4. The study recommends the separation of the branch colleges of Christopher Newport and Richard Bland from the parent institution at such time as they reach academic maturity. The existence of these branches is legislative mandate. The faculty and administration have only the responsibility to cooperate in implementing the operation and to exercise control in providing a quality program.

5. The Summer Band School was recommended to be discontinued after the summer of 1964. While this is not college level activity, it is an excellent way to keep the image of Willian and Mary before young people and their parents. It is more liberal to continue than discontinue. It is self-sustaining and could be profitable from a financial point of view. Such profit could be directed into a scholarship fund in music. It is obviously conducted in an excellent manner and should be continued.

6. Radio and television is in a position both presently and past of being expensive. Additional study and investment holds promise of a rewarding potential for both faculty and students.

7. The recommendation to absorb extension by other agencies is to but shirk responsibility. This appears to be a misinterpretation of role. Criticisms of operation appear to be a pattern of escape from the campus as to control for quality. The director has broad responsibility not only in this but other areas. Both the administration and faculty must cooperate if this function is to be exercised to the potential level desired -- both quantity and quality wise. The charge of lack of quality is only in part the responsibility of any one individual.

GRADUATE STUDIES

As indicated in other sections of this report, a clear definition of the role of graduate study at the College of William and Mary cannot be given until the institution has developed an adequate statement of its aims and purposes. Historically the graduate program was an outgrowth of the special opportunities for such study in the community, but graduate work was clearly subsidiary to the undergraduate program. The College now finds itself in a society locally and nationally in which demands for increased graduate activity are made. Such demands are particularly insistent for a publicly supported institution, one that commands the talents of faculty members who are well qualified to provide graduate instruction in a number of fields in which the state and nation have critical manpower shortages. There is every reason to believe that such demands on the College will grow rather than diminish. Therefore, William and Mary must decide whether it will accept the

responsibilities almost inherent in its present social context.

The decentralized system of administration and control of the graduate program that now exists is an expression of the belief that graduate instruction is an adjunct activity. It is contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the Standards of the Association that call for legislation and policy making by a graduate faculty or graduate council with "a single responsible agency" to carry out such legislation and policies. The present system has almost encouraged the development of varying standards of graduate scholarship from one field to another.

The Committee recommends that all graduate work except for that in the highly professional field of law and taxation be placed under the control of one graduate council. This council should concern itself with such matters as setting standards of admission of students, approving graduate courses and new degree programs, admitting students to candidacy for degrees, establishing criteria for membership on the graduate faculty, and acting on recommendation from the heads of departments concerning identification of graduate faculty. The council might also consider developing policies regarding graduate assistantships and fellowships in so far as service responsibilities, stipends, and minimum standards for selection are concerned.

Responsibility for the administration of the program should be placed under one official such as a dean or director of graduate studies. Despite decentralization it appears that up to this time administration of on-campus graduate study has been conducted carefully and responsibly. However, graduate enrollment is already reaching the point that the present administrative arrangement is overtaxed. A dean or director can oversee the program in a way that cannot be matched by a committee, responsible though the group may be.

The jurisdiction and responsibility of the graduate faculty or council in the area of graduate work in extension needs to be clearly asserted. A procedure must be developed for prior approval of faculty and courses taught at the graduate level. Credit given by the College of William and Mary carries with it the presumption of academic responsibility of the College.

In this connection William and Mary needs to clarify its relationship to the School of Marine Science. Apparently the College grants a degree (the Master of Arts in Marine Science) over which it has no control or at least very limited control. The work done in the School of Marine Science appears to be of high

quality. The chief question here is how the College can meet its responsibility to assure that its degree continues to represent work of a high order.

The graduate program in the School of Education needs to be given full-fledge recognition in the overall graduate plans of the College. Placing it under the same board that governs the rest of the graduate program should tend to emphasize its academic relationship to the liberal arts program and give it an opportunity to operate under standards considered essential to all fields. However, the School of Education must be given the means for meeting its responsibilities. Teaching loads, in most cases running up to fifteen semester hours, decidedly exceed standards for graduate instruction. The number of students for which each graduate instructor in education is responsible must be reduced. Additional staff must be provided.

It is also true that there must be increased allocation of money for library development in education. The amount budgeted for books ($250.00) in 1962-63 would not meet the needs of an undergraduate program, not to mention those of a school with over 500 graduate students enrolled.

The master's program in history and psychology and the graduate degree programs in physics are excellent examples of utilization of resources peculiar to the Williamsburg community and its environs. The cooperation of the College with the Institute of Early American History and Culture seems to have been advantageous to both groups. Cooperation with the National Aeronautics and Space Agency and now with Virginia Associated Research Center has not only greatly enhanced the graduate program in physics, biology, and chemistry, but has strengthened the undergraduate programs as well. William and Mary is to be commended for its energetic utilization of these opportunities.

It is recommended that the College consult with the central offices of the Association concerning its new Ph.D. curriculum in physics, particularly with respect to the absence of a minor or minors in the program. It seems evident that the physics department has the resources for offering the program. Attention should be given, however, to the development of supporting departments.

In general the College does well to measure its resources and limit its graduate activities to those fields in which it can make a creditable contribution. Expansion of the graduate program is likely but it should come about in a framework of careful planning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the committee has expressed throughout in appropriate places single and specific recommendations, it is the feeling of the committee that certain salient points be brought into focus in conclusion. It is not that these carry more weight than those expressed or that they are more pressing, but certainly they are worthy of prompt and serious attention.

Of course the first recommendation for the institution would be that it study thoroughly the report of the committee and react with serious thought to all the suggestions. In general, however, the committee would call the specific attention of the institution to the following recommendations:

(1) The acceptance or development of an acceptable Statement of Purpose, implemented with an adequate policy statement. It would be the opinion of the committee that such a Statement of Purpose once approved by the governing body should be thoroughly understood and discussed by faculty, administration and students.

(2) In the administrative organization of the institution, it is the unanimous agreement of the committee that the president of the institution should be the sole channel to the Board. The use of appropriate staff personnel to present information to the Board or to answer specific questions should be at the discretion of the president, but representation at the Board meetings should be by the chief executive only.

(3) The committee is of the opinion that the president needs to receive information, reports and contacts from fewer administrative officers and to have more time for policy making and reflection.

(4) The extension and off-campus activities of the institution reflect the enthusiasm and diligence of that officer, but this office should be brought into line with the other academic functions of the institution and the officer in charge of such activities should report to the chief academic officer of the institution.

(5) Although salary adjustments have been made and are appreciated by the faculty, there is need for continued improvement in this area, especially in the salary schedule of the central administrative offices.

(6) The committee would recommend strongly that no new programs be developed without adequate financial support and with such support that the faculty and administration be sure within their minds that the programs were in keeping with the fine reputation of William and Mary.

(7) It is most important that admission to the institution and admission to all courses carrying degree credit, be they on campus or off campus, day or evening, be under the central office of admissions or, when appropriate, the graduate school, and that standards of quality control be established and supervised. The committee is aware of the need for William and Mary to give certain concern in its admission standards and of recognizing the fact that it is a state-supported institution and thereby has certain geographic considerations which are both reasonable and realistic.

(8) The committee is of the opinion that careful study of the offerings and of the curriculum would lead to a re-organization, which would result in greater supervision of the overall curriculum. Especially would this alleviate the practice of such individual departmental control of majors, electives, etc.

(9) The committee was of a strong opinion that if the College of William and Mary is to train teachers, which has been a part of its heritage, then the department of education must be accorded more than second-class citizenship.

(10) The committee concurs with the recommendation that the Director of Athletics should not report directly to the President.

(11) The committee would suggest study of the matter of departmental libraries. Perhaps it is wise; it may be inevitable, but a considerable budget commitment for salaries can be made rather quickly if departmental libraries are developed indiscriminately.

(12) The committee concurs in the opinion that the use made of the library book collection by students and faculty seems low.

(13) It is recommended that the library attempt to work out a system that would be more satisfactory to all departments in notification of departments' allocations from library book fund, and working out a budget in keeping with the fiscal policies of the State of Virginia.

(14) It is suggested that such weeding as is recommended in the library be done with caution and that the utilization of the

library by non-college personnel be given serious thought since a college library is seldom equipped to serve the general public.

(15) It is recommended that there be a clarification of role of the division chairman. It should be either more clearly defined and strengthened or abolished.

(16) It is recommended that the college give serious thought to the support of professional growth; to provide leaves of absence for study and research for its faculty, and it is further suggested that there be a statement as to the procedures for performance evaluation and promotion.

(17) The committee found a need for coordination in the area of student life and more participation of the student life personnel in budget planning.

The institution is to be commended for its honor system, but encouraged to give it more support by information, education and counseling.

The committee found the medical facilities and the counseling services to need strengthening, both in size and scope.

(18) The committee would recommend a coordinating committee for research, research grants and a central office to be of assistance to the various faculty members and departments undertaking research.

(19) The committee was distressed to find on-campus, evening and extension activities, etc., divorced from the departmental control and the on-campus personnel participation so vital to maintain the image of William and Mary. It is recommended that all of these be brought "under one roof" so to speak -- that is, all academic activity be coordinated through the chief academic officer. It is urged that the faculty members and department chairmen assert their responsibility and lend a hand in these areas.

(20) It is recommended that there be created a position of Dean of the Graduate School or an appropriate officer who, with the faculty and councils of the graduate school, will coordinate, regulate and supervise all graduate work of the institution -- on campus, off campus, day or evening, in arts and sciences and in professional education. Such an official might also serve as coordinator of research activities.

INTERVIEWS

Dr. R. D. Johnson

Howard K. Holland, Professor of Education and Dean, School of Education

Dr. D. J. Herrman, Coordinator of the Community Colleges, Director of Extension, and Director of Summer School

C. Leon Looney, Assistant Director of Extension

John S. Quinn, Director, Evening College

James W. Sawyer, Radio and Television

Charles R. Varneer, Summer Band School

Harold L. Fowler, Professor of History, Chairman, Department of History

Gordon B. Ringgold, Chairman, Committee on Special Activities

Davis Y. Paschall, President of the College

Dr. Herbert J. Wunderlich

J. W. Lambert, Registrar and Dean of Students

Carson H. Barnes, Jr., Dean of Men

Birdena E. Donaldson, Dean of Women

Robert E. DeBord, College Physician

Robert T. English, Bursar

Sandra Snidow, Assistant Dean of Women

Robert A. Johnston, Associate Dean of Faculty (Academic Advising)

Six students (Men and Women, Freshmen and Seniors)

Vernon L. Nunn, Treasurer and Auditor

INTERVIEWS CONT'D

Dr. Claud B. Green

Davis Y. Paschall, President of the College

W. Melville Jones, Dean of the Faculty

Howard K. Holland, Dean of the School of Education

Members of the Steering Committee for the Self-Study

Robert P. Hunt, Dean of Admissions

Frank A. MacDonald, Chairman of the Division of Humanities

Dr. Robert C. Tucker

Alfred R. Armstrong, Professor of Chemistry

Robert T. English, Bursar

Ervin D. Farmer, Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds

James A. Servies, Librarian

Bruce T. McCully, Professor of History

Gerald Reuner, Reference Librarian

Rachel Aldrich, Cataloguing Librarian

Mildred Miller, Acquisitions Librarian

A P P E N D I X

College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

July 18, 1964

Dean Theron Montgomery
Jacksonville State College
Jacksonville, Alabama

Dear Dean Montgomery:

I received your letter of July 10 which enclosed a draft copy of the Visitation Committee Report regarding the Self-Study of the College of William and Mary.

I deeply appreciate the opportunity which your letter afforded in permitting me to offer any corrections of a factual nature. Having read the draft copy very carefully, I enclose some observations on two points which I believe to be worthy of your consideration for some revision of the brief sections in the Report to which they refer; namely, a reference to faculty salaries and to the library.

With very best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

/s/
Davis Y. Paschall
President

Enclosure

Enclosure to Letter from President Davis Y. Paschall
to Dean Theron Montgomery, July 18, 1964--re

OBSERVATIONS PERTINENT TO DRAFT
COPY OF VISITATION COMMITTEE REPORT
--Self-Study--

Faculty Salaries--Quoted Section as Follows:

> Although recent adjustments in faculty salaries have been made and a plan has been adopted for further increases of faculty salaries over the next four years, in 1968 the College will find itself able to offer salaries under this plan which will be equal only to the national average of faculty salaries in the year 1962. It seems quite obvious that in spite of the commendable efforts and achievements of recent date that the college will lose ground rather than gain ground during the next four years in the relative position of its faculty salaries, and as a consequence, it will lose ground in its relative ability to attract and retain superior scholars.

Observation:

The above statement is factually incorrect. Faculty salary contracts signed in April for the nine-month academic session, 1964-65 reflect not only a fifteen percent increase over the session 1963-64, and in some instances an even higher percentage, but the important point is that, for the first time, the scale is related to a goal that will assure a continued, substantial, annual increase each year hereafter. This is explained as follows:

> The State Director of Personnel, acting for the Governor, set a 1964-65 national mean salary for all faculty ranks in the respective State-supported institutions of higher learning in Virginia on the basis of data provided by the U. S. Office of Education, indicating the mean salary projected nationally for 1964-65 for State-supported institutions in various enrollment ranges. The mean faculty salary set for William and Mary for the nine month session, 1964-65, was $8,622, and for the second year of the biennium, 1965-66, this figure was increased to $9,146 on a nine month session basis. (In addition, merit increases are provided). William and Mary's enrollment range is from 2499 to 4999 students (it having approximately 2691 in 1963-64) and thereby it was set higher than any other

State-supported higher institution of learning in Virginia with the exception of the University of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

It was further provided that the cost of this increase to bring the respective institutions to this national salary figure would be borne approximately fifty percent by increase in tuition and fifty percent by State appropriation from the General Fund of the Commonwealth, but an institution's Governing Board could decide whether it chose to come all the way from its mean salary in 1963-64 to that allowed it for 1964-65. Although some institutions chose not to meet it, The Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary not only acted to meet it, and raised the tuition as needed, but it also declared its intention to keep on meeting it in subsequent years. (The total cost for William and Mary to meet it for 1964-65 is approximately $220,000.)

The point is that this national mean salary will increase appreciably each year, and, therefore, the faculty salaries at William and Mary, raised three times the amount and percent ever raised at any one time in its history for next academic session, will continue to be raised annually in keeping pace with the national salary goal with which the scale is now definitely associated. This action has received a very strong letter of commendation from the AAUP Chapter on campus, and from a very large number of alumni who know about it.

Summary:

In summary, the above explanation proves the inaccuracy of the following statement quoted from the Visitation Committee Report, and the conclusion expressed in the sentence of the Report that follows this quoted one:

> Although recent adjustments in faculty salaries have been made and a plan has been adopted for further increases of faculty salaries over the next four years, in 1968 the College will find itself able to offer salaries under this plan which will be equal only to the national average of faculty salaries in the year 1962.

- - - - - - - - - -

Library--Quoted Section as Follows:

> We concur in the opinion that the figures indicating the use made of the library book collection by students and faculty seem low, especially in view of the small number who can be seated in the library and use the books in the library. The average student uses the library only to the extent the faculty makes him use it. Figures on book usage suggest that too few encourage use of the library by either precept or example. In view of the location of the new building on the fringe of the present campus, there may well be no increase in use until the development of the new campus brings the new building nearer the center of campus population. Even then, the location will still be too remote from the center of campus population but perhaps no better location was available.
>
> One of the persons interviewed stated that, in his opinion, the library was better than the College ten years ago but now the situation is reversed. It is disquieting to note that, as the number of students and graduate programs has increased, the percentage of the educational and general budget spent on the library has been declining. Five percent is generally considered a minimum expenditure for a minimum operation. Quality programs cannot be supported unless this minimum figure is substantially increased, especially when the College is moving into one doctoral program and apparently is contemplating others. It must be remembered, also, that it takes time and personnel as well as money, to build good library collections.

Observation:

The following explanation tends to show that several of the above quoted statements from the Visitation Committee Report combine errors of fact with unsupported generalizations and conclusions drawn without sufficient information and, as such, misrepresent actual conditions of library usage, location and expenditures.

The first sentence in the first paragraph quoted above echoes the Self-Study Report of student and faculty usage of the library collection as seeming too "low", but continues, unlike the Self-Study Report, to suggest that this "low" usage is the result of faculty

failure "either by precept or example" to encourage the use of the collections. This implication of an intellectually derelict faculty is all the more difficult to accept when, in addition to failing to base such an observation on any sort of factual base, or on any poll of faculty opinion, the Report also fails to mention several possible reasons for the low usage as suggested in the Self-Study Report: that the "usage" figures do not show use of books not withdrawn from the library and that increasing availability of inexpensive paperbacks is a likely cause.

There has been a definite objective by several departments, for instance, to encourage students during the past three years to build libraries of their own by acquisition of inexpensive paperbacks suggested by special reading lists prepared for this purpose. This has been the real motivation, expressed repeatedly in faculty meetings during the past three years, that will result in a large new bookstore being built on the campus this fall from private funds. (Plans have already been drawn for the same.) Nor does the assertion take into account the full extent of withdrawals from departmental libraries which have increased in recent years, nor the fact that fifty-one percent of the holdings are stored in various locations on campus, outside the present library, which fact is a considerable problem in usage, but will be remedied upon completion of the new library in 1965.

Of more importance than the doubtful implications of library usage, however, are the statements on the location of the new library and on the library expenditures.

The statements quoted on location indicate the new library as being located "on the fringe" of the present campus, which will not be greatly improved even when the center of campus population shifts during the development of the new campus. "It will still be too remote" for convenient use by the student body, but the Report adds "perhaps no better location was available." These are incorrect statements and unsupported generalizations.

The fact is that when the Master Plan for the College was prepared several years ago and approved by the Board of Visitors, the major point of consideration was the location of the new library. A careful study was made because of the then advocacy by some to place it at the end of the sunken garden.

This study revealed that the location of the new library where it is now being constructed, only about one city block from the end of the sunken garden, would place it precisely at the hub of the

developing complex of academic buildings, laboratories, dormitories, and dining hall projected in the Development Plan of the College of William and Mary. Phi Beta Kappa Hall with its multiplicity of activities is nearby; the new Physics building is very close; a new fine arts classroom addition will be built in the next few months as an addition to Phi Beta Kappa Hall--a new dinging hall is being planned for which the appropriation is already in hand, this too being nearby; two dormitories (one for men and one for women) have just been built in that vicinity; the new womens' gymnasium has been completed in the immediate vicinity; plans are being drawn ($95,000 appropriated for the plans) for a Life Science Building to flank the new library to the east as the Physics building does to the west, and a Chemistry building and men's physical education building will be requested of the General Assembly in 1966 for the vicinity of the new library.

Six hundred and sixty students will be living west of the new library location this September. Another 850 students will be living nearer to the new library location than to the present one. This constitutes over half the residential students. In five years three-fourths of the student body (resident) will be nearer the new library than to the present library.

Aside from the center of campus population which the new library was determined in the Master Plan to become, it was also found that the <u>only</u> location that could even be considered on the old campus was at the end of the sunken garden (one "city" block east of the present location) and the State Art Commission would not approve it for the following reasons:

1. The multiplicity of underground springs and quicksand type soil found there would have required not only more extensive piling, but also a foundation type protection of prohibitive cost.

2. The area at the end of the sunken garden is inadequate in size for a building of the size needed.

3. No parking area would be available for the library at this location.

4. It would have had to have been Georgian in architecture and a building of the size needed would not lend itself appropriately to this style, and considerable funds would be wasted in dormers, dummy chimneys, and pitched roofs.

5. It would have destroyed the aesthetic effect of the beautiful vista looking west from the Wren Building across the mall of the approach to the sunken garden, the garden, and the beautiful trees at the end of it, because it would have simply "blocked in" the perspective and left the viewer always with a claustrophobian feeling, aesthetically.

Another point that is overlooked in reference to this location matter is the impression of the extent of the current old campus which does not take into account the impracticability of use of the "ancient" campus area. It must be remembered that the considerable triangular area--from the apex commencing the main street of Williamsburg--consisting of the three ancient buildings is not intended for classroom use, and the Wren Building will be so discontinued, except for a few "privileged" classes during the next four years. This leaves only five buildings (one small and one, the physical education building with gymnasium) on the old campus to be used for classes and administration. Within five years there will be more classroom and laboratory opportunities on the new campus than on the old, and the new buildings will be much more functional--all in the immediate vicinity of the new library.

Referring to the off-hand opinion of one "person" interviewed, a rather limited basis for judgment to be referred to as such in the Visiting Committee Report, the Visiting Committee goes on to comment on the "disquieting" fact that in recent years "the percentage of the educational and general budget spent on the library has been declining." The percentages referred to are taken from the Self-Study Report, page 130, and do, indeed, show a decreasing percentage of library expenditures as percent of total college expenditure. While the statement is factually correct, the implications are misleading and do not reflect the actual situation as supported both by the other data in the Self-Study Report (page 130) and by the appended statement following this data. It would perhaps be best, at this point, to summarize the relevant figures and to include those from 1963-64 which have only become available at the close of the past fiscal year.

Years	Total library expenditures	Expenditures for books, periodicals, binding	Total library expenditures per student	Total library as per cent of total college expenditures
1958-9	$119,251	$ 35,022	$57.14	6.2%
1961-2	158,231	47,699	62.81	5.7
1962-3	201,054	86,022	71.09	5.9
*1963-4	231,351	104,858	90.19	5.1

*Note: These figures were not available in time for the Self-Study Report.

It should be noted that the Self-Study Committee commented that "this comparison does not give an altogether accurate picture of the relation of library costs to total costs of the College" since, for example, library costs have increased less than 50% while College expenses have increased 93% and instructional salaries have increased 122% during the period in question. This is most certainly true and is, of course, the major factor behind the obvious anomaly of a slowly decreasing percentage on the one hand and a rapidly expanding total library expenditure on the other. Furthermore, a more clearly meaningful comparison can be made by noting that the total library expenditures per student have markedly increased each year from $57.14 in 1958-9 to $90.19 in 1963-4 (a dramatic increase of 59.6% in six years.)

It would seem that the Visiting Committee's concern over library expenditures would be well taken, as well as their admonition that "it takes time and personnel as well as money, to build good library collections" if it were not for the seemingly abundant evidence that the College of William and Mary gives full support to such concerns by a per-student expenditure on the library which must rank it high among member institutions in the Southern Association of comparable enrollment.

The mere fact that, in 1963-64 for instance when the State appropriation for library books and acquisitions was only $30,000, the College actually expended $104,858 for this specific purpose must give conclusive testimony to the determined effort of the Administration to support, by all possible means, the library as the intellectual core of the College.

In addition, the College was permitted to expend $31,000 during 1963-64 from a separate Virginia Associated Research Center Budget (not reflected in the $104,858 figure above) for library acquisitions for the graduate program in physics alone. The VARC Budget for the years 1964-65 and 1965-66 will allow $31,000 each year for this purpose--the same to be utilized under the VARC auspices for graduate work in physics.

Not reflected in the $104,858 figure from State funds, the College acquired through private sources acquisitions valued at approximately $15,000.

Summary:

The above explanations would appear to justify some revision of the quoted statement in the Visitation Committee Report in reference to library usage, location and expenditures.