974 institutional self-study stated conveyed this image:

The College offers a wide range of courses, seminars, and programs to adults, both for credit and non-credit, in the evening and during the day, at its Williamsburg campus, at the VARC in Newport News and at its branch college, Christopher College, also in Newport, during the regular academic year and through the summer. This contribution to the educational enrichment of the citizens of Virginia throughout their careers is provided through the offerings of the professional schools of education, business, and law, and through the faculty of arts and sciences. It is in keeping with the College's commitment, as a State institution, to community service and enhanced educational opportunities for the adult citizens of the State of Virginia.

Finally, in a 1973 speech to the State Council, Graves reassured the members once again that "William and Mary is not in any sense out of continuing education nor out of

the business of public service" (William and Mary News,
October 9, 1973, p. 6).

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

Summary: Factors Influencing the Public Service Mission

An examination of William and Mary's public service mission between 1906 and 1972 reveals that the nature and scope of service were shaped by both internal and external forces. The most significant of the internal forces was the presidential leadership at the College during a given period. The educational philosophy, the values and expectations, and the perception of who the College's peers were and who the constituency to be served was all varied with each individual who assumed the presidency. However, external factors determined the extent to which a president could implement his programs and impose his standards. For example, Pomfret's goal was to emphasize faculty research and scholarship and to build a national reputation, and to a laudable extent he did, yet the demands of World War II on the College forced him to expend most of his efforts attracting military units to the campus to generate revenue, fill classrooms, and occupy dorm space. Other external influences on the college were economic and demographic factors. For instance, the decline in enrollment during the Depression era kept the College administration from imposing

selective admissions standards to enhance the college's prestige. Similarly, the low birthrate during the Depression would again affect the college enrollment a generation later.

Another internal force was the tension among various administrators, faculty members, and Board members over the primary identity, character, and purpose of the College. Although the president was highly influential, no one conception prevailed to the exclusion of others. Rather it was a matter of shifting balances and varying emphases. For example, although Bryan clearly cultivated the liberal arts as the College's dominant role, numerous service activities flourished without being spotlighted. Again, external influences prevented a strict adherence to his preferences in the curriculum. To build up the male enrollment diminished by the outbreak of World War II, for example, Bryan had to accede to a business administration program he would have preferred not to strengthen, a professional appendage that clouded the Ivy League image.

The tension created by the varying perceptions of the College's dominant identity stemmed from the fact that the College had in 1888 reopened as a normal school and had in 1906 become state supported to fulfill this mission. In the absence of private endowment sufficient to reassert its historic identity with the liberal arts and regain something of its former prestige from the Colonial era, the College had to fulfill its obligation for service to

the State that supported it. A varying balance existed between professional education and the arts and sciences. Aspiring to be a top liberal arts college, William and Mary was never to establish a purely liberal arts identity since it had from the time of its 1888 reopening professional obligations. Yet the selective memory of many at the College appeared to make them oblivious to the fact that teacher training had been the key to the College's enduring at all. The ad hoc committee to study the role of Arts and Sciences in continuing studies voiced this surprising conclusion:

While the College has modified its structure and some of its functions from time to time, it is universally accepted that William and Mary in Williamsburg has always been and should continue to be a coeducational and residential college of liberal arts and sciences, with selected programs of high quality at the graduate and professional level. (President's Office Papers, Graves, Box 6, Continuing Studies Folder)

Jones (1974) discussed these competing goals in terms of the resulting fragmentation:

We were never quite sure whether we were a state institution which had to do a number of things or whether we were actually a college of liberal arts and sciences devoted entirely

to quality education.

It was difficult to be sure what this college really was doing or attempting to do at any one time. . . . We weren't unified.

(pp. 116-119)

A clear assertion of a liberal arts identity was finally achieved in 1971 when Graves, with faculty support, made the radical departure from the broadly-based extension services to a more exclusive conception of the College's constituency. After years of uneven progress by his predecessors toward selectivity of admissions, ability to attract top faculty, and appropriations sufficient to develop an attractive physical plant, Paschall had achieved all of these goals during his presidency as well as securing the approval of the State Council for Higher Education to limit the size of the student body and to shape the image of William and Mary as a selective liberal arts college. As his successor, Graves was then in the position to pursue an image long aspired to by many on campus.

As a newcomer unfamiliar with the sixty-five-year-old ties linking state support with teacher education, Graves distanced the College somewhat from that aspect of its mission when he eliminated extension. Coursework for public school teachers had for half a century been offered through extension as well as on campus; now this function would continue on campus. What had changed was that

William and Mary was not visibly "carrying education to the people"; the decision had been forced by proposals for off-campus residence credit and a degree through extension--proposals that had been perceived as threatening the prestige of the William and Mary degree and the predominant image of William and Mary as a liberal arts college. Healy had recognized that the issue of continuing education was tied to the more fundamental question of the basic purpose, mission and character of the college itself.

Rival Conceptions of Learning:

A Theoretical Framework Reexamined

The College of William and Mary was not accorded university status in the modern sense until 1967, but it had for a while achieved recognition as a university under Thomas Jefferson's leadership in 1779 when it began offering studies in medicine and law in addition to the arts. It is, therefore, appropriate and meaningful to examine William and Mary within the context of Veysey's analysis of the American university since it has long been more than a liberal arts college.

According to Veysey (1965), the competing conceptions of the goals of the American university--practical public service, abstract research, and the transmission of culture--had generally been resolved within a given university by the early twentieth century. The case of William and Mary clearly provides a counterexample, since

it maintained an uneasy balance accommodating disparate views of mission and primary identity that was not resolved until 1971.

Subsidiary Findings

A revealing parallel may be drawn with the non-credit continuing education courses offered through Special Programs beginning in 1972 in contrast with the credit-bearing extension courses that had preceded them: The former represented a conception of continuing education more compatible with a liberal arts college and the notion of learning for the sake of knowledge; the latter paralleled the credentialing and certification emphasis of education for the professions.

Another discovery was that what was considered a benefit to the College in one era often proved to be a hindrance in another. Most basic in this respect is state support itself, the sine qua non of William and Mary's institutional survival. The teacher training mission upon which that support was based proved later to be an unwanted obligation that hampered the College's image and prestige in the eyes of many. Another benefit was the Rockefeller endowment for the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg; the College profited greatly from the increased exposure afforded by this attraction, but rumors that Rockefeller had also endowed the College itself hampered attempts to gain other endowments for years to come. The enrollment of women proved also to be

alternately a benefit and a drawback. Without Tyler's 1918 decision for coeducation, the College would not have received greatly needed Hatch Act funds, and without the female enrollment in war and postwar years, the College would have suffered even greater financial losses. Nevertheless, William and Mary's coeducational status damaged William and Mary's quest for prestige, giving it a bad reputation even in the eyes of some alumni! Finally, the extension centers and later the divisions brought increased enrollment figures and funds to the College but with the concomitant lessening of Williamsburg-centered control came questionable practices and uneven standards.

Implications

The College of William and Mary proved valuable as a case study because the wide variations it has undergone in character, in purpose, and in leadership have brought changes in the service mission into sharp focus. It would have been more difficult to discern the nature of the public service aspect of mission in an institution with a more predictable course of development.

Although the study is limited in its generalizability, a number of conclusions may be drawn concerning the nature of the public service aspect of the college mission. First, the public service mission is not constant but changes over time as an institution evolves. For example, William and Mary, having parented five institutions to provide educational opportunities for

citizens of the area, was then free to develop its unique identity as a selective liberal arts college and to offer forms of public service more compatible with its image: research and consulting by the faculty and social and cultural activities for the community. In sum, public service is not a static list of obligations or responsibilities but a dynamic response to the internal and external forces that shape the identity of a college. Finally, the key to the type and extent of the public service mission is the perception of the constituencies to be served. For years William and Mary's constituency was considered to include the eastern region of Virginia; the range of public educational service provided was correspondingly widespread. During Graves' presidency, the role of William and Mary was conceived in terms of a diverse statewide system of service: to provide for the citizens of Virginia within their own state an excellent university with a national reputation.

In addition to providing insights into the nature of public service, the study also illustrates the implications of institutional history for organizational behavior. Through the use of applied history--the concept of the "useful past" articulated by Thelin (1982)--the study identified historical influences on decisions made at William and Mary in more recent times. For instance, the saga of the College's colonial grandeur shaped the expectations of many that William and Mary would one day

regain that prestige. Ignoring the College's 1888 reopening as a normal school and the ensuing obligation to train teachers in exchange for state support, the Arts and Sciences faculty as a whole upheld the image of William and Mary as an elite liberal arts college with a few "unfortunate appendages." Exhibiting a remarkably selective memory to the point of institutional amnesia, many faculty members would reiterate claims of having "always" been primarily a college of liberal arts. This supports Clark's claim that in the college saga, the key group of believers is the senior faculty:

The faculty cadre of true believers, formed over years and potentially self-replacing for decades, helps to effect the legend, then to protect it against later presidents and other new participants who, less pure in belief, are ready to swing the organization in some other direction. (p. 507)

One implication of this case study for organizational theory is that institutions can change not only their missions and courses of action, but also the view they have of their own past in order to justify present actions and decisions.

With the competing images of William and Mary as a state-supported, service-oriented institution and William and Mary as a prestigious liberal arts college, the College's charter (the implicit consensus on appropriate

groundrules) was at the heart of the debate. In Kamens' (1971) conception of charter, problems arise when an institution violates its charter by adding on some uncharacteristic activity. After decades of balancing rival conceptions of institutional identity, William and Mary was forced to articulate its predominant mission--and therefore specify what constituted an "uncharacteristic activity"--in response to the proposals for residence credit and degrees for extension courses.

According to Clark (1970), the College mission itself becomes a saga that tells what the organization has been as well as what it is and plans to be. Gordon Davies (1986) observed that institutional mission statements are necessarily vague, tending to focus on the college's aspirations rather than its present functions. In response, Thelin (1986) conveyed this vagueness and lack of clarity in his image of the "campus as chameleon," conveniently altering its identity to blend with its changing environment. In his study of corporate culture, Morgan (1986) encouraged the use of such imagery and metaphorical thinking in organizational analysis, explaining that

Our theories and explanations of organizational life are based on metaphors that lead us to see and understand organizations in distinctive yet partial ways. . . . By using different metaphors to understand organizational life, we can find

new ways to manage and design organizations.

(p. 121).

In this spirit, The College of William and Mary between 1906 and 1972 can be depicted as a balancing act or a tug of war.

Recommendations for Further Study

Vital aspects of public service to be investigated include the growing focus on individual faculty initiatives in research and consulting as public service; the role of the individual student in public service; and the development of partnerships between colleges and corporations in addressing public needs.

Recommendations for further study specific to The College of William and Mary include a resumption of the study from 1972 to the present and, on a more general level, a continuation of the type of oral history interviews conducted by Emily Williams in the mid-seventies and available in the University Archives. Such interviews provide valuable dimensions of institutional history not otherwise available.

REFERENCES

- Ashby, E. (1971). Any person, any study. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ben-David, J. (1972). American higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Berry, W. (1977). The unsettling of America: Culture and agriculture. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Bok, D. C. (1982). Beyond the ivory tower. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bok, D. C. (1986). Higher learning. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carey, J. T. (1961). Forms and forces in university adult education. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.
- Clark, B. R. (June, 1971). Belief and loyalty in college organization. Journal of Higher Education, pp. 499-520.
- Clark, B. R. (1970). The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine.
- Commission on Non-Traditional Study (1973). Diversity by design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Corson, J. (1968). Public service and higher education: Compatibility or conflict? In C. G. Dobbins & C. Lee

- (Eds.), Whose goals for American higher education? (pp. 83-90). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Crosson, P. H. (1985). Public service at public colleges: Mission and management. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Crosson, P. H. (1983). Public service in higher education: Practices and priorities. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 7). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Crosson, P. H. (1988, November). The study of public service in higher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, St. Louis, MO.
- Cubberly, E. P. (1967). The expansion of the American college. In J. H. Best & R. T. Sidwell (Eds.), The American legacy of learning. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Davies, G. K. (1986). The importance of being general: philosophy, politics, and institutional mission statements. Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research (85-102).
- Good, H. G. & Teller, J. D. (1973). A history of American education (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Godson, S. H. (1989). Lyon G. Tyler's fight to admit women to William and Mary. Alumni Gazette. 56(5), 15. Winter, 1989.

- Godson, S. H. (1991). Admiral Chandler at the Helm: Running A Tight Ship. Alumni Gazette. 58(5), 17. Winter, 1991.
- Harrington, F. H. (1977). The future of adult education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Heatwole, C. J. (1916). A history of education in Virginia. New York: Macmillan.
- Higher Education in the Tidewater Area of Virginia (1959). Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Higher Education in Virginia. Report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to the Governor and General Assembly. August 13, 1951.
- Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). The academic revolution. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, L. G., et al. (1984, March). Mobilizing the faculty for service. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, IL.
- Jones, R. C., Oberst, B. S., & Lewis, C. S. (1990). Building U.S. competitiveness: The land-grant model. Change, 3, 11-17.
- Kale, W. (1985). Hark upon the gale. Norfolk, VA: Donning Co.
- Kale, W., and Smith, H. L. (1990). Davis Y. Paschall: A Study in Leadership. Richmond, VA: Dietz.

- Kamens, D. H. (1971). The college "charter" and college size: effects on occupational choice and college attrition. Sociology of Education (270-96).
- Kerr, C. (1963). Uses of the university. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Levine, A. (1978). Handbook on the undergraduate curriculum. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levine, A., & Weingart, J. (1973). Reform of the undergraduate curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lynton, E. A., & Elman, S. E. (1988). New priorities for the university. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moos, M. (1981). The post land-grant university: The university of Maryland report. Adelphi, MD: University of Maryland.
- Morgan, G. (1986). Images of Organization. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.
- Portman, D. N. (1978). The university and the public. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Re, E. D. (1968). Commentaries on "Public service and higher education: Compatibility or conflict?" In C. G. Dobbins & C. Lee (Eds.), Whose goals for American higher education? (pp. 83-90). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Roskens, R. W. (1985). The public service role of the state university in a changing world. In L. W.

- Koeplin & D. A. Wilson (Eds.), The future of state universities: Issues in teaching, research, and public service (pp. 85-92). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rouse, P. S., Jr. (1973). Cows on the campus. Richmond, VA: Dietz.
- Scott, R. A. (1989, June). Beyond the ivory tower: College and university partnerships with business. Paper presented at a conference sponsored by Universita Degli Studi Di Roma and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Rome, Italy.
- Steffens, L. (1909, February). Sending a state to college. American Magazine. In E. E. Slosson, Portraits of the American University 1890-1910 (118-33). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Stern, M. R. (1980). Universities in continuing education. In H. J. Alford (Ed.), Power and conflict in continuing education: Survival and prosperity for all? (pp. 4-35). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Thelin, J. R. (1982). Higher Education and Its Useful Past. Rochester, VT: Schenkman Books.
- Thelin, J. R. (1986). The campus as chameleon: rethinking organizational behavior and public policy. Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research (103-08).
- Veysey, L. R. (1965). The emergence of the american university (1st Phoenix ed.). Chicago: University of

Chicago Press.

Virginian-Pilot. (1934, June 27).

Virginian-Pilot. (1938, September 22).

Virginian-Pilot. (1955, October 3).

Wallenfeldt, E. C. (1983). American higher education: Servant of the people or protector of special interests? Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Williams, R. L. (1989). George W. Atherton and the beginning of federal support for higher education (Doctoral dissertation, Penn State University, 1989).

Wilson, L. (1972). Shaping American higher education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

DOCUMENTS

- Alumni Gazette. The College of William and Mary.
- Alumni Gazette. 20.2:5, December 1952.
- Alumni Gazette. 33.1:22, October 1965.
- Alumni Gazette. 35.2:17, December 1967.
- Alumni Gazette. 56.5:15, Winter 1989.
- Alumni Gazette. 58.5:17, Winter 1991.
- Announcement: Evening college. Fall 1972. Williamsburg,
VA: The College of William and Mary. University
Archives.
- Announcement: Evening and Saturday classes. IX, 2. Fall
1969.
- Announcement: Newport News evening session. 1919-20.
Williamsburg, VA: The College of William and Mary.
University Archives.
- Bulletin. Extension. XIII, 3. November 1919.
- Bulletin. Extension. XIII, 4. November 1919.
- Bulletin. The College of William and Mary. XIV, 8.
October 1980.
- Bulletin. Evening classes and special programs. Fall
1973.
- Catalogue. Extension. 1956-57.
- Catalogue. Evening College. 1958-59.

Chandler, J. A. C. (1921). Installation Address.

Reprinted in In Memorandum: J. A. C. Chandler.

William and Mary Quarterly. October 1934.

Dean, Arts and Sciences. 1982.70, Box 2.

Faculty Minutes, Arts and Sciences. October 8, 1968, and
November 10, 1970.

Flat Hat. X(2), 5. October 8, 1920.

Flat Hat. XVI(16), 4. February 11, 1927.

Flat Hat. XI(25), 2. April 28, 1922.

Flat Hat. XI(19), 1,7. March 3, 1922.

Flat Hat. XX(32), 2. May 24, 1991.

Graves, T. A. (1976). The College of William and Mary in
Virginia. Address given at the meeting of the
Newcomen Society, Williamsburg, VA.

In Memoriam: J. A. C. Chandler. William and Mary
Quarterly. October 1934.

Johnson, L. Personal Papers.

Minutes of the Board of Visitors. 1902-1972. The College
of William and Mary. University Archives.

Oral History Transcripts. Interviewed by Emily Williams.
The College of William and Mary. University
Archives.

Andrews, M. C. June 10, 1976.

Brooks, R. B. February 19, 1976.

Fowler, H. L. November 4, 1974.

Gibbs, W. F. March 14, 1975.

Herrmann, D. J. August 16, 1976.

Jones, W. M. November 19, 1974-January 17, 1975.

Lambert, J. W. January-February, 1975.

Lowance, C. O. July 23, 1976.

Marsh, C. F. November 8 and 13, 1974.

Marshall, N. April 14, 1975.

Miller, J. W. January 21, 1975.

Morton, R. L. March-April, 1974.

Paschall, D. Y. (1970). The College of William and Mary: Highlights of progress 1960-1970: Report to the Board of Visitors. The College of William and Mary.

Paschall, D. Y. (1984). Personal Papers.

President's Office Papers. The College of William and Mary. University Archives.

Tyler. 1984.19. Box 12.

J. A. C. Chandler. 1982.45. Box 18.

Bryan. 1979.35. Box 8.

Pomfret. 1982.55. Box 7.

Graves. 1981.90. Boxes 6, 8.

President's and Chancellor's Office Papers. The College of William and Mary. University Archives.

A. D. Chandler. 1982.65. Box 12.

Quittmeyer, C. (1984). The development of business administration as a field of study at The College of William and Mary. Williamsburg, VA.

Report of self-study of The College of William and Mary in Virginia (1964). Williamsburg, VA.

Report of self-study of The College of William and Mary in

Virginia (1974). Williamsburg, VA.

INTERVIEWS

Barnes, C. Personal Interview. March 27, 1991.
Bowditch, W. Telephone Interview. March 21, 1991.
Brickell, E. Telephone Interview. March 22, 1991.
Brooks, R. Personal Interview. March 29, 1991.
Goodrich, E. Telephone Interview. March 21, 1991.
Graves, T. Personal Interview. March 18, 1991.
Hanny, R. Personal Interview. March 28, 1991.
Healy, G. Personal Interview. March 14, 1991.
Herrmann, D. Personal Interview. March 13, 1991.
Looney, E. Personal Interview. March 26, 1991.
Paschall, D. Personal Interview. March 13, 1991.
Savage, W. Telephone Interview. March 21, 1991.
Selby, J. Personal Interview. March 22, 1991.

Vita

Kathryn Jean Scarborough Patterson

Birthdate: December 3, 1952

Birthplace: Selma, Alabama

Education:

**1988-1991 The College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia
Educational Specialist**

**1977-1979 The University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, Texas
Master of Arts**

**1971-1975 Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky
Bachelor of Arts**