

Session 4

March 18, 1976

Charles City Co., Virginia

Williams: Did the college have to raise its tuition considerably to meet these developments?

Paschall: That question leads to a very interesting revelation. Only once did we raise tuition to any significant extent. The institutions gave assurance to Governor Harrison that if the General Assembly provided one-half of the funds necessary to attain the national salary scale average, the institutions would provide the other half by increase in tuition, and this was done. There were no other significant increases made in tuition. I recall that some members of the Board of Visitors would often inquire why we did not raise tuition that comparatively was so low. I answered this inquiry in pointing out that the college was still fortunate in obtaining very bountiful state appropriations, not only for capital outlay projects, but especially for the maintenance and operation budget, including faculty salaries, and faculty salaries were being raised appreciably. I indicated the belief that the day would come when state appropriations, for reason of depression or otherwise, would not be so lucrative and that the college would then be in a fortunate position in being able to raise tuition and still be competitive in admissions.

Williams: Did you differentiate between tuition charges for graduate and undergraduate students?

Paschall: No, we did not. This question was asked me once or twice when I appeared before the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees. While I answered in recognition of the fact that graduate programs cost more, I hastened to explain that those at William and Mary were, unlike those at V.P.I. and University of Virginia, of recent origin, and we needed time to stabilize enrollments. And so it was that when I left the presidency in September 1971, the tuition for a doctoral student in physics or history or a law school student was the same as that for a freshman undergraduate student. We were particularly fortunate in obtaining huge appropriations for library support, graduate assistants, salaries, equipment and research in support of the graduate programs -- in addition to private fund support. I would explain this to the Board of Visitors and point^{out} that when the rainy day came in state appropriations, here was the opportunity to charge increased tuition for graduate students in programs well established that had an attraction for such students.

Williams: I take it then that you feel this was a significant achievement?

Paschall: It was indeed. I was somewhat proud that my successor could find an excellent faculty salary situation based not on a lock-step scale that I inherited, but on a basis of peer grouping of institutions across the nation, abundantly supported by state funds, with tuition low, which could be raised appreciably to offset any future rainy day in state appropriations. At the same time my successor could find it easy to differentiate tuition costs for graduate students when necessary without injury to the continuity of the graduate programs.

Williams: Last time, I believe it was, we had discussed the Colleges of

William and Mary, and going back to the disestablishment of the system, the Colleges of William and Mary, in 1962, what happened in reference to the Chancellor of that system? Would you comment on it?

Paschall: I am glad you asked this question because in the chapter that I have written on the Colleges of William and Mary I documented reasons for establishing and disestablishing the system but did not refer to matters thereafter in regard to the chancellor.

When the system was disestablished by law, effective June 30, 1962, the administrative positions (chancellor and comptroller) were of course discontinued. Mr. Hugh Sisson, the comptroller, who had previously served as bursar of the College of William and Mary, obtained a position with a very fine private school in the north and then became business manager of Norfolk College, later designated Old Dominion University. He was a person of considerable competence in college business matters.

Dr. Alvin D. Chandler served in what might be termed special assignments of the board in regard to the branch colleges, Christopher Newport and Richard Bland, until September 1962, when he retired.

Williams: I think you wanted to offer some observations about Dr. Chandler and your association with him.

Paschall: I first met him when he was beginning his naval career and would visit his father, Dr. J.A.C. Chandler, whose table

I served when I worked as a student in the dining hall. Soon after attaining an admiral's rank he was asked by the Board of Visitors to become president of William and Mary. He followed Dr. Pomfret, who resigned the presidency. That was a period of considerable unrest at the college, and it was felt that a hand of strength and firmness was needed. I became a member of the Board of Visitors in 1957 when I was state superintendent of public instruction and worked with Dr. Chandler in many ways that enabled me to know him personally. Then when I began my service as president and he was the administrative chancellor of the system, the Colleges of William and Mary, I learned to know him quite well.

His background in naval service had enabled him to travel extensively, and he was quite cosmopolitan in outlook. He was a person who had strong convictions, who spoke frankly and openly, who left no doubt where he stood on issues, and who worked hard himself and expected the same of others. Undoubtedly this frank expression of his invited criticism from some. Overall, he was a fearless administrator and was thoroughly devoted to the college. I feel that his accomplishments as president have never received the credit or acclaim that they should, especially since they were realized, in my opinion, against great odds at times.

I will mention several instances to illustrate what I mean. The largest endowment in the history of the college, the Lettie Pate Evans endowment, was the result of the efforts of Alvin Duke Chandler and his gracious wife, Louise.

Incidentally, this endowment, which we preserved through my administration, has been the backbone of private fund support for my successor. The other instance to which I refer was the handling of the Blackstone ceremonies. This very auspicious series of occasions did more to publicize the Marshall-Wythe School of Law than anything that had happened since the days of his father, President J.A.C. Chandler. He gave the leadership to this memorable series of events that attracted national attention.

No person could have been more influential in establishing ties with Great Britain than Alvin Duke Chandler. He was instrumental in starting and expanding a student scholarship exchange program under which the Drapers' Company of London supports the work of students from Britain studying at William and Mary in exchange for William and Mary students sent to British universities. These same very significant ties which he had cultivated accounted in large measure for the Queen Mother's visit to the college and later, in 1957, the visit of Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip to the college.

I could mention other significant contributions of Dr. Chandler and trust that any future historian will reflect carefully in according deserved attention to his leadership.

Williams: What happened then in your association with Dr. Chandler?

Paschall: Well, after his departure from the administrative chancellor position under the system the Colleges of William and Mary,

I felt and the Board of Visitors certainly shared the feeling that he should be recognized in some effective manner for the contribution he had made to William and Mary and the other colleges. Accordingly he was selected for conferral of an honorary degree of doctor of laws at the 1963 commencement exercises and was also elected chancellor of the College of William and Mary, the investiture to be at the 1963 exercises. This was done.

Williams: What did the term honorary chancellor mean?

Paschall: It is in my judgment a very time-honored, illustrious position that was provided in the ancient royal charter of the college. Before the American Revolution the chancellors were either the archbishops of Canterbury or the bishop of London. George Washington was the first American chancellor of the college. In this position the chancellor attends convocations as a special member of the honor party and processional. He is accorded a distinctive recognition in college affairs. The chancellor, although having no administrative responsibilities, is a patriarchal symbol of the college and its traditions. There is a private fund, the Chancellor's Fund, at the disposal of the chancellor. When the position is vacant the fund is subject to disposition by the president of the college. I wish to emphasize that Chancellor Chandler never used this[#] fund for anything personal, not even to pay his travelling expenses from his home in Virginia Beach when he attended convocations and special events at the

college. He methodically and deliberately built it up as an endowment ^{and} as saw to it that any income from the principal ^{of} was used for some good and needed purpose in the interest of the college. For example, his authorizations from this fund enabled the college to support additional students under the Drapers' and Exeter student exchange program. As a result of his prudence and frugality the fund built up to a very sizeable amount by the time he resigned as chancellor in 1973.

Williams: Did you have other official association with, first, Admiral, then Dr. Chandler?

Paschall: Yes, in regard to the Endowment Association. After the disestablishment of the system the Colleges of William and Mary in 1962, Dr. Chandler expressed the view that he should discontinue as president of the Endowment Association, a capacity in which he had served since his becoming president of the college. He told me and the Endowment Board that he felt that the president of the college should serve as president of the Endowment Association. He was correct in this view. Nevertheless, I urged him in the presence of the Endowment Board to continue as president for at least a few years, and that I would serve as vice-president. I based this advocacy for his continuance as president on the fact that his long experience had provided him more firsthand knowledge of the endowments than anyone else, the fact that he possessed a very keen perception as to investments and had

demonstrated it many times; and the fact that he possessed a philosophy of building up endowments by avoiding any unessential spending of income and ploughing it back into the corpus or principle^{al}; and the fact that he was adept and supportive in establishing endowment reserves. On the basis of this advocacy and the enthusiastic urging of the Endowment Board he agreed to continue as president of the Endowment Association. After some five or six years he indicated his desire to relinquish the presidency of the association and felt that I should as president of the college then undertake it. I agreed to do so, provided he would continue as vice-president, and this arrangement came into being. In his enthusiastic service on the Endowment Board and as president and then vice-president of the Endowment Association he made a very significant contribution to the college -- one that I fear may be overlooked by those who were not in a position, as I was, to observe it.

He and I shared a very deep conviction: namely that the college as a state institution must build endowment resources if it contemplated a future measure of independence; if it aspired to certain excellence in honors programs and otherwise that required funds beyond those that the state could or would provide; and that when state appropriations were substantial, as they then were, it was a good time to exercise frugality in building private resources. Now this should not be construed to imply that there was a Scrooge-type

approach in providing private funds for scholarships and other legitimate purposes during the period. Quite to the contrary, scholarship funds for undergraduates and fellowship funds for graduate students were liberally provided, and also a Heritage Fellows Program for faculty salary supplements was begun.

There was another conviction that Dr. Chandler and I shared deeply: namely, that the intent of donors of endowments should be adhered to quite strictly, and to this end we had the assistance of Mr. Vernon L. Nunn, treasurer-auditor of the college, in researching and keeping up-to-date authentic records and descriptions of endowments, both under the Board of Visitors and the Endowment Association.

There is much more that I could say in regard to Dr. Chandler's contribution to William and Mary, and I trust that the instances I have indicated will prove helpful in any assessment of his fine work.

Williams: Dr. Paschall, one of the subjects that we had touched on briefly last time and you had talked about was the academic developments during your administration. Would you comment upon those please?

Paschall: Just as it was an exciting period in attaining physical facilities, which we have discussed, it was equally exciting in academic growth and development. Perhaps I might try a summary first and then answer specific questions that may occur. While this summary is directed primarily to graduate

programs, I will be certain to speak later of changes in the undergraduate curriculum.

Prior to 1960 William and Mary offered graduate degrees at the master s' level only in education, history, marine science, physics, psychology, and of course the law degree and the master of law and taxation. After 1960 the following programs were inaugurated and the years indicated:

New Master s' Degree Programs:

- 1961 - Mathematics
- 1963 - Biology
- 1965 - Chemistry
- 1966 - Business administration
- 1967 - Government
- 1967 - Sociology
- 1968 - Special education (handicapped children)
- 1970 - Master's in applied science, focusing at the Virginia Associated Research Campus in Newport News, a graduate campus of the College of William and Mary

Doctoral programs instituted:

- 1964 - Physics (Ph.D.)
- 1964 - Marine science (Ph.D.)
- 1966 - Education (Ed.D.)
- 1967 - History (Ph.D.) - emphasis on early American

Additional graduate programs approved by State Council of Higher Education:

- 1970 - Ph.D. in biology
- 1970 - Ph.D. in psychology
- 1970 - Master s' in English (revival of former program)
- 1970 - Master s' in foreign languages

New Departments after 1960:

- 1961 - Department of geology (bachelor's degree)
- 1962 - Department of theater and speech (former a division of the fine arts department)

- 1968 - Department of religion
- 1968 - Department of anthropology (formerly a part of the sociology department)

During the latter part of the administration, the bachelor of civil law conferred by the law school was changed to the juris doctor degree, and a bachelor of business administration (BBA) degree was inaugurated.

Schools established (in addition to the existing law school)

- 1961 - the school of marine science
- 1966 - the school of education
- 1968 - the school of business administration
- 1968 - the school of continuing studies

Williams: You mentioned a few minutes ago changes in the undergraduate curriculum. Would you comment on some of these?

Paschall: In a self-study report developed by the faculty and administration and completed in 1964, many recommendations were made that strengthened the undergraduate curriculum at that time. Courses available to undergraduates increased substantially. In 1960, for example, there were nineteen undergraduate courses in biology. Ten years later there were thirty-four. In the department of history the undergraduate courses more than doubled. A limited sampling of a broad spectrum of new courses revealed titles such as: Geology, Religion, General Endocrinology, Biochemistry, International Relations, Comparative Political Systems, Latin American Politics and Government, American Intellectual History, the History of the Caribbean, of Brazil, of Mexico, of Modern Germany, Experimental Physics, Philosophical Problems in Physical Science, language

courses in Italian and Russian, a new series of courses in anthropology. This is a mere sampling.

The first major review of the undergraduate curriculum in thirty years was commenced in 1968 by the faculty of arts and sciences. The basic purpose was to revitalize the curriculum, making it responsive to the educational needs of students in a rapidly changing society but also preserving the base and core of a strong liberal arts education. This study resulted in the establishment of certain guideline principles, such as: the curriculum should provide opportunities for breadth and depth in education; effective academic advising by the faculty within explicit guidelines should replace inflexible requirements; the college program should extend the high school background but not be a repetition of it either in types of experience or in subject matter; the college should seek to ground students in the concepts, principles, and methods of thought and analysis inherent in areas and disciplines rather than merely to import information; students should be encouraged to enter early their fields of interest rather than be impeded by many required courses in their early years; and the quality of academic effort is more important than the quantity. As a result of these guideline principles, freshmen and sophomore advisors were given more responsibility; the distribution system in the freshman and sophomore years evolved into a system of area requirements based upon a clearly stated educational philo-

sophy; undergraduate degree requirements came to be stated in courses rather than credits; and every freshman was eventually assigned to a tutorial section of an introductory course in the area of his indicated interest. All of this strengthened the undergraduate curriculum.

Williams: I know there was some criticism, saying the graduate program was damaging the undergraduate program. Were there any specific efforts to protect the undergraduate program under the impact of this rapid growth in the graduate program you've just described?

Paschall: Yes, very strong efforts were made. I will mention several to illustrate. We deliberately refrained from use of graduate assistants as teachers of freshmen and sophomores, a practice employed by many universities. Instead we endeavored to use the most experienced teachers for freshmen and sophomore courses. For example, Dr. W.G. Guy, chairman of the chemistry department and a master teacher, taught freshman chemistry. We accorded a top priority to maintaining adequate library resources for undergraduate programs. We avoided a breakdown or division of graduate and undergraduate faculty, thereby assuring a balanced academic protection for both levels and a more flexible use of faculty member talent and a much better faculty salary situation for all. We also sought to enrich the undergraduate program by providing such ancillary programs as departmental honors, general honors, and the College-Wide Reading Program.

Williams: In addition to the physical growth and academic expansion on campus during your administration what were the other off-campus responsibilities?

Paschall: The college by legislative direction and support undertook the development of two branch colleges (Christopher Newport in Newport News and Richard Bland in Petersburg) and the Virginia Associated Research Center near Newport News, where the college had responsibility for a multimillion-dollar Space Radiation Effects Laboratory, and also the development of a large extension service to meet continuing education needs throughout Tidewater Virginia.

Williams: Dr. Paschall, would you comment on how the graduate program expansion began. Was there opposition? Did you have guidelines for it? Generally what was the climate of opinion?

Paschall: Those are all very relevant questions. I hardly know where to begin in answering them without omission of some factors that are important. First of all let me emphasize that these were "shared achievements." No one person could have possibly realized them alone. Overall they were the result of the times and circumstances; the educational needs that had to be met and the college's role in meeting them; the policies of the governors and the General Assembly, the State Council of Higher Education, the Board of Visitors, faculty and alumni efforts, student responsiveness, and administrative leadership. I will try to be more specific in analyzing these.

As for the times, the beginning of the decade 1960 was

the very eve of a period of great explosion in knowledge, in science and technology, in industry, business, and government. There was literally a horde of students to be educated at the college level throughout the nation. State colleges and universities everywhere were expected to meet this need at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. What was true nationally certainly obtained in Virginia. No institution supported by state funds was oblivious to this impending situation. The basic question, I felt, in the instance of William and Mary was whether it could muster the wisdom to meet its share of the educational need and at the same time safeguard its fundamental mission and purpose. For instance, could the college accommodate graduate programs without hurt to the undergraduate? Could the college be selective and restrictive in such graduate programs and avoid becoming a multiuniversity? Could the college accommodate an increase in enrollment and avoid becoming a colossus in size that would impinge adversely on the interpersonal, individualized relationships that mean so much in the education of students? Could the college avoid a proliferation of offerings in some possible misguided effort to be everything for everybody? Could the college chart its course as an institution of recognized excellence, not so small as to suffer inadequate resources in support of research, faculty salaries, libraries, distinguished scholars, and student aid, and not so large as to relegate its destiny to internal

organizational bureaucracies characteristic of the big university? Could problems inherent in being "in-between the small and the big" be wisely solved? I wish to emphasize that whether these questions can be called guidelines or not, they were foremost in my heart and conscience, and I took advantage of every opportunity to translate them humbly and inquiringly to others *who were interested*.

Williams: ^{There} was [^] a diversity of opinion at William and Mary at that time.

Paschall: Yes, but there has always been a diversity of opinion in academic circles -- or there should be. One should recall that the college went through a very unusual and unorthodox period, 1960-'62, when it was a part of the system, the Colleges of William and Mary. For some it was a traumatic experience, and feelings were deep among faculty, alumni, and others about the college's role in that situation. The year 1962 seemed to me to be a time for building a spirit of unity, to exercise patience, and to muster diplomacy. It was a time to take stock and evaluate new directions. Fortunately, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, our regional accrediting agency, was just beginning a new policy requiring the institutions to conduct a self-study once every ten years. The year 1964 was scheduled by the association for William and Mary to submit its report. This afforded a welcome vehicle for college-wide participation in evaluation of all phases of the college and in

projection of directions. This process would, I felt, afford an opportunity for collective study, reason, and deliberation.

Williams: Had you publicly indicated some of your own philosophy as to the mission and purpose of the college?

Paschall: Yes, on the occasion of inauguration ceremonies on October 13, 1961, my speech incorporated quite a number of hopes, aspirations, and objectives. Permit me to give you this copy of the entire inaugural ceremonies, and I trust you will wish to file it with a transcript of this interview. I am constrained to believe that a future historian would like to review it as a quick reference. But as to mission and purpose of the college, permit me to read a brief excerpt from the address:

Let us apprise business, industry, government, and all the professions that it is the basic image and mission of the College of William and Mary in Virginia to provide a graduate who is the educated man -- one so steeped in the knowledge and values of a liberal education as to enable him to build the skills of future specialization without losing the perspective of the good life.

Williams: You mentioned the necessity for taking stock or evaluation in 1962 and the fact that a college-wide self-study was launched. Did you yourself do anything else that helped in this evaluation?

Paschall: I did do something that proved to be most helpful at the time. The Board of Visitors had undergone some difficult situations during the system, the Colleges of William and Mary, and the

members sensed the need that I felt for taking stock, so to speak. In the early summer of 1962, I prepared a rather extensive documentary report summarizing the then current status and future projections of the important phases of the college. This report contained compilations of information that are more factually revealing than anything else that can be found pertaining to the college at that time. It was then and is now, therefore, a very important historical reference. Because of its importance I now give you a copy that I hope you will file with a transcript of this interview. Permit me to make some comments about it.

First you will note that the letter of transmittal to the Board of Visitors is dated July 17, 1962, thereby permitting time for the board to study it before the regular meeting scheduled in September. I quote the last paragraph in the letter of transmittal:

An early acceptance of the Report in principle, or such parts as are deemed worthy and proper, by the Board of Visitors will afford the College a timely basis for future planning which is so essential to its continued progress and support.

The report summarized the legal status of the college, concluding with a full copy of the 1962 legislation disestablishing the Colleges of William and Mary and the statement made by Governor Harrison in 1962 to the General Assembly in reference to the College of William and Mary, its heritage and mission. It included a summary description of the then academic program at the undergraduate and graduate levels

and a projected expansion at both levels; the State Council of Higher Education reaction to the expanded program; and a time schedule for inauguration of the advanced program. It also included an up-to-date description of the summer session, evening college, and extension programs, as well as the Institute of Early American History and Culture, the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, and the joint agreement involving William and Mary in the operation and maintenance of the Space Radiation Effects Laboratory. The report included a very pertinent section on admissions and enrollments, indicating that 2519 students were enrolled for the session 1961-'62. Keep this number in mind because it did not, contrary to the fears and opinions of some, increase appreciably during the decade 1960-'70, despite the pressures for admissions. The report also described possible development projects, some ^{of} which would still be appropriate, and an up-to-date report of the accreditation status of the law school. In regard to the latter, there have been some erroneous reports recently to the effect that a visitation by the American Bar Association has not been made since 1953. As this report indicates, a visitation was contemplated for 1963 and was so made.

Williams: I can tell just from looking at the table of contents this is a very information-packed report, and yes, I will be glad to file it with the transcript. Would you comment on the report's specific implications for graduate programs, which was the basic question when you first referred to it?

Paschall: I am glad to have an opportunity to do so because I think it is most important in revealing a framework from which the

graduate expansion emerged. There are four references in particular made in the report which I have just given you that constitute an early policy background for developing the graduate program. The first (on page 15) refers to the report "Higher Education in the Tidewater Area of Virginia," published under the auspices of the State Council [of Higher Education] in 1960, which said in part:

The resources that are present at the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg for development of graduate programs badly needed in the area should be utilized and turned to local area service. Its program of graduate studies in teacher education and in some special arts and science fields such as physics and mathematics should be expanded . . . graduate programs in several fields are feasible now at the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg.

It was this State Council of Higher Education Report in 1960, which was basically formulated in 1959, that provided the main thrust or bases for establishing the system the Colleges of William and Mary. It deplored the absence of graduate program availability in tidewater Virginia -- that vast, rapidly developing area from the fallline (Richmond, for instance) of the rivers to the ocean. Richmond Professional Institute had some graduate offerings in the field of social work, but Norfolk College had just attained a four-year degree granting level and was seeking accreditation as such by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Only William and Mary had some masters' degree programs. The report, in recommending a consortium of institutions to form the Colleges of William and Mary, described the

system as a foreseeable third leg of the stool of graduate higher education in Virginia, the University of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute being the other two legs of the stool. This advocacy by the State Council of Higher Education and its approval by the General Assembly provided a policy direction, a public mandate, and responsibility to the College of William and Mary to assume the leadership in meeting this graduate need in tidewater Virginia.

Williams: How did the Board of Visitors react to this policy mandate?

Paschall: The board had been expanded in membership under the system of the Colleges of William and Mary and felt that it should take steps indicating cooperation. So I now mention another reference from the report that I gave you (page 16), quoting from a resolution of the Board of Visitors of the Colleges of William and Mary, March 4, 1961:

Therefore, Be It Resolved, That the Chancellor, the President, and Faculty of the College take such steps as will advance existing programs to expanded levels of knowledge and excellence in all areas in which by tradition and resources special interest and competence be found . . .

A more definitive action was taken by the Board of Visitors of the Colleges of William and Mary and submitted to the State Council of Higher Education on September 15, 1961. This was a document entitled "The Colleges of William and Mary: Goals, Purposes and Scope." It contained a copy of the March 4, 1961, resolution, which I quoted, and several specific proposals for expansion of current programs to graduate levels. So you see the rapidity of policy actions.

Williams: How did the State Council of Higher Education react to that proposal?

Paschall: The State Council of Higher Education in a report publicly released under date of December 14, 1961, gave its reaction by indicating wholehearted agreement with the board resolution of March 4, 1961, by recognizing that the college had outstanding resources in colonial Virginia history and could eventually achieve distinction at the doctoral level in this special field, by encouraging the development of existing programs in government and dramatic arts to the masters' levels, and also those in chemistry and biology to similar levels, and by continuing to consider the doctoral proposal in marine science. All this is in that report. Governor Harrison in his address to the General Assembly on January 15, 1962 (which is also in that report), spoke eloquently in reference to the College of William and Mary (see page 16 of the report I gave you) and indicated that it should strengthen and improve its graduate offerings.

Williams: The General Assembly did dissolve or disestablish the system, the Colleges of William and Mary, in 1962.

Paschall: Yes, it did. But when the college was again launched on its own, so to speak, it was by then circumscribed in an expected role of leadership in providing graduate programs for tidewater Virginia. I have recounted specifically the major actions and policies of the State Council of Higher Education, the governor and the General Assembly, and the

Board of Visitors in having established this graduate program leadership expectation. As you know, under the law and in accordance with accreditation regulations, the Board of Visitors has the authority to designate what degree programs shall be offered, but the authority for determining the course offerings for such degree programs is that of the faculty.

Williams: Then by the fall of 1962 did you regard the inauguration of future graduate programs as inevitable?

Paschall: The policy action which I have cited left no other choice. It was a matter of when, to be determined on availability of resources, physical and otherwise.

Williams: There were some faculty members, I know, who were opposed to any graduate expansion.

Paschall: Yes. As I recall, those who voice^d opposition were chiefly among those who had been associated with the college for fifteen or more years. Even among those, however, there was a difference in opinion. For example, Dr. W.G. Guy, chairman of the department of chemistry, felt that if physics, mathematics, and biology were to have graduate programs, then it was logical that chemistry also have one.

Williams: What reasons were advanced by those faculty members who favored graduate expansion?

Paschall: Some of the younger members in particular saw it as an opportunity to bring "new blood," as they called it, into their midst, to attain faculty-supported research, to increase salaries, and to meet an educational need which they felt

faced the college.

Williams: Did you yourself preside at faculty meetings?

Paschall: Yes. We had a regular meeting each month, usually in Washington Hall, room 200. The faculty increased in number from 175 to approximately 419 during my years as president. I presided at the meetings, this being customary and also specified as one of my duties under the bylaws of the Board of Visitors. When, however, we advanced organizationally about 1967 to the point of having several schools, then the faculties met separately. The deans of the schools presided at their respective faculty meetings, and the dean of the faculty of arts and sciences presided at the meeting of this rather large group.

Williams: How did you find this experience of presiding at faculty meetings?

Paschall: I found it to be exciting and exhausting. Perhaps at some other period in the college's history such meetings may have been routine and brief, but not so during the 1960s. The extent of faculty politics at such meetings was very revealing. There were times when I thought it to be a "jungle academe." The college was emerging departments and new degree programs, and these became subject to recurring debate and rather sharp divisions at times. As presiding officer I was expected to maintain a respectable neutrality. I did insist on giving everyone a chance to be heard, and this sometimes trespassed on parliamentary procedure. I discovered,

however, that quite a number of faculty members remained independent of voting cliques, and their thoughts, when expressed, tended to bring a sense of reason to the deliberations. Eventually we arranged to have an elected parliamentarian, and this aided me greatly in avoiding undue parliamentary snarls.

Williams: As the college expanded, then, there were changes also in the administrative structure.

Paschall: I discovered that as much as some administrative structure was desperately needed before the college's self-study report was completed in 1964, I had best wait until then to try to achieve it. That report stated: "In the past quarter of a century, as the College has grown, its administrative organization has evolved in such a way as to handicap rather than aid the President in performance of his functions." In addition to the twenty-one officers reporting directly to the president, the report noted, he had various degrees of responsibility for twenty-two faculty committees. This arrangement, it noted, greatly burdened the president in trying to see everyone and maintain communication, in laying the groundwork for a desperately needed building program, in keeping in touch with the governor and the General Assembly, in fundraising, in working with alumni, and in giving leadership to the new academic programs needed at the college.

So in 1964 I proposed, and the board approved, an organizational plan

whereby four major officers reported directly to the president: the dean of the college, the bursar, the dean of students, and the director of development. The athletic director continued to report to the president. The plan also provided for the establishment of a dean of graduate studies to coordinate the college's rapidly growing advanced curriculum and to serve as chairman of the new graduate council.

In 1968 the position of dean of the college was eliminated and the position of vice-president of the college and two assistant vice-presidents were established. The plan also created an administrative council comprised of the top-ranking administrative officers of the college, the council serving as a general policy-making and advisory body to the president.

Finally, the administrative organization of 1969 brought the administration to the concept of a modern, medium-sized university level. Under this, the only major officer reporting directly to the president was the executive vice-president, and reporting to the latter were: vice-president for academic affairs, vice-president for student affairs, and vice-president for business affairs.

So it took almost a decade for an effective administrative structure to emerge. Although a burdensome wait, it did result in the college having the lowest percentage cost for administration of any four-year state institution during the decade, and this was a persuasive factor in getting appropriations.

Williams: I take it then you were pleased with this and that you regarded it as another contribution that you could pass on to your successor?

Paschall: I most certainly did. In retrospect, I just don't see how I endured all the responsibilities until this administrative structure finally emerged. Whereas I had to meet and confer individually with twenty-one officers of the college in 1960, my successor in 1971 only had to look directly to the executive vice-president, Mr. Carter O. Lowance.

Williams: Mr. Lowance is known to be a very remarkable man. Would you comment on him?

Paschall: Before accepting appointment as executive vice-president at William and Mary, Mr. Lowance had served as special or executive assistant to five Virginia governors and also as vice-president of the Medical College of Virginia. He was admired, respected, and esteemed throughout Virginia. Always quiet in manner, composed in demeanor, modest and gentlemanly in conduct, he displayed an exceptional insight in handling problems and issues, and his judgment was superb. He certainly merited and enjoyed the respect of the entire college community. I valued him highly for all these attributes, but even more for his friendship. My successor inherited a jewel in that man and in the position he held.

I might also add that others in the key organizational structure were highly qualified for the responsibilities inherent in their respective positions.

Williams: You might then want to comment on who these key administrators were.

Paschall: Dr. W. Melville Jones was vice-president for academic affairs, Mr. J.W. Lambert was vice-president for student affairs, and Mr. R.T. English, Jr., was vice-president for business affairs. I have mentioned Dr. Jones and Mr. Lambert previously in this interview. Mr. English, who served as bursar throughout my administration, was a very capable official. He not only handled the normal business affairs of the college, but also the taking of bids for building construction, the contractor accounts, and many other duties. He was not only very efficient, but also highly regarded at the college and in the Williamsburg community.

Mr. James S. Kelly, executive secretary of the Society of the Alumni, was of great assistance. He enjoyed the support of so many alumni and evidenced a strong loyalty to the president of the college. During the last few years of the decade he served as parttime executive secretary of the Society of the Alumni and director of development. (When I say "part-time," his salary was paid one-half by the Society of the Alumni and one-half from state funds as director of development.) His parttime service as director of development was all the assistance I had in that important function, but I felt that in the final analysis the president had to serve basically as the development officer.

Williams: I'm glad you mentioned that. As this administrative structure

was completed toward the end of the 1960s, you might want to mention also the deans of the various schools.

Paschall: Dr. Harold L. Fowler was dean of the faculty of arts and sciences, which of course consisted of the largest number of faculty members. James P. Whyte, Jr., served as dean of the Marshall-Wythe School of Law; Richard B. Brooks, dean of the school of education; William J. Hargis, dean of the school of marine science; Charles L. Quittmeyer, dean of the school of business administration, and D.J. Herrmann, dean of the school of continuing studies. Dr. John Selby served as dean of graduate studies.

Williams: Coming back to this point on growth of graduate programs, you indicated that policy demands for those programs that might come from tradition, resources, and competence -- would you illustrate how this happened?

Paschall: I will be glad to give the highlights in several instances. First I will talk about the physics program, for which the first doctoral degree was approved in 1964. The college already had a rapidly developing master's¹ program. In 1962 the General Assembly authorized the establishment of the Virginia Associated Research Center (VARC) as a joint venture of the College of William and Mary, the University of Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Located just thirteen miles from Williamsburg, VARC was conceived to manage and operate NASA's huge Space Radiation Effects Laboratory and to develop research programs at the advanced graduate level. Soon

thereafter the college was offered a \$400,000 federal grant to upgrade its physics program to a doctoral level. Unless this were done, it was obvious that the college could not operate on par with the University of Virginia and V.P.I. as expected under the VARC obligation. I recall that Dr. W. Melville Jones, then dean of the faculty, Mr. J.B. Woodward of the Board of Visitors, and I conferred with Governor Harrison, whose office had authority for acceptance of such grants. We indicated that this would mean a doctoral program in physics which might well herald others, and the college would thereby attain a university status. After thorough discussion it was felt that the college had the obligation to go ahead. So as a result a new team of high-level nuclear physicists were recruited for the physics department, huge financial support for equipment was received, additional graduate courses were inaugurated, and a new academic building occupied in 1964. The program was therefore virtually at the doctoral level in strength, resources, potential capability, and enrollment when it was officially approved as such by the State Council of Higher Education in 1964.

I might cite similar resources and outstanding academic strength that led to the state council's approval, also in 1964, for a doctoral program in marine science simultaneously for William and Mary and the University of Virginia.

The Ph.D. program in history (though not approved as such

until 1967), with a particular emphasis on early American history, capitalized in large measure on the tradition and unique setting of the College of William and Mary in the heart of the historic triangle of early America and the scholarly reputation and resource material of the Institute of Early American History and Culture, plus the distinctive research laboratory of Colonial Williamsburg. In addition, the state, through the encouragement of the governor's special graduate funds, assured adequate financial support for additional faculty, library resources, graduate assistantships, and faculty research. In addition, Mrs. James Pinckney Harrison established a sizeable endowment for a chair in history, and Mr. Jay Johns gave an endowment in excess of \$300,000, the income from which was to acquire library books and valuable manuscripts and papers of the early American period in support of the doctoral program. So the master's program was advanced to the doctoral level with an affluence of resource support.

Williams: Was similar support generated for the new departments that were established?

Paschall: Yes, I had a commitment to the faculty that I would not request the Board of Visitors' approval of the establishment of a new department nor the faculty to make a final determination of course offerings unless I could present assurance of adequate resources and that the same would not deny other departments accordingly. This assurance was kept in the

establishment of the departments of religion, geology, theatre and speech, and anthropology.

Williams: What about support for faculty research?

Paschall: Research support for William and Mary faculty increased from \$27,116 annually to \$900,000 during the decade 1960-1970. In addition state-funded research grants for summer research by faculty increased from \$8,175 in 1959-'60 to \$21,000 in the summer of 1970, plus an annual contribution of \$5,000 from the Society of the Alumni. I was particularly proud that my successor could inherit a research-funded program that had advanced so far.

Williams: I know faculty members are always concerned about faculty teaching loads. What was the effect on faculty teaching loads during your administration?

Paschall: The impact of the graduate programs and the fact that we did not divide the faculty into graduate or undergraduate enabled us to reduce the normal semester hour teaching load from sixteen to eighteen semester hours in 1960 to nine to twelve hours in 1970, with the major number being nine hours. The number of students per class was reduced appreciably at all levels.

Williams: What about faculty housing?

Paschall: Well, the college from private funds built apartments, acquired and renovated properties, and rented these nominally to faculty and staff. We established a housing loan fund which increased from \$350,000 in 1962-'63 to \$800,000 in January

1970, and then to \$1,000,000 in 1971. Under this plan loans were made at $4\frac{1}{2}$ percent interest up to \$25,000, or 80 percent of the appraised value of the property, whichever was lower. This was recognized as an outstanding fringe benefit in acquiring homes.

Williams: What were some of the other things that helped faculty members?

Paschall: Well, in October 1964, an alumnus of the college, Mr. J. Bruce Bredin, of Wilmington, Delaware, made the first contribution that established the Bredin Sabbatical Fund. Subsequent annual contributions brought the fund to a total of \$70,000. The allocations were used in assisting some thirty-five faculty members for travel to international conferences, supplements to research grants, supplements to fellowships, and aid in pursuance of higher degrees.

In September 1967, the Endowment Association of the College of William and Mary established a Heritage Fellow Fund for the purpose of providing \$500 annual (nine-month) salary supplements to members of the faculty judged by their peers to be outstanding scholars and teachers. Approximately eleven such faculty members could be aided each year. Through the wise use of endowment funds, after 1964 approximately ten faculty members received supplements each year under the state Eminent Scholars Fund. In addition, after 1964 the Society of the Alumni supported five faculty alumni fellowships, which included \$500 annual (nine-month) salary supplements. We also assisted six or seven faculty members to attain higher degrees by providing a sizeable portion of salary to those on leave of absence for that pur-

pose. I have already mentioned the significant increase in faculty research support.

Williams: You have also referred to the large faculty salary increase during your administration. Would you add to that please?

Paschall: I believe it particularly significant that despite the increase from 175 to about 415 faculty members the average nine-month faculty salaries increased from \$6,000 in 1960 to \$13,000 in 1970-'71. I recall that 61 faculty members were there the entire period. Of these, 53 received salary increases (nine-month) of 100 percent or more; 32 received increases of 150 percent or more; and 6 received increases of 200 percent or more. This reflects the very substantial state support accorded William and Mary during the period, especially since we were able to keep tuition low and since the faculty more than doubled in number.

It must also be remembered that although we did not permit graduate assistants to teach, the number of such assistantships increased from 2 to 80 during the period. Toward the latter part of the decade these paid approximately \$2800 each, plus tuition. These graduate students provided invaluable assistance to senior faculty members and to those departments having graduate programs. A large fellowship program was also provided from endowment funds to assist those graduate students not having graduate assistantships.

Williams: One topic we haven't mentioned and that's athletics. I know

it's a perennial subject at William and Mary. Would you comment on this during your administration?

Paschall: In 1961 I submitted a study report on athletics to the Board of Visitors. As a result the board adopted an athletic policy that continued in effect even after I left the presidency in September 1971. This policy was soundly based and indicated the college's role as a member of the Southern Conference and also in respect to the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The athletic program during the decade 1960 to 1970 was characterized by stabilization and sound growth. There was a considerable indebtedness in the program at the beginning of the period, but it was paid off, and thereafter no further indebtedness was incurred. The budget during the decade increased nearly 200 percent, which was occasioned by the philosophy that the program should be expanded for increased participation by a large number of students. This expansion in breadth resulted in doubling the number of sports in ten years and also doubling the coaching staff. These sports programs by the end of the decade were: football, basketball, track, fencing, baseball, soccer, rifle, hockey, golf, gymnastics, lacrosse, swimming, tennis, and wrestling. This expansion was accompanied by a phenomenal growth in the intramural program, which we valued highly. This increased participation brought and encouraged a certain virility that was healthful for the student and the campus.

Williams: You mentioned the policy statement on athletics made by the board. What were some of the principles that were followed or implemented?

Paschall: Well, first of all the philosophy or classical concept of "a sound mind in a sound body" should be implemented in both sports as well as intramural programs. This concept was certainly appropriate to a liberal arts institution. Another principle emphasized that the college, while not aspiring to become professional or big-time in its sports programs, did intend to strengthen and broaden these opportunities. Another principle or practice of the policy was that the college would play teams primarily within its conference membership and would avoid playing teams that were out of our league, so to speak -- those that clearly and obviously would put our teams at an unfair advantage in competition. Another point was the recognition of the faculty athletic committee as the basic policy overseer of the sports programs. In all of it, top priority was accorded the integrity of the operation of the program, especially in regard to grants-in-aid, budget solvency, recruitment, and respect for academic standards. The specific achievements are described in considerable detail on pages 48 through 51 of the ten-year report, Highlights of Progress, 1960-1970, which I gave you for filing with a copy of the transcript of this interview. I would urge anyone interested in this in the future to review these pages.

Williams: Did the alumni actively support the athletic program?

Paschall: The William and Mary Educational Foundation increased its support for athletic scholarships from \$14,500 in 1962-'63 to \$75,000 in 1967-'68. This support continued to increase.

Williams: Would you say that you had a keen personal interest in this part of the college life?

Paschall: Yes, I did indeed. I attended the games and often spoke to teams before games and visited in the dressing rooms to offer encouragement. I was privileged to present awards at athletic banquets and always reminded recipients that had it not been for the "nonrecipients," who "also ran," the awards could not have been made. I traveled to the athletic foundation chapters throughout the state and helped to raise funds for the program. There was something about this fine development which definitely enhanced the spirit of the college and certainly inspired alumni to return.

My wife was an avid fan of the sports program and attended all the events that she possibly could.

Williams: In speaking of the alumni, how would you characterize your working relationship with them?

Paschall: My working relationship with alumni was a most rewarding experience. I always made a presentation to the Society of the Alumni Board on "The State of the College," at which time I discussed the current status and plans for the college and sought reactions. The board consisted of elected

alumni who were not only keenly interested in our alma mater, but who were quite capable in assessing projects and plans as well as in their fund-raising efforts. In 1960 about 400 alumni were returning for homecoming; in 1970 about 5,000 were returning. The number of contributors doubled during the decade, and the membership increased from 15,000 to approximately 23,000. One of the actions that gave me a great deal of satisfaction was approval of my recommendation by the Board of Visitors that the Bright House be converted to the Alumni House, and this project was well underway when I left the presidency.

Williams: Earlier today you have discussed the academic facilities built during your administration. What of the dormitories?

Paschall: We constructed the lovely duPont dormitory for women, Yates Hall for men, a very extensive new dormitory complex for men, which was occupied by the fraternities, and also a very extensive complex for women, intended for sororities.

It is significant to note that during the 1960s the college moved toward a type of dormitory concept and design that would avoid repeating the traditional, institutionalized style of buildings with their long straight halls, mass study and recreational facilities. The dormitory complexes which I mentioned, for instance, provide an intimate, quiet, home-like atmosphere, each accomodating thirty-six students. The top two floors are restricted exclusively to living quarters -- eight rooms to the floor. Centrally located with entrance

from two sides are bath facilities on each of these floors surrounded by u-shaped corridors. The first floor provides a large living room, dining room-study area, kitchen, housemother's suite, and quarters with an office for the student head of the unit. The basement consists of a large recreational area and an auxiliary room.

We had plans underway when I left the presidency for remodeling Old Dominion, Monroe, Barrett, and Jefferson dormitories in such a way as to provide for small group living. We had amassed \$720,000 in auxiliary enterprise funds to begin the first of these projects.

Williams: Would you comment on endowments?

Paschall: Endowment funds held under the Endowment Association and the Board of Visitors increased from \$3,820,000 in 1959 to \$8,852,000 in 1970. It should be remembered that annual income was used for scholarships and fellowships. Obviously if such income had been converted to principal the increase would have been considerably larger. The above amount does not reflect more than \$1,000,000 that I personally knew was included in wills as future bequests to the college.

Williams: Turning to another part of the story of the decade 1960-'70, we have not discussed student affairs. Would you comment on this?

Paschall: I refer you to pages 34 to 39 in the ten-year report, Highlights, 1960-1970, which I gave you for filing with a transcript of this interview. This details the important com-

parisons in admissions, the significant student services, student activities and participation, changes in social regulations, and something about student activism that pervaded all college campuses in the late 1960s. I plan to write a rather extensive chapter on this to be put in the archives.

In the meantime I might say that there were many, many constructive involvements by students in the late 1960s in activities related to the community at large rather than specifically to the campus as such. There were other manifestations after the spring of 1969 in the cause of student "rights," this being influenced by adoption during the previous year of such declarations by various national organizations. The college endeavored to set forth a policy that involved the principle of "responsibilities" as well as "rights. The student unrest in those late years of the 1960s was not something apart from the unrest then permeating society in general. Deep-seated concerns increased nationally in regard to America's war in southeast Asia, the inequity in certain draft situations -- all implied an uncertainty of the students' future destiny and occasioned widespread personal confusion and frustration. Nor could the college campus be an island apart from the mainland of mounting problems in race relations, conditions of poverty, ghettos, the plight of the cities, and the depletion of the environment. There were therefore certain changes made in social regulations-but not under pressure. They were

made only after careful study and justified in terms of real progress rather than merely "change for change's sake."

When I say these were not made under pressure I do not mean to imply that students did not urge some of them. They did, but they made the approach through orderly channels. We did not suffer burned buildings, riots, and violence that characterized many college and university campuses at the time -- for instance, Berkeley, Columbia, and Harvard.

Williams: And what were some of the changes that were made?

Paschall: After a year of intensive study, the automobile regulations were modified to permit juniors and seniors to have cars on campus. This however was accompanied by a very carefully planned establishment of a representative board of automobile control, assuring adherence to traffic regulations on campus. Seniors or students twenty-one years of age were permitted to live off-campus. This had a precedent when I was a student at William and Mary during Dr. J.A.C. Chandler's administration. I never did appreciate or even understand how this restriction had come about during the intervening years. The alcoholic beverage regulation was modified, but within the strict framework of legal and campus restrictions. This matter was studied for two years before the report for modification was submitted by the president to the Board of Visitors. It was a board regulation. The board unanimously approved the modification. Certain extension of curfew hours for the women's dormitories and provision for

limited open house visitation under prescribed conditions were realized. It must be remembered that the college adhered to certain values and traditions, and the idea in loco parentis was still strong in the minds of parents who paid for their son or daughter's education at William and Mary and was also strong in the attitude of the Board of Visitors in such matters. This was an ever-reminder that change had to be made slowly and with broad understandings rather than stamped under pressure. Whoever assesses this in the future is admonished to judge the situation within the context of a value system held by the constituencies of the college at that time rather than within the context of views held later. We could not condone, for example, unrestricted visitation in rooms of residents of the opposite sex nor a total abolition of curfew for women's dormitories. Such I presume has been subsequently condoned, but I personally am adverse to it. I might say that J. Wilfred Lambert, the long-time dean of students, voiced his opposition to it in presentations to me and the Board of Visitors. The decisions that had to be made, however, were mine and/or the board's, and he (Mr. Lambert) happily escaped student criticism that sometimes followed some of the decisions.

Williams: Were some of the regulations changed because of federal court decisions?

Paschall: Yes, there was an avalanche of cases before federal courts

in the late 1960s that related to student regulations. Such court decisions involving institutions other than William and Mary but having a bearing on the college pertained, for instance, to dress and personal appearance regulations. Suddenly the effect of federal court decrees virtually eliminated the dress and appearance restrictions of the college which had been observed with considerable pride on the part of most students for years. For a time then we observed the onslaught of long hair and beards, frayed jeans, weird gowns, and even bare feet. After a period there was a gradual return to normalcy. In my opinion we suffered a loss in attire and appearance under court decrees that in some instances meant a loss of respect for one's own person and a psychological invitation to modes of behavior in keeping with a certain shabbiness in appearance.

Williams: You mentioned the spread of student activism at various colleges and universities. What was your basic concern about it, Dr. Paschall?

Paschall: Well, I go back to my days as state superintendent of public instruction. I have already told you about those days and my devotion to "keeping the lamp of learning burning." Building on that concept I felt that if education is indeed the basic hope for the survival of a republic that is to be sustained by an enlightened electorate, then the sure way to destroy that type of government is to snuff out the lamp of learning by closing the citadels of learning, or so dis-

rupting the same as to hinder and impede the normal process of educational endeavor. The road to this end, I felt, by those so motivated was first to create revolution on campuses, accompanied by violence or threats of it and hopefully a state of academic anarchy, whereby the constituency that supports the institution, whether by state or private funds, will withdraw the same. Nothing in my opinion was more insidious and taken cumulatively on many college campuses, more ominously prophetic in the short-range future of higher education. I rather think this proved to be a correct concern.

Williams: Were there efforts to broaden communication involving students?

Paschall: We established a student affairs committee, composed of students, faculty, and administrators that took under consideration the matters of student concern. The Board of Visitors established a student affairs committee for the purpose of conferring with representatives of the campus student affairs committee. In 1969 I appointed students to regular college-wide as well as faculty of arts and sciences committees, such as discipline, scholarship and student employment, athletics, arts and lectures, foreign studies, honors, library, women's athletics, recreation, environment, and the committee to study revision of the college curriculum. Beginning in 1964 dormitories developed councils, composed of an elected president ^{and} representatives.

These were gradually strengthened in responsibility and became self-governing units. In addition to promoting social and cultural activities they encouraged a purposeful academic atmosphere by inviting department heads and faculty members to discuss academic offerings and the like. Incidentally the Board of Visitors received periodically a visit from the faculty affairs committee for the purpose of discussing matters of mutual interest and concern. I feel that these channels of communication assisted greatly in sparing the college some of the extremes of student activism that manifested themselves in violence, burnings, and disruptions of classes on other campuses.

Williams: I know that you had a very lively interest in admissions. Would you comment on admissions during your administration?

Paschall: Well, as early as August 1960, I felt that in view of what would be a deluge of students seeking admission we should have some policy that would guide us. The board did then establish a ratio of 70 percent in-state students to 30 percent out-of-state. This guaranteed us a cosmopolitan student body which I felt was so essential to the college in its aspiration to maintain a national character. Despite many changes this policy ratio remained and was inherited by my successor. It is significant that by 1970 almost ten percent of the seventy percent in-state students had lived in Virginia for less than five years. This was the result of the increased influx of industry and business in the state, the transition from an agrarian society, and the rapid

urbanization of many areas of Virginia.

Williams: Do you recall any specific comparisons regarding students admitted?

Paschall: If the reputation of an institution of higher learning can be implied from the qualifications of its students, then no area better reflects the changes that occurred at William and Mary during the '60s than admissions. In 1959 the entering freshman was one of 791 selected from 2700 applicants. In 1969 he was one of 900 selected from 5,775 applicants. I have here some data that I would like to give you: in 1959 twenty-five percent of entering freshmen were from the top tenth rank in their high school graduating class, but in 1969 sixty-five percent were from the top tenth rank. In 1959 five percent of the entering freshmen were valedictorians or salutatorians in their high school graduating class, but in 1969 thirteen percent were in this category.

Here is a breakdown of some interesting facts about the 1969 entering class: three-fourths were members of the National Honor Society, 56 were high school student body presidents, 259 held other student body offices, 77 were newspaper editors, 355 were Key and Keyette Club members, 119 were Boys' and Girls' State delegates, 225 were outstanding debaters, 145 were captains of varsity athletic teams. The large majority had four or more extracurricular activities.

The verbal average Scholastic Aptitude Test score for

entering freshmen in 1959 was 520. In 1969 it was 612. The math average increased from 530 to 628. I never relished such test scores as a criterion, but it was a common practice. I felt it was an unfair determinism in educational practice for many reasons, and I urged our admissions staff to minimize its importance. In 1959 sons and daughters of alumni in the freshman class constituted four percent. In 1969 the number was ten percent. I felt that it was a fine tribute to the college for sons and daughters of alumni to wish to attend. Their qualifications were assessed like those of other applicants. If it were felt in some instances that the comparison indicated a hard time in succeeding academically, the admissions officer was to telephone the parents and reveal the facts, leaving the choice to the parents. In all such cases but one that I recall, the son or daughter went elsewhere, but in many instances transferred to William and Mary later. In the one case that I recall, the student failed to make it in his freshman year. I might add that we introduced an early decision plan in 1964 that helped students and the college by reducing the necessity for multiple applications by students, by distributing more efficiently the burden on the admissions office, and by helping both the applicant and the college determine mutual commitment in November rather than wait through the regular decision process which continued into the spring. So in summary the college by 1970 was nationally

regarded as a highly selective institution dedicated to quality and excellence.

Williams: It certainly was. Now I know at a couple of points the U.S. Office of Education contacted the college in regard to discrimination in admissions.

Paschall: Yes, there were three instances that I am glad to relate. For many years (and up until about 1964) the college had required applicants to submit pictures of themselves and also to indicate on their application their religious affiliation. The first was done more out of practice than anything else, and the latter was done to provide the information to local churches and synagogues who wished to invite incoming freshmen to their services. It was suggested that we discontinue both, and we did. Under the impact of efforts in behalf of minorities in the late 1960s, I felt that the elimination of the picture tended to work adversely for them.

Another instance was that of applications by teachers from many states for a summer science institute which was each summer supported by a federal grant. We were told not to ask for pictures of the applicants. When we discontinued the practice there was a corresponding decline in minority admissions.

The third instance was a communication from the regional U.S. Office of Civil Rights indicating that we should establish quotas for minority race students and recruit them for

admission. I replied that it would be as discriminatory to recruit by race for established quotas as it would be to do so by creed. I pointed out that the admissions policies had and did focus on the academic preparation and potential of the applicant, and I cited the Board of Visitors policy statement:

Within the limits of its facilities as to numbers that can be accommodated, the right of admission to William and Mary is open to all students who are qualified according to the standards of admission stated in the College Catalogue. The facilities and services of the college are open to all enrolled students, and all standards and policies are applied without respect to race, creed, color or national origin.

This reply evidently satisfied the federal representatives.

I can assure anyone that the college had no discriminatory practices.

Williams: From all that we've talked about today did you have much time for your family for vacations?

Paschall: I believe it is evident from all the developments I have described that the president's position during that exciting period was a time-consuming one. I usually worked late into the evening. I took only three vacations during that period. One was for five weeks when my wife and I went to Europe and Greece. Even then I addressed an international conference in Salzburg. Another was one week one summer spent at Jackson Hole, Wyoming, and the third was for two weeks spent at San Diego. The latter involved my going to Los Angeles to address an alumni chapter. If I had had the administrative

organization earlier than 1968 and 1969, I might have been able to delegate more. If I had been made up differently I might have found more time for personal consideration. But the college was in my nervous system, and I felt there was so much to be done for it. Only an alumnus who loves the college deeply can fully comprehend what I am trying to say.

Despite all the innovative and creative thought that one can bring to bear in such a position, there remains a sizeable amount of pure drudgery in taking pains putting pieces together and buttoning up details to assure success in meaningful tasks and objectives. When one cares enough -- and I most certainly did -- the overall demand on energy, effort, and time is often exhausting, but deeply rewarding.

Williams: I believe you may want to pay tribute to your family during that period.

Paschall: My wife was a jewel. As an alumna of the college she shared my feelings for the college. Because of her understanding, she put up, so to speak, with my late working hours and the many demands on her to accompany me to numerous banquets and occasions, often on quick notice on my part. She deserved a medal for having to listen to my speeches. She was the one who arranged for the teas and receptions in the President's House for students and faculty and visitors. She also arranged for the house to be open for garden club occasions, for the Association of Preservation of Antiquities ^{for the} ^{Virginia} events, and other appropriate occasions. Above all, she had